HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—THIRTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

44 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XII, 1995

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE NINTH DAY OF JUNE, 1995
TO THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1995

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 9, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

The House resumed from June 8 consideration of Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and on Motions Nos. 1 to 7.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate Bill C–85, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, and the amendments the government proposes. I am doing it in the short time that remains, given the closure and time allocation tactics of the government.

The amendments to the bill submitted under my name and under the name of the member for Calgary Centre have four main functions. First, to bring the members of Parliament pension plan into line with the private sector, both for MPs and Senators. Second, to allow MPs in this and in all future Parliaments to fully opt out of the pension plan. Third, to impose a Canadian citizenship requirement on all plan members. Fourth, to subject members pensions to the same clawback provisions that exist to old age security, something the Liberal government had opposed when it was in opposition but now seems to believe is fully acceptable for ordinary Canadians.

We are debating the first set of motions. Motion No. 4 provides that if a province separated, members of Parliament from that province would not automatically draw a pension from the Canadian government. This is the effect of proposing a citizenship requirement. We will be very interested to see whether it is the intention of the government to guarantee pensions to members who eventually may not be citizens of the country.

I have heard some comments from members of the separatist party in the House that they do not care what is happening in the House because they will not be here in the fall anyway. I happen to think they are wrong and they may be here much longer. In any case this raises an interesting question.

[*Translation*]

It is because the members of the Bloc Quebecois are insisting that Quebec is going to separate in the coming year, I suppose.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): This amendment in fact reveals the strength of their convictions on this objective.

Bloc members' intention to guarantee their own Canadian pension or participate in this retirement pension plan indicates a lack of confidence in the possibility of separation. I suppose there is an element of sacrifice in the sovereignty project. Interestingly enough, the Bloc Quebecois is proposing putting Quebecers in a position to lose the benefits of Confederation, including pension benefits, but is pushing here for the adoption of the Parliament's pension plan.

I would suggest that one way to show their good faith in the matter would be to vote for this amendment and to support the idea that things like pensions need to be negotiated, if, by chance, Quebec should really separate after the referendum.

[*English*]

It will be interesting. I doubt the Bloc will be prepared to take such a daring step in the House of Commons.

The effect of Motions Nos. 1 and 6 are to change the opting out provisions so members of future Parliaments can make a one time decision to opt in or out of the plan during the first 60 days the House sits after they are elected. Reform MPs will save taxpayers over $38 million by opting out and clearly in the absence of substantive changes to the plan future parliamentarians must have this option as well.

• (1010)

We will keep in mind that the failures of the government are starting to add up. While it may reject some of the populist measures used by my party I expect the next federal election to

be very much a referendum on issues like MP pensions. I do not believe by any means this issue will go away even if government members defeat this amendment.

We will see as in the Ontario election this is a hot issue and will still be a hot issue in the next federal election. Voters will ask for members to cut their pensions without any increase in pay, a suggestion which I think is perfectly reasonable.

Motions Nos. 2 and 3 change the bill so that a member who dies before the expiry of the 60–day decision period is assumed not to have opted in. Bill C–85 automatically opts these people in. I guess Reformers would rather assume the best of people than the worst of people.

It seems strange the government would make the default option here an assumption of action of opting in. I understand a lot of pressure is being placed on backbench Liberals to opt into this plan so the driving forces of the plan, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister, do not look too bad. Forcing dead MPs to opt into the pension plan is taking the idea of party discipline to new heights or to new depths even for the Liberal Party.

We know who will bear the brunt of the public backlash of this in the next election. It will be the Liberal backbenchers who did not really support the plan, who were told to participate and who if they lose the election will lose all pension in any case. This is really a remarkable coincidence of both lack of intelligence and lack of integrity coming together on an issue.

Motions Nos. 5 and 7 change the bill to allow all members to opt out completely. Under Bill C–85 MPs who as of October 1993 already had six years of service could only opt out of benefits earned after the last federal election, thus creating the terms trough regular and trough light which we like to refer to, the two tier system.

We have talked already about how this inability for longer serving MPs to completely opt out of Bill C–85 creates the two tier system. However, this is a minor issue in my opinion. The real issue is the two tier system between MP pensions and what is available to other Canadians.

One of the witnesses who testified before the committee which studied this bill, and I use the term studied very loosely, Mr. Brian Corbishley of Edmonton, testified the pension proposed under Bill C–85 is about seven times more generous than a typical public sector plan and four times more generous than a typical private sector plan. Mr. Corbishley's testimony and others should be listened to much more carefully and much more seriously than some of the government members seem to take this issue.

In Alberta Mr. Corbishley's firm, Peat Marwick, proposed a pension scheme for MLAs much less generous than that which existed in Alberta at the time. The plan in Alberta at the time was almost identical to what the government is now proposing.

In the heat of the pre–election build up in Alberta the government refused to significantly alter that plan to deal with the objections of taxpayers and citizens and it was increasingly looking like that government would face defeat in the election. Ultimately Mr. Klein ended up abolishing the plan, a major factor in his winning the election and doing some of the good things in Alberta he is now trying to do.

What is interesting about this, and I urge Liberal members to consider it very carefully, is ultimately a half hearted attempt to reform the MLA pension plan in Alberta resulted in MLAs in Alberta having no pension plan whatsoever, a situation which I do not think is ideal but which will result if the government follows the course it is on.

• (1015)

I urge members once again to consider some of these amendments. They will significantly alter the bill to make it more acceptable to the public. Ultimately the public will find this bill unacceptable. We know the MP pension plan will die because of the unreasonable form it is in today. It will die in any form and there will be no increase in compensation that the members on the other side so earnestly desire and do not deserve.

In any case, I ask them to consider these amendments and I thank them for their patience.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few points with respect to the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Calgary West because they deserve some comment.

They are clearly amendments—

An hon. member: You already gave your comments.

Mr. Milliken: No, I have not spoken on the bill. This is the first time I have spoken to the bill at this stage in the House. The hon. member should be pleased that he is getting a balanced approach to the bill instead of the twisted rhetoric that the Reform Party is engaging in.

I want to point out a couple of things that are important to the Canadian public in viewing the bill. We are hearing a great deal from members of the Reform Party about wanting to abolish the pension altogether. They say that if we get rid of these pensions then everything would come up roses and we would solve the problem.

I want to point out first of all that some members of the House were elected at a time when there was not significant discussion in the House or in the country about abolition of these pensions.

I draw the hon. member's attention to the 1988 election. He was a Tory then and was working for a Tory member of Parliament who was seeking re–election and who was going to earn a pension. He may have already qualified for all I know. I do not know who he was working for in those days but he was very supportive of the whole thing. There was no public debate about pensions in 1988.

Many members who were elected at that time in good faith left their employment, took a reduction in the earnings they had on the basis of a certain salary that was stated to be the salary for members of Parliament plus the possibility of earning a pension at the conclusion of their term of service in the House of Commons.

The pension was generous. It is generous and remains generous. That is true. However the members of Parliament who entered the lists, as it were, for the election in 1988 and in all previous elections did so on the basis that at the end of their term of office they would be compensated in some way that was generous but was designed to make up for the loss of income they suffered in being elected to Parliament in the first place.

The hon. member is now saying that those people had expectations that were out of line, that they do not qualify to receive the pension to which they are entitled under the law. These people in the Reform Party want to change the law to prevent those persons from receiving those pensions.

I can understand their approach when only one of them has qualified for a pension, when only one of them was a successful candidate in 1988. In fact she lost in 1988 and then got elected in a subsequent byelection. There was not a single one of them in 1988 and they were not talking pensions big time during that election. It was a non–issue.

It was a non–issue for me in 1993. Nevertheless, the members of the Reform Party insist that members who were elected before are somehow pigs at the trough because they were elected under a system of remuneration which they are now accepting.

Most people enter a career looking at the remuneration package and seeing what it is like. When they are successful in either choosing the job or in this case getting elected to the job, they are then told by Reformers who come along later, Johnny come latelys if ever there were any, that somehow they are pigs at the trough because the remuneration package that they accepted when they started the employment is unacceptable to the new group.

First of all, that is a stupid argument. It is wrong. The members of the House who were duly elected on the basis of a package are entitled to receive the package they obtained.

What has the government done? It made two promises in 1993 to change that package. One was to prohibit double dipping and the second one was to put a minimum age in place so that members would not draw a pension at an unduly young age.

The bill fully complies with those promises. The age change is there and the double dipping prohibition is there. The government went beyond that and reduced the rate at which the pension accrues which means members of Parliament who are elected on a certain remuneration package will in fact get less. That is a very significant change which is totally unappreciated by the members of the Reform Party for one good reason. They are all going to opt out.

• (1020)

I suggest the electorate will opt them out of the pension scheme. They will not qualify anyway. The only one that has qualified is the member for Beaver River. I suggest none of the others would qualify anyway.

The member for Beaver River has been on a rant on this issue for one good reason. She has been cheated out of her pension by her colleagues who have muzzled her, beaten her into the ground and forced her to opt out of the pension scheme so she can join their ranks. They will be taken away by the electorate anyway in the next election. They will not qualify but they have muzzled her into opting out so she is in a fit of rage.

She is the one, with her leader who asked for the opting out clause and now wants it taken out of this bill. She wants it removed from this bill because she wants her pension. She is having a fit because she cannot get her pension. I hear she is taking wrestling lessons in Calgary this weekend because she needs to be able to deal with her caucus colleagues. She is being wrestled to the ground.

I want to turn to one other aspect. We keep hearing we should cut the pension more. We have not gone far enough. However, we do not hear from the Reform Party that we should change the double dipping scheme more by preventing double dipping not just by people who take federal appointments but by those who are receiving another pension from another source. Why is that? Because there are at least three members on the other side who are earning substantial pensions from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Morrison: Federal?

Mr. Milliken: Yes, three of them are federal. They are getting big, fat military pensions and maybe others. They are pocketing that money while they sit in the House earning a salary. They do not talk about extending double dipping because their colleagues will feel it in the pocketbook. They should have more sympathy for the hon. member for Beaver River and let her express her own opinions without wrestling her into the ground on this issue.

Look at the other pensions they are getting. When hon. members opposite stand up and say they are not taking their pensions, why do they not also stand up and say: "The reason I am not taking my MPs' pension is because I am already getting a pension from another source". Why do they not come clean and tell us about that? I do not have a pension from another source, but some of the hon. members opposite I know do have one.

Why do those members not stand up and say: "I'm getting a pension from another source, so I don't need an MPs' pension. I'm happy to opt out". I know why. They would be embarrassed if they were caught double dipping later. It is amazing the members that are double dipping now are not confessing to it. We do not hear any talk about that. Why does the hon. member for Calgary West, in his white knight charger set of amendments, not propose the kind of amendments that will cut out the double dippers in his own party? Why will he not do that? I know why he will not. Because his leader told him not to.

His leader knows all about pensions and the way to collect pensions. His father was in the Senate which is a pension haven. Everybody knows that. His leader's father was a senator for years.

It is quite unbelievable that members of the Reform Party who speak on one side saying that we have to cut the pension will not speak on the other and say that we should cut double dipping more. Why will they not? They know all about double dipping. They are pros at double dipping. They know how to get big, fat pensions from other sources. I will not mention names but hon. members opposite know who I mean when I say there are people sitting there who are getting fat cat pensions of $40,000, $50,000, $60,000 a year and they are earning their salary here as MPs at the same time.

In many cases those pensions are paid out of public funds. They may not be paid in every case by the federal government but they are paid out of taxpayers' funds.

We do not hear a word about it either from the Reform Party or from their friend David Somerville and the National Citizens' Coalition who is a mouthpiece for the Reform Party on this issue. The two of them have been in bed together for years.

The hon. member for Calgary West and the National Citizens' Coalition conspired together to defeat the former Tory member because of his views on the pension and on electoral reform. He knows that. He knows they have been working together to do this. The Reform Party members in the House and their performance in calling other members names, calling other members who have earned their pensions in good faith pigs, are absolutely disgracing this House. They should be ashamed of their conduct. The hon. member for Beaver River after her performance yesterday, threatening to beat up members of the House, should also be ashamed of her performance also.

• (1025)

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In reference to the member's remarks during his intervention, where he accused a member of beating someone up, if he is accusing her of doing that in the House I wonder if he could retract that statement. It is absolute nonsense and he knows it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order, please. I have had the benefit of being in the chair for the better part, if not the entire portion, of this debate. I am well seized of the fact that it has been a very vigorous debate. I would say respectfully to the hon. member for Fraser Valley East that his point of order is a matter of debate. It is not a point of order according to our standing orders, our own rules in this House.

I would urge members on both sides participating in this debate to be judicious and to continue to be respectful of one another, and certainly of the collectivity of this institution, the House of Commons.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues I rise to speak on Bill C–85 with a heavy heart and a sense of despondency.

Yesterday we were again reminded that there is no respect for the democratic process on the government benches. Once again they have not once, not twice, but three times invoked time allocation, thus stifling honest parliamentary debate on matters of great importance to Canadians.

It is perhaps appropriate that I speak after the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader because I am one of the people who he referred to as drawing a pension from the military. I have no trouble admitting that. I served for over 36 years in the military. I paid into a pension fund 7.5 per cent of my pay for 35 of those years, which was the maximum that I could qualify for. The fund from which I draw my pension is now $30 billion and growing as people continue to contribute to it. Therefore, the idea that the taxpayer is paying my pension is absolutely ludicrous.

I have no regrets about it. Double dipping has been adequately defined as the retirement of a member of Parliament who has been appointed to a government job and continues to draw his pension and his salary at the same time.

I earned my place here. The people who elected me knew that I was drawing a military pension and they knew that I would be keeping that pension once I was elected. I feel there is no problem, but I have some doubts about the honesty and impartiality of the parliamentary secretary in this instance.

The Reform Party is placing before the House 35 amendments to Bill C–85. First, if implemented, these amendments would bring the MPs pension scheme into line with the private sector for both MPs and senators, and failing that, second, the amendments would change the opting out provisions so that newly

elected members would have a choice to opt out of the plan to allow all MPs to withdraw from participation in the plan. Third, Motion No. 4 would ensure that all members of the plan are Canadian citizens. Fourth, Motion No. 34 is based on the private member's bill of the hon. member for Yellowhead, which would make provisions to recover former senators and MPs pensions on the same basis as other income received by a former member, if that former member was in that year entitled to receive old age security.

• (1030)

These 35 motions are important for Parliament and for the Canadian taxpayer. Unhappily, it appears that presentation of these motions is a futile parliamentary exercise as it becomes increasingly evident that the government has made up its mind and will move ahead with the legislation as it stands.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been listening with interest to my friend from Saanich—Gulf Islands. I believe him to be a man of integrity. I do not think he meant to say it but he did say it quite directly. He questioned the honesty of the member for Kingston and the Islands.

Under the rules, you will be aware, Mr. Speaker, it is not permitted to cast aspersions on the integrity of an individual. I would ask that you ask him to withdraw that aspersion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In listening to the member's intervention I suppose what I should do and will do is review the blues for verification of the wording and possibly the spirit of what was said.

I take the member's point of order with great seriousness and, if necessary, I will report back to the House.

Mr. Frazer: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation to withdraw the comments the member for Burin—St. George's referred to. They were uttered inadvertently. I did not intend to cast aspersions on the parliamentary secretary's integrity or his honesty.

The House has heard many arguments as to why the proposed revisions to the MP pension plan are still too generous. Committee members have received repeated testimony from highly qualified witnesses who confirm that the plan is still far too rich and is basically poor public policy.

Let me quote Paul McCrossan, a former member of Parliament and now an actuary for Eckler Partners Ltd., who appeared before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. He said:

> My conclusion is that the bill is bad for you as members, bad for Parliament as an institution and bad for Canada because, having acted on this bill, you will hamstring this Parliament in dealing effectively with the most urgent challenges it faces, namely redesigning Canada's national retirement income and medical care systems to reflect the financial realities of Canada as well as Canada's rapidly aging population.

This is exactly what is now happening. Parliament is hamstrung from dealing with important issues of the day: our increasing deficit and debt, social program reform and building a stronger economy which will produce more jobs for Canadians, to name just a few key problems.

Despite the apparent futility of our efforts, Reform members cannot, with good conscience, allow the legislation to slip by without resistance. Perhaps those large pink pigs placed on the front lawn of Parliament to protest this pension scheme last week say it best. Surely there is no other place in this great nation where people are authorized to legislate the amount of their own benefits and salaries.

I would agree with those who contend that the basic pay of members of Parliament is insufficient when the responsibility and workload are considered. However, this pension benefit cannot be justified and continues to leave a foul taste in the mouths of all taxpayers.

Is our government blind to what is right? Why, rather than paying lip service, has it not undertaken realistic pension reform? Certainly there have been enough good suggestions given both in the House and in representations to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Reform member for Beaver River will refuse her million dollar payout and, under the deliberately planned punitive opting out provisions, will lose any government contributions made to that plan.

Members will know that normal pension plans see the employer matching employee contributions. Even with the revisions to the pension plan instituted by the government, the taxpayer will be contributing an excessive $3.60 for every dollar members of Parliament contribute.

• (1035)

The government made the opting out provision punitive because it very much wanted the member for Beaver River to opt into the plan so that during the next election it could point the finger at members of Reform Party and say that we were no different from the others.

But we are different. We fought for these very principles during the last election. The parliamentary secretary's reference to the fact that it is Reformers who are bringing these measures to Parliament is absolutely wrong. Yes, we are transmitting it, but we are bringing the message from all Canadian taxpayers.

Unhappily, despite the wishes of the parliamentary secretary, it would appear that the same issue will be around again in the next election.

I return to Paul McCrossan's testimony before the committee about the legislation. Referring to the legislation he said:

> It does nothing to develop a sensible compensation package for members and may actually impede redesign. It entrenches your benefits at a level higher than those available to general taxpayers. At the same time it reduces the cost of your compensation package.
>
> So when you come to redo a compensation package, you will be left with having then to increase it from the level you have reduced it to and it is going to make it much more difficult to do it in two steps rather than one.
>
> It reduces compensation for future service but leaves benefits substantially above the private sector and, indeed, public sector permissible levels.

It is just this that members from this side of the House have been saying. The benefits go well beyond anything in the public realm.

Some time in the future MPs will again decide that the compensation package is not adequate and adjustments will be made.

Many take great pride in pointing out that MPs have curtailed their salaries in seven of the fourteen years since the present pension scheme was adopted in 1981. Are the salaries kept low in exchange for generous benefits? That question has been raised many times in the House and in committee.

The study by Sabeco, Ernst and Young called for a 37 per cent increase in MP salaries, accompanied by a reduction in pension benefits, also recommending that they should be limited to retirees who are at least 60 years of age.

The report further suggests that when the parliamentary wage freeze is lifted in 1996 the MP basic annual salary be increased to $75,000, and that prior to the next election Parliament be urged to pass legislation to increase MPs' salaries to $86,000 to take effect on the first day of the 36th Parliament.

Given the political climate, the ever present debt and deficit and this ineffective pseudo pension reform, I do not believe the government has the political will to make these badly needed appropriate changes to current MP compensation and pension arrangements.

Once again let me go back to Paul McCrossan who said:

> I believe that legislating preferred treatment for yourselves, even if it is reduced preferred treatment, as proposed under this bill—will continue to foster cynicism.

Each of us holds a very privileged position and thus must make every effort to avoid abuse of that position.

As long as Parliament holds the power to set members own salaries, perks and pensions, the job will clearly not be effectively achieved. Politics will come into play as they have in this instance and longstanding MPs will resist every effort to make appropriate changes to the pension plan.

Even in the Progressive Conservative government Wilson budget of 1986 provisions were made to lower MP pensions to private sector levels. We could wonder why this had not happened but the answer is clear. Decisions such as this cannot be left in the hands of Parliament. Rather, a competent, independent body must be assigned to ensure appropriate compensation and pension reforms are implemented.

It is not too late even at this report stage to make some important changes. The proposed reductions make only a small dent in the cost to the taxpayer. Treasury Board officials have indicated that most of the savings will result from actuarial factors rather than legislated changes.

For my own part, unless the government makes real changes which bring the MP pension scheme into line with that of other Canadians, I will be signifying my intention not to opt into the proposed plan.

I call on government to go back to the drawing board, heed the very clear direction given by its own constituents and make meaningful, realistic changes to Bill C–85. I call on rank and file members of the government to press for these changes. They know what is right and proper. They know that Bill C–85 does not meet this need, and they should know that a concerted effort on their part could influence the changes needed to fulfil at least one of the promises made in the red book.

• (1040)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me deal with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Burin—St. George's. I express my appreciation and respect for the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for his withdrawal. I am not recognizing or ruling that it was necessary, but I welcome his initiative. I will not be reviewing the blues and consider the matter closed.

I should like to return momentarily to the point of order raised previously by the member for Fraser Valley East. I ruled that it was not a point of order and I continue to believe that to be the case. The issue which occurred yesterday between two hon. members is presently before the Speaker for a ruling. I would deem any allusion to the incident inappropriate at this time.

Vigorous debate certainly will not be curtailed by myself while I am in the chair, but I would ask that respect be extended particularly to the institution and more specifically to the two members involved.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the committee that studied the bill. I also participated in second reading debate on the bill.

[*Translation*]

Today, I am again going to take a few minutes of the House's time to give my opinion on this bill. I support the comments of

one of my colleagues, who said yesterday that she had no qualms about accepting her paycheque and the benefits of being a member of Parliament, and neither do I. I consider that I work and that I do the job expected of me. If the voters in my riding consider this no longer to be the case at some point, I would encourage them strongly to replace me, rather than lower the salary and benefits of parliamentarians, thus probably reducing the calibre of those who stand for public office.

[*English*]

I take exception to something the member for Calgary said a little earlier today about members of the Bloc retiring and their MPs pension. I am paraphrasing his remarks when he said that if they lived in another country they should not receive their MPs pension. I for one hope the country never separates. I pray it does not. In the unlikely event that it would, the logic of the hon. member would be absolutely disastrous to my constituents.

I have people in my riding who work in Quebec and live in Ontario. Does that mean they would be denied the Quebec pension plan, their employers' pension plans and so on? We can see how stupid that kind of reasoning can be if applied. I dissociate myself as a staunch federalist from the comments of the hon. member. They are wrong and they further create and augment the kind of division which he and others say should not exist in the country. He is appealing to the lowest common denominator in trying to get his point across.

An hon. member: You are grasping at straws.

Mr. Boudria: I am not grasping at straws. The unity of the country is not straw. It is a strong principle. To try to run roughshod over the benefits of my constituents is not grasping at straws. It may be in the minds of some members across the way. We know what they stand for.

Before getting into the issue of MPs' pensions let me talk about the lack of understanding toward one another. Mr. Speaker has made a judgment on one incident and I will not refer to that one.

• (1045)

There is another incident that happened yesterday in which members across, in the same party, said something as follows.

[*Translation*]

They said the Liberal and the Bloc members were conniving in some sort of treason—that is what they said—because the three bills will be adopted by the House by June 23. In support of their remarks, they said that the reason was in order to celebrate the Saint–Jean–Baptiste holiday. First, as we know, the holiday falls on a Saturday, this year. Second, if it fell during the week, the House would not sit that day. So, that is wrong. Third, and most important, as my hon. colleague for Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine has just said, celebrating the Saint–Jean–Baptiste holiday is not treasonous.

The members opposite have no sense of our country's culture. They should learn about it. People in my riding celebrate the Saint–Jean–Baptiste holiday, and, this year, they will be celebrating in the village of Cheney. Thousands will be there, and they are not traitors. The members opposite who describe them as such are mistaken. They should apologize to the House and, more importantly, to all French speaking Canadians for having made such stupid remarks about our fellow citizens. This is what is important. Once again, the Reform Party members stooped as low as they could to support their remarks.

[*English*]

They are using the same kind of thing now in the MPs pension issue. The people in the third party across—it was them I was referring to, not to any other colleague—talk selectively about what they say is the unfair compensation MPs receive.

We had a member here making comments while he is receiving a lucrative pension from the federal government, claiming that he has a right to receive such a pension but that nobody else does, and saying that with a straight face.

Other hon. members have said that they would not refer to the MPs who were receiving some of these double dipping pensions. As they say in the province of my hon. colleague from Newfoundland, "What is good for Goose Bay is good for Gander". So I do not mind raising some of these things.

It has been said that the Deputy Prime Minister, were she to retire today—and not that she will, she will be an hon. member of this House for decades to come—would receive a pension. What is the difference then from the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, a Reform MP, who receives a pension as a former military officer? He has a right to receive it. That is not the point. Why does he think that nobody else does? What makes him that god–like creature he thinks he is? What about the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan, a general, who says that he can receive a pension but others should not were they to retire in the future?

What about the member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke, a former federal government employee? What about retired teachers across the way? What about retired MLAs who are receiving an MLA pension from a legislature across this country? They stand up in this House and say they are not going to get an MP pension. Do members know why? Because they are getting one from elsewhere already from the public purse. That is the truth.

No matter how they try to camouflage and wrap that truth, the truth will always be the truth. We know. That is not grasping at straws, that is stating fact. Fact sometimes gets in the way of Reform Party policy.

Reform Party MPs have said that the taxpayers of Canada contribute these huge amounts toward MPs' pensions. I have here the document tabled by the President of the Treasury Board. It is a report on the administration of the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. There is not one year since 1952 in which the contributions to the plan were less than the money going out of the plan in pensions—not one year.

• (1050)

Mr. Speaker, I will give you examples of various years. For instance, the total receipts for the year 1990–91 were $7 million to the plan and the disbursements were $6 million. The disbursements in 1989–90 were $7 million, with $6.3 million in withdrawals, and so on—total receipts, total disbursements.

When some members opposite claim that the amount creates a huge debt of some sort, that is factually incorrect and they know it. This report was tabled in the House by an officer of the government. It was designed to show these numbers. But they refuse to listen to that. They invent, they concoct numbers of their own, supported by the likes of David Somerville, whose claim to fame is to draw little pigs in newspapers. That is all they have to support their argument.

Between that and the nonsense we heard today that only some MPs should be entitled to a pension and others who have different political views, such as Bloc members, are not entitled, and that members should be able to get a military pension and an MP's salary but that other people should not get a pension, that is the kind of logic that works for Reform thinking but not for logical thinking.

[*Translation*]

It is time to inject an element of intellectual honesty into this debate. I am not ashamed of my salary as a member of Parliament, I earn it. If the voters of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell do not think I am worth this salary, they should not lower it, they should find someone who can do the job better, if that is what is required some day or other.

I say to the members opposite that, if they do not think they are earning their pay, they should work harder and not claim that salaries should be cut. If they are embarrassed about their lack of ability, they should improve their skills. If they are ashamed because they are not working hard enough, let them work a little harder for the voters who sent them here. I was elected by the voters in my riding to do my best, and that is what I intend to do so long as I am here.

That is what the members opposite should do instead of continuing to make Canadians believe things that are the opposite of the truth, to say the least.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thought it might not be necessary for me to speak to this bill on the parliamentarians' pension plan.

I have been a member of this House since 1984. I did not go into politics because of the pension but because I had a vision of the future. I did not run for Parliament because of the salary; I did not even know how much members made until after I was elected. So you can see, my first concern was not about salary and pension. It was to defend the public interest, the interests of the people of Longueuil, as well as my party's policies, which I believe in.

Since the Reform Party says that Bloc members should not receive a pension from the federal government if Quebec ever becomes sovereign, I wish to reiterate what I said on several occasions in response to English speaking journalists. I asked them if someone now working for a U.S. company, who has contributed to this company's pension fund for 10 or 15 years, will not be entitled to receive his pension from a U.S. company because he is Canadian.

I think that is the major issue in this case. I have been working for the Canadian government for 11 years. We as members are not employers, but we still work for the Canadian state, and the day Quebec becomes sovereign, I will have made my own contribution to a pension fund. I do not see how anyone can say today that I would not have the right to receive what I paid into this plan.

• (1055)

That is why I think that such statements are totally disloyal and a little twisted coming as they do from the Reform Party, and from some journalists who have often argued that it would not be legitimate for us to receive a pension should Quebec achieve sovereignty.

I am feeling very legitimate and very comfortable, because I have contributed to this pension fund and I am simply entitled to it, whether it comes from an American or Canadian company or from the Canadian government. I am entitled to it because I have already contributed to this fund for 11 years.

Whenever I hear talk of a gold-plated pension plan, I think that, as far as I know, the majority of people who go into politics do not come here for the fat pension we receive after we leave. Most politicians, at least those I know, did not go into politics for the pension fund; they came here to further the interests of their party and put forward what it stands for.

Such arguments do not seem valid to me, and I do not think that the Reform Party will score very many points by trying to give the public the impression that members of Parliament are overpaid and that their pensions are too generous. I think that this is of little concern to the people of Canada.

All they want is, first and foremost, to have jobs and healthy businesses that can create more jobs. Canadians want the kind of climate that will be conducive to a sound economy that will lead to job creation. I think that is what they want. Whether MPs make $64,400, $64,00 or $75,000, they really do not care, but they care about their member's performance. They also want their MP to fulfil their aspirations in many respects. In any case, people of my riding of Longueuil have seldom told me that I was making too much money. Their comments had more to do about whether they felt I was doing a good job or not or representing them well or not.

As the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said earlier, the reason why constituents complain about their MPs is not because they are making too much money but rather because they are not paying enough attention to fulfilling their wishes. That is the spirit in which this bill, which seems reasonable to me, should be supported.

The government has come a long way, and if there is one aspect that I might have questioned myself, it is the fact that pensions are paid as soon as MPs leave public life one way or the other, but this bill provides for pensions to start when MPs reach the age of 55, and that sounds reasonable to me. Reducing slightly pension benefits, which may have been on the high side, also seems reasonable to me.

For these reasons, I support the bill on pensions.

The Speaker: My colleagues, it being 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members under Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the chemical weapons convention opened for ratification in January 1993 and will become law when ratified by a minimum of 65 states. According to authoritative doctrine, it codifies the general principles of the international law of war already recognized in customary international law from at least the time of the Geneva protocol of 1925.

The treaty itself symbolically caps an historical process of lawmaking already in place on interdiction of chemical weapons, which applies legally whether or not and until the treaty itself should become law in its own right.

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC CITY BRIDGE

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, because of the federal government's inertia when it comes to adequately maintaining the Quebec City bridge, 25 organizations, including Quebec City authorities and municipalities located on the south shore, formed a coalition to ask the federal Minister of Transport to do what is necessary to save and promote this part of our national heritage.

The coalition is also asking that the bridge be excluded from CN's assets for the purposes of the bill on the privatization of that railway company, as was done in the case of the CN tower, in Toronto.

Quebecers are more and more fed up with the federal government's double standard policy.

* * *

[*English*]

TAIWANESE CANADIANS

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Taiwanese Canadian Cultural Society has brought to my attention an example of discrimination against Canadians that should not be tolerated by this government.

It seems that when Canadians of Taiwanese origin apply for visas to China their visa applications are refused. We know what the policy of China toward Taiwan is. There probably is not a lot the Canadian government can do about that. However, when Canadian citizens are discriminated against overseas because of the country of birth they list in their passports, then it is incumbent on our government to get involved. This is not an issue of two countries disagreeing over sovereignty. This is a matter of the fair treatment of Canadians around the world.

I call on this government to get involved and to use its newfound influence in China. We must not put trade above the fair and just treatment of citizens of Canada. We must defend what is right and attack what is wrong. End the unfair treatment of Taiwanese Canadians.

* * *

THE LATE CHARLES RITCHIE

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we note the passing of one of Canada's most distinguished diplomats, Mr. Charles Ritchie.

Charles Ritchie did much to enhance Canada's stature in the world community in the troubled years of the post World War II period. In nearly 40 years of service with the Department of External Affairs, Charles Ritchie served in high profile and

demanding diplomatic posts as high commissioner to Great Britain, ambassador to the United States, UN ambassador, ambassador to NATO, Germany and in Ottawa as deputy undersecretary of state for external affairs and special adviser to the Privy Council Office.

After retiring in 1971, Mr. Ritchie enjoyed a successful career as an author. He was later named a companion of the Order of Canada.

On behalf of my colleagues, I express condolences to Mrs. Ritchie, the family and friends.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, National Transportation Week is a fitting time to recall the historical role played by transportation in the prairie provinces.

We understand the importance of an efficient and cost effective transportation system. We live surrounded by immense distances. At one time in our history we relied completely on the railway to link us with the rest of the country. Now we are served by air and road as well as by rail. What is needed is an efficient and cost effective national transportation system, not subsidies.

Western grain producers are ready to compete with the world. With the repeal of the WGTA and the proposed amendments to the National Transportation Act regarding efficiency measures, we believe they will be even better prepared for the challenges of the global economy.

The theme of this year's National Transportation Week is "Careers in Transportation: Opportunities, Training and Skills". It should remind us that the future holds opportunities as well as challenges.

If Canada is to have the transportation system it needs, we will need to start now to recruit, educate and train those who will keep the country moving in the years to come.

* * *

ST. BRIEUX, SASKATCHEWAN

Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in praise of my home province of Saskatchewan, in particular the town of St. Brieux in the northeast corner of my riding.

St. Brieux is an extraordinary town. It is 90 minutes northeast of Saskatoon with a vigorous farm equipment manufacturing plant, lots of employment, business opportunities, schools and is bilingual. The gateway to the northern lakes, it has golf, hockey and no crime. So ran the ad in the *Toronto Sun* about two weeks ago. A four bedroom house can be purchased for a mere $48,000.

If it is quality of life they are seeking, Torontonians will soon be flocking to St. Brieux, especially after last night's election results. The possibility of living in a kinder, gentler and economically robust environment should make Saskatchewan a more attractive alternative than ever.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Prime Minister said he had no objections to letting a House committee review the recommendations made by the Senate committee on euthanasia and assisted suicide.

However, the Minister of Justice does not consider these issues to be priorities. Indeed, while he did acknowledge yesterday the importance of discussing these matters, the minister would not say when and how Parliament would be asked to review them.

• (1105)

Could it be that the personal opinions of the Minister of Justice might prevent Parliament from looking at these sensitive issues in the near future? Let us not forget that the minister already stated his opposition to legalizing euthanasia and assisted suicide at the 1994 convention of the Liberal Party of Canada. The attitude of the Minister of Justice says a lot about the real will of this government to debate these important issues.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for two weeks we have heard those opposite stand and plead with the citizens of Ontario to vote Liberal in the provincial election. Their pleadings were to no avail.

Ontario has spoken and told those opposite they do not believe Liberals will provide justice for victims of crime. The people of Ontario have chosen instead the Reform ideal of putting victims first. They voted for mandated discipline and structure in the lives of young offenders as the best policy for preventing further youth crime. The people have chosen the Reform principle of holding criminals accountable for their crimes and that the best form of deterrence is swift sure punishment for criminal activity.

I am proud to say that the people chose Reform common sense and abandoned the false ideology that criminals are victims and must not be judged.

In Ontario the Liberal justice philosophy is dead. May it rest in peace. Are you now listening Mr. Justice Minister?

DAWNDALE FARM SUPPLIES LTD.

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to offer congratulations to Dawndale Farm Supplies Ltd., located in Hunter River, Prince Edward Island, on the occasion of its 10th anniversary and its recent investment in new milling equipment and expansion of its business.

David and Jean Tingley have worked very hard over the past 10 years devoting their time and energy as well as money into making their business a successful one. It is this type of entrepreneurship which leads to economic prosperity, not only to communities and provinces but to the country as well. When communities thrive and prosper, everyone benefits. The Tingleys are not just working for their community and their business but they are also supporting community events like 4–H.

Congratulations to David and Jean and best wishes for continued success with this latest investment not only to their business but also to the farming communities they serve and work with so well.

* * *

POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every day police officers across Canada face many tough challenges.

Perhaps the most delicate challenge is balancing what is politically correct and what needs to be done to maintain law and order. Police officers put their lives on the line. Often many of them perish in the line of duty while making our communities safer.

In my experience as a community representative for the past nine years I have dealt with our local police on a number of occasions. I am proud to say that we have one of the finest police organizations anywhere in North America and perhaps in the world.

I would like to congratulate the Ottawa–Carleton police on a job well done. It is our duty and our responsibility to work with our law enforcement officers and to support them so they can continue to provide their excellent services to our communities.

* * *

REFORM PARTY

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage with recent developments in the Reform Party of western Canada's tactics in this Chamber. Its new American style smear campaigning reflects the Reform Party's underlying approach: no principles unless they are politically expedient for the moment.

The Reform Party sends different messages to different regions of the country on issues of importance to Canadians. Take for example the recent comments by the Reform member for Fraser Valley West who has been telling the people of Atlantic Canada that the Reform Party opposes tolls on highways. However, his boss, the leader of the third party, in speeches delivered as recently as May 25 in New York City, said that the rebuilding of roads will include everything from privatization of publicly owned infrastructure to user pay systems and public–private ventures.

What is the Reform policy? Who is telling the truth? Why the mixed—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Laval East.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ETHICS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during this past week, political events have shown how quickly ethical issues, so dear to the heart of the Liberal government, are being sidetracked.

When the members of the party in power formed the official opposition, they called for a stricter code of political conduct and an end to Conservative patronage. However, now that their party is in power, the government has been quick to adopt the system cherished with such enthusiasm by its predecessors. Unlike the Conservative government, however, the Prime Minister did not ask his Minister of Canadian Heritage to resign and he turned a blind eye to the minister's benefit dinners, attended by guests who a few months later just happened to be awarded major contracts.

• (1110)

The Prime Minister will not admit that the lobbyist and political organizer who made the arrangements was also awarded contracts and represents associations that receive money under government programs. This government's code of ethics is obviously just a smoke screen.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform principles we ran on in 1993 have once again been embraced by the voters in Ontario in their overwhelming support of the Mike Harris common sense revolution.

Once again, the voters have shown they are miles ahead of the politicians who still practise the top down, we know best politics of the 1970s and 1980s. The common sense of the common people as outlined in the Reform blue book will not be denied and the common sense revolution responded to that.

It is ironic that yesterday, while the Ontario voter was rejecting undefined sexual orientation, gold plated pensions and gun registration, this government was introducing closure to ram legislation dealing with each of those through this House.

The Liberals did not win in 1993; the Tories were thrown out. Yesterday this government provided the voters in Ontario with three very good reasons to throw them out in 1997 and elect a government that is listening and responding to their concerns, the Reform Party.

* * *

CHILDREN

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been speaking in the House of the importance of direct parental care for preschool children.

Research done by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research and the National Foundation for Family Research and Education has shown clearly that poor quality care means a higher likelihood of problems in the health, social and criminal justice areas.

In 1961, 65 per cent of families with preschool children had one parent in the home. That figure reduced to only 12 per cent in 1991. What is the impact of reduced parental care? One example is that the suicide rate for youth between the ages of 15 and 19 has increased by 600 per cent over the same period of time.

We must invest in our children. An investment in our children today is an investment in the future of all Canadians.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, farmers in my Dauphin—Swan River riding rely on the ribbon of steel that unites our country from east to west to move their high quality commodities to market. Therefore it is crucial that shippers from Dauphin—Swan River and across the prairies have access to a rail system that moves their commodity quickly and at competitive rates.

It is fitting that National Transportation Week comes at a time when the Liberal government is making massive improvements to our national rail system. These measures will increase competition and lead to greater efficiency. It is crucial that these efficiencies are passed along to prairie farmers, the highest volume shippers in Canada.

I strongly encourage the Minister of Transport to ensure that the interests of prairie farmers are at the forefront of all decisions made regarding the future of our rail system.

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last night the Liberals got yet another taste of how quickly they can go from the top of the heap to official opposition. Despite a commanding lead at the beginning of the campaign, Ontario Liberals finished a distant second. That makes three provinces which have provincially stated: "We do not like the example the federal Liberals are giving us".

As for the resurgence of the PCs, look at the federal Tory policies and then look at the Reform policies. Tell me whose platform Ralph Klein and Mike Harris are really following.

On the subject of mergers, the leader of the federal PCs should merge not with Reform but with the Liberals with whom he has much more in common, especially since Liberal cabinet ministers started to follow the corrupt patronage practices of the former Tory government.

I am not one to wish my life away, but I am looking forward to 1997.

* * *

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF EASTERN ONTARIO

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I had the great pleasure of manning the telephones for two hours to raise money for the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario. Once again the people of this region proved their generosity as volunteers and hundreds came out.

This year they were helped by a marvellous group of young people. Over half the pages of the House of Commons were out volunteering for the telethon for the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario.

• (1115)

I had the great pleasure of having one of them bring me a message and as I looked down I saw the message was coming from another two pages down there answering phones and scribbling out pledge forms.

On behalf of all the people of this region, I thank the pages who come to our community, often from far away, and who start fitting right in and making a contribution.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

COUNCIL FOR CANADIAN UNITY

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs stated that during the referendum campaign in Quebec, the

federal government would comply with Quebec's referendum legislation as it did in 1980, which is not very reassuring, when we consider the contempt shown for this legislation by the Trudeau government and its Quebec lieutenant, the present Prime Minister of Canada, who spent millions of dollars and ignored the spending limits imposed on the "yes"and "no" umbrella committees.

Are we to conclude from yesterday's statements by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that in 1995, the federal Liberals, like Trudeau did in 1980, intend to ignore the letter and the intent of Quebec's referendum legislation, which sets democratic rules for all such campaigns in Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made it very clear that we complied with the legislation in 1980 and intend to comply with the letter and the intent of the legislation in 1995.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte–Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the following figures will illustrate the extent of this compliance. In 1980, the federal government spent at least $17 million, although the spending ceiling for umbrella committees was set at $2.7 million. It was slightly out of line here. And according to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the federal government intends to repeat this exercise during the next referendum campaign.

Should we conclude that the Trudeau government's behaviour during the 1980 campaign was a model of good faith and transparency, which the present federal government intends to follow during the next referendum campaign in Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of compliance, I may remind the members of the opposition that they made a promise there would be a referendum, and they should keep that promise.

They promised it would be held in the first half of 1995, in May or June, but they did not keep their promise. Now they promise it will be in the fall. I hope that promise will be kept.

When I look at the money their big brother, the Parti Quebecois, spends on regional commissions to sell sovereignty, I think they should show some respect for the democratic system in the province and for the spirit of the law, in addition to making people abide by this legislation, which in fact we do.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte–Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we said it would be in 1995. For the minister's information, there are twelve months in 1995, and the year ends on December 31.

Speaking of big brothers, what about those subsidies to big brother, to Power Corporation, the real big brother of the Liberal Party?

While the Government of Quebec acts openly, the federal government acts behind the scenes by handing out subsidies that are directly related to the referendum campaign. A few examples: $35 million for tourism advertising, in addition to the $15 million already budgeted; $6 million for the unity operation; $1.1 million to celebrate the 30th birthday of the Canadian flag; $2.2 million for the Charles Bronfman Foundation, friends of the government. This plus the other hidden costs.

Is that what the federal government means by complying with the spirit of Quebec's referendum legislation?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that we on this side will refrain from mentioning the advertising in the Montreal subway, the Commission on Quebec's sovereignty and the regional commissions.

• (1120)

We will refrain, because we already abide by the law and intend to comply with the spirit of the referendum legislation. However, what this country needs is for the referendum to be held as soon as possible, with a clear question, so that we will be able to deal with this problem once and for all and can start dealing with the real issues: creating jobs in Canada, including Quebec, and reducing poverty in Canada and Quebec.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. The federal government gave $32 million to the Council for Canadian Unity last year for its prereferendum campaign and the government has pledged funding again for the coming year. In addition, the Department of National Revenue has granted it charitable status, and its number is 0333054–59.

Can the minister explain to us how the Council for Canadian Unity can be considered a charity?

[*English*]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have explained to the House a number of times how the charitable status for organizations is given out. It is given out on the basis of court decisions. There is no legislation. It is not decision of the minister but a series of court decisions which has determined that various areas of activity

considered to be in the public interest should be permitted charitable status to encourage that. It has resulted in substantial improvements in Canadian living standards, in health and in all sorts of other areas.

I am afraid, however, with respect to the specifics of the hon. member's question I do not have in my hand the number he gave out. If he would like to give it to me I could check out that number.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of National Revenue justify that big businesses get a tax deduction for their contributions to the Council for Canadian Unity, when charitable status is usually granted on the basis of the following criteria: relief of poverty, promotion of education or religion and other efforts to the benefit of the community like the relief of suffering or sickness?

[*English*]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again with respect to companies as opposed to individuals the rules are quite clear. A company can make expenditures and provide money to organizations but the final line in terms of determining this, which again is in the courts and not in the hands of the department, is whether it advances the business interests of the company involved.

* * *

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government cannot seem to get its story straight over the heritage minister's contract for dollars dinner.

Yesterday the Deputy Prime Minister stated there was no breach of ethics and therefore there was no need for the ethics counsellor to investigate this paid access to the minister. However, today we learn the ethics counsellor is investigating the matter. It appears Mr. Wilson feels there is more to this affair than meets the government's eye.

Is the ethics counsellor conducting an open investigation into the minister of heritage's dinner? Will Mr. Wilson's report be made public?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister informed the House two days ago that he had consulted Mr. Wilson about the question. I spoke to the Prime Minister at approximately 10.45 a.m. and he advised me, as he has stated publicly in the House many times, that if there are questions about the ethics of the government the ultimate arbiter of those questions is not a bureaucrat, it is the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I guess that is a question mark.

The Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the heritage minister have suggested all the information on this matter has been made public. However, the heritage minister refuses to provide the House with a list of the people invited and those who contributed to the dinner.

• (1125)

With the latest revelation that Guylaine Saucier donated $1,000 to the minister's debt fund and was appointed chairman of the CBC six months later, we have to wonder who did not get a contract from the minister's private dinner.

When the Prime Minister appointed Guylaine Saucier as chairman of the CBC, did he know she had contributed $1,000 to the heritage minister's debt fund?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Guylaine Saucier happens to be the first woman to be president of the Quebec Chamber of Commerce. She has served on several boards including the board of the Bank of Montreal, the board of Bell Canada, the board of Petro–Canada. She has been active in a number of community events including the University of Montreal, the Montreal Symphony Orchestra, the Hôtel–Dieu de Montréal. She was appointed to the Order of Canada in 1989 by a government that was not Liberal.

Madam Saucier has said she has contributed to numerous political parties. She is a federalist and supports the role of federal political parties in Canada.

If the member has a problem with the appointment of Madam Saucier, then let him so state in the House because her credentials speak for themselves.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, her credentials were not questioned in any way. I asked if the Prime Minister was aware that a donation had been made to that fund before the appointment was made. The question was not answered.

Canadians want ethical and honest government. The success of Mike Harris' populous grassroots campaign proves that. Instead of honesty and ethics, the Liberals are giving Canadians the same old Mulroney style government they had from the Progressive Conservatives.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage specifically targeted clients of his department, invited them to a dinner to pay off his campaign debts and then rewarded all of them, every single one, with grants, contracts and chairmanships. This is a direct conflict of interest and it is about time the government recognized this.

What is this government afraid of? Why will it not release the invitation list of those who contributed to the dinner? Why will the Minister of Canadian Heritage not do the honourable thing and resign?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member to review his first question. Implicit in the question was the

suggestion that somehow Madam Saucier bought her position in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I pointed out, as she has publicly pointed out, she has contributed to several political parties over a great number of years.

Every political party has the responsibility of collecting funds. I refer the member to an article he might have missed: "The Reform Party will soon be knocking on corporate doors in Nova Scotia in search of political donations for its election war chest. Nationally the party says it—has banked $2.4 million to bankroll the next vote where it will be running candidates in 295 ridings. If you have an extra $125 and you would like to break bread with Preston Manning, you are in luck. Reform's chief will be in Halifax—for a fundraising dinner".

Political parties raise money. I am sure the member would agree with me that it would not be reasonable to exclude every Canadian who donates to a political party from ever serving in a capacity with the Government of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs demonstrated Canada's lack of leadership in the Bosnian crisis by refusing to publicly state Canada's position on the rapid reaction force, while at the same time, behind closed doors, the Minister of National Defence supported the initiative at a NATO meeting.

Now that we know, thanks to the media and the Minister of National Defence, that Canada supports the creation of a rapid reaction force in the former Yugoslavia, and the UN's leadership of it, will the Deputy Prime Minister tell us whether the government intends to contribute troops or to contribute logistically to this rapid reaction force?

[*English*]

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

As he knows, there are activities under way by other allied countries participating in Bosnia to look at a rapid reaction force.

The Prime Minister stated in the House earlier in the week that we are aware of the plans being made but at that time Canada was not part of that activity. As I stand in the House today I have to say the same thing. Canada is not part of that activity and the decision has not yet been made.

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States' reaction to the rapid reaction force is lukewarm, which is seriously hampering the effort of the international community to consolidate the peacekeeping forces in Bosnia, will the Deputy Prime Minister tell us whether she shares the opinion of the British secretary to the Foreign Office that, if the rapid reaction force does not get up and running, the only other option will be to withdraw the peacekeepers from Bosnia?

[*English*]

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, there are 35 countries involved in the former Yugoslavia. Canada is one of them. He has asked me questions about other countries, but I can only answer the question for Canada. I have answered that question and I can do no more.

* * *

BILL C–69

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, almost since this House began sitting early in 1994, the government has been attempting to redo the redistribution of boundaries in the House of Commons. This latest bill, C–69, which has been bouncing back and forth, is coming back to this House. It will increase the size of the House and add $6 million in redistribution costs. We saw last night in Ontario that the people of Canada do not want to spend this kind of money on the House of Commons.

I would ask the government House leader if he would now consider doing the right thing by withdrawing Bill C–69, saving $6 million, and allowing the redistribution to go ahead?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his question is reflecting adversely and unfairly on the work of members of this House who for the first time under the rules of parliamentary reform actually brought in and drafted a bill. Instead of his unwarranted criticism, he should be recognizing this good work and urging his friends in the Senate to respect the wishes of the elected people of this House and let this bill go through.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how many friends I have in the Senate.

In the Ontario election last night premier–elect Harris defeated the Liberals partly by proposing that there be a 25 per cent reduction to the number of seats in the Ontario legislature. If the government is not willing to at least let the redistribution go

ahead, would it consider combining the redistribution with the modest 10 per cent reduction to the number of seats that the Reform Party has proposed?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the increase in seats that would come into effect, not just in the bill he is talking about but in the redistribution process that was interrupted by it, is provided for in a formula in the Constitution of Canada.

This government does not propose opening a new round of constitutional discussions. I am surprised my hon. friend wants to take up the time of the country with a new round of constitutional discussions. I am sure the people of Ontario and British Columbia would be most displeased and disheartened to learn that he does not want them to have fair representation in the Parliament of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

In response to the Official Opposition's questions in the House regarding the fraudulent use of the growth hormone somatotropin, the Minister of Agriculture announced close to a month ago that he would investigate dairy producers and single out the ones that are guilty of fraud.

Will the minister tell us whether, as part of his inquiry, he requested and obtained the collaboration of producers' associations, Canada Customs officers and Health Canada inspectors, and will he reveal to us the fruit of his research?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can inform the hon. member that no further information has been drawn to my attention since the issue was first raised a number of days ago in the House.

The issue is obviously one, as he implies in his question, that would involve co–operation among a number of departments, most particularly the two departments he referred to, the Department of Health and the customs department.

If and when there is further pertinent material that is drawn to my attention as a result of the inquiries we are making, I would be most happy to inform him and all other hon. members.

• (1135)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the minister has already had the question in his hands for one month, not just for a couple of days and that we are waiting for the results.

Will the minister tell us whether, as a follow up to his inquiry, he intends to pursue this issue further and to take legal action against those who used somatotropin illegally, given that the hormone had not yet been declared safe by Health Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at this point I think it would be imprudent and inappropriate to make any references to the possibility of illegal conduct.

Obviously if in the course of these inquiries or any other inquiries that are being made there is evidence that comes to light of activity that would be in violation of the law, the appropriate action would be taken.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

All the polls and pundits have indicated that a major reason behind Mike Harris' victory last night in Ontario was due to his position on employment equity. He was not messing around; he said he was going to scrap the employment equity plan.

On this side of the House we are very interested to know if the federal government is going to take a lesson from this victory last night. I realize that the Charest–Mulroney gang brought in employment equity, but is this government going to stop now trying to bring in an expanded employment equity plan? Will it withdraw its plans on Bill C–64?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member had better make up his mind. His colleagues were running around saying that the victory was as a result of gun control.

The Speaker: My colleagues, just to remind you very gently, when we refer to each other in the House, sitting members, we refer to our ridings as opposed to our names.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are quite a few Reform policies that got the Mike Harris government elected.

The director of communications for the Prime Minister's office said that the federal Liberals would be helping the Ontario

Liberals in their campaigns. The quote is: "They helped us, we help them. A Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal." I am sure Lyn McLeod is saying to herself this morning, "With friends like this, who needs enemies?"

Since the voters of Ontario totally rejected the Liberal concept of employment equity, will the minister listen to the voters and back down on the government's own employment equity plans, its plans to expand employment equity, or is it going to take a federal election defeat for the Liberals before they listen to the people and understand that employment equity is not wanted?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Unlike the Reform Party, we actually believe in employment equity, and unlike the Reform Party, we actually believe in political democracy.

Unlike the Reform Party, we did not put the jackboots to provincial Reformers who wanted to run in the Ontario provincial election. We allow and encourage everybody to become members of the Liberal Party because we are not afraid of a little competition at the provincial level.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval–Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is Friday, everyone is a bit on edge.

My question is for the Minister of Health.

Although the studies on the impact of somatotropin on human and animal health are not yet complete, Quebec and Canadian consumers are finding this hormone in dairy products they purchase, since, despite the Health Canada prohibition, certain producers are not afraid to use it, particularly since the Minister of Agriculture seems in no hurry to do a serious investigation.

Would the Minister of Health tell us what measures she has taken to ensure that somatotropin, the sale of which is prohibited by her department, is not found in dairy products?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, so long as this hormone remains unapproved, it is illegal to use it. We will do all we have to, not only at the Department of Health, but at customs and at the Department of Agriculture.

• (1140)

As my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has just said, it is early yet to really assess the situation and lay any charges. If you have any information that can help us, please let us know, because we are interested.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval–Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if I have understood the minister's response, she is counting on her colleague in agriculture to do the investigating. What the Minister of Agriculture has told us, unless I misunderstood him, is that he was not exactly sure where he was going.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether she can explain why she is letting the Minister of Agriculture carry out the investigation all by himself, when she is responsible for prohibiting the use and sale of the hormone somatotropin in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in reply to the earlier question, the issue that has been raised relates to the jurisdictional responsibilities of several ministers, including the Minister of Health, the Minister of National Revenue, with his responsibility for customs, and agriculture with its obvious interest in the dairy industry. All of us are endeavouring to be as vigilant as we can to ensure that the laws of Canada are fully and faithfully respected.

* * *

ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment.

It is very important that the government lead by example in all things, including environmental matters. One of the most visible symbols of government is the national capital region. Our national capital is beautiful at this time of year, but I ask the Minister of the Environment what she is doing to ensure that it is and remains truly green.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the intention of the Government of Canada is to ensure that every part of Canada is green. Obviously one of those very important parts is the national capital region.

We believe that some of the recently announced policies on issues like the Commission for Sustainable Development and also the very excellent initiative of Bill S–7 by Senator Colin Kenny, which will begin to create a market for alternative fuels in this country, will get smog out of the air and keep those tulips growing and make sure that all urban areas of the country also benefit from a cleaner environment, which is something we owe our kids.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the justice minister first claimed that his gun control legislation would cost

the taxpayers no more than $85 million. Estimates the justice minister tabled later with the standing committee revealed the cost to be $118.9 million. These estimates did not include the cost for the gun inspectors who will now have to be hired and trained to ensure compliance with the Firearms Act.

I ask the justice minister, how much will the hiring and training of these new gun inspectors add to the cost of the gun legislation?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the entire cost of the program was put before the committee, of which the hon. member was an active and hard–working member. The committee examined the cost estimates and for weeks heard 70 witnesses discussing costs, among other things.

I conclude from the committee's work and its report to the House, which is due next week, that it found that the estimates presented by the government were indeed accurate and complete.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if that were true then I would not be standing here asking about the cost of the program.

I have been told by the justice minister that he will not even reply to requests from some authorities in areas of the country regarding the failure of the federal government to reimburse them for the cost to administer the present gun control legislation.

Did the justice minister discuss with the provinces and the territories the additional cost of hiring and training the required gun inspectors before he imposed these conditions on them through his amendments to his gun control legislation?

• (1145)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the the hon. member knows, we have told the provinces and territories the cost of establishing, implementing and designing the registration system will be borne by the federal government. We have also told them the cost of administering the registration system will be paid by revenues generated through the reasonable fees that will be charged.

Based on the figures we put before the committee and the very reliable estimates we produced, there is no basis in cost to oppose the registration of firearms.

I wish the hon. member would put aside the details he is trying to raise which have been fully explored in committee, and explain to the House and the country why he is opposing something the police forces in his own province, and by a margin of two out of three, the people in his own province want to see the House put in place.

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health must be aware that the European Community has declared a seven–year moratorium on the use of recombinant bovine somatotropin because this product is a health hazard to both humans and animals.

Given that Health Canada has not yet completed its studies and that the voluntary moratorium expires in 22 days, does the minister intend to take action by imposing a real moratorium?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada's role is to determine if a product is safe and does what it is supposed to do. The moratorium that has been in effect for a year was arrived at through negotiations between Agriculture Canada and the producers, with the approval of Health Canada. Health Canada's only responsibility is to ensure that the product is safe.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, earlier, my colleagues reminded this House of the illegalities committed during this voluntary moratorium. How can the minister condone the use of a product that is banned in Canada, when her department does not even enforce the legislation? Will she allow the lifting of the moratorium? Is this what she calls taking action?

[*English*]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after consultations with officials in Quebec, with Customs Canada, with Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada, we have not found any evidence that the product is being used illegally in Canada.

If the hon. member has any evidence of that nature please bring it forward. It is not being sold in Canada nor is it about to be sold unless Health Canada proves it is safe and effective and that has not happened.

It was a voluntary moratorium arrived at through negotiations with Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada and the producers of the product. If there is going to be an extension of the moratorium I believe it has to be negotiated again between Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada and the producers of BST.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food.

In my riding of Peace River some farmers have diversified and are now growing organically grown wheat. This is a special-

ty product which the Canadian Wheat Board simply cannot handle. Organic farmers have had to find their own markets, yet the wheat board insists these farmers go through all its costly red tape.

The fine for bypassing the Canadian Wheat Board on this issue is $12,000 and two years in jail.

Will the minister allow organic farmers to sell their product without jumping through all the wheat board hoops necessary?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the last number of months the Canadian Wheat Board has made a substantial effort to find the appropriate regulatory and other means to accommodate the needs of organic producers.

It is my view, which I think is shared by the board, that in the future organic production, whether of wheat or potentially a great many other commodities, will be able to find very significant and valuable niche markets that may over time grow to be much more than just niches in terms of the future marketing potential.

• (1150)

The hon. member may rest assured that we will be endeavouring by all possible means to promote the maximum marketing opportunities because those opportunities are valuable not only to the individual producers of the organic product but also to the entire grains economy.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the minister of agriculture.

As he knows, the current system is simply not working. It is penalizing farmers who are struggling to diversify. It is ironic that at a time when the federal government has spent millions of dollars on western diversification, the wheat board is standing in the way of those farmers who have already found their markets and simply want to market their grain.

Will the minister at least amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to remove organic crops from wheat board jurisdiction and allow this industry to develop?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is a substantial division of opinion in western Canada on the issue he has just raised.

It is important for all producers, whether they be organic producers or others, to have the opportunity to examine the marketing system and all the various options, all the pros and the cons, all the benefits and the consequences, to understand completely what is involved in the marketing decisions that need to be made in the future.

The opportunity for that kind of dialogue and discussion among farmers and farm organizations will be forthcoming very soon.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question concerns Canada's tourism industry.

Over the last number of years Canada has lost a large part of its tourism business from all over the world, but in particular, from the United States.

Is the current campaign having any effect on our tourist business and at what cost?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first let me stress for the hon. member the importance of the tourism sector to the government's jobs and growth agenda.

I am pleased to tell him the $50 million commitment that the government made to the Canadian Tourism Commission has already leveraged an addition $30 million from the private sector, no strings attached.

The campaigns are under way, both on television as well as in newspapers. The responses are formidable. I would like to mention to the House that in the first quarter of 1995, we already have very encouraging numbers.

Travel receipts are up by 19.5 per cent and the travel deficit figures for the same period are down by 11.3 per cent. Tourism is jobs for Canadians in all parts of the country. It is jobs and growth.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in 1990, the Canadian government banned the export of PCBs to the United States without prior authorization by the U.S. Environment Protection Agency, which systematically refused PCB shipments, thus making any PCB export virtually impossible.

This created an opportunity for a fledgling PCB destruction industry to develop in Canada and Quebec. In the spirit of the Basel convention, Canada now tends to look after the disposal of its own hazardous wastes, thereby avoiding the serious problems associated with long haul shipping of these products.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Is she prepared to make a public commitment to maintain the policy position that Canada must manage its own waste, no matter what decisions the EPA may make in the future, and does she undertake to press the U.S to do the same?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the regulations proposed by the former environment minister, the hon. member for Lac–Saint–Jean, were designed to govern PCB exports, but these were never approved. This is what the minister proposed but it was never confirmed in the legislation.

That said, we have taken the position at the EPA hearings currently going on in Washington that we would rather see to the disposal of our PCBs ourselves.

• (1155)

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière–des–Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, given that the situation has evolved since 1990, does the minister undertake to amend the PCB Waste Export Regulations to prevent once and for all Canada from being tempted in the future to dispose of its PCBs by shipping them to the U.S., which would compromise the development of emerging industries in Canada and Quebec?

[*English*]

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat in English what I said in French. The former Minister of the Environment promised to ban the export of PCBs in 1990. It was announced but never proclaimed. Therefore, it is not currently the law that PCBs cannot be exported.

However, it has been the policy of Canada, despite the fact that the minister of the day did not follow through on his commitment to make it illegal. It is still the position of the government that the handling of PCBs should be done in Canada by Canadians.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the agriculture minister.

Farmers have notified the minister of their deep concern over the questionable activities of the Canadian Wheat Board. Very simply, when will the minister take these people seriously and address their concerns about the grain marketing system?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I presume the question relates to the discussion which has been ongoing in western Canada for some time about the appropriate jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board and the issue that some have referred to as dual marketing or other types of marketing options.

As I indicated in reply to an earlier question with respect to organic crops, it is important for farmers and all of the stakeholders in the Canadian grains industry to have the opportunity to examine the issue of their preferred marketing options and marketing systems in a fully informed, fully comprehensive and rational manner.

I undertook some time ago to provide a forum within which that dialogue could take place. As I said in response to the previous question, that forum will be forthcoming very shortly.

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is not just about dual marketing or whatever system. It is about mismanagement.

It is reported today that the Canadian Wheat Board is hauling barley to be shipped to Japan by rail from Thunder Bay to California at a cost of $82 Canadian a ton. This is $9 a ton more than the farmer gets for it initially, plus they have to pay the freight to Thunder Bay.

When will the minister start acting like a minister of agriculture and look after the concerns of western farmers?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been following closely the developments with respect to barley sales and marketing over the course of the last number of weeks and months, he would have known that the Canadian Wheat Board has had considerable challenges before it in enticing the right kind of barley into the system to meet the sales opportunities we do have.

The board is obviously, in the circumstances referred to by the hon. gentleman, going to some extraordinary lengths to make sure that Canada meets the marketing opportunities it has before it. The wheat board would not be engaging in that pattern of marketing unless it was convinced it was in the best interest of farmers in making money for farmers.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Both the Prime Minister and the Minister for International Trade have spoken recently about the need to strengthen economic ties between North America and Europe.

Would the Minister for International Trade please bring the House up to date on the status of this initiative?

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister some months ago raised the question of closer economic ties between Europe and North America, including the possibility of an eventual free trade agreement. He did so because on this side of the House we recognize that in the post cold war period, the era of the cold war having past, the security emphasis is no longer so central to our

relationship and should be further underpinned by closer economic ties.

• (1200)

In addition, we are a government that recognizes the possibilities of going beyond the commitments we made in the World Trade Organization to reduce trade barriers. We believe that initiative could be embodied in a freer trade agreement with Europe, as we have already committed to over a longer period with Asia Pacific and the western hemisphere.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was reported yesterday that the minister of immigration is considering granting minister's permits to up to 17,000 refugees who cannot be given permanent residency in Canada. They cannot get permanent residency because they came to Canada with no identity documents and we have no idea who they are or what crimes they may have committed. We do know that most came from a country that was ripped apart by bloody civil war and terrible violent crime.

Will the minister promise to protect Canadians by not granting residency to one single individual if we do not know the full background and complete history of the person?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this issue is under active consideration. There is a concern that a number of individuals have accepted refugee status from the Immigration and Refugee Board. On their application for landing, according to law, they clearly have to demonstrate documentation.

A number of individuals are in this catch–22 situation. They come from countries where there is not only no government but no valid documentation to obtain. It is not an easy black or white situation. The government and the department are seriously looking at this file to try to come up with a solution which will clearly protect the Canadian community and also try to benefit individuals who have been accepted as refugees and want to become members of the Canadian family.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ART BANK

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Following the last budget, the minister announced cuts to various cultural organizations, including the Canada Council. On March 1, the Canada Council itself announced the closing of the Art Bank. That decision was strongly denounced by several organizations in Quebec and in Canada, including Quebec's association of visual arts artists.

Given that the Canada Council did not first consult visual arts stakeholders, what action will the minister take to force it to reconsider a decision which was made in stealth and seemingly in a hurry?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Art Bank is the exclusive responsibility of the Canada Council. It is up to that organization to decide what it wants to do with the bank. However, I would be very pleased if arrangements can be made with the private sector and other interested parties to ensure the survival of the bank.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 27(1), I move:

> That, commencing on June 12, 1995 and concluding on June 23, 1995, on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays the House shall continue to sit until 11.30 p.m. and, on Fridays until 5 p.m., for the purpose of considering Government Orders, provided that proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38 shall, when applicable, be taken up between 11.30 p.m. and 12 a.m.

• (1205)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is a normal proposal at this time of year. The standing orders anticipate that there will usually be a backlog of business before the House in June. Therefore, as part of what might be called a trade off in the rules which provide for an automatic summer adjournment beginning on June 23, there is a provision for an extension of sitting hours during the two weeks prior to that date, the intention being that the additional time be used to complete business that the public interest requires.

When the House resumed the session last September, there were five government bills on the Order Paper and seven in committee. Fifty–two more government bills have been introduced since that time. We have passed 34 of the bills and have made progress on 20 more, but we are now at that point of the parliamentary calendar when the rules I mentioned were designed to come into effect to facilitate a special effort to help complete the legislative agenda.

I should like to outline for the House the business the government would like to see done by June 23, which I repeat is the date of adjournment for the summer period specified by the rules.

It is our intention to seek completion of all remaining stages of Bill C–68, the firearms bill; Bill C–41, the sentencing legislation; Bill C–85, the parliamentary retiring allowances

bill; and Bill C–72, dealing with the defence of criminal intoxication.

We also will give similarly high priority to the completion of the debate on the motion for a special joint committee of the House and Senate to consider an update of a code of conduct for parliamentarians, that is, both members of Parliament and senators.

We also would consider it a high priority to deal with, if necessary, any messages from the Senate concerning Bill C–22 regarding Pearson airport and Bill C–69 concerning electoral boundaries.

There are a number of other bills to which it would be very much in the public interest for the House to give third reading before we adjourn on June 23. Some of these are bills which have an impact on the fiscal position of the government or on economic development for the country. These include: Bill C–70, amending the Income Tax Act; Bill C–82, regarding the Royal Canadian Mint; Bill C–86, concerning the Canadian Dairy Commission; Bill C–88, regarding the removal of internal trade barriers; Bill C–89, the CNR commercialization legislation; Bill C–91, regarding the business development bank; Bill C–92, regarding the Canadian Wheat Board; and Bill C–94, regarding the fuel additive MMT.

There is also an international commitment which Canada has for quick passage of Bill C–87 regarding chemical weapons.

In addition, there are a number of bills that have been before the House for some time which ought to have their report stage and third reading completed so they can be moved on to the Senate very soon. I am speaking about Bill C–45, to update our parole and corrections system; Bill C–52, reorganizing the Department of Public Works and Government Services; Bill C–54, concerning administration of the old age security and Canada pension plan systems; and Bill C–65, to reorganize or eliminate certain government agencies.

• (1210)

We would also like to send to the appropriate parliamentary committee for consideration before second reading two rather complicated bills, Bill C–62 regarding regulatory reform and Bill C–84 also concerning regulations.

This is a rather heavy legislative agenda. It is for this reason that we are proposing extensive additional sitting hours for the next two weeks, that is until June 23, the normal date of adjournment for the summer provided for to come into place automatically under the rules.

Our proposal is for the House to sit until 11.30 p.m. with an additional half hour for the adjournment debate Monday through Thursday, and until 5 p.m. on Friday. We have opted for later hours than in the past because of the heavy agenda, but we are prepared to be flexible on a day to day basis.

To conclude, I want to say accordingly it is our hope to be able to work with the opposition in the detailed scheduling of the business I have outlined with a view to serving the public interest, the interests of all Canadians. Therefore we seek the co–operation of all members of this House. I make special reference to the opposition parties in this effort.

I urge the House to support this motion. It is very much in the public interest that this motion be adopted and the legislative agenda I have outlined be completed.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, by way of comment I might draw to the solicitor general's attention the fact that I have just made a list of the number of items he has given to this House. If my addition is correct it is 22 items. Unless I am mistaken there are only nine working days in which we are supposed to be putting the 22 items through.

He speaks in grandiose terms about serving the public interest. Truly in this House of Commons as members of Parliament we come here to serve the best interests of the people of Canada. I have to ask the solicitor general, how does it possibly serve the public interest when he comes to this House two weeks before the time when he wants to end this particular session, two weeks, nine working days, and gives the House 22 items? To any reasonable minded Canadian reading *Hansard* or watching this debate on television, does it not give the appearance that this government is treating the House of Commons like a rubber stamp?

Coming forward with 22 items to be dealt with in nine days in my judgment is irresponsible. Would the solicitor general care to comment on that?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend would look at the list of bills I have mentioned, they are almost all bills that have already had extensive debate in this House and extensive consideration in committee. With respect to most of them we are only asking the House to move on the final stages of debate, report stage and third reading.

Why would the hon. member want to hold up for months more Bill C–45, to update our parole and corrections system? I thought that would be something the Reform Party would want to see in effect. Why is it backing down on something like this? This is the kind of thing we want to make progress on. We are providing extensive additional hours of debate.

There are some measures that we are simply asking to be the subject of motions and referred to committee for more detailed study. Almost without exception we are talking about measures that have already had very extensive debate in this House and in committee. We are only asking that the final stages of debate, report stage and third reading, be proceeded with. We have extensive additional hours, which we hope all members of the House will be willing to use to complete these stages.

• (1215)

That is the answer to my hon. friend's question. Again, I hope we will have his and his party's co–operation in making progress on these bills in the overall public interest.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the House leader. The Reform Party is alleging this list was provided to it just now in an effort to adjourn the House, according to what the member says is the House leader's wish, on June 23.

Is it not true that opposition parties have been consulted about the agenda on a weekly basis and that the list provided today or something close to it was submitted to the opposition many times before? Is it not also true that the rule provides that we can start using this mechanism of extending hours only next Monday? Finally, is it not also true that when we tried to extend hours in the past, very often the same people have refused to extend the hours when we wanted to complete the particular bill that day?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, we ordinarily do not discuss before the House consultations we have with other parties outside the House with respect to the business of the House. Under the circumstances, I can only agree with what the hon. member has said.

We have shared this list or one very similar to it with opposition parties, not today in my speech for the first time but a number of days ago. We have sought co–operation—I point especially to the Reform Party—on working out the schedule to get this set of measures completed.

The attitude of the Reform Party speaks for itself as to the degree of co–operation it has offered. I would not like to say the degree of co–operation it has offered can be characterized by the word zilch because I am not sure the word zilch is parliamentary; if it is not, I will withdraw it. If it is all right I will leave it on the record and everybody will know what I mean.

It is quite correct that under the rules we could not move this motion for extended hours until today. There have been other occasions, I have been reminded by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, when efforts have been made to extend hours on individual measures, and opposition members, especially Reform members, have always blocked that. They could easily have had additional time to consider some of these measures individually in the past, and I am informed they blocked efforts to do this.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has raised some interesting points. I hope my comments have shed some light on these matters.

I further add that contrary to what was suggested by the leader of the Reform Party in some quite unwarranted remarks I saw reported in the press this morning, the date of June 23 is the date for the adjournment of the House for a summer break, which comes into place automatically under the rules of this House and has been part of the rules for some time. This should be borne in mind in assessing measures being taken to facilitate the business of the House in the days leading up to June 23.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when Bill C–68 came before this House everyone knew it was a very contentious bill. Yet all members were denied the opportunity to express the concerns of their constituents on that very extensive bill.

Then the bill was rushed into committee and a deadline was set for the committee hearings. I did not object to that. I was only concerned that we were able to get the necessary witnesses before the committee in order to consider their testimony. Then we were rushed into clause by clause on this committee.

• (1220)

I ask the solicitor general why that we are in such a rush to move such a huge bill through the House in such a hurry when it is not going to become mandatory until 2003. What is the rush? Why could we not at least allow that bill to be set over until this fall, when everyone would have an opportunity to examine the large number of amendments that will be tabled before this House on that bill?

I understand that there are well over 100 amendments. Yet time allocation is being imposed. Why is Bill C–68, many portions of which will not become mandatory for eight years, being looked at with such urgency? Why could we not relieve the demands upon the government, upon this House, and upon the members by simply allowing that bill to be moved and taken up when we resume sitting in the fall? I do not understand that. Would the solicitor general care to comment?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I should remind the hon. member that Bill C–68, the bill to which he refers, was debated for days and days in this House. It was then studied for weeks and weeks in committee.

The hon. member speaks of 100 amendments. Most of them are his party's amendments. I can ask why the amendments of his party were not proposed in the parliamentary committee, which is the normal time and place for amendments. Is the purpose of the hon. member at this time to use the device of proposing amendments simply to engage in what amounts to a filibuster? That is a question the majority of Canadians, who want this legislation, can validly ask the Reform Party, although the majority of Canadians who support this legislation already know the answer.

The hon. member should be aware that in our parliamentary system the other place still has to consider this measure. That is its right and duty under our Constitution. If the hon. member does not want to see this bill and its implementation delayed

even longer than the date provided for in the statute, and if he wants to have adequate time for its orderly and fair implementation, then rather than urging that there be further delay until the fall for the consideration of this bill in this House of Commons, he will be applauding our efforts to have it voted on before June 23.

In my view, this is a fair and reasonable step to make sure that the bill is not only law but is adopted and implemented in a fair and reasonable way to serve the overall public interest when it comes to protecting Canadians from improper and unlawful use of firearms, which the majority of Canadians indicate over and over again in public opinion polls that they want from this Parliament.

I am surprised that my hon. friend, interested as he says his party is in listening to people, refuses to listen to them on this important issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Colleagues, the period for questions and comments has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on behalf of the official opposition on the motion to extend the sitting hours in the House of Commons for the next two weeks.

I would first like to clarify a few points concerning our party's position regarding extending the hours of the House of Commons.

In the past, the Bloc Quebecois has never objected, far from it, to extended sittings in the House of Commons, because it wanted to ensure that the parliamentary machine ran in a calm, democratic and efficient way. Each time it was proposed to extend the House's sitting hours, we have always replied "count us in".

• (1225)

For example, during the last debate on the railway conflict, our members came to the House in great numbers over the week–end, Saturday and Sunday, which was quite exceptional—apparently these hours of sitting were unprecedented—to discuss the measure proposed by the government, whereas our colleagues of other political stripes were less diligent in this regard.

The same thing will apply this time, but do not think that the Bloc Quebecois will support the government's motion lightheartedly. In fact, the sore point in this case is the timing of the government's decision to impose extended hours on the House. First of all, we must ask ourselves why the federal government waited until now, just before the session adjourns, to extend the hours of sitting in the House.

Why did the government not extend the hours in a more balanced manner, in the weeks preceding the usual end of the Parliamentary session? There are several possible explanations, but the most plausible is that the government has again been laid low by two ills that have dogged it since it was elected, and by which, it would seem, it continues to be dogged. They are amateurism and improvisation.

The amateurism is nothing new. As one example among many, we had the federal government calling an emergency debate with less than 24 hours' notice to discuss whether or not the peacekeepers should remain in the former Yugoslavia, just as their mandate was about to expire. Then, we were treated to a technical presentation by the Department of National Defence and the Department of Foreign Affairs only two hours before debate began. As they say, incredible but true.

And yet, more recently, this same government had to be pushed to hold an emergency debate on whether our troops should remain in the former Yugoslavia, following the dramatic and tragic events that took place in that country not so long ago. Amateurism and improvisation still characterize the actions of this government now, for if it truly wanted to see its legislative menu passed before the summer, it should have known, it should have seen that at the rate things were proceeding, it was going to be virtually impossible to complete all business before the present session was adjourned.

With all the resources at its disposal, the federal government should have foreseen that, in the present context, the House was going to have to extend the hours sooner or later. Although all the signs were there, the government preferred to stick its head in the sand, which has led to the present situation in which we must rush through a number of important bills. Unfortunately for the people of Quebec and Canadians in general, the proposed extension of the hours of sitting until late at night from Monday until Thursday will make it more difficult to follow the proceedings of the House of Commons on television.

Similarly, the extremely heavy legislative agenda the government wants to ram through over the coming weeks could well compromise significantly the quality of debate in this House. The normal democratic process will thus be negatively affected. I mentioned earlier that a number of reasons could underlie the government's decision to extend the hours of work of the House of Commons beyond the usual times.

I have just pointed out that the most plausible reason is the amateurish and improvisational approach of the government, which prevents it from planning its legislative agenda. However, I would like to come back to the point that, by extending the hours of work of the House beyond the normal times set out in the Standing Orders, the federal government will use the opportunity to push through major legislation that will hit Quebec's interests hard.

In this regard, and unfortunately for Quebec, the federal government has already used its majority in the House to have a number of bills passed, which have hurt Quebec's interests significantly. I refer to Bill C–76, among others, which concerns the budget provisions for the 1995–96 fiscal year and which implemented the provisions on the reduction in transfer payments to the provinces.

• (1230)

Perhaps you will also permit me to say a few words on this bill, which is now before the Senate, in view of the extent of the damage it is causing to Quebec interests.

Bill C–76 is nothing less than the implementation of the latest disastrous decisions in the federal government's most recent budget. This is the budget in which, need I remind you, the government made the unacceptable decision to transfer $7 billion of its own deficit to the provinces. You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that $7 billion will likely make a substantial hole in the provinces' budget.

Unable to properly manage the money of taxpayers in Quebec and Canada, this minor league government, through Bill C–76, is shirking its responsibilities by transferring to the provinces $7 billion out of its deficit.

It goes without saying that Quebec will receive its share of this poisoned gift, which will directly affect its own public finances in the years to come. However, unlike the federal government, the Quebec government has already indicated in its last budget that it did not intend to offload its own deficit onto the municipalities. In doing so, Quebec has shown that it can take its responsibilities in public finance management, despite the blow it just took from the federal government.

The federal government will merge into a single program, called the Canadian social transfer, two of the three transfer payments to the provinces, namely the Canada assistance plan and established programs financing. In 1996–97, after merging these two programs, Ottawa will cut $2.5 billion from transfer payments to the provinces.

In the following fiscal year, the federal government will cut by $4.5 billion the Canada social transfer to the provinces. These unfortunate actions by the federal government will translate into a $650 million shortfall for Quebec in 1996–97. And, in 1997–98, this shortfall could go up to $1.9 billion.

In fact, Bill C–76 helps us understand better the federal government's talk about cost–effective federalism. What could be more cost–effective for Ottawa than cutting the funds to be transferred to the provinces, when it is unable to manage its own finances? That is the cost–effective, flexible federalism they have been harping on about for several months.

The federal government's actions with regard to Bill C–76 hide a problem that is more serious than simply shovelling the Canadian deficit into the provinces' backyards, although this is indeed a major problem.

Canada is facing a fiscal crisis, and transferring the federal deficit to the provinces is only the beginning of the central government's inevitable process to withdraw from its obligations.

In this regard, we must remember that, in 1980, during the first referendum on sovereignty, the federal debt amounted to roughly $90 billion. Fifteen years later, the federal debt is nearly $550 billion. At this rate, according to the available estimates, the public debt accumulated in Canada will push its way past the $800 billion mark by the year 2000. You will agree with me that there is cause for concern and that these figures are telling us something.

Bill C–76 is clear proof of the fact that, unlike Canada, Quebec is already able to take charge of its own public finances and would do well take full responsibility for them as a sovereign State. Also, Bill C–76 is underhanded in that it provides for the establishment of new national standards. While cutting back transfers to the provinces, the federal government will not only maintain national standards for health but also introduce additional national standards for social assistance and post–secondary education, areas which, must we be reminded, both come under exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

• (1235)

This means that, under clause 48 of this bill, Ottawa will be able to interfere in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. With the federal government holding the purse's string, Quebec would be exposing itself to being cut off by the federal government any time it failed to comply with these federal national standards.

Moreover, in an area as important as education, one can wonder how Canadian standards can possibly meet the aspirations and expectations of Quebecers in that area, when Canada cannot even recognize Quebec as a distinct society.

As we say where I come from, you can see just by looking. We did not need a constitutional agreement to see—it is clear as day—that Quebec is a distinct society. Given that even this obvious fact could not be recognized, what can we hope to get from this system?

In fact, Bill C–76 gives a free hand to the federal government to regard post–secondary as a social program. From now on, Ottawa will be able to enforce national standards in this area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. If Quebec rejected the stan-

dards and refused or failed to comply with them, the federal government would be authorized to stop all transfers, even though this money is our own money, money coming straight out of Quebec taxpayers's pockets.

Similarly, there is nothing in this bill to force the federal government to look for a consensus amongst the provinces before putting these new national standards in place. Indeed, while the federal government must consult the provinces, at least in theory, it is not required to get their unanimous consent before going ahead and implementing new national standards.

Moreover, Quebec and the other provinces could, at any time, be the victims of new federal rules, since Ottawa has the authority to unilaterally amend the legislation.

I want to say a word on the government's legislative agenda, assuming of course that it has one. Not long ago, the federal government informed the official opposition of its intention to pass, in the next two weeks, several important bills, including Bill C–88 on internal trade.

The purpose of Bill C–88 is to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade. As shown during the debates on NAFTA and on the Uruguay Round agreements establishing the World Trade Organization, the Bloc Quebecois has always been in favour of trade liberalization and it supports the principle underlying that bill. It is common knowledge that Quebec is a free trader, and has been one for a long time.

However, the wording of some provisions, particularly clause 9, poses some problems. Clause 9, in particular, provides for a wider interpretation which could allow the federal government to intervene and impose retaliatory measures even when it is not involved in the dispute. The federal government is giving itself very important powers.

Then there is Bill C–91, which concerns the Federal Business Development Bank. That bill, which is a new attempt by the federal to centralize, will again result in useless and costly duplication which will increase the government's deficit.

While the trend, at least in Quebec, is toward regionalization, the federal government pursues its secular centralizing tradition. This is mind–boggling. I can only hope that Quebec's interests will not suffer too much when these bills are reviewed. This is doubtful though, considering what happened with Bill C–76.

Should this government hurt Quebec's interests with these bills, as it usually does, it will find us in its way, like it has since October 1993. We will vigorously and tenaciously defend Quebec's interests, as we have done since we were elected.

• (1240)

The contempt shown toward Quebecers will only last for so long. Soon, with the referendum, the federal government will realize the price to be paid for constantly attacking Quebec's interests and basic values.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the hon. member's speech, and you will not be surprised to learn that I am not entirely in agreement with some of the things he said because, of course, the Government of Canada, and the Liberal Party in particular, has made it a habit of defending Quebec's interests and that is what the Government of Canada will continue to do with the same level of interest as it has shown in the past and that is what it will continue to do in a prosperous and united Canada.

I would ask my colleague to look at his own track record and that of his party regarding the number of times they have supported attempts to extend hours in order to increase the number of bills which could be voted on by the hon. members in the past, before accusing the government of not moving fast enough to get certain bills through. We have appealed to them many times. Will he tell us how many times his party came out in favour of this? I think that the answer is zero.

Will he also tell us whether he is aware that Standing Order 24 and Standing Order 28 in particular provide for the Parliamentary calendar, and whether he is aware of Standing Order 27, which stipulates that we could not propose before today a systematic extension of sitting hours for the coming weeks? Since it is the first day and the first hour of the first day, how could we possibly have proposed a systematic extension of hours before today? After all, it is the first day.

Mr. Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on some of the things the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said. He says the federal government has always made a point of defending the interests of Quebec. I have my doubts about that.

If ever a government chose to ignore the interests of Quebec, it is the Liberal government. Or should I say governments, to be as specific as the hon. member for Louis–Hébert, the successive governments under the Liberals.

People tell us: You have good representation in Ottawa, you have ministers from Quebec, you have a Prime Minister from Quebec. For more than 20 years, Canada's Prime Ministers have been Quebecers. The word window dressing comes to mind because, basically, has it done Quebec any good to have a prime minister or powerful cabinet ministers from Quebec in Ottawa? Did it prevent the implementation of the War Measures Act in 1970? Did it prevent the unilateral patriation of the Constitution in 1982? Did it prevent the demise of Meech Lake? What does

Quebec have to show for the fact that a number of federal cabinet ministers and prime ministers were from Quebec?

Mr. Paré: An illusion!

Mr. Bergeron: An illusion, as the hon. member for Louis-Hébert said. It was the illusion of French power. We have realized since then it was only an illusion, and Quebecers have realized this as well and will act accordingly this fall.

That being said, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell talked about a prosperous and united country. United it still is, at least theoretically, under the constitution. We will see about that this fall. But prosperous is something else. Prosperous, I am not so sure. I talked about this in my speech, and if the hon. member had listened carefully, he would have noticed that this country is not as prosperous as he says it is.

But first of all, to answer his question, I wonder why the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell asked me a question in the House when he already knows the answer; in fact he gave the answer himself.

• (1245)

I said we had always shown we were ready and willing when asked to sit for extended hours, especially during that one weekend when we debated the government's outrageous proposal to deal with the railway dispute. Many of us were here when the House sat throughout the weekend to express our objections to the federal government's proposals. I said earlier that some of our colleagues did not show the same stamina, but that is not the point.

As for the other question about Standing Order 27, I may remind the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who says he listened to my speech, that basically, my point was not that the government had failed to extend the sitting hours of the House before. I said that because of the government's poor planning, now, towards the end of the session, we have a kind of bottleneck and will have to pass a number of bills at breakneck speed, which will not improve the quality of debate in this House.

That was the point I was trying to make in my speech. The hon. member should listen more carefully next time.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is always unfortunate that when a Bloc member speaks, we end up dropping into this whole us versus them; Canada, Quebec discussion and so on and so forth. The real issue here, as far as this motion is concerned, has more to do with the management of the affairs of the government.

I wonder if my friend from the Bloc might not agree that what is going on here is the government has purposely backed up legislation to the point that it will be able to put pressure on certain issues and certainly on certain people in its back bench by bringing in time allocation on some of the so-called hotter issues.

I would suggest—Mr. Speaker, you will have to correct me because I got away with this word the other day—that it is legislation by stealth. It is unfortunate that in Canada, where we live in a democracy, that the government would bring in time allocation, or closure by any other name, and then go forward with this knowing full well that we are coming to the 23rd. It is no surprise to the government any more than it is a surprise to my leader or any of the members in the House that we are coming to this point and yet we have this backlog.

I wonder if the member from the Bloc would not agree with me that the motion we are talking about really goes to the whole core issue of the lack of management on the part of the government or, in the alternative, that the government is attempting to bring in legislation and treating members of the House as though they were rubber stamps.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for Kootenay East for his question. I thank him, because he is allowing me to drive home my message. I agree with him entirely. This is exactly what I was saying in my speech and in my response to my colleague for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. I said that, with its motion today, the government is behaving with unprecedented amateurism and lack of foresight.

I agree entirely with my colleague when he says there is a complete lack of planning on the part of the government. My remarks were in fact intended to point out the government's bad planning of its activities, leaving us at the end of the session with a bottleneck of bills to consider and adopt in a very short period of time. This will affect the quality of debate and the quality of speeches, particularly, I would say, for my colleagues in the Reform Party in connection with the bill on gun control. I imagine they would have liked to say more about it, although I think a perfectly reasonable amount of time has been accorded it. I expect it is a concern for them.

Our concern is for other bills, which will have to be debated in great haste and which perhaps could have been debated longer, in our view. The government, however, decided to submit a series of bills at the last minute, and so here we are with all these bills to consider, debate and adopt within two weeks.

• (1250)

So it is a planning problem. It has nothing to do, as my colleague for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell explained earlier, with the fact that the hours of debate should have been extended earlier in the session. It has to do with the fact that the legislation now before the House should have been tabled earlier.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my question to my colleague from the Bloc the fact that the government and everyone in Canada knew June 23 was coming. We can all look at a calendar.

In my question to the House leader I asked how it could be that we have 22 items that are supposed to be jammed through the House in nine days. I suggest now, as I suggested in my question to my colleague, that I cannot help but believe the government purposely and intentionally backed up the legislation to the point that when we come to debate these bills, the quality of debate will not be there because it will not be extensive enough.

I can speak for myself on the issue of Bill C–68. As revenue critic I had an opportunity to speak on an amendment we had brought and discuss the question of how the revenue minister and the customs department were not going to be able to enforce the provisions in the bill. However I have not had an opportunity to express to the House, to these members, to Canada the concerns people have in my constituency over the issues that have arisen on the issues in Bill C–68.

Reform has tried to encourage the government to deal with issues Canadians really care about, namely the deficit and debt. Bring in legislation, bring forward motions that deal with the whole issue of deficit and debt. Instead, on Tuesday night we came to the House and again worked like rubber stamps because that is the way the system works.

Why are we not discussing how the system is going to be changed so that the members, as the representatives of the people of Canada, can regain control or even gain control over some aspects of the expenditures of the government?

We should be here talking about tax reductions. We should be here talking about the issue of crime, not the paper thin way the government has come forward with its amendments, for example on the Young Offenders Act, but something with some real teeth.

We should be talking about referendums, citizen's initiatives and free votes. We should be doing things that are going to make a change for Canadians. What has the government done? "Oh, we are going to have a big change. We're going to bring Bill C–68", which I submit is nothing more than a warm fuzzy. It makes people feel good.

People are not dumb. Canadians have looked at that legislation. While many of the people who may want to see registration may say that they register cars and they register this and that. But when they are asked if they think registration will make any difference to society, to violence on the streets, they say that it will not make any difference but that it will make them feel better.

The government is bringing forward things like affirmative action which was repudiated by the people of Ontario last night. The members know one of the major things Mike Harris won on was the issue of employment equity or quotas which the government is trying to bring forward and to strengthen. Come on.

The government is also talking about bringing forward a toonie, which is the duplicate of a loonie. Why are we worried about $2 coins? Why are we not worried about making sure the coins get to stay in Canadians' pockets? Why are we worried about those kinds of things? Of course the government is going to say that the Reform Party is just trying to be obstructionist, to block things.

• (1255)

An hon. member: True.

Mr. Abbott: The member says true, that is exactly what they are trying to do.

The people in my constituency and I suspect anybody in a coffee shop anywhere in Canada is starting to become familiar with the word "spin". What kind of spin is the government going to put on an issue? It is really unfortunate that there are times when the spins are done in such an intentionally dishonest way.

For example, I read in the Montreal *Gazette* an article with the name of my leader mentioned which talks of treason in a closure deal. "The Reform leader charged that the federal Liberals made a deal close to treasonist with the Bloc to close down the House of Commons for the summer by June 23 to allow separatists to begin campaigning for Quebec sovereignty on St. Jean Baptiste Day".

I find this next part really very unfortunate because there is spin and then there is unfortunate spin. It says that the Reform Party leader's accusation became distorted before it even got off Parliament Hill: "To pretend the celebration of St. Jean Baptiste Day is somehow associated with treason is I think an insult to all French Canadians", said the government whip. That is what he told reporters.

We had some fun the other evening during the votes when the Reform Party whip stood and complimented the government whip, saying what an intelligent person he was. There was a bit of bickering and some fun over that compliment.

I will say again that as with all members the government whip is an intelligent person. Therefore I have to ask if he was not intentionally distorting the words of the leader of the Reform Party when he was referring to the fact that the government had done a deal with the devil so that the House would be able to rise on June 23. This would allow Bloc members to get involved in all their separatist games on St. Jean Baptiste Day.

That is exactly what my leader said. Unless the member has been misquoted, let us assume that Terrance Wills from the *Gazette* Ottawa Bureau misheard what the government whip said. However, for him to pretend that the celebration of St. Jean

Baptiste Day is somehow associated with treason is an insult to all French Canadians. That is just an absolute total distortion of anything even remotely close to reason.

Why do we have this kind of pressure situation right at this moment? Let us take a look at some of the bills that the government thinks are so important.

When Reformers came to the House, unlike most of the government members, we had been listening to the concerns of Canadians with respect to the porky pension plan that MPs have. When we arrived here, for an extended period of time, almost three and a half months, we hammered and hammered at the Prime Minister: "Will you do something about these pensions? Will you get them revised? Will you open the door so that we, as members of Parliament, can say: "No, we do not consider ourselves a special group a people. We are not on a special plateau". Will the Prime Minister do something about this?"

That went on through the spring of 1994. The Prime Minister said: "Well, you know there will be an election in 1997. Nobody will have to worry about pensions until 1997. We will get around to it. Sooner or later it will happen. There is lots of time".

• (1300)

Then out of the clear blue sky the President of the Treasury Board introduced Bill C–85. Interestingly, he just happened to choose a Friday afternoon. It was a very slow Friday afternoon. Because the Tory convention was happening over in Hull that afternoon, there was no attention in the news media to the fact that Bill C–85, the little bit of fine tuning the government was doing on the porky pension plan, was being introduced.

Then the Liberals brought it back to the House and with a number of different procedures attempted to get it out of the House. Reform Party members, to a person, have stated it is unconscionable that members of Parliament would put themselves on a different level from other Canadians. As a consequence, we stood against it. We stood and we stood until, oh, my goodness, we suddenly have it in committee.

So government members could understand the frustration Canadians feel, I have suggested it might have been a good idea to expose that bill to Canadians so that Canadians could have some input on it. But no, the Liberals decided they were going to have their very own hand chosen experts. I would suggest to their embarrassment the vast majority of their hand chosen experts really did not come forward with the kind of recommendations or testimony they were looking for in order to fit into their little porky plan.

When the Reform member for Calgary West got up and left the room at the end of the testimony, in disgust I might add, the members opposite did the clause by clause study on Bill C–85 in 12 minutes. It is called lightning speed, the speed of light. All of us know that the whole parliamentary system and a glacier have a lot in common. To get something through in 12 minutes makes me think that maybe it was sliding along on pig fat it went so fast.

What we are looking at in the whole issue of legislation is the issue of exposure to the Canadian people. I use a three legged analogy when I speak to students. I enjoy speaking to students because I want them to appreciate the wonderful democracy we have. In spite of some of the things the government does, we still do live in a democracy.

There are three legs to the stool of democracy in order for it to work. The first leg is the people. The people become involved. The second leg is the politicians. The politicians come forward with proper, sound, right thinking legislation. The third leg is the press. If we did not have the press, and if we did not have what the politicians are doing exposed to the people by the press, we would not have a three legged stool. We would have something that would not stand.

With the issue of Bill C–85, the government, knowing that the press is not necessarily going to run and jump on this issue all that quickly, wants to get it in and out of the House as quickly as it possibly can. The government tries to destroy that one leg and the whole process of democracy ends up falling over.

The government House leader raised a number of interesting bills. For example I cite Bill C–72. As a matter of fact, my colleague from Wild Rose was trying to get the government to move forward so we could have vote on this bill weeks ago.

• (1305)

We were prepared to put Bill C–72 through the House in one day. What is the bill about? It has to do with the self–induced intoxication defence. This defence cannot stand. This is wrong. Students and other people in my community have asked me what the government is going to do. To its credit, the government has come forward with Bill C–72. If we, and I do not doubt for a second, the Bloc were prepared to put it through in one day, why now is he raising issues like this and saying that we must hit the June 23 deadline?

The hon. member for Wild Rose has also brought to the attention of the House the issue of the admissibility of DNA testing in criminal cases. We have absolutely tragic situations, hearings pending in court where DNA evidence will not be permissible. If the government wants to sit all night long, the Reform Party will be here to put through the legislation so that DNA evidence can be admissible in court. That is a commitment I know I can make on behalf of the members of my party.

The issue is not that we are trying to stop legislation. In fact, we are trying to get the government to move on things like self–induced intoxication, DNA and fiscal issues. We are trying to get the government to move. For it to turn around and suggest we are trying to be obstructionist is an awful stretch of the truth.

Let us look at Bill C–41, the much desired bill. Is this the bill which all Canadians are clambering for? I think not. Bill C–41 has to do with sentencing. As many people in Canada know, there is one clause in particular which is singularly troublesome. That clause in the judgment of the Reform Party basically creates categories of victims. We believe that all Canadians are equal regardless of race, language, creed, colour, religion or gender. For us to be applying a test, to be applying a shopping list to create categories of victims is a step backward. It puts people who do not fall into that shopping list at a disadvantage.

We would be voting against that bill on the basis of that clause alone as it presently stands. The most difficult part of that clause is putting the undefined term of sexual orientation into the shopping list. I believe that at least 80 per cent of Canadians are opposed to the inclusion of the undefined term of sexual orientation, yet the government is prepared to go ahead against the wishes of Canadians and against the wishes of many of its own backbenchers. Government backbenchers know there is a problem.

Another thing which has happened is that there has been the passage under pressure of Bill C–76, the bill which got our friend from Notre–Dame–de–Grâce into so much trouble. The whip will be turfing him off his committee, trying to get everybody whipped into line. I guess that is why he is called the whip. The hon. member I just mentioned, although I absolutely disagree with his position, nonetheless is a person of principle who is prepared to stand and say that the Liberal Party does not have a mandate to go ahead with Bill C–76 and that he is not about to support it.

• (1310)

The red book promised openness, protection of health. I suggest that the government is prepared to ram things through the House, to treat the House like a rubber stamp. I suggest if it walks like a pig, if it grunts like a pig, if it smells like a pig, it is probably a pig. If the government is trying to jam things through the House of Commons with closure, time allocation and with extended hours, it is legislation by stealth.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like most members I would like to get on with the business of the House. However since the member thought to take up 20 minutes of House time to babble on about a number of things which he obviously knows nothing about, I want to question him on a couple of matters.

First, the member said that the House should be talking about matters such as tax reductions. Why is it that his party when it proposed its budget to the House did not include any tax reductions in its plans and simply cut social programs?

Another reason I think the member knows nothing about what he was talking about is his comments to do with the proposal for a $2 coin. He somehow trivialized the proposal for the $2 coin. The member ought to know because it has been presented and debated in this House that the introduction of a $2 coin will save Canada $250 million over a 20–year period, simply because of the savings on reprinting $2 bills which erode. It is a very simple reason.

The impact to the Canadian economy, to small business people who operate coin vending machines, is also going to be very substantial. The member has trivialized a move that will save Canadians $250 million. He has trivialized the impact on small business, all for partisan and opportunistic purposes. This member should explain himself.

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to explain myself.

On the issue of tax reductions, anybody who knows anything, and I know this member has an accounting background, would know that the biggest single problem Canada is faced with today is that the government refuses to acknowledge that we are spending $1,800 per second more than we are taking in right now. The problem is expenditures.

We can come forward with tax reductions when we reach the point that this or any other government is prepared to bite the bullet and tell the people the truth. As the member for Willowdale, who is the chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance said the other day, until this government realizes that there must be cuts in the area of social spending under its CHST, there cannot be any balancing of the budget. Until there is a balancing of the budget, there cannot be tax reductions.

On the matter of the toonie, what we are really coming down to is a question that has never been asked to the best of my knowledge, which is whether or not we need a $2 denomination. If the hon. member is talking about saving $250 million by replacing a $2 bill with a $2 loonie or whatever it is going to be called, I wonder how many dollars would be saved if we just did away with the $2 denomination. I want to make my position clear. I am not suggesting that nor am I recommending that. I am saying we should be looking at that before the bill comes before the House. I do not believe there has been any study done on that.

• (1315)

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak against extending the hours.

It seems to me that we have a contradiction on the basis of what happened yesterday. We have the government invoking closure three times so that it can ram through some very unpopular legislation. On the one hand, time allocation or closure is being forced on the House. On the other hand, we are talking about extending the hours.

If the government were serious about quality discussion and quality debate on any of the bills, the last thing it should be looking at is closure so that we cannot have a full airing and debate of issues that are important to the Canadian people.

In view of what happened in this place yesterday and what happened in the province of Ontario, it is interesting that closure was being rammed through the House on three very contentious bills. At the same time voters in Ontario went to the polls and rejected the bills, the government is attempting to ram through the House of Commons. It is unbelievable.

It raises the suspicion that perhaps that was the agenda, that some very unpopular bills were not to be allowed to remain in the public arena for further exposure because things are starting to fall apart and they have to be rammed through. The wheels are falling off. MP pension plans, gun control and undefined sexual orientation are three issues that were overwhelmingly defeated in the Ontario provincial election.

The government talks about zilch co–operation coming from the opposition. In my experience there has been zilch shown by the government in the way in which it has organized its agenda and brought to the Canadian people very important issues that need to be discussed.

Two other things were very big factors in the Ontario election. One was that the common sense revolution was very much opposed to employment equity or hiring quotas based on race and sex, another bill the government is determined to put through in spite of the fact that it has been rejected by the people of the province of Ontario.

I should like to talk a bit about the three bills because they are key to closure and trying to ram through legislation. I will start with the MPs pension plan. While it does not represent a whole lot of dollars, it is the flashpoint with the Canadian voter.

We have seen it in Alberta where the premier of that province started out a campaign being less than double digit in the opinion polls. He started to listen to the people and realized that a gold plated pension plan was not supported in any way by them. Therefore he did away with it in Alberta. As a result he gained some credibility and the people started listening to him. It was leadership by example. Somebody was showing real concern for the problem of overspending and debt by doing something about a gold plated pension plan.

Let us move into Ontario. Mr. Harris stood and said that the gold plated pension plan was gone. That was a big part of his platform. It was the part of his platform that gave Mr. Harris the credibility he needed when he addressed other issues. Two provinces have addressed the concern and because of it have been rewarded by tremendous support by the voters. It is unbelievable that the message has not reached the House. The government thinks the bit of tinkering done on the bill will satisfy Canadian voters. It is an absolute sham.

When I was campaigning and after I was elected I cannot think of a public meeting where questions and comments were invited at which the issue of the MPs pension plan did not come up. Voter after voter said to get rid of it, and I agree. It is an abuse of our office. We want fair compensation. There is no argument about that, but the pension plan is not fair. It should be made more in line with what is available in the private sector.

• (1320)

Here we have an issue of high profile that touches all Canadian voters. Many of our citizens would love to have pension plans. Some do not have them. Some are struggling without work. Many people are unemployed. Indeed many young people are underemployed. Because the government is showing no leadership in attacking that serious problem the dilemma continues.

The MPs pension plan is nothing more than another broken red book promise. I know the red book was loosely worded. I have suggested that perhaps it should have started out with: "Once upon a time". The problem with loose wording is that while it may get us off the hook by saying that we did not exactly say this or this is what we meant to say, the voters will make the same interpretation and say that they think this is what was said. When we do not follow through it is indeed a broken promise to voters.

The comment made by my colleague from Calgary Centre about the $150,000 compensation has been referred to many times by the opposition. The point that was missed and continues to be missed by the government was that whatever our compensation the total package should be up front and on the table with no special deals and no tax exempt expense accounts. That was the point he was making regardless of the number. Perhaps he used the wrong number, but the main point he was making was that whatever we were to be paid should be up front and fair and we should make sure that all Canadian people know exactly what we are being paid.

It goes back to the heart of credibility. Because of the failure of the government to attack and do something about the gold plated pension plan it lost all credibility on the deficit and the debt. How can we go to Canadian voters and ask them to accept

spending cuts when we are not prepared to show some leadership by example in making some sacrifice?

The thing that continues to mystify me on the pension plan is that poll after poll clearly indicates Canadian people overwhelmingly want the plan changed. It is not even close. When a poll is broken down by party affiliation, the Liberal supporters also show overwhelming support for having it changed.

We might have a problem with what is known as selective hearing. We hear what we want to hear and we ignore what the Canadian people are really saying.

Money should never be the motivating factor for coming to this place. I do not think it is with many members. When I came to this place I had no idea of what the total package was and frankly I could care less. I was more concerned about the issues and bringing some fiscal sanity to this place. Compensation was secondary. We do not dispute there should be fair compensation. That is all Canadian people are asking for.

The arrogance and the contempt for Parliament shown yesterday in the House have to be coming from the inflated popularity opinion poll numbers that are coming out. Liberals think they can do no wrong and the people love them. We saw what happened in Ontario to a Liberal party that thought it was up in the polls and could no wrong. It said: "We will do nothing. We won't rock the boat. We will just ride this out".

Mr. Penson: The same thing happened in Manitoba.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): That is right. The same thing in Manitoba.

On the basis of inflated opinion polls that have no depth and when the rubber hits the road as it did in Ontario and Manitoba, the real poll comes out and the voters respond to politicians who are not listening to them. I am proud to say I opted out of the pension plan and all my Reform colleagues have opted out of it. I am looking forward to the next federal election. I am looking forward to a debate on MPs pension plans, anytime, anywhere, anyplace. I would relish it.

• (1325)

I have mixed emotions when I deal with the matter. While I want change on the one hand, I am absolutely convinced the Liberals are digging a hole they will never get out of. They are ensuring a Reform victory in 1997. There is no question about it. They do not understand. They are not listening.

They think they won the election. They did not win the election. The Conservatives lost it. The Conservatives were thrown out. The Liberals just happened to be there. Canadian voters were very sure of what they did not want. They were not too sure who they should vote for but the message was that Canadian voters were voting on the issues. They are watching the politicians. They are watching the promises being made and for integrity. Not following through on the promises made will cost them very dearly in the next election. So many of the promises in the red book have been broken at this point that I cannot see how the Liberals can possibly survive.

We just had an indication of how good the red book is because the daughter of red book that was used in Ontario did them absolutely no good at all. It destroyed them.

So much for pensions. I dealt with pensions because even though it is not a whole lot of dollars it is a major issue with the Canadian voter. It was in 1993 and it will be even bigger in 1997. There is no question about it because our financial position will have worsened, absolutely. There is no doubt about that. With the road the government is taking us down our debt situation will be far worse than it is today. We will be $600 billion in debt. We will still be overspending by $25 billion and we will have interest payments of $50 billion a year. When we try to balance the books to accommodate $50 billion in interest payments it is a real challenge for any government. The Liberals are not meeting their target.

Let us talk about the gun control bill, one of the three being rammed through the House so that we do not have quality debate and we as the opposition do not get an opportunity to fully air all concerns. The gun control bill is a red herring. It is a smoke screen. It is an attempt to make the government look like a government in action. If we asked Canadian people what the 10 most important issues are in Canada today, gun control would not make 11. Here we are wasting all this time and all this discussion on a bill that will do absolutely nothing to clean up the problems it is supposed to address: unsafe homes, unsafe streets and unsafe communities. It will do absolutely nothing.

Mr. Ramsay: It will not come into effect for eight years.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): It will not come into effect for eight years. The Liberals have made a major issue of something that is not a major issue. They have not been dealing with major issues like the deficit and debt, the criminal justice system and creating jobs. Those are the issues Canadian people want addressed and they are not being addressed. Gun control was just a sham to make the government look like a government in action.

When we talk about the gun control bill I hear comments from the other side indicating that it is supported by the people. That support is diminishing. When we ask people whether they support gun control they answer: "Yes, we do". When we ask them whether they think it will achieve a reduction in crime they answer: "No, we do not". They support gun control and admit at the same time that it will not do what the government says it will do.

How do we adjust to that? Why would the government not respond to that?

Mr. Hanger: They will spend money anyway.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): They say: "Let's spend it because we said we were going to. It does not matter what the voter wants. Let's give it to them. We know what is best. Never mind the mindless masses out there. The government knows what is best". Members are told: "Don't listen to your people. We know what is best for them". Do ot let them fool you. They really do not understand; we do. We have some kind of superior intelligence here and we know what is best out there".

• (1330)

Mulroney thought that and he found out to his sorrow that when politicians do not listen to the Canadian people, as his government did not, they pay very dearly when they go back to the voters at the next election.

During the Ontario election, Mr. Harris said he was opposed to gun registration. That is the other part about the bill which makes no sense. It is almost like it was an intentional deception. We are mixing apples and oranges in the bill. It is unbelievable. It is mixing law–abiding citizens with the criminals. It makes absolutely no sense.

We made an attempt to have the bill split. There is 100 per cent support, I am sure in all parties and in all parts of Canada, for getting tough with the criminal misuse of firearms. That is where the problem is. That is where we have to address our attention. That will contribute to making our homes safer, our streets safer and our communities safer. No, we had to have the whole package. We had to have the harassment of the legitimate gun owner and combined with that the spending of all the tax dollars we do not have to accomplish nothing.

Poll after poll has indicated the bill will not do what the government has said it will do. Time after time polls have shown that. It is a charade and the voters will see through it. The government is not listening. It is not paying attention. Perhaps it is selective hearing.

On hate crimes, Ontario voters said they do not want the undefined phrase sexual orientation in there. Mr. Harris won on that. Here again we have the government pushing through one of three bills which nobody wants. The voters do not want them. I cannot believe the government does not the message. It is not listening. It does not want to hear. It will dearly; one term members. I am looking forward to the next election.

The deficit and the debt is the issue we should be dealing with. We wasted all of this time on other bills which are not on the main agenda. We will extend hours to debate bills secondary in importance to the majority of Canadians. The number one issue, the burning issue, is the deficit and the debt, and we continue to fiddle while Rome burns. It is unbelievable.

Unfortunately the first part of the budget did absolutely nothing. It is amazing the government took office after being in opposition for as long as it had and did not know what the major problem in Canada was and or know how to deal with it. We heard: "Give us a year. We did not realize how serious the situation was. We need some time to have a look at it and see if we can do something about it". It wasted a whole year. The government had been in opposition supposedly preparing to take office.

Then we hear the government inherited the problem. At first the government would not even admit that it was a problem. What we heard about the deficit was: "Do not be too concerned about it. Be happy. It is all right. Take an Aspirin, go to bed, wake up in the morning and you will be fine".

We were honest with the Canadian voters. We said this is a serious problem when we were campaigning. We were the only party to put in writing a plan to eliminate the deficit in three years with no new or increased taxes. We are the only party that had the courage to do that. We produced a document which actually had some numbers in it, not a red book full of rhetoric; a masterpiece of writing, an absolute fairy tale.

• (1335)

We did worse than waste a year in the first budget. In that first year we gave away what it said was to be $350 million when we gave in to the smugglers. The government said it would cost only $350 million; $350 million when we were in debt to the point that we were is unbelievable. However, we found out later the government's numbers were wrong. It underestimated by about $500 million—only $500 million.

In effect we gave away almost a billion dollars to the smugglers when we were so deep in debt and in overspending it was absolutely unbelievable. That is typical. It is avoidance of this issue and here again is where the gun control bill comes in, smoke and mirrors, let us hide the fact that we are not dealing with the real problem.

I am looking forward to the next election because what happened in the House yesterday has absolutely ensured a victory for the only party listening to the Canadian voter and that will respond to the concerns we are hearing.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member said something I agree with and that I think all members agree with. When we ran to become the elected representatives of our constituents and to serve in this place we did so because we wanted to make a contribution. We wanted to do what we could to make Canada a better place.

The hon. member discussed what he felt was a number of deficiencies. Gun control came up, that registration will do nothing. I will share examples of how registration will help to

reduce crime. Some 47 per cent of crimes involving firearms in Canada are committed with long arms, as reported by the Canadian chiefs of police.

Today we have registration of handguns and this piece of legislation will now bring all firearms under registration. A specific example has to do with imported guns. Today a legitimate importer does not have to register the guns. In a case recently in Toronto guns imported were then turned around and black marketed to the criminal element.

Under this legislation imported guns must be registered at the time of importation. As a result those weapons now cannot be very easily sold to the criminal element and used in criminal activity. That registration element alone will help to reduce the number of weapons getting out of the hands of law–abiding citizens.

The member also made reference to Bill C–41. He referred to it as the sexual orientation bill and the hate bill when he knows full well it is a sentencing bill. There are some important things in that bill. I have a motion at report stage, which I hope all members will support, concerning sentencing provisions as they relate to aggravating circumstances. There are two circumstances, first where bias, prejudice or hate is involved and second where there is an abuse of trust or authority relationships. The motion I have raised with all parties and all members is to provide stiffer sentences for spousal abusers.

• (1340)

This is an important element of the bill and I have asked all members and particularly this member for support on a very important issue. Bill C–41 is not about one issue. It is a sentencing bill, an extremely important bill that will help deal with crime in Canada.

The member referred to the member for Calgary Centre's saying we should eliminate all forms of alternative compensation for members of Parliament and that members of Parliament should be paid $150,000 a year instead. This unacceptable.

The member also said he may have used the wrong number. He has used the wrong number. What he has failed to recognize is that if we incorporate legitimate business expenses in income grossed up those expenses also become deductible on a tax return and there would be no limit. The tax act presently says all expenses directly or indirectly associated with earning income will be deductible. As a result there would be virtually no limits on what members could spend for what purposes. If $150,000 a year is not the number, what is the number?

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments and question from the member for Mississauga South.

Dealing with the compensation package and the real number, we do not know what that number is. We are not putting a number forward. We are saying the total compensation package has to be looked at and all the loopholes have to be eliminated so that whatever we are being paid we have no special deals, no gold plated pension plan, no tax exempt status. We can put it all right out on the table and let the voters, an independent group, decide what our compensation figure should be, not the members in the House. I am quite prepared to do that.

The burning issue with Canadian voters is get it out in the open, stop this double standard of a better deal for us than they can get in the private sector. They are infuriated by that. You miss the message and you continue to miss the message and that was—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I know that with great enthusiasm at times in debate we become more animated but I remind colleagues on both sides of the House that all interventions must be made through the Chair and not directly to one another.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I did get carried away and I apologize for that. I will go through the Chair.

On compensation the mistake was putting a number when a number did not need to be put. The point by the member for Calgary West was it should be above board.

If we were to ask the Canadian people the top 10 issues they want to see the government dealing with, gun control would not make that list. It is a sham because we are not dealing with those issues. In dealing with the gun control bill we ask for proof that the registration program will do what the government says it will, but we do not get that.

Polls show that people who say they support the bill do not believe it will achieve what the government says it is will. It is incumbent on the government to prove if it can that the bill will reduce crime. It cannot do it and that is why the voters are rejecting it. That is why Mike Harris won with the huge majority he did.

On Bill C–42, it is a sentencing bill. It contains something the voters do not want. I keep hearing in the House it is what we want. What is important is not what we want but what the people we are representing want.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Obviously a lot of people want to speak on this topic but I can only give the floor to one at a time.

• (1345)

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to remain focused on you rather than getting into a debate.

The point that I was making is that it is what the voters want, not what we want or what we think they want. The point I made when I started out was that Mike Harris won in Ontario because he listened to the voters and adapted his agenda. The Liberal Party, on the other hand, provincially and federally, are not listening to the voters. They paid the price for it in the province in Ontario.

My suggestion to the member and all members of the government is that you will pay the price for it in the next federal election because you are not listening to the Canadian people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I will make a suggestion. I think if we could all be somewhat conscious of the fact that when we use the word "you" it leads to something less than what we desire in the Chamber. I will leave it at that for today. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hear the howls of dread on the other side and I do not understand why. I can only imagine it is because fear of the truth is striking the cords of their vocal organs.

I can understand their reluctance to hear some facts. I have come today armed with the odd fact to deal with the question of time allocation that members have raised in the course of their remarks and the extension of hours that we are going to enjoy together next week.

The first thing I want to say is that the hon. member for Simcoe Centre talked about what the voters want. He seems to have forgotten the lesson of October 1993.

Mr. Abbott: Talk to us about the Ontario election.

Mr. Milliken: I am talking about this House, not about the Ontario legislature. The Liberal Party of Canada put forward the most comprehensive and acceptable program that has ever been put forward by a political party in the history of the country and that was the red book.

I am sorry I do not have my copy here today because I know the hon. member who is making all the noise over there and who I urged a few weeks ago to get a copy and put it under his pillow, would not be so vociferous this afternoon if he had spent a little more time studying the red book. I can tell him that the voters of Canada chose the Liberal Party of Canada to be the government because of the promises in the red book.

In other words, the voters chose what they wanted when the election was held. They made their choice on October 25, 1993. They are getting delivered to them what it was they voted for in the red book. Every one of the campaign promises from the red book are being enforced in legislation today. The legislation we will be dealing with next week under time allocation was contained in the red book. The government is living up to the commitment it made to the Canadian electorate in 1993 in the red book.

I notice the Bloc is silent and agreeable on these points because it knows that governments are elected to fulfil certain commitments. Frankly, its members recognize the commitments we made were good and valid ones so they are agreeing with us in this respect. However, the members of the Reform Party like to think of themselves as a government that got elected but in fact, because of their success, having had no one here before except the hon. member for Beaver River, they think they won the election because a whole bunch of them got elected. However, what percentage of the vote did they have? Did they break 10 per cent or was it 15 per cent? Whatever it was it was not a number that inspires confidence in the hearts of Canadians.

While hon. members in the Reform Party can argue that they may have won the confidence of the people in their constituencies, which some of them did, one of them had the lowest percentage anyone had to get elected, I think it was 28 per cent or 29 per cent of the vote. He still managed to get in. It shows how badly split the electors were in that riding. The fact is they did not win the confidence of Canadians with the votes they had. In my constituency the Reform candidate had 12 per cent of the votes. Canadians did not vote for Reform policies. They voted for Liberal policies. They voted for Liberal policies as outlined in the red book. Those are the policies that are contained in the legislation we are debating, and were contained in the list of bills presented by the government House leader during his remarks earlier today when he presented the motion to extend hours.

• (1350)

While I can understand a certain disagreement between the Reform Party members and the members of the government because of ideological points of view or differences in policy—I remember the little blue book had other promises in it—the fact remains our party was elected with a substantial majority of seats in the House, a very substantial portion of the popular vote in the country and we are proceeding to fulfil the promises we outlined to the electorate in 1993.

Instead of asking us to substitute—

Mr. Abbott: Allmand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I am going to draw on an experience of a previous life, that of a hockey referee.

One of the principles we strived for was not to have "rabbit ears". I am not seeking to hear more than I would customarily hear. I would not want to put in question or in doubt the validity of the convention of not mentioning members in the House by name but in fact by their ridings.

The Chair understands the vigour of the debate, of the co–operation necessary within the rules and spirit of that debate in this Chamber and I hope all of us will keep that in mind.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not refer to someone by name. I try to avoid that. I apologize for doing that if I did. I do not recall.

As I was saying, hon. members opposite may feel their views represent the majority of Canadians but it is not an opinion shared (a) by the majority of Canadians, and (b) by the vast majority of the members of the House. While they might want us to substitute Reform Party policy for the red book we will not do it. We will not be dissuaded from proceeding with the policies outlined in the red book because of a lot of shouting and yelling from the other side of the House. Nor will we do so because of obstruction practised by members from the opposite side of the House. I want to refer to that right now. I have some statistics that hon. members opposite may want to hear.

In respect of Bill C–68, about which we heard a lot of bleating and whining yesterday when we applied a time allocation motion to the debate on it, I want to point out what has gone on here. This bill was introduced in February, debated at second reading on February 16, February 27, March 13, March 27, March 28 and April 5 for a total of 20 hours and 21 minutes. Over 38 members of the Reform Party spoke in the debate on second reading of this bill.

Mr. Abbott: And we're proud of it.

Mr. Milliken: They may be proud of it but I would have been embarrassed at some of the speeches I heard. After 20 hours of debate the bill went to committee where it spent something like five or six weeks. I have forgotten the amount of time.

Ms. Meredith: How many witnesses were refused to be heard?

Mr. Milliken: "How many witnesses", says the hon. member. Hundreds. The committee heard witnesses night and day four or five days a week for four weeks. Then it spent over a week studying the bill in committee with something over 200 amendments, I am told.

Mr. Morrison: Four hundred and five.

Mr. Milliken: Four hundred and five, the hon. member says. He only serves to prove my point. Hon. members opposite are wasting the time of the House and Parliament. They are deliberately trying to obstruct the bill. They have no interest in seeing that democracy takes its full course. Members of the House are entitled to express their view by a vote. That is the normal way of concluding debate. That is what the government is seeking to do by the time allocation motion it has brought in respect of this bill.

I do not know why the government House leader was so generous as to allow six hours on each stage but he did. The fact is we will be debating this bill next week. Hon. members opposite will have a chance to express their views along with the other members of the House, the members of the official opposition and the members of the governing party.

I am pleased we will have an orderly debate and that we will conclude debate with a vote to see what happens to the bill. I strongly suspect it is going to pass, notwithstanding the objections of hon. members opposite.

Let us turn to Bill C–85, another bill dear to the heart of the hon. member for Calgary West. This bill was also debated in the House at great length. We are hearing bleats and whines again from the Reform Party about the time allocation motion in respect of this bill. It was debated on May 4, May 9, May 10 and May 12 for a total of 15 hours and 57 minutes. That is almost 16 hours of debate. Then it was referred to committee.

• (1355)

The committee proceedings were expeditious. The matter was dealt with in a day. We heard five, six or seven different witnesses during the course of the day. Then, as I pointed out when I tabled the report from the committee, every clause was carried unanimously in the course of the clause by clause study in that committee.

Now the hon. member for Calgary West is objecting. He has a whole string of amendments which he wants to bring to the House. He did not bring them in committee. He got up in a huff and huffed and puffed and blew himself out of the room. He was not there to propose his amendments. We did not have any discussion on any amendments. Now he thinks maybe we had better change the bill, so we are busy debating amendments in the House.

We have allocated four hours to debate the amendments of the hon. member for Calgary West, then we will have a vote and then four hours on third reading. After 16 hours on second reading, four hours on third reading, four hours in report stage and a full day in committee, I do not know what objection there could be to passing the bill. The bill was in the red book. Everything in the bill was promised in the red book except the extra things we have added which can only help make hon. members feel more comfortable.

What did we add? Opting out of the pension plan, which they asked for. They asked to be allowed to opt out and that has been granted in the bill. They asked that the pension be reduced and it has been reduced in the bill. It is not enough for them, but it has been reduced.

Let us turn to Bill C–41. This is another bill which hon. members opposite think should not come under time allocation. We have heard nothing but complaints from hon. members opposite about the bill; not about the whole bill of course, just about one clause. Again, we have another red book promise being implemented by the government. Hon. members opposite

were not elected on the red book so they should not ask us to substitute their opinion for ours. We chose what we were going to run on. We put the platform forward in the red book and the people voted for it in droves.

Let us look at the record on Bill C–41. It was given first reading in June 1994. It was debated in the House on September 20, September 22 and October 18 for a total of 8.5 hours. It went to committee on October 18, 1994 and did not come back from committee until March 22.

Yet the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley is bleating from her seat about the fact that the bill was in committee for six months. What did she do all that time? Did she sit and obstruct the bill? Why did she not call witnesses and move amendments then? There has been a whole pile of amendments moved to the bill. The hon. member clearly does not want a decision in the House, she just wants to obstruct and cause delay.

The government has to make a decision. That is what governments are elected to do. This government made a decision. Its decision was outlined in the red book. It brought the bill before Parliament. It has allowed ample time for debate, ample time for discussion, ample time to hear witnesses and ample time to consult. There comes a day when you have to bite the bullet and make a decision and, by George, we are going to do it next week. The great thing is that we are going to be able to sit until late to do it.

Mr. Abbott: Just what we all want.

Mr. Milliken: Exactly. It is just what we all want, as the hon. member says. I am glad he is as enthusiastic at the prospect as I am. I will have supper with the hon. member in the lobby.

As we look forward to next week's late night debates and, undoubtedly, very late night votes, I can only say that I hope the weather stays a little cooler. I know that debate will be heated on many of these bills. I recognize there is a difference of opinion. However, the fact is that the government has to bring these matters to a decision at some point in time and the time has come. These bills have been around and they have been debated extensively in Parliament.

An hon. member: No, they have not.

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member says they have not. I have just been through the facts. I wish he would listen to my speech. If he would listen he would agree with me.

The fact is these bills have been debated extensively and Canadians have been consulted. There is disagreement. Of course there is disagreement. We recognise that. However, the government made a commitment to the Canadian people in the red book. The government made a series of commitments, and those commitments form the basis of government action in the House and will continue to form the basis of government action in the months and years to come.

• (1400)

The Prime Minister made it very clear when he was campaigning, and I remember hearing him say this, that at the end of the day Canadians will be able to turn to the red book, go through it and say this government lived up to its commitments. As Prime Minister, he will be going to Canadians in the next election, whether it is 1997 or 1998—it cannot be too soon, and hon. members opposite must be very nervous at that prospect—and he will say: "Here is the red book. Here are the commitments we made. Here are the promises that we kept, one after the other."

Mr. Abbott: That would be a short speech.

An hon. member: What about the ones you did not keep?

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member says what about the ones we did not keep. We were not elected for two years, we were elected for four or five. There is ample time for us to live up to the red book commitments. It was a blueprint for action, not for one or two years but for the full term of a Liberal government. That is what the government is doing.

Hon. members opposite refer to the Ontario election as though it is some kind of setback.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Milliken: I can only say to hon. members opposite that in spite of their laughter, the setback is going to be with them. If we go to most of the ridings around Ontario—and the hon. member for Simcoe Centre knows this very well, and it is Ontario they are now concerned about because of this election, which is why I am referring to those particular seats—we have to add up the Reform vote and the Tory vote in the last election and see what it comes to. Had the two been together—and of course we know they are becoming bedfellows over there—they might have won a few more seats than the one they got in Ontario in 1993.

The success in the Ontario election can be attributed to the fact that the Reform Party failed to field any candidates in the provincial election. We know why they did not. As a national party they are going to have a tough time the next time living this down.

Mr. Abbott: It is because our members said no.

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member says it is because their members said no. We know it is because their leader said no, not because their members said no. Their members in Ontario wanted to run, but their leader said no. We all know about the dictatorial powers possessed by their leader. Let me get the little green book again, if members do not believe me on that score.

I know hon. members opposite do not like me to quote from the little green book, the little book of Reform, the gospel according to Preston Manning and the Reform Party.

Mr. Abbott: Is that an authorized publication?

Mr. Milliken: If the hon. member who is doing all the yelling kept this little book under his head at night he would not sleep well. I suspect that is the problem.

Listen to this on the struggle against the usual charges. I cannot really read this; it is in small print. It says: "Reform candidates must effectively combat the charges of separatism, extremism and eccentricity, which are invariably levelled against any new party originating in the west". That is on the Reform Party questionnaire, but it does not say how they do it.

Ms. Meredith: If you are going to use a prop, give us the name of it.

Mr. Milliken: I will read one more quote from the leader: "People make assumptions that we are eccentric, that we have weird baggage"—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hon. member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia on a point of order.

Mr. Morrison: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. parliamentary secretary is using a prop.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): No, I would rule that is not a point of order. In fact he is quoting from a document, as I understand it.

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would suggest it would be valuable if the parliamentary secretary were to identify the document he is reading from. I am making a statement that there is no such authorized publication by the Reform Party in that form.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I say respectfully to the hon. member for Kootenay East that the accuracy of the actual document being quoted from that might be debated. But it is certainly not a point of order.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I understand the members' discomfort. They are simply trying to run out my time.

Mr. Abbott: Well, identify the document.

Mr. Milliken: I did. I read the title to the hon. member. It says: "The Little Book of Reform: The Gospel According to Preston Manning and the Reform Party". It is published by Little Red Book, Arsenal Pulp Press. It is compiled by Christopher Gudgeon and Mark Leiren–Young.

Mr. Abbott: A little red book? Oh.

Mr. Milliken: I am sorry that hon. members do not have copies. Anyway, I would like to quote from their leader before my time runs out.

• (1405)

He said: "People make assumptions that we are eccentric, that we have weird baggage on policy, that we are extreme and that we are separatists. We are not extreme. We are not crazy. We are not separatists." That is the hon. member for Calgary Southwest.

With great respect, hon. members opposite are asking us to substitute Reform policy for Liberal policy. The Liberal Party, as a government elected on principles outlined in the red book, will not do that. I ask hon. members to stop asking for that. Vote against these bills if members want to do so, but for heaven's sake, recognize that the government has an obligation to do what it said it would do.

If the Reform Party were in government I hope they would try to live up to their promises, as we are succeeding in living up to ours.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order. One, is it common when one quotes from a book or whatever that the member would table that document?

Second, during his remarks the member made mention that the Reform Party was somehow in bed with the Conservatives. He is imputing motives, and I so not think that is right.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me be brief and succinct. That is no point of order.

And more than five members have risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 27, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, June 12, 1995, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages and pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), the government's response to 21 petitions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 2.08 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

Before we proceed to private members' business, I get indication from a number of members who were possibly waiting for tabling of petitions. Regrettably, in terms of process, given the events of the day, daily routine of business in those circumstances is cut off after government bills. If any further information might be required by any member I would simply advise members to seek the expertise of our table officers.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ALTERNATIVE FUELS ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There are six motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles. Motions 1 and 4 have been withdrawn.

• (1410)

Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6 will be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 2 applies to Motions Nos. 3, 5 and 6.

[*Translation*]

I will now submit Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6 to the House.

[*English*]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.) moved:

Private Members' Business

Motion No. 2

That Bill S–7, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 11 to 14, on page 2.

Motion No. 3

That Bill S–7, in Clause 3, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 2, with the following:

"federal bodies will be".

Motion No. 5

That Bill S–7 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 6

That Bill S–7, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 15, on page 4, with the following:

"end of each fiscal year, by the President of the Treasury Board, a report for the year on the application of this Act in respect of all federal bodies."

He said: Mr. Speaker, of these four amendments, the amendment of substance, which required the tabling of the other three, is Motion No. 5, that Bill S–7 be amended by deleting clause 5. The objective is to remove crown corporations from being covered by this bill.

Historically, crown corporations are supposed to act at arm's length from political interference. In recent years they have even in some cases been expected to make money and to run their operations in the same manner as private business. Therefore, although this House can, if it wishes, proceed to pass laws to regulate the operations of federal departments, I suggest that when it starts delving into the minute detail of the operations of a crown corporation it is exceeding its authority. Therefore I have tabled these amendments.

If we are going to talk about what government should and should not do, I would like to elaborate a little more on that. It is not the business of government to pick winners and losers in the marketplace. I have received more intense corporate lobbying in favour of this bill than I have ever encountered in the brief year and a half that I have been in this place. Let us be clear about something. I do not have a problem with the practical purposes of this bill. The objectives are fine. The intentions are fine. But we know where the road goes that is paved with these intentions.

The bill is very general in its wording, but it mandates a market specifically for propane and natural gas. There is mention in passing in the bill to ethanol, to hydrogen, to electricity, but let us be realistic, let us be honest: what we are talking about is propane and natural gas. The propane and natural gas companies have been doing the intense lobbying, along with various manufacturers and jobbers who would have a special interest in converting the government fleet.

I do not have any problem with the products of these corporations being used as automotive fuels. Propane and natural gas have a very legitimate place in the energy mix and they have a well–defined applicability for vehicle fleets with high usage rates, especially in urban areas.

In my riding we produce large amounts of both natural gas and liquid petroleum, so I do not believe I can be accused of geographic bias. My objections to this bill are based on technological, economic, and environmental considerations. In other words, I am not lobbying for anyone.

• (1415)

I previously stated that there are certain applications where the use of these alternate fuels makes economic sense. Unfortunately, within the government fleet a very small number of vehicles have a sufficiently high annual fuel consumption or cover a sufficiently high annual distance to make them economically viable for conversion. This has been brought out by one of the government's own studies, the Bronson study, which indicated that only some 10 to 20 per cent of government vehicles are really good candidates for conversion.

However, in this bill the schedule of conversions suggests that by April 1, 1997, 50 per cent of all new vehicle purchases have to be for vehicles with alternate fuel capacity, one year later it is 60 per cent and finally building up to 75 per cent of new vehicle purchases in 1999. Ultimately 75 per cent of all vehicles in the fleet will have to run on some alternate fuel.

An amendment has been presented and passed in committee adding the words "where it is economically feasible". When this was discussed in committee nobody seemed to know exactly what that meant. Frankly, I do not know what it means either because where economically feasible can mean whatever one wants it to mean depending on who is presenting the argument. This muddy bill has been mudified even further with this amendment.

Let us do what we are supposed to do in this House which is to formulate policy. Let us not tell our fleet managers for heaven's sake how to manage their fleets. How nitpicking in detail do we get and for what reason?

I would suggest that the lobbyists who are pressing for this bill want to set a precedent. They want to show that there is an opening for their product. If they cannot sell it in the marketplace or convince people to convert on the basis of sound economics then they say: "Let us have the government mandate a market for us, even if it is just a little tiny one of 39,000 vehicles". If my amendment is accepted, it would be 25,000 vehicles out of some seven million cars and vans. It is not going to make a great deal of difference to them on the spot. However, it sets a precedent of government interference in the normal course of doing business in the fuel industry. That is what I and the Reform Party do not want to see.

I mentioned the environmental aspects. Everything is not black and white on the environmental effects of converting from gasoline or diesel over to natural gas and propane. Some emissions actually are worse with the compressed gas products than they are with gasoline and diesel.

I refer specifically to nitrous oxides. Because of the higher compression ratios of the gas powered vehicles they are produced in considerably higher quantities than they are in gasoline and diesel motors. This has a profound effect on acid rain among other things. Other pollutants such as carbon dioxide are produced in lower quantities than the gaseous fuels. However, it is not entirely black and white.

Therefore, I am stating flatly that these decisions should be left to the experts, the people we pay to operate our motor pools. We as politicians should keep out of it. We are not all mechanics or engineers. Let us let the marketplace decide what will happen here. If the product is good these lobbyists should be out selling it to the people who have to do the buying, not selling it here in Parliament.

• (1420)

I almost hate to admit it but in part of our government we do have some good management, in the RCMP fleet. It has 32 per cent of the vehicles owned by the federal government apart from the crown vehicles. It certainly does not want to be put in a position of being mandated to do a conversion. Can we envisage pursuit cars on the highway powered by propane? The RCMP could change its slogan from "we get our man" to "we sometimes catch him if he does not have a good start".

Propane has its place; natural gas has its place. These places should be decided on the basis of practicality and realism, not on the basis of what some high powered lobbyist wants the government to do.

During first reading there was some comment about ways the government, if it is sincere about wanting to do away with emissions, could solve some of the problems without getting into conversion. I believe my hon. colleague from Macleod suggested the ministers with their big fat limousines could have their chauffeurs turn the motors off once in a while in winter when they are parked out front.

Maybe they could even go to smaller vehicles. I would like to see all the ministers put in very small cars. If the government really wants to cut down on the emission of noxious gases in the precincts of government it could drive the whole bunch of them into the Ottawa River. That would be a good form of closure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you have been very patient so far, and I hope you will be patient with me, too.

This planet was loaned to us, so to speak, so that we could improve it if possible. If we want to leave a valuable legacy to our children, we must protect the earth. Obviously, I am in favour of Bill S–7, because its purpose is to convert 75 per cent

of all federal vehicles by the year 2004 so that they can run on fuels that are less damaging to the environment. I think that this should have been done a long time ago.

The bill defines alternative fuels as fuels that are less damaging to the environment. What I find harder to understand is that the expression "less damaging" is not defined in the bill. What does that mean?

In proper French, propane gas should be called "propane" instead of "propane gas".

Here are some facts. The federal fleet now includes more than 39,000 vehicles, which emit some 156,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere every year. This is terrible.

Every year, 570 million tonnes of various greenhouses gases are emitted into the air from coast to coast. This is called pollution. For the past 18 years or so, the gases accumulated in the air have caused a gradual warming of the planet. The best experts predict that the earth's average temperature will rise by 1.5 to 4.5 degrees Celsius within a few years, which is almost unbelievable.

• (1425)

This rise in temperature will have a major impact on sea levels, on ecosystems, of course, on the amount of drinking water and, as a result, on agriculture and human health.

Every year, new diseases appear. We do not know where they come from, but we know very well where they are leading us. They are leading us to our death, of course, without our realizing it. By polluting the environment, thus aggravating these diseases, we are killing thousands of children.

We will then spend enormous amounts on detecting these diseases. It is an endless cycle because, humans being what they are, they cannot keep adapt to nature. You know, nature is brilliantly organized; yet, with all our brains, we are going to destroy it.

The Canadian government has committed itself in front of the international community to stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions at their 1990 level by the year 2000. The problem is however that, while she was prepared to do that much, the hon. minister was unable to get Cabinet approval. This means that there are several ministers on the other side of this House who are not aware of the consequences. That is a tragedy.

Carbon dioxide emissions in Quebec are half the Canadian average. We, in Quebec, have been taking our responsibilities in this regard for many years. If only the federal government would follow our lead. I am not saying that everything is hunky–dory in Quebec; much needs to be done, but compared to others, we are certainly on the right track.

Some, like the Reformers, question the validity of scientific results pointing to the existence of a greenhouse effect. I would like to share with you some of the reasons why I am for Bill S–7. In addition, this bill was introduced by a senator, and I congratulate him on that.

In a speech to this House, I said that the senators were creatures living in a large aquarium, in which they swim now and then, although not too fast, and then rest. But seriously—I must be logical and responsible here—there are senators who do an excellent job and the sponsor of this bill is one of them.

By passing Bill S–7, we will force the Canadian government to set an example. It will have to practice what it preaches, which it has never done yet.

Of course, Treasury Board directives were issued regarding the conversion and improved management of the federal fleet. However, we are forced to recognize that these have hit a wall of inaction and resistance to change. Only through legislation will the government departments and agencies be forced to comply with the new environmental priorities.

In addition, the federal government will save approximately $43 million in fuel over five years and another $15 million in the following years. Of course it will be a little more expensive. It will cost almost $1,500 more per vehicle purchased, a total of approximately $38.5 million more over a period of five years. However, it should also create savings of $7 million over five years.

• (1430)

Converting the federal government's fleet will have a ripple effect which will break the vicious circle of the low demand for converted vehicles because of the small number of outlets selling the fuel, which itself is caused by the small number of converted vehicles on the road, etc, etc. We hope that the large car manufacturers and fuel suppliers will take this opportunity to develop new models and to cultivate new markets.

Clause 2, however, sets three conditions in the legal definition of an "alternative fuel". The three conditions are the following. The fuel must be: (a) for use in motor vehicles to deliver direct propulsion; (b) less damaging to the environment than conventional fuels, and (c) prescribed by regulation.

I have some doubts about that definition, even though we support this bill.

One can, nevertheless, not help but wonder about the relevance of designating specific fuels which, after scientific analyses and the development of new technology, could very well be condemned within a few years as more harmful to the environment than other fuels.

I will give you an example. According to an article in *Le Devoir*, a study carried out by Carnegie University revealed that a 1988 vehicle which ran on electricity emitted 60 times more

lead into the environment per kilometre than a comparable vehicle which ran on leaded gasoline.

What is considered less harmful at a given point in time can change drastically because of new developments and new technology.

Despite these reservations, we support Bill S–7. Canada, the second largest producer of garbage in the world, the second greatest energy consumer and second highest emitter of greenhouse gases per capita, cannot afford to once miss such an opportunity.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I join in the debate today with a mixed message. Very few things we encounter in Parliament and in life are entirely black or entirely white. They are usually a shade of grey, with the notable exception of the ongoing pension debate which is fairly direct in black and white. One is either on the side of the angels on that one or not. Today we are talking about Bill S–7, the alternative fuels act. In my opinion it is not quite so cut and dried.

Our party is basically a free enterprise party. Our position is that if it can be done in the marketplace by the marketplace that is probably where the motivation and the determination for what happens in life should be made, primarily if we are talking about things commercial.

The legislation is typical of government's desire to somehow manipulate the market or determine what is best for Canadians rather than let the marketplace decide what is best for Canadians.

• (1435)

On the other side of the coin is the fact that most people are very much aware that some alternative fuels, specifically propane and natural gas, are far less polluting to the atmosphere. They are in great supply in Canada and are relatively cheap.

If we could induce the marketplace to convert to propane or to natural gas, we would definitely be in a win–win situation, especially if the inducement for the marketplace to convert was of a moral suasion nature rather than an inducement by having to spend taxpayers' money to do it.

Other aspects of the bill on alternative fuels are not so benign. My colleague who spoke before me raised the point about electric cars. There is a possibility that electric cars put more lead into the atmosphere than people had anticipated. When we talk about converting to ethanol we have to look beyond the immediate where it makes sense to use ethanol as a replaceable product. We can grow it. We can get it from the farms. It is not a depleting resource. It makes sense, especially if it is mixed with gas. However, as we dig into the ethanol situation we discover the cost to the environment to produce ethanol is not so benign. It has to be fertilized. It costs a fair amount to grow the crop. Then resources have to be put into the refining of ethanol. The cost relative to gasoline is substantially higher.

The bill is not quite so easy. While part of it deals with alternative fuels which are readily changeable to and are very good for the environment, part of it also deals with other alternative fuels that may not be.

I should like to put on record a few thoughts about what happened in Brazil's mandate to move to ethanol:

> Brazil's ethanol program is the world's largest and most ambitious government initiative supporting alternative motor fuels. In 1979, Brazil's passenger car fleet was comprised almost exclusively of gasoline vehicles; a decade later, about 30 per cent of its vehicles were built to run on ethanol. In the period 1975 to 1979, ethanol was blended with gasoline as a fuel extender in a 20 per cent ethanol–80 per cent gasoline blend.
>
> In 1979, as a result of large oil price increases, the government decided that a new fuel—96 per cent ethanol—was needed to replace gasoline at the fastest possible rate. This decision meant that new fuel and automotive infrastructures were required. A large expansion of ethanol production capacity was needed to meet the government's new target of 10.7 billion litres by 1985. This changed the cost and character of the program: until 1979, ethanol production had been increased by using existing distilleries at sugar refineries; the 1985 ethanol production target could only be met by building new free–standing distilleries dedicated to producing ethanol. There were also new demands placed on the fuel distribution system. For example, local fuel stations needed to add pumps dedicated exclusively to dispensing ethanol fuel.
>
> Consumers who had converted vehicles to take advantage of ethanol prices encountered problems with poor quality conversions. Also, after 1980, consumers faced higher fuel prices when the government increased ethanol prices [previously as low as 40 per cent of the price of gasoline].

This begs a question. We were going through the effort then to convert to alternative fuels that are cheaper today. What will happen when the market supply is such that suddenly there is enough demand? The price is likely to go up and we will not have a price advantage. That is the way the marketplace tends to work.

• (1440)

The quotation continues:

> Consumers reacted rapidly, and ethanol vehicle sales fell to less than 10 per cent of total vehicle sales by July 1981.
>
> The government then renewed its support for the program by holding ethanol prices at 59 per cent of gasoline prices for two years and extending ethanol vehicle purchase incentives. Auto makers improved ethanol vehicles by using corrosion resistant materials, adding a small pump to inject gasoline to reduce cold starting problems and improving ethanol vehicle warranties. Public confidence in ethanol vehicles steadily recovered, with purchases peaking in 1985 at about 95 per cent of the vehicle sales.
>
> Ethanol demand began to outstrip production as early as 1986. From late 1989 to early 1990, there was an acute shortage of ethanol, and consumers with dedicated ethanol vehicles waited in long fuel lines. Ethanol vehicle sales dropped from over 50 per cent of the 1988 market to less than 4 per cent of vehicle sales in

mid–1990. Most cars made in Brazil now are designed for ethanol/gasoline blends rather than neat ethanol.

That was a long quote, but I thought it important to refer to the fact that once the government gets into the marketplace by regulating either the gasoline that can be sold, or the types of vehicles that should be sold, or in one way or another artificially changing the cost of a particular fuel, it sets up an intrinsic, automatic adjustment in the marketplace. The marketplace will be its own master. No matter how beneficial or how benign the intent behind a government motion might be, we cannot automatically assume that the result in the marketplace will have the same benign reaction.

As I said earlier, there are conversions which on the face of them make great sense: the conversion to propane or to liquefied natural gas, particularly the conversion to propane in Canada. I believe there are over 3,000 stations in existence today in Canada that will allow people to fill up their vehicles with propane. Propane is significantly lower in price than gasoline. It has wide acceptance in fleets of taxis. It has wide acceptance in other industrial fleets. It is a consumer recognized good product.

There is really no need for the government to provide any particular incentive for people to use common sense. We as a nation do not have the money any longer to be inducing consumers or changing the marketplace at our whim.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise to speak to this issue today. You can tell by looking at me that I am a person who believes in great efficiency.

We ought to do everything possible to utilize our available fuel sources in the most efficient manner and to conserve our environment. They are two very worthy goals and probably there is no debate from anyone on that point. There should be no difference. I believe all Canadians in general would agree.

If the goals in terms of moving people and materials in a transportation system are the most efficient use of limited resources and the elimination or reduction as much as possible of pollution of the air, ground and water environments, how should those goals be accomplished?

• (1445)

Once again we have an example of a government thinking that unless it legislates it, it will not happen. I reject that hypothesis forthwith. I am sure people who come up with ideas to pass these laws are well motivated. There is no doubt about that but when one thinks of producing a law such as the one we are looking at today, it does start out with the assumption that if this law were not passed nothing would happen.

That is not true. By and large Canadians are becoming more aware of their environmental responsibilities and simply because of that they are beginning to make adjustments in their lifestyles. Members of my family and I have been doing this for a long time. We used alternate fuels to the day many years ago. When it was possible we rode our bicycles.

Maybe what the government should do is say everybody in the federal civil service instead of having a vehicle should have a bicycle. Maybe we should ask our Prime Minister who has gone from his Cadillac, Lincoln or whatever he had before to the Chevy to get a bicycle built for two. His assistant could help him provide the power. He would come toddling down Sussex Drive to the Hill every day.

Mr. Abbott: He rode a bike in Beijing.

Mr. Epp: He has proven he is athletically oriented and that would be a wonderful statement of government leadership in how to move passengers in an efficient way.

Members may know if they have ever read *Scientific American* that of all the modes of transportation the one requiring the least amount of energy per kilometre is the bicycle; the clear winner over every other form of transportation. If we want to reduce costs and pollution we ought to be pushing bicycles.

Bill S–7 specifies we should go for alternate fuels. One of the things that disturbs me or causes me the most amount of concern is here again we have the push toward quotas and legislative requirements. I know it is good to set goals. There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with saying we ought to set a goal but the error in this bill is instead of using the legislation to set a performance goal we are using the legislation to set a method goal.

In other words, we are not saying we want to have vehicles run with better and cheaper fuel that pollute the atmosphere less. We are saying we require a certain quota of vehicles converted for alternate fuel.

I noticed in scanning the bill there is an internal contradiction. It states that by a 2001 the goal is to have 75 per cent of vehicles on alternate fuels. If 75 per cent of the vehicles are on a certain type of fuel, the other ones are the alternate because these are now in the majority. If we did that our definitions would have to be changed. That is a moot point but it is one where we need to be careful in what we say.

Most important, is it really cost effective? We know that to convert vehicles manufactured for one type of fuel is a costly activity. The return economically on that conversion is only there if the vehicle is driven a sufficient distance per year. For most of these conversion costs the fuel source is also less expensive and so there is a financial gain to be had. However, unless one drives the vehicle a sufficient distance it is not economical.

• (1450)

Approximately 70 per cent of vehicles owned by the federal government or its agencies are driven a distance less than the critical point at which it is economical to do the conversion. We need to go back one step and say that instead of converting existing vehicles we need to produce vehicles in the first place with the ability to handle current or alternate fuels.

Here again we have a great problem because it is impossible to predict with accuracy the future. It could well be because of certain economic or environmental disasters or things beyond our control that certain types of fuels will become unavailable in sufficient quantity. As the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest mentioned, there have been examples of vehicles designed to run on one kind of fuel suddenly being parked because no fuel is available. It is wise to have dual fuel vehicles not only for the availability of the fuel but also in the event it goes out of the range of the alternate fuel station.

There are many dual vehicles. I have been a passenger in a vehicle in which there is a switch on the dash. It drives along on propane and as soon as the propane is gone and the propane station is out of range, the driver can flip a switch and the vehicle will resume running on gasoline as it was originally intended. That is a cost item. Vehicles which run on two fuels require a greater cost in manufacturing if it is done at the manufacturing level and certainly involves a cost if done at the conversion level.

Another factor is what proportion of the cost is the actual cost of producing the fuel and what proportion is the taxation. Provinces and certainly the federal government have fuel taxes. There has been a bit of publicity given to the latest fuel tax the government had the audacity to introduce in the last budget. It was a nominal 1.5 per cent per litre. Many Canadians do not realize that figure is not accurate; it is a new tax of 1.605 cents per litre since GST is paid on the tax as well. The government is not happy unless it is taxing the taxes.

Propane, compressed natural gas and normal gasoline, as we call it, have different taxation levels. It is no secret, at least in Alberta, that one of the main reasons propane is economical is simply that the government is not taxing it. At the manufacturing or refinery level the cost of the two fuels was not that much different. The tax differentiated them.

Perhaps we should simply change the tax structure to give a slight advantage to one fuel if it can be proven advantageous to the environment. Here again I express caution because we are now intruding in the marketplace and what we ought to be doing is setting performance standards, not method standards. In other words, we do not care how the goal is achieved; rather we do care the stated environmental goal is achieved.

I can think of specific examples in which governments have tried to encourage good environmental practices. I remember the $100 tax on air conditioning. That was really a very bad tax, because there were a lot of vehicles that were much more efficient with air conditioning than without.

• (1455)

I would simply urge the government to think very carefully about passing bills of this nature, which are so coercive and are not clearly defined in terms of objectives to be met.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying for the Liberals: "If it moves, regulate it; if it does not, tax it". It seems to me that this bill is yet another one of them that is being supported. I recognize that it came originally from the other place of great rest. We took a look at it and we are wondering what we should be doing about it. Then when the Liberals took it under their wing as if it were one of their own, we really started to take a look at it and we realized that it fit the principle of "if it moves, regulate it".

One of the biggest problems we have in Canada today, whether it is this bill or anything else, is the constant, never-ending interference of all levels of government in everything we could possibly imagine: if it is interaction between people, let us legislate it and get it made right by legislation; if it is interaction between people relative to commerce then we have to make sure we have that absolutely airtight.

What do we have motor pool managers for? Why do we have departments in the government and crown corporations that look after matters like this? What is their job? If their job is not to manage, if their job is not to make good sound judgments that can be based strictly on economics or can be based on a combination of economics and environment or can be made strictly for the purpose of environment, what are they there for? The government desires to consistently interfere and get into the faces, get into the lives, get into the wallets, get into the back pockets of every Canadian. It is a piece of work.

In doing a little research for this, I reviewed a document called "Comparative Analysis of Alternative Transportation Fuels", put out by Clean Fuels Consulting Inc. in Toronto with branches in the States. I was interested in page 5 of the document which relates directly to my question of what do we have motor pool managers for, why are they there, do they not have any level of expertise. I do not profess to have any expertise so I went to the source.

As an example: "High alcohol fuels have problems with cold starts because the fuel does not vaporize easily. This problem does not exist for compressed natural gas and propane, where the fuel is already in the vapour phase to begin with. However,

these gases have a high ignition temperature and a high ignition delay, which could cause some cold start problems."

Rather than taking the time of the House to read more of this documentation, I just cite that as one example of the little bit of research that even a novice like myself can do to come across the fact that there are some serious problems that professional motor pool managers, people in the whole business of moving vehicles, moving people or materials in those vehicles, should be able to have a handle on. I would bow to their wisdom before I would bow to the wisdom of any member of the House, unless they had equal understanding, background, and schooling.

For example, in talking about gasoline, another piece of research that came to me is that emission controls are working. In the past 15 years, unburned hydrocarbon emissions have been reduced by 98 per cent, nitrous oxides by 90 per cent, and carbon monoxide by 96 per cent.

Again, I do not cite these numbers to in any way infer that I am an expert on this topic. I am merely asking, other than any members in the House who by pure coincidence happen to be experts, why are we as members of Parliament coming forward with this kind of legislation that will give quotas?

• (1500)

I go back to the fact the government seems to have a thing about quotas for everything. If the country does not have enough of this kind of person in this kind of industry, then we will have a quota. We have seen what the people of Ontario thought about that kind of legislation last night.

The government just does not get it. It does not understand there is such a thing as a free market that actually drives the economy, that brings us to a norm, to a proper level.

This morning I received a letter from a gentleman from Superior Propane in Unionville, Ontario via fax. I appreciated receiving the letter. He was trying to suggest to me reasons why this is a good bill and should be passed. His concluding sentence is: "I look forward to the record of the vote showing your endorsement of this valuable bill".

I am prepared to listen to the debate on this bill and make a determination which way I will be voting at the conclusion of the debate but it is pretty obvious which direction I am leaning at this point.

He says: "I am contacting you regarding S–7, an important piece of legislation awaiting third reading in the House". Then he explains five benefits of passing the bill like "industrial benefits resulting from increased private sector investment of $40 million to $50 million".

With government mandating certain things through legislation we are going to be generating $40 million to $50 million worth of private sector investment. The question I have is, if we were not mandating this would that private sector investment be happening? In other words, I want to get a balance between those things.

His second point is diversification of transportation energy, thus increasing competition among transportation fuel suppliers and economies to consumers. His third point is expanded markets for canola farmers. His fourth point is diversification of the western economy.

It raises this question in my mind. If we have literally millions of vehicles that roll up and down the road, whether private vehicles, cars, trucks or whatever, or if we have vehicles that are not in the private sector but are owned by government, what is the comparison?

The number of government vehicles is in the tens of thousands whereas the number of vehicles that are actually on the road are in the many millions. It then begs the question: Why are we doing this? We are talking about expanded markets for canola farmers. Surely converting the tens of thousands of vehicles that are owned by the federal government is not going to make a significant difference to canola farmers, and diversification of the western economies is, with all due respect to this gentleman, something of a stretch.

However, in his fifth point he suggests the savings to the taxpayers resulting from reduced operating costs in the federal fleet are estimated at $4 million to $6 million annually. It then begs the question: If savings of $4 million to $6 million annually could be had by making these conversions, and if the government presently is trying to watch every dollar it is presently spending, why is it necessary to pass legislation? If the motor pool managers and the people who are in charge of these fleets cannot see there is a $4 million to $6 million annual savings and they are not prepared to do it, maybe they should be fired.

I go back to page 13 of my research on this comparative analysis of alternative transportation fuels. I refer to what my colleague from Edmonton Southwest was mentioning about the situation in Brazil and I will recall one sentence. From 1989 to early 1990 there was an acute shortage of ethanol and consumers with dedicated ethanol vehicles waited in long fuel lines.

• (1505)

We have seen with this and also with the artificial level of taxation on propane that the government has a tremendous ability to manipulate the private sector. Within the bill there consistently appears the phrase "where it is cost effective and operationally feasible". I am suggesting, is this legislation actually necessary? Are there not some other ways of achieving exactly the same thing? Surely we can reduce the amount of legislation that is currently on our slate. It seems to be pushing the government to all of these wonderful hours of time allocation and extended hours. Perhaps we could just dispose of this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I remind the House that at 3.10 p.m. I will put the question.

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will just make a few remarks.

My hon. friend from Elk Island mentioned perhaps buying bicycles and saving some energy that way. I would suggest perhaps we should match the speed of our vehicles to the speed that the government moves. It would mean that we would go back to the horse and buggy days.

Putting horses on the Hill might have a double advantage. We could collect the methane produced by these animals and run the little green buses. In that way we could really save energy. It would help tremendously environmentally and also help non–renewable resources.

When I heard the member for Kingston and the Islands this afternoon there was so much hot air coming from that side of the House it led me to think we could do away with the airlines and travel by hot air balloons. That would really help us conserve energy in the air industry. We have good ideas around here, if we could just get the government to move fast enough to implement them.

I have mentioned before but I will mention again that over the last two years we have been backtracking grain from the west to Thunder Bay. As we heard today, we then take it from Thunder Bay to California. If we had changed our attitude and gone the shortest route we could have probably saved enough energy for the House and crown corporations to operate their vehicles on regular fuel and still be gallons and gallons ahead as far as energy consumption is concerned.

It is always a matter of using the most reliable and most efficient system. Back in the 1940s and early 1950s a big move was on toward propane in the farm industry, especially for tractors and some other vehicles. Very soon it was realized the value of the energy was not there. It slowed down machinery and the conversions that were done quickly faded away. It was just a matter of wasted money.

One of the members pointed out that the RCMP would look very foolish with a propane car. That is probably what would happen. Substitutions would be made. Vehicles would be switched over to different fuels and because of taxes or inefficiencies of that system they would be done away with and vehicles would return to the regular energy.

I appreciate these few minutes. I hope that some day I do see the horses and buggies back on the Hill, because it will sure speed up things the way this government is moving on some of this stuff.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Colleagues, I might have inadvertently misled you when in my exuberance and it being Friday and wanting to get to other duties I said I would put the question. It was in fact the wrong technical term.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being 3.10 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 3.11 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 12, 1995

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing right to know legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to urge the House to support the motion. It has not been deemed votable but nevertheless it could be voted on and passed if there were a will to do so. The House can do this by unanimous consent. The procedure by which resolutions or private members' bills are deemed votable was designed so only a minimum number of motions and bills would be votable. It was not designed in any way to prevent more than the required amount from becoming votable, if the House chose to do so. I urge the House to do that today if there is a will on the government side to allow the motion to go forward. I will explain why I think that should be done.

I thank my seconder in this instance, the member for Kamloops, for helping me today and also the International Association of Firefighters with which I have worked closely over the last little while in developing this motion, along with a couple of others, a notification protocol for infectious diseases and the public safety benefit.

The motion urges the government to improve the safety regime for firefighters and other emergency response personnel. Firefighters as well as other emergency response personnel are often called on to risk their lives to deal with accidents and emergencies involving highly volatile and toxic chemical substances at great personal risk not just in the immediate sense but also in the long term sense. Studies have shown firefighters have higher vulnerability and a higher incidents of certain diseases associated with exposure to these kinds of toxic chemicals.

They need to have rapid, accurate and complete information about these hazardous materials where lack of information can cost lives. It is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure all reasonable measures are taken to provide that information. That is what this motion is about.

I take the opportunity of this debate to make a specific proposal. If the government is looking for something it could get behind in a concrete and practical way the passage of this motion would create a context in which it might do so.

I will make a specific proposal for this kind of problematic situation involving toxic substances, accidents that occur during the transportation of hazardous materials. In other words, it is not only with respect to transportation that these things happen but in the transport sector we could, as I will go on to suggest, have a pilot project.

Firefighters have been calling on the government to take the first steps in the development of a state of the art system to provide emergency response personnel with the information they need by taking advantage of the latest computer technologies and software.

This is an issue on which there is clearly little occasion for partisan politics. I hope members from all sides of the House will support this motion and that the government will let it come to a vote if someone on the government side near the end of the debate could seek unanimous consent to have this go forward. I am not aware of any members of the House who are opposed to this. It is after all only a motion which asks the government to consider the advisability of it. For the House to pass this motion would afford Transport Canada an excellent occasion to move this important file forward.

Accidents involving hazardous materials pose a number of special challenges to emergency response personnel. On the one hand the consequences of not reacting quickly and in the appropriate manner can result in the death or injury of not only emergency personnel but of large numbers bystanders if accidents occur in densely populated locals.

On the other hand because such accidents occur relatively rarely, giving personnel very little experience in dealing with such emergencies and involve highly complex chemical compounds, it is often difficult for personnel to react quickly in the

appropriate manner. Immediate access to information about the contents of containers and the necessary procedures to be followed is the key to improving this safety regime in Canada.

The current system which uses placards on containers to identify the contents is not one that fulfils all the needs of emergency response personnel. Firefighters told us when we met with them recently at their national lobby in Ottawa that the placards do not always provide sufficient information to aid emergency workers and that these placards are often missing or destroyed by virtue of the very accident that has called them to the scene in the first place. We are in urgent need of an upgrade in the reporting system for these emergency response situations.

Fortunately there is an emerging technology which would prove to be very useful in filling the gaps in the current system. Computer software along with communications links between firefighters and police dispatch stations and the transport companies is now being developed which would allow emergency response personnel almost instantaneous access to detailed information to be taken directly from transport companies' data bases.

Not only could such a computer linkup provide firefighters with precise information about the contents of a container, it could also provide detailed guidance about the necessary safety precautions to be taken when dealing with the material in question.

It has also been shown that such a computer linkup could help emergency response personnel in the event of train derailments involving passengers trapped in damaged rail cars. The linkup could provide rescue workers with detailed plans of how these rail cars are constructed with blueprints which could aid them in their search for trapped passengers.

While this network is now a technological possibility it is up to the federal government to take a leadership role in developing the specific computer software and communications networks and putting a system in place.

The International Association of Firefighters has been urging the government to begin the development process by establishing a pilot project in concert with industry, labour and local government stakeholders. It is proposed that such a pilot project take place in a major transportation centre that would permit the stakeholders to experiment with the new software and communications links and to demonstrate the system's effectiveness for later use across Canada.

• (1110)

Winnipeg with its thriving rail and truck traffic has been suggested as an ideal choice for such a project not by me but by those interested in this project; although Winnipeg is not always as thriving as I would like it to be on the rail side.

I hope my fellow colleagues from the Winnipeg area would help make the case to the government for passing this motion and also that if there were a pilot project to follow the government consider very seriously using Winnipeg as a place where this project might proceed.

The primary aim of going forward with such a project in a timely manner is to save lives, the lives of the firefighters who at present work in dangerous situations without all the information they need and the lives of residents in communities where accidents occur.

There is also an important international dimension to this question. The American department of transport has already begun work on developing such communications networks and it is helping fund a pilot project in the Houston, Texas area called operation respond. All indications are that the experiment is proceeding well and that the department of transport will be moving to set up a national system of regulations for the transportation of hazardous materials.

In the context of NAFTA, Canadian export and transport industries will be directly affected by such regulations and there will no doubt be pressure for harmonization. It is therefore imperative that Canada develop its own system which meets particularly Canadian needs so that in the future we will not be obliged to adopt uncritically or simply out of necessity the American regulations by default because we did not have the foresight to apply the available technology to a pressing safety issue in Canada on our own.

I believe all members of the House will want to do whatever is in their power to improve the safety of firefighters and their fellow emergency response workers. Here is a case where the hype about the possibilities of the new information revolution might actually live up to expectations and do something concrete in terms of human health and human safety.

Who would deny firefighters access to state of the art technology in situations in which they are laying their lives on the line? Who would deny them the right and the means to know exactly what they are handling in these very dangerous situations?

Support for this motion would be an excellent means for members of the House to convey to firefighters on behalf of all Canadians we are grateful of the often heroic service they provide, and to convey our support for their efforts to improve safety in their work environment.

I hope the government will allow members of the House to do this by passing this motion; allow members to convey the grateful support of Canadians to firefighters by using its discretion collectively speaking to allow this motion to come to a vote or to be passed by unanimous consent. I cannot imagine that we

would divide on the matter. Either we will pass it by unanimous consent or it will be talked out.

I understand the government believes the wording of this motion is too vague and without specific reference to the transport of hazardous materials to be allowed to come to a vote. I have talked to the Ministry of Transport about this.

I suggest to the contrary this motion simply conveys to the government the House's desire that it take action on improving a firefighter's safety and would give the government a welcome boost in the ongoing discussions between labour, industry and government stakeholders on the appropriate way forward.

By letting this motion go forward the government would supply itself with an excellent spur to move a file forward which members on all sides of the House think should be moved forward. I hope the government has rethought its position over the course of the weekend. This is after all only a motion. If it passes, all the government is obliged to do is consider the advisability of bringing in this system. It would create the context, it would create a little parliamentary momentum.

Last year I had a similar motion on a completely different topic and at the end of my speech I asked for unanimous consent that the motion be put to a vote at the end of the hour. Some may recall it was a motion having to do with the creation of a medal for Dieppe veterans.

The procedure we followed at that time is the one I am suggesting could be done now, that we could decide now that the motion would come to a vote. People could speak to the motion and at the end of the hour we could allow it to pass.

• (1115)

With that precedent in mind, knowing this is procedurally possible and that firefighters were here not so long ago reporting that no one disagreed with this suggestion, I seek unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): If I interpret the member correctly, is he asking for unanimous consent at this point in time?

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I believe we could agree now that at the end of the appointed hour the motion be put, if there were unanimous consent to agree to do that. If there is not, then we could seek it at the end of the hour, but we have to seek it at some point if there is a will in the House to allow the motion to pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I trust I get not only the intent but the spirit. The unanimous consent being proposed at this time by the member for Winnipeg Transcona would be that this motion become votable at the end of this hour of debate on this motion.

Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent. Resuming debate, the hon. member for St. Boniface.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak to this motion. I applaud my colleague's initiative, because he raises an extremely important issue, which must be discussed and eventually resolved.

I myself have a particular interest in this motion because, for a number of years, I participated in conferences on this very issue. My greatest wish is for us to find an equitable solution for all concerned.

As you know, the motion reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing "Right to Know" legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

[*English*]

As was pointed out, this is an all encompassing motion. I assume it includes not only firefighters but also ambulance attendants and police officers. As I proceed to raise questions I do so in the spirit of trying to strengthen the motion, focus it, and come to some sort of resolution.

No doubt it encompasses police officers and ambulance attendants, quite apart from firefighters and perhaps others. It might be useful to try to define those. No doubt it is also intended to cover goods transported by rail and truck, but it is important not to exclude air and marine modes as well.

As to potentially harmful substances, this is very broad and may require further definition. For example, I believe it includes infectious diseases and infectious material. However, that remains to be discovered; perhaps it does not.

When I have discussed this initiative on different occasions a number of questions have arisen. People want to know specifically what is to be accomplished. They want specifics. They want to make sure no one is excluded, that all who might benefit from this or a similar initiative are identified.

The authorities also suggest there are some systems in place, which my colleague has mentioned, that respond at least in part to some of the concerns that have been voiced here. For example, there has been reference to the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act. There has also been a reference to the CANUTEC system, an initial emergency response guide, which is really quite common, popular, and useful. It is available in

English and French throughout Canada and the world. I am told it is a useful reference and useful tool as well.

• (1120)

The federal authorities also point out that it need not be the federal government by itself but that there are other partners involved, for example, the provincial and territorial governments, local governments, and perhaps even the private sector. Those are questions that need to be resolved before we can in fact proceed with a definitive proposal.

With respect to an initiative on the part of the federal government, I want to tell my colleagues that the government is monitoring the pilot projects. The government is concerned with the scope of the project, what it is attempting to do and what it has in fact accomplished. They are also obviously concerned about cost. In today's world one has to be particularly prudent about taking on additional initiatives and cost is obviously a high priority.

The federal government also wants to make sure there are partners, all of those people involved who could potentially benefit from the initiative. I have mentioned the various levels of government, but I should also mention that the private sector indeed is involved in certain sectors and needs to be involved.

I want to study what is happening in the U.S. and elsewhere. I give my assurance I shall continue to be extremely supportive of such an initiative.

[*Translation*]

In summary, the transport department officials I spoke to felt that the proposal was perhaps a little too broad and not specific enough. I think, however, that my colleague is on the right track. We can provide extra protection to firefighters and others likely to be involved in disasters or difficult situations.

The other extremely important consideration is the need for additional, clear information on pilot projects under way elsewhere. I felt that before moving in that direction, the government wanted to know all the facts, including how much it would cost and who the partners would be. It wanted to ensure that this would lead to something that would help not only firefighters but all those involved.

For my part, I participated in a number of forums over several years. This is something I care about and a most important issue. We must realize that we will eventually have such a system. The basic question for me is not only the issues I raised, but how we could proceed, when, with whom and at what cost. I hope that the questions I just raised will be answered soon.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but one of my colleagues across the way felt the need to shout to someone, and I lost my train of thought. Unfortunately, some people are not as polite as others. I now get back to the motion.

[*English*]

As I said, I am interested in pursuing this proposal and I will do everything in my power to try to find some sort of solution. Clearly not today but hopefully in the near future we can come up with specifics with regard to a pilot project where the partners will be identified, where the costs will in fact have been found as well, and perhaps we can go forward and do something meaningful for our firefighters, our ambulance attendants, our police officers and others involved.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as Bloc members, we are pleased to support this motion made by our colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

This is what we could call a forward–looking motion mainly concerned with the interest not only of a trade, namely firefighters, but also of the public in general.

For one thing, the government has a role to play in the area of occupational safety. In fact, it can play several key roles by the influence it has, the example it sets and the legislation it passes.

• (1125)

Through its influence, the government can encourage employers to adopt more adequate safety measures. For instance, under existing legislation, since legislation does already exist—we may not find it adequate but it nevertheless exists—the government can check and make sure that safety standards are complied with in many areas, such as construction. The most common areas where risks are still high are the agri–food industry, the environment, transport and, of course, sites where explosives may be handled.

Through the way it deals with its own employees, the government plays a crucial role. Naturally, as I said, the government must set the example, for the entire population is governed by the occupational safety legislation it enacts.

Safety standards for government employees must also be monitored closely and, above all, the government must afford its employees the opportunity to put standards in place so that they are well protected. In addition, by introducing new legislation, the government can strengthen those standards which may seem inadequate or at the very least deficient at this time.

In our view, this is a fundamental role of government, especially since new technologies, such as nuclear energy and all the related areas, have developed rapidly.

This fundamental role has become even more essential with the proliferation of chemicals and toxic substances used in various industries to develop new products. Many environmental disasters in recent years have shown how important government action is when it comes to protecting those government employees responsible for managing such disasters.

We need only think back to the explosion—in other countries, but we cannot be spared forever—of the nuclear power plant in Chernobyl or the oil spill off the coast of Alaska. These two examples clearly show the kind of hazards to which government employees are exposed.

Closer to home, the fairly recent devastating fire in Saint–Basile–le–Grand and the lead contamination incident in Saint–Jean are other examples which show that legislation is crucial in this field, whenever chemical and toxic products are used.

The Bloc will therefore support the motion. We were hoping that there would be a vote on it but, unfortunately, the required unanimous consent was not reached. Again, the government must be a leader in the protection against dangerous products. It can, through its attitude toward its public servants and the public, and also by tabling a new bill, make the job of many workers much safer.

Firefighters associations, including the International Association of Firefighters, have been urging the government for years to set up a national computerized information system on dangerous products.

With such a system, as soon as the alarm went off, firefighters would have information on the location of the fire and would be able to react accordingly so as to prevent greater damage or make sure that they did not pointlessly endanger their lives and their health or those of the public.

The presence of dangerous products on the site of a fire can be extremely costly, even fatal, for those involved. Recently, in a small village in Quebec, firefighters answered a call to put out what looked like an ordinary barn fire. However, because they did not have adequate information concerning the premises, the firefighters used normal techniques to put out the fire, without being aware of the danger to which they were exposed themselves.

• (1130)

There was a propane tank inside the barn, that no one had any reason to suspect was there. After they set up their equipment and started fighting the fire, the tank exploded. Seven firefighters were killed instantaneously in the blast and several others were injured. This catastrophe could easily have been avoided if the firefighters had known that the barn concealed a deadly bomb.

Seven lives were lost, and the only thing the speaker who preceded me, an hon. member from across the way, was concerned about was the cost. Do other lives have to be lost before they take action?

Another bill is currently before the House, Bill C–68 on firearms. Why is the government in such a hurry to take action? It is in such a hurry because 14 students were murdered at a university in Quebec by a lunatic who was in legal possession of a firearm. Because 14 human lives were lost, the House is debating a bill on firearms, and the cost of implementing and administering it are of no concern to the government. What it is trying to do is protect the lives of Canadians, protect everybody's life.

There are other causes of loss of human life each week in Canada: toxic spills during transport by rail, oil spills on the ocean, the use of chemical fertilizers which pollute or certain toxic substances, such as pesticides or insecticides. Many toxic substances which are widely used, sometimes carelessly, are decidedly very dangerous in the long run.

We are proposing preventative measures, which sometimes, actually not just sometimes but almost always, are less costly than deterrents.

In the opinion of the International Association of Fire Fighters, the computerized system currently in place, CANUTEC, is not well adapted. Towns with firefighting brigades have already put in place their own systems. I know that, before the new year, cities are going to convert to this system which will inform them before they respond to a fire alarm whether dangerous goods could be at the site. Towns are already absorbing the cost of these systems, so, there is no reason for the government to claim that additional costs will be involved. Local organizations will already be assuming the bulk of them.

Therefore, through such legislation, the government not only would increase the safety of workers but also would give peace of mind to all citizens who have to live near or deal on a daily basis with such life threatening products or environments, which would improve their standard of living and protect them.

For these reasons, we support this motion and hope that it will become votable as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Motion 136, proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona. The motion states:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of "Right to Know" legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

That is a very broad statement. I am surprised we are talking to such a statement because to my mind it would be a given that

kind of information would be available or that there would be processes in place to provide such information.

• (1135)

The motion was developed out of a genuine concern for the safety of firefighters. These people seem to be lacking the necessary information so they can do their jobs effectively or as effectively as they would like to do it. I equate it to an emergency department in a hospital. Emergency staff really do not know what they are dealing with until the patient gets there.

I commend the member for Winnipeg Transcona for bringing this problem to our attention. Because of the nature of the firefighters' job it is not often they are actually in the news unless some very unfortunate situation occurs. Several recent incidents highlight the danger of the nature of the firefighters' job.

Recently in Ottawa firefighters had to respond to a fire that turned out to be in a house that was used mainly for drug purposes. When the firefighters arrived at the fire they rushed into the building to put the blaze out. They moved as quickly as possible according to procedures for firefighting. They were not expecting or necessarily looking for exposed needles and other dangerous drug paraphernalia. The irony is that the local police were aware it was a drug house but because of concern at overstepping the bounds of privacy, the information was not shared with another emergency response group. I find it phenomenal that they cannot work in partnership and share information that relates to an incident.

That is a concern we must definitely address, if not through legislation proposed in this motion, then the government should be looking at other ways to get around the letter of the law and use some common sense. Information should be shared among the principal players that are addressing the same concerns, especially when safety is involved. We must be practical and use some common sense on the issue.

Another issue which relates to the whole attitude of how emergency response personnel deal with injured persons would be to keep in mind today's environment in relation to infectious diseases. HIV–AIDS and tuberculosis are two diseases that come to mind that can cause a great deal of concern not only to firefighters but any other emergency response personnel.

In response to these valid concerns, groups such as the International Association of Firefighters have done a lot of work in researching the problem. That research is available to us to pursue. The association has called on the government to take steps to protect firefighters while they are performing their duties. One of the arguments put forward is that firefighters deserve to know what hazardous materials may be present at any incident. That follows logic. If firefighters are called to a potentially hazardous situation, it sounds very logical to be able to pass on information about what they are facing and what they are dealing with.

That is a principle we can address by looking at a better communication and perhaps addressing the Privacy Act or situations involving that act.

A second principle would be access to reliable information that will save lives by ensuring that firefighters use the most effective response techniques at any incident. The previous speaker talked about a propane tank in a barn. If somebody was aware the tank was there, that information should have been available to the firefighters responding to the fire.

Both arguments put forward by the IAFF are certainly valid. The principles involved in them are certainly worth looking at. They are very timely. There must be numerous options for addressing the proposals by the association that we can look at and it is time we did. This motion presents a couple of suggestions in relation to ways of addressing that.

• (1140)

The IAFF supports the establishment of a computerized national emergency response. This is one suggestion on how to address these issues. It would provide accurate information to firefighters at the scene of a hazardous material incident. The system would provide not only information for stationary incidents such as the propane tank in the barn, but also for hazardous materials that are on the move.

A system which deals with materials in stationary structures should certainly be looked at for a couple of identifiable reasons. We are already doing one through the women's program in many institutions such as hospitals, et cetera. The other one would be to prevent firefighters from going into the barn without knowing about the propane tank.

I would like to move on to the computerized system for materials in transit. A system is already in place which requires little placards to be put on vehicles. One of the problems occurring with that is that the placards may not be up to date. Therefore, firefighters can arrive at a derailed train and find the placard is not up to date or they may not even see the placard because of fire. There are situations in the system which really do not address all the problems.

A computerized system seems to be one very good answer. However it will only be as good as the information being put into it. The government is suggesting that this system is not up to par in relation to providing the kind of information that would facilitate the problem that firefighters have.

In the world of technology today, I am suggesting that system, if it is not here now, is not far away. We should be looking at it very seriously as a possible solution. We should be doing some research and investigation of it and figuring out what the cost of it is going to be. If it is plausible it should be implemented on a

test basis some place to see whether or not it will address the problem.

The motion deals not only with small aspects of the problem but is all encompassing. It deals with stationary situations, movable situations, health and all other aspects. Therefore, because of the nature and broadness of this motion and the fact that it is a problem that should be solved, we should be looking at it. It is not an isolated type of thing. It is a general thing.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a few comments on private member's motion M–136 presented by the member for Winnipeg Transcona.

The motion urges the government to consider the advisability of introducing right to know legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who in the course of their duties are confronted by fires or disasters involving harmful substances.

Let me first commend the member for bringing the issue up for discussion through his private member's motion. I personally know the member to be a politician of vision and passion and a vigorous and eloquent defender of worker interests.

Those of us on this side of the House share the concern he brings to occupational safety and health. We too are appalled by the number of accidents and fatalities that annually occur in our workplaces. We also believe that work in Canada ought to be a rewarding and satisfying activity that does not pose undue risk to those who must perform it.

The good news is that because many innovative measures have been taken over the years, considerable progress has been made in the area of occupational safety and health.

• (1145)

The intent of the member's motion is something upon which I think we can all agree. However, its fatal flaw is that it does not fall under federal jurisdiction. If I may say so, the member is knocking on the wrong door. Labour related matters including occupational safety and health issues are mainly a provincial and territorial responsibility. Requiring employers to provide information on hazardous substances to emergency response personnel is a matter which provincial and territorial authorities need to address.

As the member may know, occupational safety and health legislation in Canada is based on the internal responsibility system. This arrangement recognizes the employer's right to manage an enterprise in an efficient manner as well as the employer's responsibility to protect the safety and health of the employees. It also recognizes three fundamental rights of workers: the right to participate, the right to refuse dangerous work, and the right to know.

Since 1988 Canada has had in place a nationwide system to provide information on hazardous material being used in the workplace. Known as WHMIS for workplace hazardous materials information system, it established a uniform identification system for dangerous ingredients in the workplace. It came about because in the early 1980s business, labour and government realized that Canadian workplaces were woefully lacking the kind of information necessary to handle safely the kind of materials and equipment which were being introduced in the workplaces of Canada.

The system was comprised of four features: labelling requirements, the provision of material safety data sheets, worker education, and protection for confidential business information. WHMIS ensures that the hazardous materials produced, imported into or used in Canadian workplaces are adequately identified by suppliers using standard criteria. It requires the data sheets on hazardous materials to be transmitted by suppliers to employers and subsequently to employees. It obliges employers to provide their employees with adequate professional training on how to use the materials.

By effective dissemination and information through WHMIS, employers and workers get the data and knowledge required to communicate with one another, making possible the kind of co–operative efforts necessary to enhance safety and health in the workplace. Because employees have firsthand knowledge of the workplace, their involvement is essential. For employees to be able to assume responsibility for workplace safety and health they must be able to recognize what is going on and understand the changes occurring in the workplace. WHMIS ensures that workers have the information they need to make the decisions which they must make. In short, WHMIS is a response to the right of employees to know the hazards of the materials with which they work and the way to safely handle such substances.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that WHMIS is the most advanced information system in the field of occupational safety and health in the world. It is a system which works and, if I may say so, it is a system we can proudly speak of internationally. It should also be mentioned that WHMIS was the result of an extraordinary collaborative effort which brought together not only the governments in Canada but also organized labour and the business community. No one sector, no one government acting alone could deal with this issue in an effective and efficient manner.

WHMIS legislation in each of the jurisdictions throughout Canada is harmonized legislation based on a model regulation which was developed during the consultative process. Regulatory agencies in each jurisdiction ensure compliance within its

boundaries. WHMIS has been successfully implemented in all jurisdictions.

I think most officials and informed observers believe that its successful implementation was due to the fact that potential problems were identified by the stakeholders during the design stage when steps could be taken to minimize any possible adverse impacts in the workplace. Although the process was time consuming, its participatory nature made possible a relatively smooth implementation.

• (1150)

As I indicated, most emergency response personnel, that is, the employees alluded to in the member's motion, come under provincial jurisdiction. Those who fall under federal jurisdiction, including firefighters, receive their WHMIS information and training as required by part II of the Canada Labour Code, the part that deals with occupational safety and health issues and by the provisions of part X of the Canada occupational safety and health regulations.

The member might be interested to know that presently a committee of labour and business representatives and government officials is reviewing part II of the Canada Labour Code. Among other things it is considering a recommendation that part X of the Canada occupational safety and health regulations be changed to indicate the local health and safety committees which would participate in the development of an inventory of hazardous substances. This inventory would then be made available to health and safety committees, health and safety representatives to the fire department and to the employees' physicians on request.

At the present time only the province of Ontario has a provision in its occupational safety and health act requiring employers to provide a material's safety data sheet to fire departments and local medical officers of health upon request.

Ontario is to be commended for taking the lead in this area. The member might consider approaching the other provinces, perhaps beginning with British Columbia and Saskatchewan to urge them to consider implementing the kind of legislation he has asked this House to implement.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the hon. member's motion.

I want to express my very deep concern for the welfare of this country's emergency response workers who risk their lives to protect ours. Most Canadians cannot begin to conceive the nightmare these individuals must be living through wondering in doing their jobs to the best of their abilities whether they have put their own health in jeopardy. We cannot imagine the fear and trepidation all emergency workers must feel when they respond to a call never knowing what danger awaits them.

Canada owes a great deal to the dedicated men and women who put their lives on the line each day for our health and safety. I can reassure the House this government does not take their risks lightly. These risks are taken so seriously that this government along with our provincial counterparts, industry and labour have for some time now been developing programs to protect not only emergency response workers but also those in the transportation sector and those handling hazardous chemicals in the workplace.

Under the transportation of dangerous goods regulations, for example, a United Nations number or product identification number and the shipping name of a commodity must be on the label and the shipping document. Even in the absence of a shipping name or a product identification number or a placard or label the product may be identified by contacting the Canadian Transport Emergency Centre or CANUTEC using any of the following information: the flight number; the call sign if the goods are being transported by ship; reporting marks and car number if it is being transported by rail; carrier and truck or trailer number and carrier and licence plate number if it is being transported by road.

In the event of an emergency, the firefighter can call CANUTEC which has an inventory exceeding 320,000 material safety data sheets. CANUTEC is a national bilingual advisory service provided by Transport Canada to assist emergency response personnel in handling dangerous goods emergencies. CANUTEC has established a scientific data bank on chemicals manufactured, stored and transported in Canada. It is staffed by professional chemists experienced in interpreting technical information and providing advice which can be obtained by calling collect on a 24–hour basis.

CANUTEC is able to immediately provide the relevant information by accessing its database through the use of key words such as the UN number, the product identification number or shipping name required on the transportation of dangerous goods shipping label and shipping documents.

• (1155)

Also, part VII of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act requires that shippers and importers of certain dangerous goods have an emergency response assistance plan, ERAP, approved by Transport Canada. Currently there are approximately 14,000 such plans covering over 4,000 organizations entered into the transportation of dangerous goods directorate's national registry. All of these plans are audited.

Due to the seriousness of safety and health problems of hazardous chemicals used every day in the workplace, the federal, provincial and territorial governments agreed following a consensus proposal developed through extensive consultation with industry and labour representatives to implement a workplace hazardous materials information system. This system is a national program to reduce workers' deaths and injuries by

providing workers and employees with health and safety information about hazardous workplace chemicals. This system is implemented through interlocking federal and provincial legislation under the hazardous products act and in response to the workers' right to know the hazards of the materials with which they work.

Under the hazardous products act, suppliers of hazardous materials must provide precautionary labelling and material safety data sheets to employers. Complementary provincial legislation requires employers to develop appropriate workplace labelling and other forms of warning about hazardous materials produced in their workplace processes and make data sheets available to their employees and provide for worker education on the safe use of hazardous materials.

Furthermore in the province of Ontario, the Ontario Occupational Safety and Health Act requires that employers provide fire departments with data sheets upon request. There is no question we must continue to address the needs and concerns of emergency response personnel, such as firefighters as well as all other workers using hazardous chemicals.

Our goal is where possible to continue improving the systems of hazard communication for the benefit of all workers. We want emergency responders to have access to the most up to date information on prevention methods available. We are encouraging close co–operation between employers and employees to ensure that they have appropriate training and equipment to deal with out of control situations.

It is clear that the protection of Canadians, particularly those whose job it is to protect the general population is tremendously important to this government. In co–operation with the provinces, industry and labour we are doing everything within our jurisdictional power to provide emergency response workers with the necessary vital information to assist them in carrying out the dangerous work in as safe a manner as possible.

The intent of the motion is an honourable one. The government will support any strategy or technique that will provide protection for our citizens involved in such an honourable and extremely dangerous endeavour. The intent of this motion can become a reality with the co–operative efforts of the federal and provincial levels of government plus the others concerned and involved in the private sector.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to participate in what probably is one of the most important private members' debates we have seen in this session of Parliament. We are making an effort to listen to the lobbyists for the firefighters particularly but also the police forces and ambulance services across Canada which have been asking for this initiative for many years.

I want to speak enthusiastically in favour of the initiatives taken by the member for Winnipeg Transcona. If this motion passes by all of the parties in the House of Commons, it will go a long way in saving lives and making the work that the emergency response personnel carry out much safer.

Previous speakers have acknowledged that emergency response personnel, particularly firefighters, are often called upon to deal with volatile and toxic chemical substances. If there has ever been a time for rapid, accurate and complete information about these hazardous materials, the time is now more than ever before.

Accidents involving hazardous materials pose a number of special challenges to emergency response personnel. By not acting quickly the result can be death and injury, to say nothing about bystanders, particularly if the accident takes place in a densely populated locale.

• (1200)

It is sufficient to say that we have had the debate. We have heard from all parties in the House of Commons. We have heard enthusiastic support for an initiative that simply calls upon the government to consider appropriate legislation and to take appropriate action.

I seek unanimous consent for the motion to be accepted to allow the initiative to continue forward.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Kamloops. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the record to show that government members said no to this private member's motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): With the greatest respect to the member for Winnipeg Transcona and the important motion he raised before the House today, that is not a point of order.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96, the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There are 267 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons.

Group No. 1: Motions Nos. 1, 10, 158, 167, 266 and 267.

Group No. 2: Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5, 19, 20, 39, 40, 55, 58, 59, 107 and 145.

Group No. 3: Motions Nos. 4, 6, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108 to 113, 154, 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224 and 225.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 4: Motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 35, 133, 134, 136 to 144, 146, 147, 163, 164, 165, 166, 173 to 206, 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 220, 221, 222, 223, 228, 230 to 256, 259, 264, and 265.

[*English*]

Group No. 5: Motions Nos. 13, 14, 38, 209, 211, 217, 219, 258, 260 and 262.

Group No. 6: Motions Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 93 and 102.

Group No. 7: Motions Nos. 21, 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172, 227 and 261.

• (1205)

Group No. 8: Motions Nos. 25, 27, 159, 160, 168, 169 and 226.

Group No. 9: Motions Nos. 26, 37, 44, 46, 86, 94 and 96.

Group No. 10: Motions Nos. 30, 31, 32, 114 to 132, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162 and 263.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 11: Motions Nos. 48, 53, 61 to 68, 75, 83, 84, 135, 229, and 257.

[*English*]

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the table. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C–68 be amended by replacing the words "other weapons" in the long title, on page 1, with the words "related matters".

Motion No. 10

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended by adding after line 38, on page 4, the following:

"(*a*.1) generally to promote firearm safety and reduce firearm–related crime without jeopardising the reasonable uses for firearms in Canadian society or imposing an undue administrative and financial burden on Canadian taxpayers, including legitimate firearm owners;"

Motion No. 158

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after lines 40, on page 58, with the following new Clause:

"112.1 (1) The Minister shall periodically conduct a review of this Act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within twelve months of commencing the review.

(2) The first review must be conducted no later than December 31, 2003, and no more than five years may elapse between the tabling of the report on a review in the House of Commons and the commencement of a subsequent review."

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 167

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 33 on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.1(1) Sections 3 to 129 expire on December 31, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section

(*a*) the Auditor General has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful and cost–effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(*b*) the report of the Auditor General has been referred by the House to such committee as the house may designate for the purpose,

(*c*) the committee has considered the report of the Auditor General and made a report to the House on the success and cost–effectiveness of the section and on the extent to which

(i) public safety has been or will be increased or decreased,

(ii) the incidence of crime related to the use of firearms has been or will be reduced or increased.

(iii) a cost–effective use of public funds has been or will be made to achieve an increase in public safety or a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(*d*) the committee has recommended to the House that the section should not expire, and

(*e*) the House has concurred in the report of the committee.

(2) Where a section is to expire as result of subsection (1), the Governor in Council may, by order, defer its expiry for a period not exceeding one year, if the section contains matters that do not relate to firearms control and the deferral is necessary in order for legislation to be proposed to Parliament to continue the other matters in force after the expiry of the section.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 266

That Bill C–68, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 134, the following new Clause:

"185.1 (1) In 2000, no later than June 1, and every three years thereafter, a comprehensive review of the provisions of this Act shall be undertaken by such Committee of the House of Commons as the House may designate for that purpose.

(2) The Committee shall review the effectiveness of the provisions of this Act and the use of firearms in the community in general and shall report to the House as to whether any provision of this Act or the regulations or any other legislation respecting firearms should be amended, augmented or repealed."

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 267

That Bill C–68, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 134, the following new Clause:

"185.1 No later than January 1, 2001, the federal Minister shall prepare a report on the effectiveness of this Act in reducing the incidence of indictable offenses involving the use of a firearm and lay the report before the House of Commons."

Mr. Milliken: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the extraordinary number of amendments and in view of the fact there is a limit on the debate today, I think you would find unanimous consent to deem the motions in each group put to the House when they have been put as you have just said.

If you indicate to the House that we will be debating Motions *x*, *y* and *z*, the motions would then be before the House for debate without your having to read the motions to the House. They are deemed moved and seconded.

Similarly this evening, when it comes to the votes, the same would apply. The Speaker could say the question before the House is on Motion No. 26, for example, and the vote would follow on that motion without having to put the motion. It would save us a lot of time today in view of the very large number of motions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the suggestion of the parliamentary secretary. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Just to be helpful to the House, in group No. 1 Motions Nos. 1, 10 and 158 stand in the name of the member for Algoma; Motion No. 167, the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville; Motion No. 266, the hon. member for Kamloops; and Motion No. 267, the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka.

I will begin the order of debate by recognizing each of these four members and then we will follow the normal sequence for debate. I will begin with the member for Algoma, followed by the member for Yorkton—Melville, the member for Kamloops and the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka. Then we will follow the normal sequence of government, opposition and so on and so forth, according to the wishes of whoever may be seeking the floor.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after many months of discussion and debate we have come to an important point in time as far as Bill C–68 is concerned.

My three motions in this group deal with one of the most fundamental issues I have tried to express over past months both in this place and in my constituency. They concern the need to be respectful toward the legitimate gun owning community in Canada. I am speaking particularly of the many hundreds and thousands of legitimate gun owners in my riding of Algoma who feel strongly with pride about their firearms ownership. They believe as I do that they properly own and use firearms.

• (1210)

My first motion deals with the title. The current title of the bill states:

An act respecting firearms and other weapons.

It is my proposal in this motion that we simply refer to the act as an act respecting firearms and related matters. The inclusion in the title of the word weapons places a negative nuance on the legitimate gun owning community in Canada. In the hands of legal gun owners firearms are not weapons. They are only in the hands of criminals.

It is important to send the right message. In so doing if we could amend the title by simply saying an act respecting firearms and related matters we would send the right message.

My second amendment in this group relates to the purpose clause. I am proposing an amendment to the purpose clause which I should like to read to the House. It states:

(a.1) generally to promote firearm safety and reduce firearm related crime without jeopardizing the reasonable uses for firearms in Canadian society or imposing an undue administrative and financial burden on Canadian taxpayers, including legitimate firearm owners;

The message that I have consistently tried to convey throughout the months leading up to this point is that we have many situations where firearms are misused or are improperly stored. The message the government wants to give is that those who

commit crime and in so doing use a firearm need to be dealt with swiftly and firmly.

The message must also be that those who legitimately own firearms and use them for recreational or sustenance hunting, for target shooting, for collecting or for use in occupations deserve our respect. They represent Canadians across the country who properly own and use firearms.

I would have preferred a preamble to the bill, but that not being possible I believe this statement in the purpose clause would clearly state to Canadians, to the legitimate firearms community, that the bill is not intended to be a punishment for them because they happen to own firearms. The bill is to deal with crime and criminals. The provisions that deal with the legal firearms community are simply part and parcel of a bigger program to deal with crime and firearms abuse.

The final amendment in the group I am putting forward, seconded by my colleague from Parry Sound—Muskoka, is that there should be a periodic review of the legislation by the minister. This is to acknowledge that no piece of legislation can be perfect. It must be our duty in this place and the duty of the minister to look on a regular basis at how effective and how efficient the legislation is operating, on the one hand as it operates in relation to the legal gun owning community, and at on the other hand how it is operating with respect to the criminal abuse and misuse of firearms.

Periodic review is very important. it cannot start tomorrow because the bill has not yet passed. It cannot start on January 1, 1996 because the first stage of the program will just be starting. However I believe a few years after the program is in place there should be a first review. I suggest the following amendment:

112.1 (1) The minister shall periodically conduct a review of this act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within 12 months of commencing the review.

(2) The first review must be conducted no later than December 31, 2003—

And every five years thereafter.

• (1215)

I have chosen the year 2003 because it is the end of the first five–year period after the beginning of the registration program.

I am hopeful that this set of amendments, which I encourage my colleagues to support me on, will help to assure the legal firearms community that there will not be reams of red tape involved in what I expect to be a simple and inexpensive system for firearms owners; that it is not a tax grab by government; that it will not be an untoward invasion of privacy; and that it will not lead to the mass confiscation of firearms.

Instead of discouraging young people from entering target shooting sports or recreational hunting, the various provisions in the act will continue to encourage the pursuit of those very legitimate and honourable undertakings.

I encourage the House to look seriously at these amendments and I look forward to the House's support.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and all the responsible firearms owners who have written me over the last year and a half, it is an honour and a privilege to be one of the few members of Parliament who will have an opportunity to speak during the six hours of limited debate granted to us by the arrogant and dictatorial Liberal government.

While I have the privilege of representing my constituents in the debate against Bill C–68, literally dozens of members of Parliament will be denied that right because of the six–hour time allocation imposed by the tyranny of the Liberal majority.

Voters send their MP to Ottawa to be their voice in Parliament, and what do the Liberals do but take the voters' right to be represented away from them by using anti–democratic measures like time allocation and closure and by making MPs vote according to the wishes of the Prime Minister, not the people of their riding. It makes me sad and it should make every Liberal member who did not oppose this abuse of power sad too.

The Liberals abuse their majority to do anything they want because they know there is nothing voters can do to stop them until the next election. I know there are about seven million gun owners who are just waiting for the next election. Considering what happened to the Liberal Party in Ontario last week, I think there are some Liberal backbenchers who are pretty worried about the direction in which their party is taking them.

Last Thursday the Liberals abused their power by limiting the time for debate on three bills, Bills C–68, C–41, and C–85. In doing so the Liberal government limited debate on three of the most controversial issues ever to be debated in the House, gun control, sexual orientation and MP pensions. By forcing time allocation the Liberals have declared their highest priorities to be gun control, MP pensions, and including sexual orientation in the sentencing legislation.

Personally, I do not believe these controversial issues are priorities for the people of Canada. I am sure that if the people knew how democracy was getting a kick in the teeth here in Ottawa there would be a lot more concern expressed. I wonder if the Liberals are hoping voters will forget this by the time the next election is announced.

Today I am introducing two amendments to Bill C–68 that would automatically repeal any and all gun control measures in five years unless the provisions have proven to be cost effective by the auditor general in improving public safety and reducing violent crime committed with firearms. If any gun control measure is not cost effective in improving public safety and in saving lives, it should be discontinued in favour of more cost effective measures. Is that not common sense?

It will be difficult for the Liberals to argue against my sunset clause amendment because they will have to argue that they support gun control measures even though the auditor general cannot find any evidence to show the measures to be cost effective at reducing violent crime involving firearms. If the Liberals oppose this amendment it will be clear to everyone in Canada that public safety is not their primary purpose in bringing forward this gun control bill.

Will the Liberals really stand up and say they support gun control measures that do not work? Will the Liberals tell Canadians they do not care whether gun control measures are cost effective or not? Will the liberals tell Canadians they cannot afford to implement new criminal justice measures that would save more lives because they are wasting money on ineffective gun controls?

• (1220)

There should be a sunset clause in all legislation. We have too many laws. If they are not cost effective, they should be tossed out. We are creating a huge bureaucracy and we need to spend money in this place more carefully. We are the stewards of the public purse, and all legislation should be examined to see if it is cost effective, not just the gun control measures.

The reason we need a sunset clause in this legislation is because gun control in general and most of the measures proposed in Bill C–68 defy all logic. First of all, gun control will not improve public safety. It will do the exact opposite. Gun control and registration of all firearms will mean more crime, more injuries, more expense, more deaths and more victims. I wish I had time to prove each of these, but the debate is very limited.

The justice minister says he has no intention of confiscating guns and then he proceeds to ban over 550,000 handguns and 19,000 rifles. What are the people to believe, the minister's assurances or his actions? The justice minister says he no longer believes that only the police and military should have firearms, and then he proceeds to give himself the power to prohibit all firearms in Canada without bringing any of the prohibition orders before Parliament. The people do not believe the minister's slick lawyer talk because his actions speak louder than his words.

Bill C–68 will give drug dealers more rights than law–abiding responsible firearm owners. This bill will run roughshod over every Canadian's fundamental rights and freedoms, including their right to own, use, and enjoy private property; their right to be secure from unreasonable search and seizure; their right to remain silent; their right to be assumed innocent until proven guilty; their right to legal counsel; their right to freedom of association; their right to be represented in Parliament; their right to be treated equally before the law; and their right to privacy. All of those rights will be run roughshod over by this bill. Bill C–68 will not withstand a charter challenge on many of these points.

Bill C–68 also intrudes into areas that are the sole constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces, namely administration of justice, regulation of private property, issuing of licences, assessing of licensing fees and user fees, education, and contributing to increases in provincial income taxes and municipal property taxes. Bill C–68 will not withstand a constitutional challenge by the provinces.

The final piece of illogical behaviour is the government's claim that they have broad public support for the measures proposed in Bill C–68. If this is true, then why is the government ramming this through Parliament? If the support is so broad then why not let democracy run its course? If there is broad public support then why not allow free votes? If there is such broad public support, why discipline liberal backbench MPs who are voting their constituents' wishes? If the public support is so great, why impose time allocation during second reading debate and leave at least 30 MPs waiting to speak?

If the public supports this bill, why did the standing committee on justice limit the amount of time for public hearings and deny to hundreds of people who wanted to be heard the opportunity to be heard? If support is so great, why did the standing committee refuse to hear expert testimony from individual independent experts in various areas? For example, we have been in contact with the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association and the Insurance Bureau of Canada and have learned that insurance companies do not ask their applicants if they own a gun because they are not an identifiable risk group. There are so many people who wanted to come before this committee and were denied the opportunity. We have a problem.

This proves the justice minister and his supporters are wrong when they say gun owners are a risk to themselves or others. If gun ownership represented any risk or liability, insurance companies would charge gun owners a higher premium for life, health, and property insurance. They do not. This is just one of the many areas that have not been fully explored by the justice committee.

• (1225)

If the minister is so convinced that the public supports his proposals, then why is he not prepared to do the rigorous evaluation recommended by the auditor general before implementing further gun controls? Let us see if the measures implemented in Bill C–17 are working before spending even more money on measures that are not cost effective in achieving the stated objective of improving public safety. If there is broad public support, why invoke time allocation at report stage?

I am introducing this amendment so that we will always evaluate this gun legislation to see if it is working, if it is effective. Those parts that are not working or not effective

should be repealed. Everything the government does defies common sense.

This sunset clause should be supported by all members of the House. I cannot think of any reason they would oppose it. I hope we will have some common sense when we examine it.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on this legislation.

As my colleague, the previous speaker, has indicated, it is unfortunate that many members of Parliament will not have an opportunity to speak at report stage, since the government has introduced closure and will limit the debate at this stage of the legislation. However, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a couple of remarks about the bill itself.

I am certainly not a spokesperson for what people would refer to as the gun lobby. Yes, I have been a fur trapper with my own trapline. Yes, I have been a big game hunter. Yes, I have been a recreational shooter, but that was some years ago.

The fundamental question I asked myself was whether this legislation will curtail the number of people who are killed each year by firearms. That is fundamental.

I looked at the details and noticed, for example, that about 1,400 people die of gunshot wounds each year, which has fallen substantially over the last number of years. How does the 1,400 break out? Eleven hundred people die as a result of a firearm wound through the commission of suicide. In other words, people who have decided to take their own life are using a firearm. If that firearm were registered would the person interested in committing suicide likely not commit suicide? I could only conclude that it would probably have little effect at all, recognizing that suicide is a fairly thoughtful process and that people normally think about it for some time. That takes care of 1,100 people who die of firearm wounds.

About 150 people die each year as a result of domestic violence, when one partner decides to shoot the other partner. Would that be reduced if firearms were registered? Would people not shoot their spouse or their partner? I concluded that probably would not have any effect either. If things have deteriorated in a relationship to that extent, whether the .22 is registered someplace will probably not deter the person from committing the act.

Then I noticed that about 100 people each year die who I will define as gangsters. I suspect that gangsters do not register their sawed off shotguns or pistols, so I concluded that would not have much of an impact.

About 50 people each year die in Canada as a result of shooting accidents. A shooting accident will take place, I presume, whether or not a firearm is registered.

When I looked at the 1,400 people who lose their lives each year as a result of firearms, I could only conclude that no one would not die as a result of the legislation.

Will our streets, neighbourhoods and country be safer because of the legislation? We have to acknowledge we will tie up the work of the RCMP and police forces, which will spend hundreds and thousands of hours doing evaluations and filling out forms. When I talked to many of the RCMP officers in Kamloops, I did not find a single one who actually supported the legislation. With respect to the tens of millions of dollars that will go into the registration system, they said put more members of the force on the street and it will make Canada a safer place, as opposed to a gun registration system that by and large will not be effective. Then I listen with interest to some of the aboriginal members of Parliament when they say the law ought not to apply to First Nations peoples.

• (1230)

When there are people in the Senate and in the House of Commons saying this legislation should not apply to First Nations people, what kind of system will this be in the end?

I will give the Minister of Justice credit. I suspect he was honourably motivated when he brought this legislation forward. I believe he thought it would make Canada a safer place as a result of many people urging him to take some kind of action. Will Canada be a safer place? By and large, no. I wonder if it does not get the government members off the hook so they can go across the country saying: "Look at the tremendous action we have taken to combat crime in our streets".

The legislation is by and large a smokescreen. It is a scam, it is a sham, it is an illusion the government is taking action against crime when very little change will occur. I will not say there is nothing good in this legislation, of course there is. Every year I have been here I have supported changes to Canada's firearms' legislation but not this one. This is a phoney piece of legislation that gives the impression of real action when very little is taking place at a tremendous cost both in terms of abusing the lives of legitimate firearms owners and, more important, taking so much time of the RCMP and other police forces.

Is it a priority to tie up hundreds of thousands of person hours in this type of activity? That energy, time and money are misdirected. I assume because of the muscle the government is using in Parliament that the legislation will pass. That motivated me to put forward this amendment. I will read the amendment: "In the year 2000, no later than June 1 and every three years

thereafter, a comprehensive review of the provisions of this act shall be undertaken by such committee of the House of Commons as the House may designate for that purpose".

I appreciate that the previous speaker indicated the interest in the auditor general's evaluating legislation prior to action. I support that because the auditor general has said on numerous occasions that in his judgment the present legislation has not been evaluated to see whether it is effective.

Even the justice department has stated time and time again the evaluation of the effectiveness of present legislation has simply not been done. Why then is the government so determined to proceed with a whole set of changes on existing legislation that has yet to be evaluated in terms of cost effectiveness?

Basically this is an attempt through one of 267 amendments to say that if the government is to proceed with this anyway as a result of its parliamentary muscle, let us at least include a provision so that this changed legislation is evaluated on a regular basis to see if it is effective, whether the registration system is effective, whether the whole initiative is cost effective and presumably to identify areas that need improvement.

It is meant to improve the legislation. I hope government members take it seriously and give some thought to building in some type of process by which this legislation can be reviewed on a regular basis.

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to talk at debate on Bill C–68 on my amendment which, like a couple of the others presented, calls for a review of this legislation. I have suggested a period of five years.

The purpose of the legislation, the intent of the minister and of the government to attempt to curb violence in Canadian society is a worthwhile objective and the legislation in many respects addresses that.

There are items in the legislation that have beyond a shadow of a doubt proven to have an opportunity to do that; increasing the penalties for the commission of certain violent acts with a firearm, increased penalties for possession of stolen firearms, increased penalties for smuggling, all of which most of us accept. The idea of more policing of the borders is a proven thing which most people would support.

• (1235)

On the other hand there is the question of universal registration of all firearms, going beyond what we have now which is for handguns only. There is an open question whether that provision will achieve the purpose of the bill which is to reduce violence in Canadian society.

I and many Canadians believe that with any piece of legislation there has to be a balance. There has to be a relationship between what is being done, the cost and what the result will be. There are four areas we should take a look at and which I intend to address briefly in this speech. We must look at what registration is likely to do and what is not likely to do, what it will cost and what it may do. There is a difference between what it will do and what it may do.

What is registration attempting to do? It is trying address what we know, that a firearm normally begins its life as a legal firearm and through its lifetime it goes through a process and becomes illegal. Registration is an attempt to arrest that process. It is not an attempt once a firearm becomes illegal to stop somebody from using it in a certain way. That will not happen. It is an attempt to stop the process of going from legal to illegal. It does that a number of ways.

A large number of thefts occur from bulk shipments. Registration will record those items as they reach the border and then can be tracked to their point of destination and hopefully stop theft from those shipments.

It will give police an opportunity better enforce prohibition orders issued by judges. Under this legislation and previous legislation a judge can put a prohibition order on individuals to stop them owning firearms based on their past behaviour, for instance being convicted of a serious criminal offence. Registration will make it easier for a police officer to know exactly what firearms they want to collect and execute the prohibition order.

On safe storage, if somebody has a firearm stolen from his or her dwelling and it is used in a criminal offence there will be the possibility to trace it back exactly from where it came. That might encourage certain people to practise better safe storage.

The licensing part of the registration system will give authorities the opportunity to examine somebody's past behaviour and to determine whether it should preclude them from owning a firearm. Those are some of the things registration is likely to do.

There are some things it will not do and people should be clear on this as well. Once a criminal has a firearm in their possession, whether it is registered is very unlikely to stop them from committing a criminal act. That is not what registration will do. Anybody with that in their mind is probably mistaken.

If somebody is intent on doing harm to themselves and is in possession of a firearm, that the firearm is or is not registered will probably not have a lot to do with the actions of that person. The registration part is to stop the process from becoming illegal. Once the firearm is illegal the legislation will not have a lot of impact.

There are some concerns about what it may do. I am concerned it will increase the cost of hunting. A lot of individuals in my riding hunt. It will preclude them from participating in that sport. On a more broad basis, hunting is an important economic activity in my riding which is pursued by a lot of people. A lot of individuals come into the area and spend their money on lodging

et cetera. The concern is whether it will decrease the number of people who will participate in that.

The fear of many legitimate firearm owners is whether this system of registration in the hands of a future government may be used to prohibit firearms normally used in recreational activities. It is a concern they genuinely hold and one we need to address and take into account when looking at this legislation.

• (1240)

We must look at cost. The cost individually to begin with will not be that high, $10 for up to 10 firearms plus acquiring an FPC. There is the concern that if that is the opening cost what will the cost be in five years, ten years, fifteen years. It is a legitimate concern not just with firearms but with anything that has a fee attached to it.

There is also a concern about the global cost for it. It is set at $85 million to implement and then there will be a cost to keep it in place. That has to be a concern in a day and age when we have fiscal challenges facing us as a government.

There are a number of considerations we have to take into account. We have to take into account what registration will do. We have to understand what it will not do. We have to understand what it may do or at least have an appreciation of what it may do. We also have to understand what it may cost. We need to evaluate considering all of those components.

Will it stop violence? Will it be reasonable? Will it hurt legitimate firearms owners? Those are the things we need to know. Those are things being debated in the House, things quite frankly that have been debated for the last year. I do not think it will possible at this point to get any clear consensus on that or a clear understanding.

In that respect I have proposed an amendment which will mandate a review after five years so we will have an opportunity as Parliament to understand whether the legislation is achieving its objective to curb violence in society and understand whether we need to modify or change it to make it more effective in order to have an understanding as to whether some of those negative consequences or concerns put forward will take place.

Therefore I urge my colleagues in the House today to help and assist me by voting for this amendment requiring a review of the legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I want to advise the House that we have gone through the first round of debate and I recognized the speakers under whom the motions stood. Now to a more general debate I will look to the government, followed by the official opposition, the government and the third party. We will see who might be seeking the floor at any time.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak on Bill C–68 at report stage.

I listened to the suggested amendments put forward by different members. The member for Yorkton—Melville worked on the committee and spent a good deal of time with other members of the committee working on this bill which I feel is a much better bill as a result of the work of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I do not agree when members say we tried to shut down debate. We have had a lot of debate on this subject. We will have report stage today and third reading tomorrow. Members may want to speak to the bill at this stage. The important thing is members have spoken to us about their concerns on this bill and their thoughts and ideas have been taken into consideration; not all but a lot. As a result changes are reflected in the revised edition of the bill before the House today at report stage.

I will speak to the amendments that have been brought forward. The first amendment is by the member for Algoma who wants to change the title from other weapons to related matters. I understand what he is trying to do but unfortunately the wording he wants to use is too general. What we want to do here is relate it to weapons.

• (1245)

There is not a negative connotation meant in this this bill relating to the use of weapons. A weapon is not something that has a negative connotation in the opinion of the government. If it had not been for weapons we would not have our free society today after the first and second world wars and the Korean conflict. We are not trying to downgrade or malign weapons. This is not something we want to do. For that reason we feel the wording as stated is what we would like to use.

He also mentions in section 4 on page 4 that the wording is ineffective because some of the objectives are not stated. He wants certain objectives stated. The problem is that while some of the objectives are stated by the hon. member in his amendment, other objectives are not. We feel that the section to which he refers adequately states what it is the government is trying to do.

I turn to Motion No. 158 relating to the review: "The minister shall periodically conduct a review of this act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within 12 months of commencing the review".

The review is something many members wanted to see in the bill and it was given a good deal of study. The problem is that we will be registering the gun owners from January 1, 1996 until December 31, 2001 and firearms themselves from January 1,

1998 to December 31, 2003. That is when the act will really be in place. Any time after that would be the logical time for a review if one were to be brought forward. If we are looking at a five year review the year 2008 presumably would be the time for a review.

It is not felt at this time that a review should be included in the bill. We want to give the bill a chance to work. We want to have the bill passed, to have Canadians understand what is in the bill and to have an opportunity to look at the regulations.

There certainly will be an election prior to the registration of the firearms commencing on January 1, 1998. This could be a subject of debate during the next federal election. I am sure all members will be prepared to discuss this subject and I welcome that. I think that is the way it should be. We would then have the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of the act and regulations which Canadians will have had an opportunity to review and of which they will be better aware. To leave that out at this time would be the most appropriate course.

The member for Yorkton—Melville has stated in Motion No. 167: "Sections 3 to 129 expire on December 31, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section the auditor general has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful in the cost effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms". Certainly a review in my opinion would be preferable to this.

• (1250)

We have stated we want Parliament to have the control over legislation, particularly this legislation. The motion gives the powers over the act to the auditor general. While the auditor general has a very worthwhile and important function in our system of government, he is not an institution to which we want to give control over our legislation and control over whether legislation is going to be successful or not.

The member is placing the responsibility on one man and one man's report as to whether or not legislation is going to continue. This is not a review by Parliament but a review by one person. If this precedent were instituted and followed up in other legislation then Parliament might as well stop functioning. It might as well shut down because the auditor general would declare whether he or she thought bills should continue to be in effect.

Motions Nos. 266 and 267, one by the member for Kamloops and the other by the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka, once again call for reviews of the act and I would say the same thing. This is not an appropriate time to implement a review. If it is felt there is still a lot of concern with the act later on, it could be the subject of an amendment perhaps after the next federal election.

The act has to be given the opportunity to work. We have to see the regulations. Many members of Parliament will be very pleasantly surprised.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–68 is about public safety. To ensure the safety of the public we need certain measures that will not necessarily please everyone.

When restrictions are set on our freedom of choice or freedom of action, most of us start asking questions and there is bound to be some protest against new measures. Only time will tell whether these measures are effective.

Firearms registration is one such measure that has raised a lot of controversy. Apparently harmless, this measure has caused one of the most emotional debates I have ever seen and in which I have taken part. At the time, even Bill C–17 did not seem to raise arguments that were so emotionally charged.

One that recurs ad nauseam is that the measures adopted in 1991 were entirely adequate and that it is unnecessary to change anything at all in the existing legislation. However, during the debate on C–17, the pro–gun lobby argued that the proposed measures were redundant and would put an additional burden on honest gun owners.

Apparently, the pro–gun lobby has managed to live with the provisions on storage, display and transportation of firearms. If they are satisfied with the existing provisions, it is because they are effective, and only time will tell whether a legislative provision produces the expected results.

Perhaps I may draw another analogy. I well remember the controversy that it raised in Quebec when the government wanted to make wearing seat belts mandatory. A whole range of arguments was raised against this decision. It was an attack on individual freedom, was one argument we often heard. First prove it will save lives, was another one. The government has no right to make me buckle up, people said. I am a responsible driver and never had an accident. Does that sound familiar?

However, according to the statistics, seat belts have saved lives. Especially since a car is not supposed to kill but to carry passengers. I could apply the same analogy to making helmets mandatory for motorcyclists.

• (1255)

All these measures were adopted by governments for the well–being of the community, to protect public safety. I agree some measures restrict our individual freedoms, but it is a small price to pay for the benefits down the line. So much for analogies.

Now back to the motions concerning safe storage. The motions I proposed would make it mandatory for the manufacturer, importer and exporter of a firearm to install a secure locking device on the firearm. A secure locking device means a device that cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock. Once installed, the locking device must prevent the firearm from shooting.

The amendment I proposed, which will probably be discussed later on, is entirely appropriate in a bill on public security. Access to unlocked firearms is far too easy. Guns without a trigger lock and ammunition that is not securely stored are immediately available to the individual who gives in to suicidal or violent impulses. When guns and ammunition are not immediately available, the individual has time to think and calm down.

The statistics on deaths caused by firearms are horrifying. In 1991, suicides represented 77 per cent of 1,445 deaths caused by firearms. Out of 732 homicides recorded in Canada in 1992, 246 were committed with a firearm. Most homicides during the past ten years were committed with shotguns or hunting rifles. In three cases out of four, women killed by their spouses were shot with a shotgun or hunting rifle.

The statistics are there. A trigger lock could have helped reduce the number of suicides and homicides committed with a gun. Just like making the wearing of seat belts mandatory, this measure would help us save lives.

An amendment like the one we proposed would impose few restrictions, considering the benefits that would ensue. Equipping all firearms in circulation, including shoulder arms, with a trigger lock is an indication that firearms are dangerous, that they can kill and that owners should use them responsibly.

Firearms involve too much risk to be ignored. The mere presence of a firearm in a home increases the risk of suicide five times and the risk of homicide three times. The risk of accident is greater in a home where firearms are kept than in a home where there are none.

The improper use of firearms must be reduced by showing that guns mean danger and that firearms must always be used carefully and in accordance with the law and the requirements of safety.

The mandatory trigger lock would permit this. A way must be found to inform users who do not even know there are gun storage regulations. Those primarily concerned, that is the owners, are not even aware that gun storage regulations exist. A survey by Léger & Léger confirms this disturbing discovery. It was done between September 1 and 13, 1994 and involved 515 gun owners living in Quebec. In response to a question on knowledge of the existence of the regulations, only 53 per cent believed there was legislation on storage; 31.8 per cent said the opposite; and 15.1 per cent were undecided—they did not know there were any regulations on the safe storage of firearms.

• (1300)

At the very least, a trigger lock and targeted advertising are required and just as essential as a national registration system.

Bill C–68 is not intended to stigmatize firearms owners, but, rather, to promote a form of social accountability. This is why we must oblige manufacturers, importers and exporters to equip firearms with a secure locking device.

These are my comments on the amendments before us at the moment, since, unfortunately, I believe some members will try to use the time and prevent us from discussing other motions. This is why I chose to discuss mine now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Further to the comments by the hon. member for Saint–Hubert, it is not up to me to plan strategy for anyone in this House. So long as no one questions the relevance—we know how complex it can be to resolve—we will continue the debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue for many people in the rural areas of the country.

I have considered this question over the last several years. In my previous life as an opposition member we had a debate on this issue. In fact we have debated the matter a number of times. I was here when Bill C–17 was debated, which was brought in by the former Conservative government.

That bill was supported by the hon. member for Kamloops who stood in the House today to say that he was upset with the fact that time allocation had been imposed. During the previous debate that member was the House leader of the New Democratic Party and he supported the government, in fact all the parties, in limiting debate and supported not having a vote at second reading. I find it somewhat surprising today that the hon. member for Kamloops would stand in his place and criticize the government for imposing time allocation.

We have debated this bill for the last year. I am sure all hon. members in the House have had or should have had the opportunity to express the views of their constituents, not only on the floor of the House but across the country. Certainly in the last year there have been opportunities for constituents to express their views of the issue. I have travelled across my riding. I have been to gun rallies. I have met with different groups.

This past weekend as I debated how I will vote on the issue I had the opportunity to speak with many of my constituents, especially a number of the mayors and regional councillors. In my constituency a number of motions were put forward by regional councils and a number of municipalities outlining their concerns with the legislation. I have also had an opportunity to speak to a lot of my gun guys. I call them the gun guys because they are the ones who have formed different shooting clubs.

They are members of anglers and hunters groups and they have come together to fight the bill. I say gun guys because the membership is made up of guys. I have been out west and I have discussed this issue with people in various ridings.

I took issue with the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville when he talked about the view of Ontarians on the issue. He seemed to suggest that somehow the Mike Harris sweep meant that people were against gun control in Ontario. That is simply not true. Take the example of northern Ontario for instance where there is the strongest disagreement with this bill. It went Liberal and NDP. In two of the three ridings of the members of this party that voted against the government on second reading, those ridings went Liberal.

• (1305)

Therefore, I find it hard to believe that the Reform Party, as it does in my riding, tries to take credit somehow for the Mike Harris victory in this past election. As members know, that is simply not true.

I have had difficulties on this issue in my own riding simply because I have had the opportunity of getting around and talking to a number of people. If one talks to people generally on the street, what they will say is that a lot of people are against this legislation.

The Reform Party in my riding likes to build this up. The Reform Party comes forward. Its past candidate writes letters to an editor at a newspaper saying they will use this and fight the member on it.

Most people in my riding know my views on this issue. They know that I fought hard to make changes. What they do not know is how the Reform Party says it is speaking out on behalf of its constituents but when you look at the numbers and the polls, it shows that many of these members are being two faced about the issue. They are claiming to represent their constituents and they are not.

There are only a few brave members of the Reform Party who are standing up for what their constituents want. I find that to be in contrast with what the Reform Party promised in the last election. I have always in the House taken very strongly the views of my constituents and tried to put them forward.

What the Reform Party never tells you when its members talk about free votes—we have not seen very many free votes from these people—is what you do in the House when—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I remind members on both sides that all interventions must be made through the Chair, and not directly to one other. In that way we might continue to have a very parliamentary debate on a very serious matter before the House.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, what the Reform Party never tells its constituents when it talks about free votes is what to do in a situation where your views on an issue are different from your constituents.

If one looks at the polling across the country, one poll may be different, two polls may, but when all polls across the country show support for this legislation it is difficult.

A poll taken in my own riding by the Simcoe Reformer asked a number of questions. It said: "Are you strongly in favour, somewhat in favour, or opposed to the registration of all guns?" Those who strongly support were 33 per cent. Those who strongly opposed were 23 per cent. For somewhat support, there were 26 per cent and somewhat opposed, 19 per cent.

The question I have to look at is: "How do you think your member of Parliament should vote on this issue: For or against the proposal on gun control legislation?"

Of those who had an opinion, 60 per cent said that their member of Parliament should vote for the legislation and 40 per cent said that he should vote against the legislation. That poll was taken in my riding.

It has been difficult to get a good grasp on what the majority of constituents think on this issue. What I did was call around. In fact, I talked to some of the gun control opponents in my riding. They said that they had been taking polls too. It showed 70:30. The numbers were not only true but they were stronger.

It makes it difficult for all hon. members. I know tonight as we vote on this Reform Party members will too be looking at how their constituents think about this issue. On this issue we are talking about a five–year review, which I totally support and which I have put forward. The minister is here today and he has indicated in the past that this might be a proper thing to do, to review the legislation to make sure it is working.

• (1310)

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* had an editorial which essentially said the same thing. Let us see whether or not the registration of guns will do what the government says it will do. That is why I support the motions. I would put the year for review at 2008 as the hon. parliament secretary has done. That would be a good way to do it.

Since the parliamentary secretary said he supported the idea and the minister is here and since the Reform Party agrees with this, I wonder if we could get unanimous consent to put forward a motion that would use the year 2008, five years after the implementation. If there is unanimous consent, the motion would say:

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 134 the following:

That no later than January 1, 2008, that the federal minister shall prepare a report on the effectiveness of this act in reducing the incidents of indictable offences involving the use of a firearm, and lay the report before the House of Commons.

I wonder if we could get unanimous consent of the House for this motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the unanimous consent for the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by touching on the inconsistencies that I see and the reasoning behind this bill.

Inconsistencies always bother me because fact should support fact and truth should support truth. An inconsistency indicates that fact is not supporting fact. I am concerned about that.

The two inconsistencies are these. If the justice minister and the government truly believe that the registration of rifles and shotguns will reduce the criminal use of those firearms and save lives, why are we waiting until the year 2003 to make it mandatory? Why are we waiting that long to begin to save lives and create a safer society?

The other inconsistency is that 58 per cent of the handguns that have been legally acquired and legally held are to be banned. Why? Because they pose a danger to society. Yet those handguns are not to be taken from society, they are to left in society. They are to be grandfathered.

Why would the government, if it honestly believes that 58 per cent of handguns held today in society are a danger to society, then why would it allow them to remain in society?

I will have more to say at third reading about the bill. I will begin my address to Bill C–68 at report stage by taking cognizance of those two very glaring inconsistencies behind the rationale of the bill as presented by the government.

I am opposed to a system of registration of rifles and shotguns as outlined in Bill C–68. I am also opposed to the draconian inspection powers and the absurd penalties provided for anyone who fails to register a rifle or a shotgun.

Canada has some of the most stringent gun regulations in the world now. Some 60 pages in the Criminal Code deal with the acquisition, ownership and use of firearms, and we want to add a whole bundle more.

• (1315)

We do not need further controls on law–abiding gun owners. We need the enforcement of the present laws and to get tough with the criminal use of firearms. Canadians have been demanding changes to the justice system in this country for years. All they have received are weak–kneed, bleeding heart policies that further erode the objective of justice, which is to reduce crime.

The present and past governments have used gun control to make Canadians believe they are doing something about crime in Canada when they are not.

Bill C–68 is not a gun control bill. It is not going to control guns; it is going to register them. There is a huge difference between the two.

Bill C–68 is nothing more than a pretence that the government is making our homes and streets safer and getting tough on criminals.

I recall Lynda Haverstock, the leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, when she appeared before the standing committee stated in effect that the federal government was spreading misinformation by claiming Bill C–68 would reduce suicide and domestic violence that involved firearms. I agree with this observation.

The bill creates false hopes in the minds of Canadians about what it will do in terms of making our homes and streets safer, hope that will never be realized through this bill because it does not address the cause of suicide or the cause of domestic violence.

As the auditor general concluded in his 1993 report: "Our review of the new regulations indicated that important data needed to assess the potential benefits and future effectiveness of the regulations were not available at the time the regulations were drafted. The government proceeded with new regulations for reasons of public policy".

The government is doing exactly the same thing. There is not a statistical justification for bringing in a universal registration system, and yet we see that as the central pillar in Bill C–68.

The voters have awakened. They cannot be placated by pretentious pieces of legislation. Canadians want concrete measures effectively aimed at reducing crime. The Ontario and Manitoba elections demonstrate quite clearly that the citizens of these provinces reject the Liberal form of justice. They reject the Liberal tendencies to make offenders' rights supersede the rights of victims.

Canadians must be able to see that the measures introduced by the government will meet the objective of reducing crime before legislation is passed, not after. Through common sense appraisal of the law they must be able to see that it will be of benefit to them, their families and their communities.

The justice minister has not provided any statistical information to justify the implementation of these draconian measures in this bill, although he has repeatedly been asked to do so. He has not effectively demonstrated the link between registering firearms and a reduction in crime. That is what the attorneys general from the three western prairie provinces addressed when they appeared before the standing committee. There was no linkage they could see between the registration of rifles and shotguns and the reduction in the criminal use of these firearms.

Not one witness who appeared before the standing committee could provide any substantive evidence that registration would reduce the criminal use of these firearms. No one could demonstrate how registration, the banning of .25 and .32 calibre handguns, the new licensing regime or the intrusive inspection powers will diminish the number of firearm crimes in this country.

What they did inadvertently illustrate was an unrealistic fear of firearms and an idealistic notion that by restricting ownership of firearms, criminals, those people who thrive on obtaining a valuable object to sell on the black market, would somehow be thwarted by such regulatory acts aimed at honest citizens, people who have owned and used firearms for years in a safe and legal manner.

To date it seems the only impetus for Bill C–68 is to fulfil the justice minister's original and unrealistic thought to have only the police and military possess firearms in this country.

Time today does not permit me to address and debate each of the Reform's amendments. The time allocation imposed by the Liberal government with the co–operation of the separatist Bloc party for both the report stage and the third reading of this bill denies me and my colleagues the opportunity to present evidence to substantiate our amendments or to represent the concerns of our constituents.

• (1320)

I object to the shameful and undemocratic methods employed by the government to ram this bill through Parliament. It is no secret that the government is having trouble keeping its caucus together on this issue. The threat of being kicked off a committee is hanging over every Liberal's head if they dare to represent their constituents by voting against the government and in accordance with the will of the majority of the people they represent.

I think the government is terrified to allow its MPs the opportunity to go home for the summer to consult constituents on Bill C–68, Bill C–41, or the government's pension bill. It knows that the more Canadians learn about Bill C–68, as was the case for the Charlottetown accord, the stronger the opposition will grow.

So much for the competence of the government. So much for the rhetoric that it has the support of Canadians. If it had the majority of Canadians on its side it would not be moving so quickly to have this bill passed, especially given the fact it will not be implemented until the year 2003.

Reform is opposed to Bill C–68 in many of its forms. Therefore, we will be voting against the vast majority of this bill at third reading. Our amendments tabled before the House are an attempt to make this draconian legislation more palatable for those firearm owners who will be burdened by red tape, costly controls of privately owned property, and intrusion into their lives.

Reforms' amendments in no way concede to the principle of more gun regulations in this country. We still maintain and are adamant that there is no need for the registration of rifles and shotguns.

I will have more time at third reading to address the concerns of our party with regard to this bill, which are reflected by the people all across the country.

I was in Stratford this weekend, and last weekend I was in Bridgewater, Nova Scotia. I have spoken to approximately 35,000 to 38,000 Canadians across the country who have all expressed the very same views and concerns. They are prepared to do whatever is reasonable and underlaid with common sense to bring about a safer use of firearms. However, they do not believe this bill will do that. They believe that it will do quite the opposite and simply encumber law–abiding citizens when it ought to be directing its efforts at those who would use firearms in a criminal manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill and particularly to the amendment put forward by the Bloc Quebecois. But first I must say that I am somewhat surprised by the debate surrounding this bill, which, at first sight, should bring us together in support of the goal that was set.

Without accusing anyone—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have a little bit of a problem. I simply want to clarify something with the hon. member and all my colleagues. We are currently debating the first group of motions on Bill C–68. Otherwise, if we broaden the debate—if I can use that expression—, if this is what the

House wants, the Chair will certainly acquiesce to its request. However, at this time, I am seeking some guidance from my colleagues.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, tell me if I am mistaken, but I understood that, given the limited time available to discuss each group of motions and the number of members scheduled to address the first group—as you can see, there is no Bloc amendment in this group—, we would be allowed, while speaking to the first group, to argue on any amendment moved by any other member. I am one of the movers of an amendment that will come up only in the fourth group and, if I am not mistaken, I think that this group will not pass.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker. It is up to you, but I understood the House agreed to broaden—as you say—the debate on this group of motions. It is up to you, of course.

• (1325)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): As you know, the Chair is not involved in those discussions.

[*English*]

If there has been some agreement reached by the parties as to how this debate might proceed, you would be in full knowledge that the Chair is not a participant in those deliberations and is consequently unaware of any such agreement, which is not to say there is not one.

All I am attempting to do is facilitate the debate in the traditional fashion for colleagues on both sides of the House. I seek your guidance. If there is something the Chair is not aware of, please make us aware.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement on the content or to change the format.

The hon. member for Saint–Hubert talked generally about trigger locks and things that were not related to group one. The hon. member for Crowfoot did likewise. I can understand why they would do it, because we do not know how far we will get in this debate.

However, with both parties having had an opportunity to put points of view on the record, I would hope that not all members are going to talk generally. I would like to adhere to the groupings so we will be able to discuss the merits of the amendments. I am not saying we have to adhere completely to that, without deviation, because we do have a time limit and all members have a right to be heard on the subject matter at report stage. I hope we adhere to the groupings as best we can so we give an airing to the motions that have been put forward. If not, then why have these motions at all?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I appreciate the intervention from the hon. parliamentary secretary. Certainly we are all cognizant that a great deal of work goes into formulating these groupings to facilitate the debate and to bring a certain focus to amendments within a certain grouping.

I will join the parliamentary secretary and everyone else in the House in appealing to everyone to keep their remarks and participation as much as possible within the context of the groupings. Otherwise, I will react to whatever the mood of the House is at any time during this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, in this case, I will simply pass my turn and wait for my amendment to come up before taking the floor. I will also wait for third reading to denounce the government.

In that sense, I think that, given all the amendments and the time limit on debate, the government could have shown good faith and allowed the opposition to present arguments, as was done before I rose. I was not the first member to speak to this bill in a general way. I will give up my turn, given the government's way of proceeding.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I very much appreciate the understanding shown by the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm. True, he was not the first member to discuss the bill in a more general way, but I did react to a previous speech.

[*English*]

Certainly I will attempt to the best of my ability to conduct the debate in the fashion that will be most acceptable to at least the vast majority of colleagues in the House.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I think you might find unanimous consent to consider that all the questions have been put, a division demanded and deferred.

I think you would be able to follow this procedure throughout the day if we reach the end of a group, simply to save time in the House. In other words, we will have a vote on them at the end of the day. There is no need to call the yeas and nays at this point and then defer the vote.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion of the hon. parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Does the House agree that the Chair should defer the questions instead of putting the motions in group No. 1 to a vote?

Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1330)

[*English*]

We will move to group No. 2. I want to apprise the House the only motions standing in group No. 2 will be Motion No. 5 and Motion No. 145. All other motions in group No. 2 have been withdrawn.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could we have a clarification on the withdrawal of those other motions? I am unaware of any withdrawal.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The mover or movers of those other motions within group No. 2 have decided to withdraw their motions. That is the only explanation I can offer the House at this time.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I understand some of those are my motions and I have not withdrawn any. I am not aware of anyone withdrawing them on my behalf either.

I was looking at a past Order Paper, not today's. I am in error and I withdraw my intervention.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member from Crowfoot for his co–operation. Certainly we were looking for whether we had given less than accurate information. I would not want to do that on any debate, certainly not on this one.

Now we will go to group No. 2, with only Motion No. 5 and Motion No. 145 standing. As I understand, by previous agreement I do not have to read the motions.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C–68 be amended, in Clause 2, by adding after line 11 on page 4, the following:

"(3) For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982."

Motion No. 145

That clause 107.1 of Bill C–68 be amended

(*a*) by striking out, in the English version, line 23 on page 52 and substituting the following:

"may lawfully use it;

(*b*) by striking out line 28 on page 52 and substituting the following:

"obtains a registration certificate for it; or

(*c*) a person who possesses a firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(i) has borrowed the firearm,

(ii) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it, and

(iii) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain himself or herself or his or her family."

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will speak on both of these motions proposed by the Minister of Justice. Motion No. 5 relates to clause 2 and adds a new subsection (3):

For greater certainty, nothing in this act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

• (1335)

We have heard from many aboriginal groups about the importance of firearms in exercising their traditional hunting rights. With this in mind the government is in the midst of consultation with aboriginal groups so the main tenets of the bill can be applied in a manner which is sensitive to the aboriginal communities. This motion would simply confirm the government's commitment to work in concert with aboriginal communities so that the firearms legislation can operate in their communities in a way which recognizes and is respectful of constitutional aboriginal treaty rights.

What we want to do is rationalise the constitutional and treaty rights which the aboriginal people already have with Bill C–68. That is not to create due rights, but then again it is not to derogate the rights aboriginal people already have. We want this legislation to work in conjunction with the treaty and constitutional rights of the aboriginal people. That is very important for the operation of this bill and for the respect of the rights of aboriginal people under the Constitution and the treaties.

Reform members are calling this a two tier justice system. We have stated and we state again there is to be the same rights applied to all Canadians and that the bill is to apply equally in all parts of Canada except where we have stated certain conditions would apply to those who hunt for sustenance. We are acknowledging that there are treaty and constitutional rights for aboriginal people. We want to mesh the application of this bill into that.

Motion No. 145 strikes out certain lines in the English version of the bill. We are proposing an amendment consequential to the new lending conditions to be provided in the legislation. Motion No. 145 would provide an exception to the summary offence provision of possessing a firearm without a registration certificate if the person were a sustenance hunter who had borrowed the firearm.

This is in relation to section 107(1) of the Firearms Act which will come into being with Bill C–68. It says someone who has borrowed a firearm for hunting for sustenance would not be charged because they were hunting with or using an unregistered firearm. We think that is applicable and is in keeping with those who must hunt for sustenance to feed their families in the more remote parts of the country.

I put forward on behalf of the government those two motions which we feel will add to the bill, particularly to those residents of the more rural parts of the country. We are mindful of the concerns of those in the rural and regional parts of the country and we want this bill to be respected, obeyed and applicable in a meaningful way to these regions.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was a bit unclear as to what the parliamentary secretary was saying. Is he saying this would not apply to anywhere south of the Northwest Territories, to any aboriginals in Ontario, Quebec and the west?

• (1340)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): With respect, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the amendment put forward by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. This clause was recommended by most of the aboriginal groups that came to the justice committee during its hearings on Bill C–68. Some specific recommendations were made by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec to include a non–derogation clause in the bill.

While the government's position is that the bill does not abrogate or derogate from aboriginal and treaty rights, aboriginal people want greater assurance and comfort.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Aboriginal groups are happy the government and the minister have responded. I thank the aboriginal witnesses for this suggestion. I express my deep appreciation to the minister for listening and responding to these concerns.

I am sure we will have the support of the Reform Party. I will quote the hon. member for Crowfoot who quite clearly said during one of the hearings that the support is there from the Reform Party: "I find it unacceptable that the government will make agreements with our aboriginal people and then violate those agreements. This is unacceptable. What is the purpose of the agreement and where is the honour of the agreement if it is simply to be violated? No wonder the aboriginal people come forward. I admire your patience. I cannot get over your patience in the face of this kind of treatment".

It is quite clear that when the aboriginal people of Canada want a non–derogation clause in the gun control bill the Reform Party will be with us all the way on this issue. It would not want the Government of Canada to break its treaties with the aboriginal people who have negotiated land claims and treaties over the past number of years.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

• (1345)

[*English*]

I am glad this amendment has been put forward. I am sure members of this House will find that this amendment is acceptable to all, that it will address the needs and that it recognizes and acknowledges the special place aboriginal people have in this country.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the same agreement applicable that the votes will be deferred?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Group No. 2 stands deferred. We will now proceed to Group No. 3.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 11, on page 4, the following new Clause:

"2.1 This Act does not apply in respect of

(*a*) any firearm that is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm; or

(*b*) any ammunition that is not prohibited ammunition."

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 17, on page 4, with the following:

"4(1) The purpose of this Act is"; and

(*b*) by adding after line 18, on page 5, the following:

"(2) Nothing is this Act is to be interpreted as prohibiting a person who is licensed to own a firearm from using a firearm, other than a restricted or prohibited weapon, that has been registered by the person pursuant to this Act, from

(*a*) using the firearm for recreational or sustenance hunting, target shooting, trapping or other lawful activity, or

(*b*) keeping the firearm in a collection of firearms."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 23

That the French version of Clause 10 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 36 to 41 on page 10 and line 1 on page 11 and substituting the following:

"10. Les articles 5, 6 et 9 s'appliquent aux transporteurs se livrant à des activités, notamment, de transport d'armes à feu, d'armes prohibées, d'armes à autorisation restreinte, de dispositifs prohibés ou de munitions prohibées reliant une province et une ou plusieurs autres provinces, ou débordant les limites d'une province, et, à cette fin, la mention du".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C–68, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 11, with the following:

"province."

Motion No. 28

That Bill C–68, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 14, with the following:

"registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm unless the".

Motion No. 29

That Bill C–68, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 27 to 32, on page 14, with the following:

"14. A registration certi–ficate may be issued only for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm

(*a*) that bears a serial number sufficient to distinguish it from other prohibited firearms or restricted firearms; or

(*b*) that is described by one or more of the fol–lowing characteristics:

(i) its make,

(ii) its model,

(iii) the name of its manufacturer,

(iv) the length of its barrel,

(v) its calibre, or

(vi) its assembly number."

Motion No. 41

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 25.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C–68, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing lines 20 and 21, on page 18, with the following:

"or to a police force if the person informs a chief firearms officer of the transfer and complies with the".

Motion No. 43

That Bill C–68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 32 and 33, on page 18, with the following:

"proposed transfer of a prohibited fire–arm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device, ammunition or".

Motion No. 45

That Bill C–68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21, on page 19 with the following:

"(*c*) decide whether to approve the transfer or importation; and".

Motion No. 49

That Bill C–68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 21, with the following:

"transfer of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, the Registrar may".

Motion No. 50

That Bill C–68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 21, with the following:

"transfer of a firearm, a chief firearms officer may".

Motion No. 51

That Bill C–68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 23, on page 21, with the following:

"prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm to Her Majesty in right of Canada or".

Motion No. 52

That Bill C–68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 21, with the following:

"province or to a police force, a chief firearms officer".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 54

That Clause 32 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 4 to 8 on page 22 and substituting the following:

"(i) has reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence authorizing the borrower to possess that kind of firearm, and

(ii) lends the borrower the registration certificate for the firearm, except in the case of a borrower who uses the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain himself or herself or his or her family; or"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 56

That Bill C–68, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing line 7, on page 22 with the following:

"(ii) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, lends the borrower the registration".

Motion No. 60

That Bill C–68, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing line 18, on page 22, with the following:

"(*a*) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, the transferor".

Motion No. 69

That Bill C–68, in Clause 40, be amended in the English version, by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 26, with the following:

"same effect as a registration for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for the period for which the confirma–".

Motion No. 70

That Bill C–68, in Clause 41, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 26, with the following:

"41. A customs officer shall inform a chief firearms officer without delay of the exportation or".

Motion No. 71

That Bill C–68, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 27, with the following:

"(*a*) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, holds the registration certificate for the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm;".

Motion No. 73

That Bill C–68, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33, on page 27, with the following:

"(*e*) provides a chief firearms officer with the prescribed information and any other information required by that officer."

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C–68, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17, on page 28, with the following:

"(*c*) in the case of a restricted firearm or a restricted weapon,".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C–68, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 30, on page 28, with the following:

"(*f*) provides a chief firearms officer with the prescribed information and other information required by that officer."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 78

That clause 45 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 28 to 30 on page 28 and substituting the following:

"(f) provides the Registrar with the prescribed information and any other information reasonably required by the Registrar."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C–68, in Clause 47, be amended in the English version, by replacing line 4, on page 29, with the following:

"certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for the period for".

Motion No. 81

That Bill C–68, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 29, with the following:

"49. A customs officer shall inform a chief firearms officer without delay of the exportation or".

Motion No. 82

That Bill C–68, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing line 15, on page 29, with the following:

"50. A chief firearms officer shall inform the member".

Motion No. 85

That Bill C–68, in Clause 52, be amended by replacing lines 8 to 13, on page 30, with the following:

"a chief firearms officer."

Motion No. 87

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 53.

Motion No. 88

That Bill C–68, in Clause 53, be amended by replacing lines 132 and 33, on page 30, with the following:

"53. (1) A chief firearms officer may require an applicant for a".

Motion No. 91

That Bill C–68, in Clause 58, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 10, on page 32, with the following:

"58. A chief firearm officer is responsible for issuing registration certificates for prohibited firearms or restricted firearms and assigning firearms identification numbers to them and for issuing authorizations to export and authorizations to import."

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 92

That Bill C–68, in Clause 59, be amended by replacing lines 26 to 28, on page 32, with the following:

"firearms, restricted firearms, cross–bows, prohibited weapons,".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C–68, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 34, with the following:

"64. A registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm".

Motion No. 97

That Bill C–68, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 31, on page 35, with the following:

"shall give notice of that decision in the prescribed form to the individual."

Motion No. 98

That Bill C–68, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 12, on page 32, with the following:

"67. A chief firearms officer may refuse to issue a".

Motion No. 99

That Bill C–68, in Clause 68, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 36, with the following:

"(2) A chief firearms officer may revoke an authoriza–".

Motion No. 100

That Bill C–68, in Clause 69, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 42, on page 36, with the following:

"69. (1) A chief firearms officer"

(*b*) by replacing lines 2 to 5, on page 37, with the following:

"a prohibited firearm or restricted firearm held by an individual where the chief firearms officer decides under section 65 that the firearm is not being used for".

Motion No. 101

That Bill C–68, in Clause 70, be amended by replacing lines 21 to 25, on page 37, with the following:

"or authorization to transport, a registration certificate, authorization to export or authorization to import, the chief firearms officer shall give notice".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 103

That the French version of clause 71 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 25 on page 38 and substituting the following:

"autres provinces, ou débordant les limites d'une province, et, à cette fin, la mention du".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C–68, in Clause 71, be amended by replacing lines 26 to 28, on page 38, with the following:

"province."

Motion No. 105

That Bill C–68, in Clause 72, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 30, on page 38, with the following:

"(*a*) a chief firearms officer"

(*b*) by replacing line 20, on page 39, with the following:

"officer or provincial minister under".

Motion No. 106

That Bill C–68, in Clause 73, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 29, on page 39, with the following:

"chief firearms officer or provincial"

(*b*) by replacing line 37, on page 39, with the following:

"firearms officer or provincial min–".

Motion No. 108

That Bill C–68, in Clause 74, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 11, on page 40, with the following:

"firearms officer, or provincial";

(*b*) by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 40, with the following:

"(*b*) direct the chief firearms officer to issue a licence, registration".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 109

That clause 75 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 31 to 42 on page 40 and substituting the following:

"(*a*) the Attorney General of Canada may appeal to the superior court against the order, if the order is directed to a chief firearms officer who was designated by the federal Minister, to the Registrar or to the federal Minister; or

(*b*) the attorney general of the province may appeal to the superior court against the order, in the case of any other order made under paragraph 74(*b*) or (*c*)."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 110

That Bill C–68, in Clause 75, be amended by replacing lines 33 and 34, on page 40, with the following:

"order, if the order is directed to a chief firearms officer who was".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 111

That clause 76 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 19 to 23 on page 41 and substituting the following:

"(*a*) the Attorney General of Canada, in the case of an appeal of an order made under paragraph 74(*a*) confirming a decision of a chief firearms officer who was designated by the federal Minister, of the Registrar or of the federal Minister;"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 112

That Bill C–68, in Clause 76, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 41, with the following:

"a chief firearms officer who".

Motion No. 113

That Bill C–68, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 40 and 41, on page 41, with the following:

"(i) direct the chief firearms officer to issue a licence, registration".

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 154

That Bill C–68, be amended by adding after line 26, on page 57, the following New Clause:

"110.1 Notwithstanding section 2.1, the Governor in Council may make regulations that are applicable in respect of firearms that are not prohibited firearms or restricted firearms for the purpose of

(*a*) establishing minimum age and safety criteria for purchasers of firearms;

(*b*) establishing safe storage and handling standards for firearms; and

(*c*) regulating the exportation and importation of firearms.".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 170

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 31, on page 70.

Motion No. 207

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 42, on page 87, with the following:

"a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm the serial number on which has been."

Motion No. 215

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 37, on page 98, with the following:

"ly possess the firearm and, where the firearm is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a registration".

Motion No. 216

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 99, with the following:

"(*b*) in the case of a firearm, which is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a registration".

Motion No. 218

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended in the English version by replacing line 37, on page 100, with the following:

"thing and, in the case of a seized firearm, which is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a".

Motion No. 224

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 44 and 45, on page 106, with the following:

"cate is, if certified as a true copy by a chief firearms officer, admissi–".

Motion No. 225

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 46, on page 107 and lines 1 to 27, on page 108.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Following the process we adopted in the first grouping, I have before me a list of the movers of the various motions in this grouping. I will begin with the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to debate the third group of amendments regarding Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. I also want to thank my hon. friend from Carleton—Charlotte for seconding the amendments I have put forth. Within this block I have moved four motions for debate today, Motions Nos. 4, 76, 92 and 154.

Judging by the level of debate in this House, in the media and among Canadians generally, this legislation undoubtedly is one of the most important bills presently before the House. I am honoured therefore to rise today to speak on this motion on behalf of my constituents of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Over the past year I have consulted widely with people in my constituency. Whether at public rallies, through regular correspondence or during many conversations with concerned individuals, I have maintained a regular contact with over 1,500 people on the firearms issue alone. The series of amendments I have brought forward represents the culmination of this consultation process. The amendments represent the views I have heard from many of my constituents. I feel that if adopted they will make the bill stronger and more acceptable to a large majority of firearms owners.

Before outlining the details of these amendments, I want to clearly state that I intend at the end of the day to support Bill C–68. I believe the majority of the provisions in this bill will achieve our government's stated goal in improving public safety on the streets and in our homes. Certainly I am not alone in this regard. The vast majority of Canadians have expressed support for the crime control elements of Bill C–68. Initiatives including stiffer penalties for illegal importation and trafficking of firearms as well as cracking down heavily on those who use firearms in the commission of crime will indeed improve security on our streets.

In discussions I have had with my constituents, a common theme has consistently emerged. Many individuals have serious concerns with the mandatory registration of all long guns. The motions I have introduced reflect this concern. They are also a reflection of my absolute commitment to represent the views of the people of Annapolis Valley—Hants. I have promised from day one to work to address their problems with this bill and to bring forward realistic solutions in order to mitigate these concerns.

• (1350)

The overall objectives of this series of motions is quite simple. As I proposed in my written submission to the justice committee, I support amending the legislation in order to exempt owners of non–prohibited, non–restricted long guns historically used in Canada for hunting or sport shooting from licensing and registration provisions of Bill C–68. Any new purchases or transfers of existing firearms would be subject to the requirements outlined in the legislation.

This proposal offers a reasonable balance between the rights of legitimate owners and users of firearms and our government's commitment to strong, effective firearms legislation. We have an opportunity to send a positive message to Canadians that we understand historical, cultural and economic attachments that have governed the use of firearms to this point in time. However, we will also be sending an important message that times are changing. In keeping with legitimate public concerns, new generations of firearms owners will be subject to new rules.

Within this series of motions I would like to highlight two which are of particular importance. Motion No. 4 would add new clause 2(1) to the bill. This clause reads:

This act does not apply in respect of

(a) any firearm that is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm; or

(b) any ammunition that is not prohibited ammunition.

This motion would allow for an exemption from the licensing and registration components of the bill for current owners of long guns.

By supporting the inclusion of this clause, all members of the House will have a chance to acknowledge the legitimate rights of owners of long guns. It will ensure that these individuals will not be subject to undue burden or costs without weakening the crime control elements of the legislation. It will allow us to gain greater support or at the very least, tacit acceptance of Canada's gun owners. After all, without their acceptance or their willingness to comply with the new laws we may face problems enforcing this legislation.

The second motion I would like to briefly discuss is Motion No. 154. This motion would entail the adding of new clause 110.1 to the legislation. This clause reads:

> Notwithstanding section 2.1, the governor in council may make regulations that are applicable in respect of firearms that are not prohibited or restricted firearms for the purpose of
>
> (a) establishing minimum age and safety criteria for purchasers of firearms;
>
> (b) establishing safe storage and handling standards for firearms; and
>
> (c) regulating the exportation and importation of firearms.

This additional clause responds to concerns over the ability to determine whether or not a long gun is owned and operated in a safe and legal manner. It has been included to ensure that officials have the ability to establish and enforce certain standards that must be strictly adhered to in order to legally own a long gun. This is not unlike the present system that uses the FAC.

Through this amendment, the government will have the opportunity to implement through the regulations a means to ensure the safe and legal ownership of long guns. Any regulations would of course have to remain consistent with clause 2.1 which provides for the exemption of long guns from the licensing and registration components of the bill.

I am pleased by the changes made to the bill during the committee hearings. These changes do reflect many concerns which have been brought forward by legitimate gun owners. I would also like to applaud my hon. colleagues who have worked so diligently on this legislation.

• (1355)

I would now ask my colleagues, as well as the Minister of Justice, to support the measures I have brought forward for debate today. While we have certainly come a long way in our deliberations, I believe we must go further still.

These motions represent a modified course of action, a course that will in my opinion help gain the support of many firearms owners. By adopting this series of motions, I believe we will still achieve the overall intent of the legislation without adding to the overall bureaucracy or cost. Above all, we will develop a bill that addresses the concerns of all people on all sides of this issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Just to give members the information as best I can, we are following the order of the movers of the motions in Group No. 3. I will now go to the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka who of course we anticipate will complete his remarks after question period.

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant this will be a two part process.

The amendments in this third group deal with what I believe to be one of the most significant concerns which was expressed by my constituents and was expressed generally in much of the testimony given in front of the justice committee. They reflect to a great extent much of the correspondence most of us in this House have received from the Canadian public. Quite frankly, they mention the concern that the legislation is not necessarily going to do what it is intended to do which is to control violence in Canadian society, or it will achieve that to some extent but in doing so will affect legitimate firearms owners.

There are many activities that firearms owners undertake in Canada which are legitimate, longstanding and traditional. In my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka hunting has been an important sport for many years. It is an important economic generator. It brings large numbers of people to our area every year.

I can see that we are approaching the time for question period. I will finish later.

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m., we will now go to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize National Public Service Week.

Canada's public servants have developed an enviable reputation worldwide. Their professionalism and dedication is second to none. I am particularly pleased to recognize Master Corporal Steven Vézina of Greenwood in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Mr. Vézina is one of 100 hundred public service employees receiving this year's awards of excellence. Mr. Vézina, along with Master Corporal Daniel Coté of Bagotville, Quebec are being honoured for proposing modifications to the cathode ray tube assembly in the CF–18 aircraft. Their suggestion has saved Canadian taxpayers $400,000 a year.

The award of excellence is the highest honour accorded to federal government employees. I am proud to acknowledge the work of Mr. Vézina and all of the recipients for their service and dedication to Canada.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY WEEK

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House today on this first day of the Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week, the theme of which this year is "Reach Out and Communicate".

It is extremely important to celebrate this week in order to make all stakeholders in the work force aware of the importance of a safe and healthy work environment.

Some fatal or serious accidents could have been avoided. Every day, two workers are killed and, every 38 seconds, an accident happens which could require compensation to be paid. The time has come to tackle vigorously what must not be regarded as inevitable.

Quebec has adopted very strict measures to limit occupational hazards, and the Bloc Quebecois applauds such determination. It is now up to the work force in Canada to clearly give priority to this fundamental aspect of work.

* * *

[*English*]

ROBERT PAUL THOMPSON

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has a unique opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to judicial reform in Canada.

Robert Paul Thompson has applied for early release and tomorrow the parole board will hear his application. I will be in attendance at this hearing in Renous, New Brunswick, along with his victim's mother, Helen Leadley.

Let the government and the parole board never forget that Brenda Fitzgerald was an abused and battered woman who ultimately lost her life in her battle against Thompson.

Thompson's violent rages are almost incomprehensible. In his anger and jealousy he alone was able to overcome three others, and with only a knife as his weapon.

I will be in attendance at tomorrow's hearing to confirm my commitment to Helen Leadley and to her family. I made a commitment to victims of crime to ensure violent offenders such as Thompson are not released.

Will the government also make use of the opportunity tomorrow and keep a convicted killer in jail?

ROBERT SHERREN

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize and congratulate Robert Sherren of Niagara Falls who on June 8 was awarded the emergency medical services exemplary service medal.

The ceremony was presided by Governor General Romeo LeBlanc at Rideau Hall. The award recognizes employees in emergency services who have been working with Canadian ambulance services and performing their duties in an exemplary manner for at least 20 years. Of these 20 years at least 10 have to be served in the performance of duties involving potential risk.

It is with pride that I extend congratulations to Mr. Sherren for the outstanding service he provided to the community.

* * *

GEORGE P. MORRISON

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today Brigadier General George P. Morrison was born in Quebec City. For almost 40 years now this gentleman has resided in the village of Chester in my riding of South Shore.

George Morrison who joined the army in 1915 bears the distinct honour of being the oldest living graduate of the Royal Military College in Kingston, Ontario.

In the wake of the recent celebrations marking the 50th anniversary of the end of the war in Europe, I feel it is important to recognize and honour Brigadier General Morrison, as he served Canada during both the first and second world wars and served with a Canadian artillery battery during the Russian revolution.

The freedom that Canada and many countries throughout the world enjoy today comes as a result of the selfless contributions made by people like Brigadier General Morrison. I would therefore ask those assembled in the House today to join me in wishing Brigadier General George Morrison a happy 100th birthday.

* * *

SCOTT EDWARD GOODRIDGE

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the heroic actions of a 20–year old constituent of mine, Scott Edward Goodridge.

Last October 17, a 12–year old boy was swept into the harbour at Renews by a large wave. The boy's friend ran to Scott Goodridge's nearby residence for help. Without hesitation Scott raced to the rocky shore, grabbed two lifejackets and dove into the extremely cold and rough waters. Scott swam approximately

65 metres to reach the young boy and placed a lifejacket over his head.

During these tense minutes another man assisting in the rescue was also swept into the waters. While towing the first boy to safety Scott swam to the second man, kept him afloat until all three were taken aboard a small boat.

Last fall I brought Scott's heroic efforts to the attention of the Governor General of Canada. I am very pleased to tell the House that on June 23, Scott will be awarded the Governor General's Medal of Bravery.

I invite all members of the House to join me in paying tribute to the actions of Scott Edward Goodridge who braved rough seas and a rocky shore to save two lives, those of a young boy and of another man.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is the National Action Committee on the Status of Women's annual lobbying day. This is a great opportunity for all the women's groups represented in this committee to get to know where the political parties stand on various women's issues.

Women are seriously concerned about preserving their vested rights. They know from experience how easy it is to cite financial difficulties as an excuse to ignore their needs and expectations. Yet, these are legitimate needs and expectations which, in many cases, are urgent.

Women grappling with problems of violence, poverty or unemployment must be able to rely on parliamentarians to adopt policies and legislation addressing their problems. They cannot afford to wait. And neither can their children.

• (1405)

As the recent march held by Quebec women and gatherings such as those today show, women are making their demands with an increasing sense of urgency. The government must listen and take appropriate action.

* * *

[*English*]

FLOODS

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, floods ravaged southern Alberta last week affecting High River, Pincher Creek, Fort Macleod, Lethbridge, and the community of Medicine Hat.

Friday night the South Saskatchewan River peaked at almost 10 metres above normal, forcing the evacuation of 5,000 people from Medicine Hat. Hundreds of homes were affected and acres of real estate were submerged. It was the worst flooding in over 100 years. Now with the receding of the floodwaters comes the back breaking and dirty job of cleaning up.

While it is too soon to tally the damage, by all accounts it will be in the tens of millions of dollars. In the wake of a calamity like this it is hard to see the good but there is good. The concern, the kind words and the sweat on the brows of hundreds of volunteers are eloquent testimony to a community that would not stand idly by while its neighbours struggled.

I know I speak on behalf of the members for Macleod and Lethbridge when I say it is a great privilege to serve the people of southern Alberta who have shown great character in the face of adversity.

* * *

TRANSPORT CANADA

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw to the attention of all members of the House the Transportation Safety Board's report on the crash of an Air Manitoba flight at Sandy Lake on November 10, 1993.

The report finds that previous to the crash Transport Canada's audit and surveillance of Air Manitoba "did not uncover serious maintenance discrepancies that were present". In general it finds serious "shortcomings" in Transport Canada's "regulatory overview process of air carriers". It makes a number of recommendations to improve the audit.

Families of the victims of the crash are also concerned that when safety infractions are found by Transport Canada they are not then made public, depriving crew and the travelling public of information they need to make decisions.

This incident has raised serious questions about the effectiveness of Transport Canada's monitoring of safety regulations in the airline industry and thereby of the safety of airline crews and the travelling public.

I call on the Minister of Transport to address these problems with the greatest of urgency.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the Environmental Centre for New Canadians which in partnership with Environment Canada and the Environmental Partners Fund established a very worthy environmental educational project. The creation of a multilingual resource centre which provides materials on the impact of pollutants on the environment will increase the diversity, experience and numbers of people involved in improving the state of our environment.

The centre's goal is to overcome the barriers new Canadians face in their attempts to seek information on a range of environmental issues. Their voices strengthen the efforts to improve our

environment, facilitating a better relationship with all levels of government, schools, corporations and environmental groups.

Our government along with several community partners in the metro Toronto area support the need for culturally and linguistically sensitive and relevant environmental information to diverse ethnic groups. Sustainable development can after all only be achieved through preventive environmental care by all Canadians.

* * *

THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians of Filipino heritage join the Filipino people in their celebration today of the 97th anniversary of Philippine independence.

Anniversaries like this give us an occasion to recall the immortal writings of her national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, and the bloody struggle that led to the triumph, and to renew the commitment to defend it at any cost. That proclamation of independence has since been a source of pride.

The Filipino people have also shown that democracy, a tool to secure freedom and dignity for the citizenry, can be restored without a drop of blood; witness the peaceful Aquino revolution of 1986.

Freedom is not an end in itself. It is a challenge to a higher calling: freedom to do good and thereby ensure human dignity for all.

Filipino Canadians who are proud of their new home and who pledge their undivided loyalty to Canada are equally proud to share this noble heritage.

I urge all colleagues to join Filipino Canadians nationwide on this very glorious occasion in the history of the Filipino people.

* * *

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, June 11 to June 17, is National Public Service Week.

A prominent politician once remarked:

> Public servants serve you right; indeed, often, they serve you better than your apathy and indifference deserve.

● (1410)

During this week Canadians should note the valued role that public servants play through the services they deliver.

The government recognizes and supports an efficient and strong public service. At a time when we are re–examining the role of government, public servants in my riding of Kitchener and throughout Canada are rising to the challenge to assist in tailoring a system that more effectively meets the needs of today's Canadians.

The excellence of the public service of Canada is recognized worldwide. I wish to extend my gratitude to all public servants who have offered services to Canadians in a manner second to none. I remain confident and look forward to a public service with a more defined role that is more satisfying, fulfilling and challenging for the 21st century.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today we wish to draw the attention of the House to the historic agreement endorsed by the Action démocratique du Québec, the Government of Quebec and the official opposition in Ottawa, the Bloc Quebecois. In response to the expectations of Quebecers, the team for change will put before Quebecers this fall a proposal for sovereignty for Quebec and an offer of economic and political partnership with Canada.

Faced with the atmosphere of resignation and inertia engulfing the "no" camp, the forces for change united to offer a plan for the future and invite Quebecers to say yes to themselves, to stand tall and to speak as equals to the other nations of this world.

We are all confident that this plan for partnership reflects the genuine and profound aspirations of the people of Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, along with millions of Canadians I am angry at the Liberal government for its frequent use of undemocratic tactics regarding firearms, employment equity, sentencing for hate crimes, and MP pension bills.

The Liberals are proving that they are no different from Mulroney's Tories who used procedural trickery to ram through the GST. Liberals have equaled Brian Mulroney when it comes to lack of fairness, honesty and integrity in the House.

What is worse, Liberals have got into bed with the separatists to expedite the hijacking of Parliament. They struck a deal with the Bloc so sovereignty could start by St. Jean Baptiste weekend.

Now it seems that the PQ–BQ alliance treats its members as ruthlessly as the Liberal government. Mr. Parizeau punished one of his members for voting against the PQ budget, just as the member from Notre–Dame–de–Grâce was punished for voting against the Liberal budget and three other Liberals were punished for voting against gun control.

It is clear the Liberals and the Bloc–PQ parties are old style political parties cut from the same cloth. They have no sense of fairness or democracy and are arrogant in the extreme.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge the leader of the Reform Party to explain to the Canadian people why he is blatantly disregarding their expressed wishes by voting against Bill C–68, the firearms control legislation.

He is sanctimoniously paying lip service to his stated principle of casting his vote with the majority. Can he not hear the voices of the 71 per cent of Canadians, of the 58 per cent of Albertans and of the 79 per cent of women who believe that registering firearms will bring greater safety to our streets and in our homes, or is he just refusing to listen?

The leader of the Reform Party has offered no proof that he has consulted with his constituents in Calgary Southwest on gun control. Will he follow the example of his own MPs, the hon. members for Calgary West and Edmonton Southwest by seeking the collective wisdom of their constituents and supporting the legislation, or will he ignore the two–thirds of Calgarians who support registration of firearms? Canadians deserve an explanation.

* * *

NIGERIA

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the second anniversary of Nigeria's 1993 presidential election which led to Moshood Abiola being chosen as the first democratically elected leader of Nigeria.

Regretfully President Abiola has been prevented from assuming office by the military regime backed by General Sani Abacha. General Abacha has disbanded all elected bodies, jailed the president elect, closed newspapers, repressed labour unions and carried out public executions.

Nigerians have already demonstrated their readiness and enthusiasm for democracy. On behalf of the Government of Canada I call on General Abacha to respect human rights and the democratic process.

• (1415)

Nigeria must be free to choose its own leader and its own future.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at a time when the economy is in low gear, with almost zero growth during the first quarter, the statistics tell us that for the sixth month in a row, there has been no net job creation in Quebec.

Meanwhile, the federal cabinet is looking at a new plan for reducing unemployment insurance benefits. Clearly, Ottawa has decided to reduce its deficit at the expense of the unemployed.

Will the Prime Minister confirm that the federal cabinet is putting the finishing touches on a plan to reduce unemployment insurance benefits that would cut $1.6 billion from the plan?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government made a commitment to reform social programs. There will obviously be transfers from one program to another. At this point, all I can say is that this fall, we will have a bill on the subject. The minister is consulting with his cabinet colleagues and his provincial counterparts. Hon. members will know what the bill is about as soon as it is ready this fall.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, considering what was indicated in the last federal budget and what was leaked to the newspapers last weekend, the Prime Minister should give us some assurances or confirmation.

Now that for the past six months there has been no net job creation in this country, would the Prime Minister confirm that the plan now before cabinet would oblige young people entering the labour market to work for 26 weeks full time—six full months—before they were protected under the unemployment insurance plan? Is that what he has to offer the people of Shawinigan, which depends even more than other cities in this country on government programs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that in the past 19 months since we came to power, the unemployment rate went down from 11.5 per cent to 9.5 per cent. We think we can do better. We must keep working on creating jobs. With changes like those we want to make in existing social programs in this country, we wish to provide an incentive for people to work instead of receiving social benefits. Social program reform is based on a desire to create jobs and help people to find work instead of staying home, to give them back the dignity of being able to work, which is something I am sure they all want.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister can make pretty speeches and juggle the figures, but the fact remains that the number of workers who are no

longer entitled to unemployment insurance because of the government's cutbacks and are now on welfare is absolutely shocking.

That being said, how can he justify the fact that the unemployment insurance reform his cabinet, his government, is considering will, according to his own analysis, affect people with incomes of less than $25,000 annually, in other words, workers whose employment status is precarious, who are at the bottom of the wage scale, the neediest in our society, and that these people may be permanently disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as a result of his cutbacks?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this Parliament has been in session, we have been used to hearing the official opposition make similar predictions that have never come true.

I would simply ask the hon. member to wait until the bill is introduced in the House of Commons. Our objective is to help people on low incomes find jobs and to give them a chance to get back into the labour market. That will be the objective of the reforms proposed by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

• (1420)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The major proposed cuts to the UI program will primarily affect women and will do so in a very significant way. Indeed, women, who often hold the most precarious jobs, will be particularly affected by the proposed cuts.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, by increasing the number of hours of work required to be eligible for UI from the current level of 180 to 300 hours to somewhere between 450 and 700 hours, he is directly targeting women, who hold the vast majority of part time jobs in Canada, and that many of them will no longer be eligible for UI benefits?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister said, no decision has been made regarding the UI program. A bill will be tabled this fall but, again, there has been no decision yet.

I consulted Canadians, including Quebecers, and 60 per cent of them are asking for a UI reform that will promote work and a more equitable distribution of income. This is the purpose of the UI reform.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the minister is ruling out any cuts to the UI program? Or are we to understand that the federal government's answer to the women's march, which ended in Quebec City last week, is a program of UI cuts which will force women trying to re–enter the labour force to hold a full time job for six months to be eligible for UI benefits?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that in the last several months, for example, by the previous changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act the government has provided additional benefits for close to 300,000 Canadians drawing unemployment insurance, of whom about 80 per cent were women. They gained an extra $1,000 per year income benefit. That was one of the direct results of our changes.

In the province of Quebec alone we have provided direct assistance to over 50,000 women for training and career development programs. We are introducing a special program for women to go on to graduate school in universities. We have established under the self–employment program special initiatives for women to set up their own businesses.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata attended a meeting at the women's human resource centre in her riding, to help women find work.

[*English*]

We are very committed but we have to make changes in the programs so we can move from passive assistance to active support with new tools to help people get back to work.

* * *

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the House on Friday the Deputy Prime Minister admitted that Howard Wilson, the government's much touted ethics watchdog, has no teeth and has been relegated to a very minor role on ethical questions.

She said: "If there are questions about the ethics of the government, the ultimate arbiter of those questions is not a bureaucrat, it is the Prime Minister". Canadians will take little comfort in that revelation, given the government's mishandling of the Canadian heritage minister's unethical behaviour.

Since section 23 of the federal conflict of interest code has been violated by the heritage minister without reprimand or penalty, and since the Prime Minister is now the de facto ethics commissioner, will the Prime Minister tell us what parts of the code he is prepared to uphold and how he intends to enforce it?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister was absolutely right when she said it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister of the country to make decisions about the ethics of his ministers. I am

the one who named them, and I am the one who has the responsibility to dismiss them if ever I decide to do so.

In the case of the minister of heritage, I said very clearly last week that all he did was have a fundraising activity that was according to the laws of Canada. The names of the people involved are public. Everyone has admitted they have given money to the Liberal Party, just like money is given to the Reform Party and to all other parties. Everything is public.

• (1425)

I discussed that with the ethics commissioner, who is there to advise the Prime Minister. The final responsibility is the Prime Minister's. I always take it. I never run away from my responsibilities.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Prime Minister to accept responsibility. We are not talking about fundraising.

The Prime Minister has code of conduct guidelines, which he waved around with great flourish at the beginning of the session. One section of it says that a public office holder shall take care to avoid the appearance of being placed under any obligation to any person that might profit from special consideration on the part of the office holder. The heritage minister broke this guideline. He did not avoid the appearance of conflict of interest.

If the Prime Minister assumes ultimate responsibility for the application of these guidelines, will he hold the heritage minister accountable for violating not some general thing about fundraising but this specific guideline in his own code of conduct guidelines?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we go to any fundraising activities we meet people who do business. I do that regularly, ministers have to do that regularly, and members of Parliament do that regularly. We meet with the Canadian people and some contribute to the good functioning of the democratic institutions of Canada. Everything is public.

The Reform Party is proposing at this time to make it even more open than it is today. It would like third party groups to finance while they are not running for office, to favour one cause or the other.

We say if people want to be elected to Parliament and have influence, they should run for a political party and raise the money according to the laws of Canada. That is exactly what this party is doing, the Bloc Quebecois is doing, the Reform Party is doing and the Conservative Party is doing. They go to the people of Canada and ask for contributions. The contributions are made public; everybody has access to these lists, and anyone can check at any time of the year. The list for last year will be published in the next few days. The Reform Party will check the list of people who gave to us and we will check the list of those who gave to the Reform Party.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I say to the Prime Minister that every day he pretends not to understand what the issue is he strengthens the public's suspicion that the government has something to hide.

The heritage minister clearly violated the Prime Minister's conflict of interest guidelines with his dollars for contracts dinner, and the Prime Minister has gone to great lengths to pretend that this indiscretion was merely some part of routine fundraising, which it was not and is not.

Will the Prime Minister stop this charade, admit that it is now his office that is managing the disclosure or cover up of ethics code violations and provide the House with a full and frank disclosure of the heritage minister affair—who was invited, who contributed what and who got what?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to a very long question there is a very simple answer.

There is no cover up of any kind. The leader of the Reform Party, the third party, which is about to become the fourth party in Canada, knows the names of everyone who was invited and contributed. It is all well known. It is all public information. We have nothing to hide. We gave the list of the people who were present at this party. There is no cover up. They have the names of the people and the amount of money that was contributed. That is the way we have raised money for political parties in Canada for many, many years. That is the way the Reform Party does it all the time.

The leader of the Reform Party has a lot of those kinds of dinners all the time with a lot of people who contribute to his own party.

* * *

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The federal government has shown yet again that it is proposing cuts mainly targeting Canada's jobless, who, for the second time, will be the targets of a reform proposal of this government.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, altogether, last year's unemployment insurance cuts of $5.5 billion and the $1.6 billion in cuts recently announced amount to a 25 per cent total cut in assistance to the most needy of our society, those who have to claim unemployment insurance benefits to survive?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a report published by the Quebec Department of Fisheries, which is based on consultations made by the minister, Mr. Beaudry. It said that unemployment insurance is not well adapted to the realities of Quebec's fisheries and that it currently hinders progress and development in this sector to a great extent by halting private initiatives and stifling people's dynamic energy.

I hope that the Bloc members of this House will agree with the report published by the Government of Quebec, which calls for reforms to the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm that the federal government is not planning to reform the unemployment insurance system by cutting forestry workers' benefits by 22 per cent and fishery workers' benefits by 33 per cent? Does he not feel that this would hit regional workers very hard and that, in fact, the two tier system that he said he did away with because it was discriminatory is again rearing its ugly head in in his new proposal?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last budget we indicated that we were aiming at obtaining a 10 per cent saving in order to provide for reinvestment in employment programs and to provide for general stimulus to the economy. The ways and measures in which we will undertake that will be tabled in the House next fall when we have finished the kinds of discussions and examinations of the very extensive consultation that went on last October.

For the hon. member to be citing all kinds of facts and figures concerning what may happen or what could happen simply is not relevant as we have not yet made any decisions concerning the nature of the reform. We are busy and involved in undertaking a serious review of the consultations, talking to provincial groups and others. When we are ready to put forward the legislation the hon. member then will be in a position to react to reality, not simply to speculation.

* * *

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Regarding the contracts for dollars dinner held for the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the Prime Minister stated that all the information is public. The Deputy Prime Minister stated that the Minister of Canadian Heritage would be happy to make public all the information.

Clients of the department were specifically targeted and invited to contribute. We are discovering, one name at a time, who contributed and what rewards the minister gave. The Liberal whip said the names of contributors have been tabled in the House and yet they have not.

Who is on the contributors' list that the Prime Minister is hiding from us? Who else has been rewarded with contracts, grants or appointments for contributing to the minister's debt retirement fund?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again that is a completely false accusation. Every contribution to the Liberal Party, the Reform Party, the Bloc Quebecois or the Conservative Party, which is above $100, requires a receipt to be given to that person. This list is made public every year. Every contribution which is above $100 is published.

When I was in the House the other day the minister gave the list to her. She has not read it yet. If she needs more information we have a procedure. She can table her request in the House of Commons and if it is within the responsibility of the minister, the request will be met as soon as possible. We have nothing to hide because every contribution to the Liberal Party is known by anyone who wants to know.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that everyone in the country knows that the heritage minister should resign except the cabinet. Liberal backbenchers are saying that the contracts for dollars dinner was unethical and so are newspapers and Canadians across the country. The Friends of Canadian Broadcasting is asking for the minister's resignation. The Montreal *Gazette*, *Le Droit*, the *Citizen*, the *Sun*, *La Presse* and *Le Journal de Montréal* are all expressing similar sentiments.

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

With Canadians calling for the resignation of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, how can the Prime Minister keep on a minister who is awarding contracts to companies organizing fundraising dinners for him?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question. All the documents on this matter are public. Those who made contributions have been issued receipts, and their names will appear on the lists published. In any case, the names have already been given to the press and to journalists. Everyone knows who was at the dinner. There is nothing hidden, and so I have nothing to add.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

We have learned on the eve of the G–7 Summit that Russian President Boris Yeltsin will be taking part in both political and economic discussions with the seven major industrialized nations—an indication that Russia is one step closer to membership in this exclusive group.

Given the many human rights violations in Chechnya and the attitude of the Russian President during the Prime Minister's visit to Russia last spring, what position does the Prime Minister intend to take on Russia's increased inclusion in the group of seven?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Yeltsin will not attend the G–7 meeting. He will participate in the political meeting of the G–8 on the second day. The two meetings are different. The first is the meeting of the western world's seven most industrialized nations; the second, on the following day, will be a political meeting of the group of eight. Mr. Yeltsin will participate in this meeting.

Economic discussions will be over. Mr. Yeltsin may choose to raise economic issues affecting Russia or other countries at the second meeting. I cannot stop him from raising the issues he wants. However, the G–7 economic summit will be over when we meet with Mr. Yeltsin.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is as follows.

Since there will be a political meeting with Boris Yeltsin in attendance and in the light of the discussions there will be in this regard, does the Prime Minister intend to propose a joint statement by the heads of state to encourage Russia to respect human rights in Chechnya? In other words, does the Prime Minister intend to assume a leadership role among his colleagues with respect to human rights in Chechnya?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I met President Yeltsin in Moscow a few weeks ago, I raised the concerns of the government and people of Canada about his behaviour in Chechnya. I also intend, as the chairman of the meeting of the group of eight, to raise the matter again. I am sure many of the other leaders will raise the same problem, but I will take the initiative.

* * *

[*English*]

PENSIONS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Prime Minister.

The cost to taxpayers for individual MPs' expense allowances, travel expenses and salaries are available for voters' scrutiny in the Public Accounts of Canada, volume II, part II. However, the cost of individual MP pensions is not there. The information commissioner is being forced to take recourse to the courts just to obtain a list of MP pension beneficiaries.

Why is the government trying to hide how costly the MP pensions really are?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is not trying to hide anything. It is trying to reduce the cost of MP pensions. Even though we have had suggestions to increase the size of the payroll of MPs coming from the very party that now asks the question, nevertheless we are proceeding on course to reduce by one–third the cost to taxpayers of MP pensions.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The House will notice that minister did not offer to reveal the real cost of MP pensions. We know that some Liberal members must opt out of the pension scheme in order to fulfil campaign promises made in the last election.

• (1440)

If the government will not commit to publishing the benefits of the MP pension plan, will the minister at least agree to publish a list of those members who opt in and those who opt out or is he trying to hide that information too?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it will be up to each member of Parliament. Once the bill has been proclaimed, members will have 60 days in which to make a determination whether they want to be part of the plan.

If the member wants further information he has only to look at the public accounts to determine what goes into MP pensions. What is in MP pensions, what is contributed by the taxpayer, the government wants to reduce and that is part of its reform.

* * *

[*Translation*]

JOB CREATION

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

We are now witnessing a disturbing slowdown of the economy. The GDP has been falling for the last two months. On Friday, we learned that employment growth remains stalled. In fact, there has been no net job creation in the last six months.

Since some 23 per cent of the Quebec workforce is now unemployed, does the Minister of Human Resources Development not agree that the Liberal job creation policy is a dismal failure and a glaring example of inaction?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is saying it is a disaster but if he looks at the figures that his colleague who is asking questions about the G–7 tabled, we have the highest level of economic growth of any of the countries of the G–7.

The result over the past year has been over 430,000 new jobs in Canada. To call that a disaster seems to be turning logic on its head topsy–turvy. We are working hard to put in place an economic framework that will stimulate private jobs.

Eighty thousand jobs have been created in the private sector over the past month. That shows that the stimulus is in the right place and that is the course we are following.

In the meantime we will help those without jobs to get the kind of support and training they need to fit the new kind of economy we are moving into.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the answer I just received, does the minister not realize that, as a result of this government's first 18 months in power, the unemployment rate in Quebec still hovers around 11 per cent, the employment level has not moved in six months, 50,000 more people are on welfare, and thousands of unemployed workers do not qualify for UI benefits?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it must be said that the figures quoted by the hon. member and his colleagues are wrong and that, since October, the Canadian economy has created over 219,000 jobs in the private sector, 30,000 in the month of May alone.

True, there have been job losses in the public sector because governments want to save money so they can spend it on programs. It must be said that, while job creation over a six month period starting in October reached that level, more than 50,000 new jobs have been created in Quebec in the last 12 months, 111,000 since the election.

* * *

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue.

At this time of the year many single parents, mostly women, find themselves in debt to the government because they have to pay taxes on the receipt of support payments that have not been taxed during the year.

Would it not be appropriate for Revenue Canada to require tax deductions administered through the courts so that payments into custodial homes are received net of tax like forms of employment income? Would the minister not agree that this would go a long way to alleviating the April blues suffered by these families?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and the concern he has for this important area of public policy which goes well beyond the tax area.

• (1445)

The hon. Minister of Justice has made it clear we are shortly to bring forward provisions with respect to maintenance and support and in relation to the Thibaudeau decision. These will soon be brought forward and I know that he among other members will be very interested in seeing them.

As for the department and the responsibility we have for collection for those who may have been concerned about the impact of the Thibaudeau decision, I assure him we will continue our normal practice of making sure the collections take place with sensitivity and with full understanding of the position individuals may find themselves in.

It is certainly not our intention to hassle single parents or to go after their last dime.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when interest rates are high economic slowdown and recession are inevitable.

Statistics now show the inevitable has occurred. Economic growth in this quarter at an annual rate is essentially stagnating; there is no economic growth. The tragedy is these problems could have been avoided if the deficit was smaller and had produced lower interest rates.

Does the Minister of Finance admit Canada's economy and employment situation would be better today if spending cuts in the last two budgets had been greater and the elimination of the deficit had been put on a definite time frame?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member being an eminent economist in his own right knows full well the Canadian recovery was largely based on exports primarily to the United States.

The member knows as well the United States economy is going through a substantial slowdown and that as a result quite clearly our exports have been affected which is reflected in the Canadian economy.

He also knows we have made substantial deficit reduction cuts. We have taken substantial action in the last two budgets.

He also knows the problem is the deficit we inherited. I know deep down he is very proud of the actions of the Canadians government in cleaning up the nation's finances.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, national income this year has been stagnant because exports are down. It is disturbing that housing starts are also down, car sales are down, manufacturing is down, retail sales are down and service industry output is down. The only things that are up are interest rates and taxes.

Will the Minister of Finance let the people know how he plans to get them out of the quagmire he created by his inadequate spending cuts in the past?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I may have to take back my words about eminent economist.

The hon. member knows if we take a look at the last three to four months our interest rates are down substantially. He knows our job creation has increased substantially in the private sector. He knows as well our job creation record given the last couple of months has been substantially better than in the United States which has suffered from a major loss.

On the other hand I do not want to criticize my colleague too much. I am delighted to finally see somebody from the Reform Party asking a question about the economy.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Last Friday, in response to questions from the official opposition, neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the Minister of Health were able to confirm whether there had been an investigation into the illegal use of somatotropin in Canada.

Will the minister undertake to table the investigation report prepared by her department to confirm that this hormone is not being used illegally in Canada?

• (1450)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said time and time again that, despite the rumours, no one was able to bring any concrete example to our attention. Again, if you can give us the names of any individuals selling somatotropin, please let us know, because what they are doing is illegal. It is illegal to sell this product and to import it into Canada, and it will remain illegal as long as it has not been approved by Health Canada, if indeed it is approved.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether or not her department is taking any measures to enforce the Food and Drugs Act under which, as she told this House, the use of somatotropin is prohibited in Canada, and if so, what measures have been taken?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is illegal to import this product into Canada or to sell it in Canada. We have worked together with Customs on this and found nothing. What can I say? We will arrest as many people as need be, but there is a limit.

* * *

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister stated in his budget that UI would be cut by a minimum of 10 per cent. The surplus created would be used as a buffer to prevent the need for UI rate increases during tough economic times.

Now the human resources minister has leaked a document directing half of that surplus to increased spending on training programs. Clearly the government has two ministers trying to pull the country in two different directions.

Has the human resources minister consulted with the finance minister about this abrupt change in policy?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have to consult with the Minister of Finance every day concerning these matters.

Let me correct the hon. member's statement. It is unfortunate that she tries to slip in these certain amounts of illusions and suspicions. I did not leak a document to anybody at any time. I assure the House of that.

We know very clearly Canadians want a reform which will simplify the system and provide for a real end to the disincentives in the system. It will also be a program which helps people to get back to work. Unfortunately that one crucial element of getting people back to work is not part of the Reform Party's vocabulary.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are paying substantial UI premiums to help ensure against lost income during periods of unemployment. However, the minister acts like these premiums are his money to use to tinker with the system.

Why does he not return the UI program to true insurance principles rather than continuing to invest our money in his failed training programs like TAGS?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday I visited the North Sydney learning centre where I had an occasion to talk to a number of former fishermen and plant workers under the TAGS

program. They were starting classes at eight in the morning and sometimes going through until midnight. Many of these same workers who left school at grade eight or nine are now in a position after four months of the TAGS program to take their equivalency exam to get their grade 12.

This shows that if we give people a certain hand up they will take full advantage of it. They are now ready to become high school graduates because of the kind of initiatives and resources we have been able to provide.

I wish the Reform Party had more trust in the real motivation and commitment of Canadians given the chance to work.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The recent agreement reached between Canada and the European Union to conserve and protect Atlantic fish stocks was the object of a meeting held in Toronto last week by the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. Can the minister, who was largely instrumental in developing Canada's position, inform this House of the outcome of those meetings and of the support expressed by NAFO regarding the crucial Canadian objectives?

• (1455)

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Following the NAFO meeting, the scope of the Canada–European Union agreement was expanded in two major ways. The conservation agreement on Greenland halibut, or turbot, now includes all Northwest Atlantic groundfish catches. As well, the Canada–European Union agreement now extends to the 15 NAFO members.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I think I should have a talk with Quebec fishermen sometime.

[*English*]

The meeting in Toronto last week in conclusion changed two important things. First, the NAFO enforcement rules now cover all vessels, not just EU vessels. Second, the new rules cover all species of fish, not just Greenland halibut or turbot.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

On June 9, the UN secretary general officially recommended that the security council approve the deployment of a rapid reaction force in Bosnia. While the UN is about to give the green light to such an operation, the Canadian government is still hesitant about Canada's participation in that force.

Will the Prime Minister tell us clearly whether a decision has finally been made regarding Canada's participation in a rapid reaction force in Bosnia?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is still looking at the issue. We are waiting for the outcome of the discussions taking place between those countries which have already decided to participate, and for the UN position. As I said last week, I am personally not very enthusiastic about Canadian participation. However, if it is necessary, we will participate. However, there is no urgency, and a decision does not have to be made immediately.

* * *

[*English*]

INDONESIA

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Over the last three years our country has spent over $51 million funding post–secondary education in Indonesia. Why we are doing this when we have just stripped $6 billion out of post–secondary education in Canada? Why are we funding this when the Government of Indonesia said it would ask us to pay for its students to come over here?

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the hon. member is trying to compare apples and oranges. The responsibilities that Canada has taken on regarding education are not only acknowledged but actually sought by a considerable number of stakeholders. The programs which for the most part are run in collaboration with Canadian universities and colleges have considerable spin–offs in the countries where these programs are in operation as well as in Canada itself.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the parliamentary secretary for the minister of Indian affairs who will be well aware of the six–week old blockade checkpoint now on Adams Lake in British Columbia.

Tensions are escalating. Will he or the minister of Indian affairs please travel to the site to attempt to resolve this issue, primarily over land claims, before serious problems begin?

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[Editor's Note: Members spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

If the parties agree to ask the minister of Indian and northern affairs or me to come and help resolve the issue, we are prepared to do so.

* * *

• (1500)

LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

As he knows, the law of the sea convention protects the world's fisheries and prevents ocean pollution. It came into force in 1994. Canada is among the nations who have yet to ratify it.

Having celebrated international oceans day last week, I would like to ask the minister whether he can say when Canada will ratify the international law of the sea.

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that this fall we will table a bill which I hope will allow us to ratify the treaty.

[English]

The Speaker: My colleagues, that would bring to a conclusion the question period.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Dr. Wole Soyinka, Nobel prize winner in literature and a leader of the democracy movement in Nigeria.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[Translation]

The Speaker: I also wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in our gallery of His Excellency, Émile–Derlin Zinsou, chairman of the permanent council of the Francophonie.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table today the twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The topic of this report is the Department of National Defence, which has the largest budget of all federal departments.

It covers four chapters of the auditor general's 1994 report. First, Chapter 24, Defence Management Systems; Chapter 25, Information Technology; Chapter 26, Infrastructure Reductions and lastly, Chapter 27, Infrastructure Management.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts concludes at the end of its report that the auditor general should review on a regular basis the Department of National Defence's initiatives to improve its management structure and methods regarding management information systems, information technology, rationalization and infrastructure management and that he should report his findings at an appropriate time.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee is asking the government to table a global response to this report.

* * *

• (1505)

[English]

PETITIONS

PAROLE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise in the House today to present petitions containing the names of 1,086 constituents who wish to halt the early release from prison of Robert Paul Thompson.

The petitioners are concerned about making our streets safer for our citizens. They are opposed to the current practice of early release of violent offenders prior to serving the full extent of their sentences.

I will be attending Robert Paul Thompson's National Parole Board hearing in Renous, New Brunswick, tomorrow, June 13, and I pray that the decision arising from that hearing will support the actions of these petitioners.

PAROLE

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House again today on what has become a crusade to obtain justice for the victims of violent offenders. Every day

since February 6 a petition has been tabled. Today's petition contains 1,257 names of constituents, all of whom wish to halt the early release from prison of Robert Paul Thompson.

The petitioners I represent are concerned about making our streets safer for our citizens. They are opposed to the current practice of early release of violent offenders prior to serving the full extent of their sentences.

I, along with my colleague, will attend Robert Paul Thompson's National Parole Board hearing tomorrow in Renous, New Brunswick. I pray that the decision arising from that hearing will support the actions of these petitioners.

CENSUS

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of Mr. Clifford Joynt, who along with 144 other constituents calls upon the Parliament of Canada to recognize that the word Canadian be listed as an answer to the ethnic origin question in all future censuses.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is my privilege to present 17 petitions containing well over 15,000 signatures of Canadians who are opposed to Bill C–68.

The petitioners are requesting that Parliament not attack the recreational firearms community and that it support legislation that severely punishes one who uses a weapon, including a weapon other than a firearm, protects the rights and freedoms of the law–abiding recreational firearms community to own and use firearms responsibly, passes careful scrutiny to see that it will improve public safety in a cost effective manner, and repeals present firearms control legislation, which features tortuous language and has been characterized by the courts as one of the most horrifying examples of bad draftsmanship.

As we draw to the close of the debate on Bill C–68 this week because of time allocation invoked by the government, let these petitions serve as a reminder that the minister does not have the support of these nor millions of other Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I simply want to remind the House that in tabling petitions we do not enter into debate.

LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that is humbly submitted by over 250 petitioners who are residents of Burlington, Mississauga, Toronto, and further points.

The petitioners are asking for an extension of the stay outside Canada for landed immigrants from the present 183 days to two years, the reason being that the care of property back home requires attention for a period that is longer than what is presently permitted under the law.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions on different subjects, some of which are contradictory, and I would like to table the petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present two petitions from constituents in my riding as well as ridings throughout central Nova Scotia.

The petitioners call on the government to enact changes to the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation, in keeping with the campaign pledges that were made by the governing party during the election campaign.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to present two petitions from persons from the riding of Miramichi.

The two petitions pray that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or any activity designed to terminate human life.

• (1510)

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have four petitions to table before this House. Two are concerning Bill C–68, calling on Parliament not to enact any new firearm registry, registration fees, costs, or any further restrictions on the ownership, sale, use, transportation, or storage of firearms.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, another petition is praying that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

CRIMINAL CODE

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition is requesting that Parliament delete entirely proposed section 718.2 from Bill C–41.

PAROLE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of JC–55 super country

radio station in Kamloops, who circulated a petition and have now collected nearly 75,000 signatures.

They point out in the petition that Canadians are becoming increasingly fearful to walk on our streets and in our neighbourhoods. They believe that many violent offenders and sex offenders are being paroled prematurely or being released without proper treatment or rehabilitation. They believe that those convicted of dangerous offences or sexual offences should be incarcerated until they have successfully undergone treatment and can demonstrate unequivocally that they have been completely rehabilitated.

Therefore, they are simply asking the House of Commons and the Minister of Justice to take whatever steps are necessary to accomplish these aims.

DETENTION ORDERS

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition on behalf of residents of the town of Elkford in my community.

Your petitioners call on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post–sentence detention orders and specifically passing Bill C–240.

I am particularly pleased to present this petition because of a serious situation they were in. They asked me what to do. I suggested that they do exactly this, that they petition the government.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 185 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 185—**Mr. Caccia:**

What is the total amount of federal public money, in 1995 dollars, that has been given to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) since its inception?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Milliken: I would ask that all other questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask the government House leader when I can expect to receive an answer to Question No. 137, which has been on the Order Paper since February 6, 1995. I requested an answer from the government within 45 days, and now, as of today, 126 days have passed.

Last Thursday the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader said once again that I can expect an answer to my question soon. I know the government is not interested in a free and open debate on the issue of gun control because they have invoked time allocation, but I find it hard to believe the government does not have the information on the cost of gun control readily at hand. My dictionary defines "soon" as "before long, promptly, quickly". If the government isn't forthcoming with the information on the cost of gun control, maybe the parliamentary secretary should find a better word to describe this.

Will I have an answer before the six hours of limited Liberal debate in third reading of Bill C–68? Will I have the information so we can properly debate this question?

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member suggested, timetabling and organizing House business is an important aspect of government. In the case of these bills, the official opposition and the government agreed that six hours was quite a reasonable time to debate the gun control bill at the two stages, and that is what we have agreed to do.

The government has not opposed this unilaterally, and I know the hon. member knows that and would not want to think that the government was acting unilaterally in cutting off debate, but we are trying to organize the time between now and the end of the session. Part of the duty of organizing that time involves getting answers to questions.

I can tell the hon. member that a draft answer to this question has been seen. It was inaccurate. It is being corrected and will be available soon for the hon. member.

• (1515)

Mr. Abbott: Soon again.

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member says "soon again" and that is absolutely true.

Whether I will have the answer before the six hours of debate on third reading ends tomorrow I will have to wait until tomorrow to see. I hope so but I am not optimistic. Normally movement of the document around the various places it has to go to be corrected takes more than 24 hours. However I assure the hon. member I am doing my utmost to ensure he is provided with full and accurate answers to his questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 4, 6, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 154, 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224 and 225.

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to finish my comments.

As I was saying before question period, one of the concerns that has been brought forward to many members in the House has been the issue of the legitimate use of firearms. There is a concern that some of the provisions contained in Bill C–68 could be used to curtail what in essence is legitimate activity by legitimate firearms owners.

There are a number of activities undertaken that are historical in nature, that actually represent a way of life and a lifestyle we have come to know and enjoy in rural Canada, in my case in rural Ontario.

Hunting for sustenance has a long history. Hunting for sport has been done in my riding for generations and generations. It is important to the psyche where one generation passes its firearms and the whole tradition of hunting to the next generation.

Hunting is important in terms of economics as I mentioned when I spoke earlier. A large number of individuals travel to my riding and make use of the great facilities we have there. Of course trapping is important as an economic generator. Other recreational activities like target shooting are also important and for many people the collecting of firearms.

It is important we ensure the provisions contained in Bill C–68 do not curtail such activities. For the most part they are designed to do what I fully support and what I know other government members support: control violence in Canadian society. That is the legitimate objective of the legislation, one that I support.

If regulations are put forward that achieve public safety in their implementation and that help to reduce violence in society, most Canadians and legal firearm owners would be quite willing to support that. For the most part many of the regulations in this legislation do that. However some legitimate concerns have been expressed that need to be addressed and of which we need to be cognizant.

There is the issue of cost. Many people who participate in hunting are not wealthy individuals. They either hunt for sustenance or they hunt for sport. We have to be very careful not to create a regulatory regime or a costing structure that will some day make it impossible for these individuals to pursue hunting.

Although the government has done a good job in setting out a fee schedule that is modest, I have concerns that it stay that way and that firearm owners are not going to be faced with high costs down the road.

I have a concern which I know is shared by many of my rural colleagues and by many legal owners of firearms: that provisions in this legislation could be used at some point in the future. The government has stated unequivocally that it is not its intention to do that but there is concern that people can use the provisions in the legislation to at some time prohibit firearms that are normally used for recreational purposes.

• (1520)

This is a genuine concern. It is something that has been expressed by a lot of people. We need to put something in the legislation that makes it absolutely crystal clear that it is not the intent of Bill C–68 to restrict the legitimate use of firearms for legitimate purposes like hunting, target shooting and collecting. It is absolutely essential that we make sure that it is not done.

Although most individuals will accept the regulations contained in the bill that are designed to increase public safety, although most individuals will accept those provisions that will ensure they attempt to curtail violence, it is important that we place within the body of the bill a safeguard, a provision that explicitly states that nothing in the legislation is intended to curtail the legitimate use of firearms.

I will read the amendment:

> That nothing in this act is to be interpreted as prohibiting a person who is licensed to own a firearm from using a firearm, other than a restricted or prohibited weapon, that has been registered by the person pursuant to this act, from
>
> (a) using the firearm for recreational or sustenance hunting, target shooting, trapping or other lawful activity, or
>
> (b) keeping the firearm in a collection of firearms.

It is absolutely essential that we make it clear that nothing in Bill C–68 is to be used to curtail the legitimate use of firearms. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the motions that I am presenting and speaking to on behalf of the government are:

Motion No. 23 which is a correction of the French text.

Motion No. 54 would amend the conditions which attach to lending a firearm to better reflect the actual practice. If a firearm's owner lends a gun to someone he or she knows very well, it may not be necessary for that owner to verify the

borrower's licence each time. If someone is lending a firearm to a brother, his wife, or a wife to her husband, that firearm owner has every reason to believe that the person has a licence.

Consequently this motion would change one of the lending conditions in the bill at the present time. What the government would require with the amendment now is: "having reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence".

This depends on the actual circumstances and may require a lender to request proof of the borrower's licence. For instance, if it is a stranger, someone the lender has never met before, then the lender would not have reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence whereas if it was a member of a family, the borrower would.

Therefore it is a significant change which will make the actual practice of using a borrowed firearm much more in line with reality.

Motion No. 72 would clarify that a non–Canadian business wishing to ship firearms in transit through Canada must obtain an authorization to export, but need not have a business licence in Canada.

As has been said before, even if the firearms are in transit through Canada, the firearms must be registered. There cannot be a shipment in transit, or otherwise, of firearms in Canada if those firearms are prohibited weapons.

• (1525)

A motion was adopted at committee stage which provided that in an application to the registrar for an authorization to export, the registrar could only request from the applicant such other information as is reasonably required. For consistency sake, Motion No. 78 would also add the word "reasonably" to authorization to import. Therefore, the word "reasonably" would be required not only for export but for import as well. We have to look to the business practices of manufacturers. There is no reason that they should be giving any information requested of them, particularly if it does not have any relation to what is required and gives confidential competitive data that would only serve to hurt their competitive position.

As I mentioned, a very similar motion was introduced and adopted at committee stage. However, customs in particular is asking for a slight modification in the wording referring to the in transit shipments to avoid any future confusion.

Motion No. 109 relates to changes introduced at committee allowing an appeal of the minister's decision in respect of shooting club approval. In it we referred to provincial ministers. This change is to make a reference to federal ministers as well as provincial ministers. The federal and provincial ministers will be able to give approval to shooting clubs.

Motion No. 111 is essentially the same as 109. It relates to changes introduced in committee allowing the appeal of a minister's decision in respect of shooting club approval. The minister may be provincial or federal. As I have said, this motion is intended to clarify the appropriate minister in the appropriate circumstances.

Essentially, most of the amendments in group three relate to the registry system. A number of motions delete the role of and references to the registry right through to the registrar and is related to the Reform Party's proposal to eliminate the registry.

The second largest area where motions are put forward refer to the rationale for a registration system and whether they should apply to long guns. The concern is that the registry system is put into effect for various reasons for long guns as well as for handguns. The idea is so that we will have a record of all firearms in Canada. If a firearm is stolen, we want to know where that firearm is. We want to have, if not the serial number, then certainly pertinent data that would allow us to track that firearm.

We also want to be able to register firearms immediately on their entering the country. We found that when certain firearms are brought into Canada initially and not registered, as was practice in the past, between customs and the wholesaler–distributor, some of those firearms disappear.

As I mentioned earlier, we also want to register firearms even when they are in transit through the country. If that is to be an inconvenience then so be it, but frankly we do not really want to encourage the in transit shipment of firearms through Canada.

We also want to be able to impress on people that firearms are important and that the owner's care is very important as well.

We feel the registration system will be of benefit and will reduce death through firearms. We feel there will be a greater appreciation of firearms. The minister has stated time and again that the costs are going to be minimal for the registration of a firearm beginning in January 1, 1998. It may not be anything but very shortly it will go to $10 for up to 10 firearms and maybe up to $18 for 10 firearms before the end of the five year period.

• (1530)

The minister has been very frank on that. He has stated there will not be any cost initially for getting a possession licence but for the renewal of an FAC or eventual renewal of a possession licence it will be $60 for a five year period. Once a firearm has been registered there will not be any need to register it again. With respect to the possession licence there does not have to be

any course taken if the possession licence is for firearms presently possessed and not for the purchase of new firearms.

The registration system has been put into effect with the lawful gun owner in mind. Supposedly there will be the inconvenience of having to register long guns. That is in the eye of the beholder. A lot of people who have long guns do not mind registering them. It is not, as some people have stated, an idea of keeping track of all the long guns with the eventual intention of confiscation. That is not the intent at all. If that were the case, we would not be spending up to $85 million on the registration system.

The member for Yorkton–Melville has requested costing. The minister provided the costing in committee when he initially appeared. He stated why in his and the government's opinion it would be $85 million.

The idea is to put the possession licence in effect on January 1, 1996 and the registration certificates for firearms beginning in January 1, 1998 to give the system a chance to work gradually. Also it is hoped that Canadians will see that the registration of firearms and the possession licences are not an attempt to act against the lawful gun owner.

To know what firearms are illegal first we must know which firearms are legal. That makes sense. We cannot just say that a particular firearm is illegal unless we have a common denominator to say which ones are legal. That is a basic axiom and we want to create that basic axiom in the registration of firearms.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my amendments deal with the registration system.

During the appearance of witnesses before the standing committee, I recall asking a criminologist how the registration of rifles and shotguns would reduce the criminal use of those firearms. I was surprised at his answer. He said that we would probably see no effect in this area for 15 years. That was the closest we could get to seeing any impact on the whole area of deaths by gunshot wounds during the four weeks of testimony before the committee.

When we look at the registration of firearms, before the system can register one single firearm we have to licence all the owners under the provisions of clause 5 of the bill. Clause 5 requires the chief firearms officer to take cognizance of the criminal record of the individual, the mental health record of the individual and a neighbourhood check as to the record of the individual to determine whether there is any violence in that individual's history. Before getting to the registering of firearms the owner of the firearm must first satisfy the chief firearms officer that he or she is eligible to own a firearm in accordance with the criteria set out.

• (1535)

When we look at the cost of this it is not unlike the procedure followed to obtain an FAC today. If we look again at the cost of the FAC the Toronto metro police board did an analysis of the cost for an FAC during 1994 and it came to $185. If that is the cost to register or license an individual and it is going to have to go through a similar process and cost a similar amount, then we are looking at three million gun owners multiplied by $185 which comes to $550 million before a single firearm is registered. The cost of this whole thing will be far greater than the $85 million suggested by the justice department.

Then we have to look at the possibility that a gun owner may not meet the criteria. If the gun owner does not meet the criteria what happens to his firearms? It means he cannot get a licence to own them, therefore he cannot own them. What happens to those firearms? We never got a clear response, at least I did not, from the witnesses including justice officials on that question. Some said they might be allowed to sell them or export them.

If a person is not eligible to hold a licence to own a firearm it means it would be dangerous to allow them to continue to own a firearm. It seems very clear to me that it would be the responsibility and duty of the police to remove those firearms from the possession of that individual if that individual does not meet the criteria to hold a licence. That issue has not been clarified well enough.

There is the issue of cost before a single firearm is registered. If the individual does meet the criteria and receives a licence then there is the added cost of registering the firearm. To suggest it is going to cost $10 to register a firearm is utter nonsense. What can we register for $10 today?

Although it may only cost the firearms owner $10 it is going to cost the taxpayer a lot more for the police or whoever is transferring the information and identifying features from the firearm into the system itself and then issuing a registration certificate. No one has assured the committee or assured me that it is going to cost less than $10. I will have more to say on this during the final debate at third reading.

We must seriously look at the whole registration system. No evidence, not even a smidgen has been produced that we could consider from a common sense point of view that the registration of a rifle or a shotgun is going to reduce the criminal use of that firearm. If all of the firearms in the country were registered now, what would stop the suicides? As our hon. colleague from Kamloops indicated, what would stop those individuals who lose their sense of responsibility through drug abuse, alcohol abuse or simple anger and despair? What would cause them to be less likely to use a firearm simply because it is registered? It does not make sense.

I ask all hon. members to consider these amendments that deal with that aspect of Bill C–68. We say it is not going to work so why go forward with it?

• (1540)

We asked the government to bring forward those portions of the bill that get tougher on the criminal use of firearms. There is not anyone in this House or anyone in Canada who would not immediately support that aspect of the bill. The government has failed to do so. That saddens me and many of my colleagues on this side of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We have recognized and heard from each of the movers of the motions in Group No. 3. Now we will open debate to the remainder of the House.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

My comments will be on Motion No. 54, the lending provisions.

I would like to thank Atima Hadlari for lending me his shotgun yesterday to go out hunting in Cambridge Bay for geese and ducks. He was very nice about it. I know him very well. He offered me the use of his .12 gauge shotgun and I obliged.

Both aboriginal and non–aboriginal groups who appeared before the justice committee expressed concerns about the lending provisions of Bill C–68. They talked about the impracticality of lending a registration certificate along with a firearm when someone is out on the land hunting for food, which we were doing just a little over 24 hours ago in Cambridge Bay.

This is an issue of concern in my riding of Nunatsiaq. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec, the Council for Yukon Indians and representatives of the Government of the Northwest Territories all expressed similar concerns. Again, the minister and the government have responded to the concern. I express my thanks to the minister for listening.

Motion No. 54 is a practical one. It would remove the requirement to transfer the registration certificate along with the firearm when the firearm is being loaned to someone who will be hunting for sustenance purposes.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

All of the Inuit in my riding hunt for food. They may supplement it with food from the Bay, the co–op and other stores. We do not have grocery stores as such; we have department stores. They may supplement the food they get from hunting with food from the stores, but they all hunt.

I was in my hometown of Repulse Bay two weeks ago. I went caribou hunting and got a caribou. I was in Baker Lake a week after that. People there depend on caribou. Everyone depends on the caribou they hunt. As I said, a little over 24 hours ago I was in Cambridge Bay. There because they hunt for food, they are always concerned about their neighbours, their friends or whoever else may lack hunting equipment, whether it is a snowmobile, a rifle, or gas. They lend hunting equipment to their neighbours, their relatives, their sons, their daughters or whomever. Lending firearms is a common occurrence. In the north it is as common as lending a lawnmower or a cup of sugar to a next door neighbour.

• (1545)

In doing this the government is acknowledging that we have a way of life which includes lending whatever we have to our neighbours, sons, daughters or whomever; our firearms in this case.

It is with deep appreciation to the minister that I support Motion No. 54, knowing that he has listened to my ongoing concern about that portion of the bill and knowing that he has understood that it is a special case.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for you. The hon. member is speaking to us in a language that I neither recognize nor understand. I would like to know if we must continue to listen. As far as I know, the hon. member is not using one of the official languages.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In response to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Saint–Hubert, there is nothing in the standing orders that would allow the Chair to force a member from either side of the House to speak in one language or another.

Allow me to raise a personal point. In these circumstances, I still appreciate the hon. member for Nunatsiaq's using his mother tongue and, I take it, translating his words into English from time to time. Resuming debate.

Mrs. Venne: Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of Ukrainian or German descent—our members come from all kinds of backgrounds—can now make their speeches in their mother tongues?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I can only answer the hon. member's question pursuant to the standing orders of the House of Commons, which hon. members must comply with. At this time, there is nothing in the standing orders preventing anyone from using, as you say, a language that is not one of Canada's two official languages. In the present circumstances, the hon. member for Nunatsiaq may speak in his mother tongue.

Mr. Anawak:

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

It is an insult to the people of Canada that some people would not agree with our speaking our own language when the Inuktitut language in Canada is 4,000 years old and the English and French languages are mere hundreds of years old.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1550)

Mr. Anawak: A lot of my constituents are out camping now because school is over for the summer. They will not wait around for someone to come along and say: "Here is my registration certificate. There is a polar bear coming so you better come and get your rifle or lend me your rifle". There has to be an understanding on the issue of lending. This applies to all sustenance hunters whether aboriginal or non–aboriginal.

The motion will benefit all hunters and trappers because it recognizes that there is a different way of doing things in the rural areas. I strongly support the motion and urge the House to support it.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after this morning I was a little confused about when I was supposed to speak and on what, but I think I have it all straightened out now. However I am sure you will straighten me out if I do not.

I will be speaking to clause 110 and would like to respond to the motion made with regard to it. I agree with the member across the way who moved the amendment that something needs to be done about the clause. I personally believe it needs to be totally scrapped.

I disagree with the parliamentary secretary who feels there is no concern about prohibiting certain firearms, confiscation, et cetera, because of the powers in the clause.

I have given out several hundred copies of the bill even though it cost quite a bit from my budget. I have had responses back from a number of people, including legal minds and people who support the idea, who say it is a terrible piece of legislation, that it is just plain bad and written very poorly. Many of these people came to Canada from places like Czechoslovakia and Hungary and lived in the days when those kinds of thing happened. They know what they are talking about.

We all know how much the Liberal government desires power. Bill C–68 is a further example of how power hungry the Liberal government can be. clause 110 of Bill C–68 gives absolute power through order in council to dictate every condition chosen to end firearm ownership for reasonable law–abiding people.

No matter how many times the minister and the power hungry members of his government state that their intention is not to remove ownership of firearms from Canadians, the wording and the language in the bill read otherwise.

We on this side know why the minister and his government are invoking closure on the bill. It is just another example of their thirst for abusive power. Their attempt at ramming the legislation through before the House closes for the summer is their own means of protecting their backbench members.

As the Ontario election has shown, the people of Canada are tired of top heavy government that passes legislation to look good rather than to do what the people want. The clock is ticking on Liberal style government. As each second passes more and more people have read Bill C–68 and discovered that it is a bad bill and it is not about public safety.

The people of Canada have discovered that Bill C–68 is all about giving absolute power in clause 110 to a chosen few social engineers and ivory tower intellectuals who believe they know what is best for Canada. As the Ontario election proves, the people of Canada are tired of dictatorial government of any stripe and want a government that mirrors the will of the people, not the mandate of closet dreamers.

• (1555)

The clock is ticking and each tick places more and more pressure on the minister to push Bill C–68 through the House. Each tick of the clock gives more and more Canadians time to understand the powers given in clause 110 to the governor in council and to make absolute demands upon the people of Canada. Each tick of the clock is making the Liberal government and the minister weaker among the citizens of Canada. That is why they are in such a hurry to get this dictatorial mandate through the House.

The Liberal government finally understands that the people have had enough of false prophesies from a government opposed to the wishes of Canadians. Canadians did not agree to firearm controls to hamper and incriminate law–abiding friends and neighbours who own and use properly stored firearms. Canadians want the government to use legislation to deter and punish those who believe a firearm can be a useful tool in robbery, assault and murder.

Canadians want their government to get tough with criminals, to make criminals understand that using a firearm will result in swift, sure justice with dire consequences for unlawful behaviour.

As more and more Canadians read and understand Bill C–68 they find that the legislation does not protect them from criminals and law breakers who improperly use illegally smuggled firearms. They have found legislation that criminalizes their

friends and neighbours at each and every whim of a select few and orders in council.

Canadians did not elect members to the House so that a chosen few among them could dictate their favoured beliefs. Canadians elected members to the House because they believed members when elected would stand up for constituent wishes over the elite who want control over every aspect of Canadian life.

During the last election each party promised Canadians that they would vote according to constituent wishes, that if elected constituents would come first over party politics and the whim of a few chosen to rule.

The order in council in Bill C–68 shows Canadians that the Liberals have broken the most sacred of their promises and that the government is without integrity and cannot be trusted to maintain its promises beyond the ink drying in the red book.

There is no representation by constituents in the bill. Constituents asked for input in their governments. The bill removes all authority from people and gives total control of the people to the chosen few.

The clock is ticking and the Liberal government knows it. At each tick the government knows its old style government of distortion and outright misrepresentation is doomed to failure, but the government has cashed too many cheques from its special interests and vested groups to back down.

As the heritage minister holds special meetings where contributions can buy political favours, the justice minister has special meetings where utopian idealists convince the government they know what is best: "Give yourself absolute power. Use that power to make firearm owning Canadians semi–criminals at the least and outright criminals at the most. Threaten Canadians with absolute punishment for daring to own politically incorrect private property, legally owned firearms, and then Canadians will be safe".

Canadians have read Bill C–68 and know that it has little to do with public safety. It has little to do with making career criminals and first time criminals fearful of our courts. Canadians have read Bill C–68 and discovered the government wants dictatorial powers. That is why more and more Canadians are pushing their Liberal backbench members to vote against the bill. The government knows when its backbenchers return to its constituencies there will be questions asked. The government knows constituents will ask how ill advised spending of tax dollars for registering lawful private property will increase public safety when study after study states registration will not reduce use of firearms by criminals.

The government knows constituents will ask their Liberal members why they supported a bill the constituents did not want, but most of all the government knows constituents will ask why backbench members agreed to give the chosen few absolute power to dictate to Canadians.

• (1600)

The clock is ticking. As Ontario voters proved, the Liberal ideal of government by the elite chosen few is over. Canadians have chosen to take back their right to govern and the government knows it. As I said, too much political capital has been granted by the minister and his government to abandon this ill advised bill. While the clock is ticking on their style of dictatorial government through order in council they are stuck with it and they shall be stuck with it during the next federal election. They will have to explain to constituents why they did not do as promised, why individual MPs in the Liberal Party were not listened to, why there were few free votes and why the government chose the old style Liberal way of government by the few which it stated it would not do.

The clock is ticking not only in Ontario but in British Columbia and all across Canada where Canadians believe government is elected to follow the wishes of the people, not to follow the wishes of a selected few chosen to mandate by order in council.

Bill C–68 is a documented futile attempt at social engineering, not criminal justice. This bill affects law–abiding citizens more than criminals, demands more from citizens than criminals and wastes tax dollars on a non–existent claim of public safety.

Canadians know this and that is why more and more Canadians understand what Bill C–68 means to the democratic principles they thought they voted for. More and more Canadians will abandon the Liberal government. As the clock ticks the Liberal government loses credibility on each count. The government that promised integrity but gave Canadians the old style of patronage will find its bases thinning.

The bill will not reduce the flow of illegal firearms or reduce the use of illegal firearms. It is estimated the bill will increase the flow and value of illegal firearms while it punishes law–abiding citizens.

A vote for this bill is a vote against democratic principles. It is a vote for absolute power and the worst part of it is those who vote for the bill are supporting a minor defeat for democracy in this land.

Bill C–68 is not about public safety or good governance, it is about the manner in which Canadians will be governed. I support government by and for the people, not dictatorial misadventure, and I believe that most Canadians agree with me.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I take the opportunity to address these motions. At report stage there are some 267 motions to amend the legislation.

I will address the time element because as members begin to talk we lose sight of the fact that there has been a great deal of discussion about Bill C–68. It has been happening now for well over a year. Members have had discussion papers and briefing documents. It has taken a great deal of time and now is the time to move forward.

If the House had to debate each amendment with the appropriate time allocation we would be here until next Christmas. The government has to move forward. We have had a great deal of time to discuss this. The allegation of some members that somehow this is ramming something through is quite to the contrary.

The hon. member for Wild Rose said the government's position on Bill C–68 is simply the whim of a few. Yet, as we well know, more than two–thirds of Canadians actively support this piece of legislation.

I want to address the issue of registration. That is certainly one of the areas where members have brought forward their concerns. In my riding people have asked questions concerning registration. I think it is fair to ask the question and to explain how registration and crime reduction go hand in hand and cannot be split, as hon. members might suggest.

Many members have asked why we are going after law–abiding citizens and not criminals. Law–abiding citizens are law–abiding citizens until they are convicted. There are no shades of grey in between.

• (1605)

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police recently came out with a report. I thought it was very useful. Today the law requires all handguns to be registered, and law–abiding citizens have them registered.

One of the interesting facts was that 40 per cent of the crimes committed with these guns were registered. That is very significant. Members in the Reform Party continue to say law–abiding citizens, those who register their firearms, do not commit crime. Yet 40 per cent of the crimes committed with handguns presently required to be registered were committed by registered firearms.

This legislation will ask that all firearms now be registered including long arms, shotguns and rifles. I found out another interesting statistic from this report, that 47 per cent of all firearms crimes committed in Canada involved long arms. That is the reason long arms should also be registered.

I do not think Canadians have to look too far for the facts that encourage them to tell their members of Parliament that we do value safety. Canadians hear statistics all the time about the realities of gun crime; 200 children are shot by guns every year. This is appalling to Canadians. There is a problem to be dealt with.

There a were some 1,400 firearms deaths last year, some 77 per cent of which were suicides. Only 3 per cent of those firearms deaths had anything to do with self–defence. These are facts which indicate clearly there are problems we can address to ensure our communities remain safe.

Unlike the platitudes and rhetoric I have been hearing from the Reform I will give more facts. The Prime Minister was recently in the United States. He was asked why people in the UN thought Canada was the best country in the world. He said the global economy is making us more and more alike. He said there were two things that really made Canada distinctive. The first is our medicare system. I do not have to explain to hon. members how important that is to Canadians. The second is that we can walk in our parks safely, unlike in the United States.

In the United States there are more gun shops than there are gas stations. There are private security officers in the United States than there are real police. For every one crime with a firearm in Canada there are 100 in the United States. When we take into account the 10 to 1 population differential that means the situation is 10 times worse in the United States than in Canada.

With such a vast majority of our population being so close to the U.S. border why has the gun problem not moved more fully into Canada? There are a couple of reasons. One has to do with the American constitution which has effectively the right to bear arms, whereas in Canada we do not have that right enshrined in our constitution. Ownership of a gun in Canada is a privilege subject to certain rules. Those are some of the reasons we have such a low relative crime rate with guns.

The real question has to do with crime. The members repeat the question about what the bill will do about crime. It is an excellent question. The importance of the question is how we approach it. Do we wait until after we have a problem and then start to deal with it or do we do things in advance anticipating forces in our society which may result in a greater level of crime?

We spend 75 per cent of what we do on remedial health care and only 25 per cent on prevention. To make sure our health care remains affordable and accessible, we have to deal more on the preventative side. This bill has an awful lot to do with preventing crime. It is not reducing crime; it is preventing crime and it results in the same effect.

• (1610)

Since the mid–seventies about 64,000 firearms were reported lost, missing or stolen in Canada. We wonder how many guns were actually lost, missing or stolen but not reported. This fact alone indicates that members who would suggest criminals get their firearms only through smuggling really failed to understand the facts. So–called law–abiding gun owners are major suppliers of firearms to the criminal element. Some 1,400 firearms last year were reported lost, missing or stolen.

The cost issue has come up in my riding and in the House. The parliamentary secretary has done an excellent job to make sure Canadians know despite the rhetoric we have heard from others that cost is not a major item here. Registration will begin on January 1, 1998 and does not have to be fully implemented until the year 2003. In the initial phases it will cost something like $10 for up to 10 guns for a five year period. Clearly in the first period as we go through this process of transitioning to registration of our firearms cost should not be a major problem for Canadians.

With regard to the issue of what gun control will do about crime, the most important element is public education. Now that we have discussed the issue of crime and firearms for well over a year now, more and more Canadians know what a serious responsibility it is to own a firearm. They know now they have to have a licence, that they have to register, that there are restrictions on storage and mandatory criteria for ammunition, transportation, et cetera. It is a very serious responsibility.

One of the things I am finding from talking to a number of serious gun owners and club shooters is they are finding there are an awful lot of guns now for sale to collectors and to clubs and other owners. A large number of people in Canada who have acquired firearms either through an inheritance or on a whim really are not very serious. Recent statistics show 60 per cent of firearms owners have not shot their guns in the last year and some 40 per cent have not shot their guns in the last five years.

A lot of people with firearms in their homes probably were not totally familiar with the rules and regulations. Now through this education process, now that more and more Canadians understand the important responsibility of owning a firearm, they are getting rid of those guns. That is good in terms of reducing the probability of firearms being dumped into the criminal markets.

The Minister of Justice has listened to Canadians. The amendments are constructive and address the concerns of many Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to the agreement made this morning the divisions on the motions are deemed deferred.

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

We will now proceed to group No. 4.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 24, on page 4, with the following:

"under subsection 101.1(1) of this Act or subsection 92(1), 93(1) or:"; and

"(*b*) by replacing lines 31 and 32, on page 4, with the following

"constitute an offence under subsection 101.1(2) of this Act or subsection 92(2) or 93(1) of the Criminal".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 24 and 25, on page 4, with the following:

"under section 106 of this Act and subsection 95(1) of the Criminal Code,".

Motion No. 9

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33, on page 4, with the following:

"constitute an offence under section 106.1;".

Motion No. 11

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 37 and 38, on page 5, with the following:

"offence under section 106.2 or 106.3 of this Act or subsection 99(1) or 100(1) of the Criminal Code; and".

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 18, on page 5, with the following:

"wise constitute an offence under section 106.4 or 106.5 of this Act or subsection 103(1) of the Criminal Code."

Motion No. 35

That Bill C–68, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 5 and 6, on page 16, with the following:

"sal in accordance with this Act,".

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 133

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 41, on page 50, the following new Clauses:

"101.1 (1) Subject to subsection (4) and section 98 of the Criminal Code, every person commits an offence who possesses a firearm, unless the person is the holder of

(*a*) a licence under which the person may possess the firearm; and

(*b*) a registration certificate for the firearm.

(2) Subject to subsection (4) and section 98 of the Criminal Code, every person commits an offence who possesses a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, other than a replica firearm, or any prohibited ammunition, unless the person is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1) or (2) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction and liable

(*a*) for a first offence, to a fine not exceeding one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars and to a minimum fine of five hundred dollars;

(*b*) for a second offence, to a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars and to a minimum fine of one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars; and

(*c*) for a third or subsequent offence, to a fine of not more than two thousand dollars or to imprisonment for six months or to both.

(4) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to

(*a*) a person who possesses a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition while the person is under the direct and immediate supervision of a person who may lawfully possess it, for the purpose of using it in a manner in which the supervising person may lawfully use it; or

(*b*) a person who comes into possession of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition by the operation of law and who, within a reasonable period after acquiring possession of it,

(i) lawfully disposes of it, or

(ii) obtains a licence under which the person may possess it and, in the case of a firearm, a registration certificate for the firearms

101.11 (1) Where a peace officer believes on reasonable grounds that a person is in possession of a firearm in respect of which the person does not hold a registration certificate, the peace officer shall seize the firearm and may, for this purpose, search the person or a vehicle, in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Code concerning search and seizure.

(2) Any thing seized pursuant to subsection (1) shall be dealt with in accordance with sections 490 and 491 of the Criminal Code, subject to subsection (4).

(3) A peace officer who seizes a firearm in accordance with subsection (1) shall give to the person who had possession of the firearm a notice in writing that the person shall obtain a registration certificate for the firearm within seven days of receiving the notice.

(4) The firearm that was seized shall be returned to the person who is lawfully entitled to its possession where the person obtains a registration certificate for the firearm within the period of time set out in subsection (3).

101.2 (1) A person who has been convicted of an offence under paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(2) An offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(3) For greater certainty, notwithstanding subsection (1), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*).

(4) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*).

(5) Subject to subsection (6), every person is guilty of an offence who discloses to any person any record of a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*) or the existence of such a record or the fact of the conviction.

(6) No person commits an offence under subsection (5) where that person discloses anything referred to in that subsection to a prescribed person for the purposes of allowing the prescribed person to determine whether a person found guilty of an offence under subsection 101.1(3) has been previously convicted of an offence under that subsection.

(7) Every one is guilty of an offence who uses or authorizes the use of an application form for or relating to any of the following matters that contains a question that by its terms requires the applicant to disclose a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(*a*) or (*b*):

(*a*) employment in any department, as defined in section 2 of the Financial Administration Act;

(*b*) employment by any Crown corporation, as defined in subsection 83(1) of the Financial Administration Act;

(*c*) enrolment in the Canadian Forces; or

(*d*) employment on or in connection with the operation of any work, undertaking or business that is within the legislative authority of Parliament."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 17, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"102.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who knowingly makes, before a peace officer, firearms officer or chief firearms officer, a false report or statement concerning the loss, theft or destruction of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, any prohibited ammunition, an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(3) In this section, "report" or "statement" means an assertion of fact, opinion, belief or knowledge, whether material or not and whether admissible or not."

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 28, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"104.1 (1) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), every person commits an offence who is an occupant of a motor vehicle in which the person knows there is a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, other than a replica firearm, or any prohibited ammunition, unless

(*a*) in the case of a firearm,

(i) the person or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the person or other occupant may possess the firearm and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, transport the prohibited firearm or restricted firearm,

(ii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was the holder of an authorization or a licence under which that other occupant may possess the firearm and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, transport the prohibited firearm or restricted firearm, and

(iii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was a person who could not be convicted of an offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament; and

(*b*) in the case of a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition,

(i) the person or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the person or other occupant may transport the prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(ii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was

(*a*) the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the other occupant may transport the prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(*b*) a person who could not be convicted of an offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle who, on becoming aware of the presence of the firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition in the motor vehicle, attempted to leave the motor vehicle, to the extent that it was feasible to do so, or actually left the motor vehicle.

(4) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle where the occupant or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is a person who came into possession of the firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition by the operation of law."

Motion No. 137

That Bill C–68, in Clause 106, be amended by replacing lines 41 to 44, on page 51, with the following:

"106. (1) Every person commits an offence who

(*a*) possesses a firearm, unless the person is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm and, where the firearm is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, unless the person holds a registration certificate for that firearm; or

(*b*) contravenes, in respect of a firearm, a condition of a licence, registration certificate or authorization held by the person.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) in the case of a first offence, is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction;

(*b*) in the case of a subsequent offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years."

Motion No. 138

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without lawful excuse, possesses a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition and

(*a*) does not hold a licence under which the person may possess it; or

(*b*) contravenes a condition of a licence or authorization held by the person.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 139

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.2 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, transfers a firearm or ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 140

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.3 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, transfers a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 141

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.4 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, imports or exports a firearm or ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 142

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.5 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, imports or exports

(*a*) a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition; or

(*b*) a component or part designed exclusively for use in the manufacture of or assembly into automatic firearms.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 143

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.6 Any proceedings in respect of an offence under subsection 106.4(1) or 106.5(1) of this Act may be commenced at the instance of the Government of Canada and conducted by or on behalf of that government."

Motion No. 144

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.7 Subsections 106(1) and 106.1(1) do not apply to

(*a*) a person who possesses a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition while the person is under the direct and immediate supervision of a person who may lawfully possess it, for the purpose of using it in a manner in which the supervising person may lawfully use it; or

(*b*) a person who comes into possession of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition by the operation of law and who, within a reasonable period after acquiring possession of it,

(i) lawfully disposes of it, or

(ii) obtains a licence under which the person may possess it and, in the case of a firearm, a registration certificate for the firearm."

Motion No. 146

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 10, on page 53, the following new Clause:

108.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who

(*a*) having lost a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, any prohibited ammunition, an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate, or having had it stolen from the person's possession, does not with reasonable despatch report the loss to a peace officer, to a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer; or

(*b*) on finding a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition that the person has reasonable grounds to believe has been lost or abandoned, does not with reasonable despatch deliver it to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer or report the finding to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 147

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 10, on page 53, the following new Clause:

"108.2 (1) Every person commits an offence who

(*a*) after destroying any firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(*b*) on becoming aware of the destruction of any firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition that was in the person's possession before its destruction, does not with reasonable despatch report the destruction to a peace officer, firearms officer or chief firearms officer.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 163

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clauses:

"129.1 Where, in any proceedings for an offence under any of sections 106, 106.1. 106.2, 106.3, 106.4. 106.5 and 108.1, any question arises as to whether a person is the holder of an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate, the onus is on the accused to prove that the person is the holder of the authorization, licence or registration certificate."

Motion No. 164

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.2 (1) In any proceedings under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, a document purporting to be an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate is evidence of the statements contained therein.

(2) In any proceedings under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, a copy of any authorization, licence or registration certificate is, if certified as a true copy by the Registrar or a chief firearms officer, admissible in evidence and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, has the same probative force as the authorization, licence or registration certificate would have had if it had been proved in the ordinary way."

Motion No. 165

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.3 (1) A certificate purporting to be signed by an analyst stating that the analyst has analysed any weapon, prohibited device, ammunition, prohibited ammunition or explosive substance, or any part or component of such a thing, and stating the results of the analysis is evidence in any proceedings in relation to any of those things under this Act or under section 19 of the Export and Import Permits Act in relation to subsection 15(2) of that Act without proof of the signature or official character of the person appearing to have signed the certificate.

(2) The party against whom a certificate of an analyst is produced may, with leave of the court, require the attendance of the analyst for the purposes of cross–examination.

(3) No certificate of an analyst may be admitted in evidence unless the party intending to produce it has, before the trial, given to the party against whom it is intended to be produced reasonable notice of that intention together with a copy of the certificate.

(4) For the purposes of this Act, service of a certificate of an analyst may be proved by oral evidence given under oath by, or by the affidavit or solemn declaration of, the person claiming to have served it.

(5) Notwithstanding subsection (4), the court may require the person who appears to have signed an affidavit or solemn declaration referred to in that subsection to appear before it for examination or cross-examination in respect of the issue of proof of service."

Motion No. 166

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.4 (1) The Governor in Council may, by order, declare for any purpose referred to in subsection (2) any period as an amnesty period with respect to any weapon, prohibited device, prohibited ammunition, explosive substance or component or part designed exclusively for use in the manufacture of or assembly into an automatic firearm.

(2) An order made under subsection (1) may declare an amnesty period for the purpose of

(*a*) permitting any person in possession of any thing to which the order relates to do anything provided in the order, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, delivering the thing to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer, registering it, destroying it or otherwise disposing of it; or

(*b*) permitting alterations to be made to any prohibited firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition to which the order relates so that it no longer qualifies as a prohibited firearm, a prohibited weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, as the case may be.

(3) No person who, during an amnesty period declared by an order made under subsection (1) and for a purpose described in the order, does anything provided for in the order, is, by reason only of the fact that the person did that thing, guilty of an offence under this Part.

(4) Any proceedings taken under this Part against any person for anything done by the person in reliance of this section are a nullity."

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 173

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 8, on page 72, with the following:

"(3) For the purposes of sections 92 to 95, 99".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 8 and 9, on page 72, with the following:

"(3) For the purposes of sections 95, 99, 100, 103 and 117.03 of this Act and".

Motion No. 175

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 5, on page 73, with the following:

"(*b*) a registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm if".

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 13, on page 73, with the following:

"who uses a firearm or an imitation firearm"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 29, on page 73, with the following:

"using the firearm or imitation firearm."

Motion No. 177

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20, on page 73, with the following:

"tent A firearm), 272.1 (sexual assault with a weapon), 273 (aggravated sexual assault),"

Motion No. 178

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by deleting lines 30 to 39, on page 73;

(*b*) by replacing line 2, on page 74, with the following:

"under subsection (1) is guilty of an";

(*c*) by replacing line 26, on page 74, with the following:

"offence under subsection (1) shall be"; and

(*d*) by replacing lines 32 and 33, on page 73, with the following:

"the person for an offence under subsection (1)."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 179

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 34 to 47, on page 74 and lines 1 to 11, on page 75.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 180

That Bill C-68 in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 35, on page 75, with the following:

"under subsection (1) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years."

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 45, on page 76 and lines 1 to 10, on page 77.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 182

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 16 on page 76 and substituting the following:

"91. (1) Subject to subsections (4) and (5) and section"

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 183

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 18, on page 76, with the following:

"possesses a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, unless the person is;"

(*b*) by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 76, with the following:

"(*a*) a person who possesses a prohibited firearm, a restricted firearm, a";

(*c*) by replacing line 14, on page 77, with the following:

"possesses a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm knowing that the person is";

(*d*) by replacing line 28, on page 78, with the following:

"prohibited firearm, a restricted firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted";

(*e*) by replacing line 8, on page 79, with the following:

"in which the person knows there is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm,";

(*f*) by replacing lines 17 to 20, on page 79, with the following:

"may possess and transport the firearm,";

(*g*) by replacing lines 29 to 32, on page 79, with the following:

"possess and transport the firearm, and";

(*h*) by replacing line 26, on page 80, with the following:

"ing aware of the presence of the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm,"

(*i*) by replacing line 36, on page 80, with the following:

"of the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted";

(*j*) by replacing line 33, on page 98, with the following:

"(*a*) a person in possession of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm who"; and

(*k*) by replacing line 4, on page 99, with the following:

"may seize the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, re–".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 184

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 45, on page 76 and lines 1 to 11, on page 77.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 185

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 11 on page 77, the following:

"(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(*a*) has borrowed the firearm;

(*b*) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(*c*) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person's family."

Motion No. 186

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 12 on page 77 and substituting the following:

"92. (1) Subject to subsections (4) and (5) and section"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 187

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 12 to 47, on page 77 and lines 1 to 23, on page 78.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 188

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 14 on page 78 and substituting the following:

"(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(*a*) has borrowed the firearm;

(*b*) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(*c*) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person's family.

(6) Where a person is charged with an"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 189

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 45, on page 78 and lines 1 to 4, on page 79.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 190

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 5 on page 79 and substituting the following:

"94. (1) Subject to subsections (3) to (5)"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 191

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 5 to 46, on page 79 and lines 1 to 38, on page 80.

Motion No. 192

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 1 and 2, on page 80, with the following:

"95. (1) Subject to subsection (3), every person commits an offence who, in"

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 193

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 38 on page 80, the following:

"(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle where the occupant or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(*a*) has borrowed the firearm;

(*b*) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(*c*) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person's family."

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 194

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 37, on page 81, with the following:

"under subsection (1) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of three years."

Motion No. 195

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 38 to 40, on page 81.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 196

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 19, on page 82.

Motion No. 197

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 20 to 43, on page 82, and lines 1 to 11, on page 83.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 198

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 22 and 23, on page 82, with the following:

"subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsections 92(1), 93(1), 94(1) and 95(1) of this Act, possessed a firearm without a firearm"; and

(*b*) by replacing lines 36 and 37, on page 82, with the following:

"the coming into force of any of subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsections 92(1), 93(1), 94(1) and 95(1) of this Act, possessed".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 199

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to11, on page 83.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 200

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 2 and 3, on page 83, with the following:

"between the coming into force of subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsection 92(1) or 94(1) of this Act and the later of January".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 201

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 9, on page 83 with the following:

"91(1), 92(1) or 94(1) and January 1, 1996, possesses a firearm that, as of that date, is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until December 31, 2000, the"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 202

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 7 to 21, on page 84.

Motion No. 203

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 18 to 34, on page 85.

Motion No. 204

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 28, on page 86.

Motion No. 205

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 43, on page 86 and lines 1 to 5, on page 87.

Motion No. 206

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 24, on page 87.

Motion No. 208

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 43, on page 89, with the following:

"(5) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of".

Motion No. 210

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 5, on page 91, with the following:

"(5) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of".

Motion No. 212

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 15, on page 92, with the following:

"(7) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of".

Motion No. 213

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 46, on page 93 and lines 1 to 13, on page 94.

Motion No. 214

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 3 to 7, on page 96.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 220

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended

(*a*) by adding, immediately after line 9 on page 106, the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a business as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual, in the course of the individual's duties or employment, possesses, manufactures or transfers, or offers to manufacture or transfer, a partially manufactured barrelled weapon that, in its unfinished state, is not a barrelled weapon from which any shot, bullet or other projectile can be discharged and that is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to a person."

(*b*) by renumbering the subsequent subclause and any crossreferences thereto accordingly.

Motion No. 221

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 21 on page 106, the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a museum as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual, in the course of the individual's duties or employment, possesses or transfers a firearm that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, an antique firearm if the individual has been trained to handle and use such a firearm.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a museum as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual possesses or transfers a firearm in the course of the individual's duties or employment if the individual is designated, by name, by a provincial minister within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act.

(5) A provincial minister shall not designate an individual for the purpose of subsection (4) where it is not desirable, in the interests of the safety of any person, to designate the individual.

(6) A provincial minister may attach to a designation referred to in subsection (4) any reasonable condition that the provincial minister considers desirable in the particular circumstances and in the interests of the safety of any person."

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 222

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 29, on page 106, with the following:

"offence under any of sections 89, 90, 93,".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 223

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 29 and 30, on page 106, with the following:

"offence under sections 89 or 90, any question arises as to".

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 228

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 38 on page 108, the following new Clause:

"117.16(1) Every section in this Part expires on January 1, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section

(*a*) the Auditor General has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful and cost–effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(*b*) the report of the Auditor General has been referred by the House to such committee as the house may designate for the purpose,

(*c*) the committee has considered the report of the Auditor General and made a report to the House on the success and cost– effectiveness of the section and on the extent to which

(i) public safety has been or will be increased or decreased,

(ii) the incidence of crime related to the use of firearms has been or will be reduced or increased, and

(iii) a cost–effective use of public funds has been or will be made to achieve an increase in public safety or a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms, and

(*d*) the committee has recommended to the House that the section should not expire, and

(*e*) the House has concurred in the report of the committee.

(2) Where a section is to expire as result of subsection (1), the Governor in Council may, by order, defer its expiry for a period not exceeding one year, if the section contains matters that do not relate to firearms control and the deferral is necessary in order for legislation to be proposed to Parliament to continue the other matters in force after the expiry of the section."

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 230

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 135.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 231

That Bill C–68, in Clause 135, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 109, with the following:

"ment for a term of one year; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 232

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 136.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 233

That Bill C–68, in Clause 136, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 109, with the following:

"ment for a term of eight years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 234

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 137.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 235

That Bill C–68, in Clause 137, be amended by replacing line 43, on page 109, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Vennę (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 236

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 138.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 237

That Bill C–68, in Clause 138, be amended by replacing line 16, on page 110, with the following:

"term of six years."

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 238

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 139.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 239

That Bill C–68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 111, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 240

That Bill C–68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 110, with the following:

"272. (1) Every person commits an aggravated assault who wounds, maims, disfigures or endangers the life of the complainant.

(2) Notwithstanding section 85, every person who commits an aggravated assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable

(*a*) where a firearm is used in the commission of the offence, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of six years; and

(*b*) in any other case, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years."

272.1 (1) Every person commits an offence".

Motion No. 241

That Bill C–68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 111, with the following:

"a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 242

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 140.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 243

That Bill C–68, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 111, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 244

That Bill C–68, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 25, on page 111, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 245

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 141.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 246

That Bill C–68, in Clause 141, be amended by replacing line 42, on page 111, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 247

That Bill C–68, in Clause 141, be amended by replacing line 2, on page 112, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 248

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 142.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 249

That Bill C–68, in Clause 142, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 112, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 250

That Bill C–68, in Clause 142, be amended by replacing line 13, on page 112, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 251

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 143.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 252

That Bill C–68, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 20, on page 112, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 253

That Bill C–68, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 23, on page 112, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 254

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 144.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 255

That Bill C–68, in Clause 144, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 112, with the following:

"(*a*) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis–".

Motion No. 256

That Bill C–68, in Clause 144, be amended by replacing line 33 on page 112, with the following:

"ment for a term of six years; and".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 259

That Bill C–68, in Clause 148, be amended by deleting lines 20 and 21, on page 115.

Motion No. 264

That Bill C–68, in Clause 172, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 1, on page 127, with the following:

"(8) Sections 114 to 117 of the Criminal"

(*b*) by deleting lines 4 to 9, on page 127.

Motion No. 265

That Bill C–68, in Clause 183, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 29, on page 133.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the motions under group No. 4, since this series of amendments basically deals with the decriminalization of the whole registration system for certain categories. In any case, the Bloc, under Motion No. 133, for instance, proposes to decriminalize failure to register shoulder arms. Let me explain that shoulder arms means shotguns and rifles. Contrary to certain comments by the government or even by the third party, we do not want to decriminalize all guns but only shotguns and rifles, referred to as shoulder arms.

Throughout this debate, I was surprised to see that although both the gun lobby and the anti–gun coalition raised some arguments that were very emotionally charged, there was no discussion, although there should have been, about what society wants out of this bill.

I think society wants better gun control. I think it makes sense, in a society like ours, that people who own guns should register them. But do we really want to make criminals of people who, either out of stubbornness or sheer ignorance—although all citizens are supposed to know the law, there are a number who do not— because they do not know all the details of the legislation, will not register their shoulder arms?

Does the minister want to make criminals of these people? I hardly think so.

I was on the committee when the minister came to testify and seemed to be willing to open the door to decriminalizing failure to register a firearm. I felt the minister was listening very carefully. I felt he wanted to make the legislation more flexible in this respect, but I also felt that there was a huge lobby out there asking the minister not to give in, because the public ought to feel the government is very serious about this legislation.

With the amendment proposed under Motion No. 133, the government could have sent a message showing it was serious just the same, since I do not think that giving someone who fails to register a criminal record proves anything about the government's intentions. Sure, it shows it is being serious, but at what price? Some people will be prosecuted for failing to register the old twelve–gauge in the closet—this is one of my favourite examples—will they have a criminal record, with everything that entails? For instance, someone with a criminal record may have trouble finding a job or obtaining a passport. Is that what the Minister of Justice really wants? I do not think so. So why not make this clear in the bill?

With this amendment, we could also have sent a very clear message to the public that it is a serious matter to fail to register, by imposing substantial fines. For the first violation, a fine of between $500 and $2,500, which is quite a substantial sentence. We could also send a clear message by saying that unregistered guns will be seized and the owner will have seven days to register, upon receipt of a notice to that effect. The objective is to register these guns so that the objective will be met without criminalizing a group of people for no good reason.

I think we could have achieved the purpose of this bill. But no, as I said earlier, there is this debate between two groups at the opposite ends of the spectrum, about the same bill. The first group says: Listen, the legislation goes too far, it is too totalitarian and will cost too much money. What this group really wants is no legislation at all.

• (1620)

On the other hand, the coalition and every other group in favour of firearms registration would like the legislation to go

further. The penalties are never severe enough; they are asking for pretty outrageous sentences. Basically, what would make them happy is for no one to be allowed to own weapons.

I think that the Bloc's proposal regarding decriminalization makes for a balanced amendment. I think that this kind of amendment favours neither the gun lobby nor the coalition. The ultimate objective could be served by such an amendment.

This bill is certainly a step in the right direction. There is obviously a need for the government to legislate in this area. This bill meets a need. I think that the statistics showing a large majority of voters in Canada and Quebec in favour of increased gun control are right.

I spoke to my constituents, not only hunters or representatives of one group or another, and they have told me that they want increased control. But they do not necessarily agree with certain specifics, such as criminalization. I think that a considerable education effort is still required if we want to know what the people really want us to do in this regard.

Yes, the people want firearms legislation, but I think this is not the kind of legislation they want. In light of the amendment proposed by the Bloc Quebecois in committee, the government has relaxed a number of clauses in its bill along the lines of what the Bloc had suggested. Much to its credit it paid attention, in certain respects, to the amendments and suggestions made by the Bloc Quebecois on Bill C–68.

If what the government is looking for is a bill that meets a consensus, a bill that will gain the widest support possible, the bill before us contains a stumbling block called decriminalization and, on this subject, the government should consider the proposed amendment carefully.

Ten minutes is a very short time to debate these amendments, but since I can speak only once and this bill is being debated globally, let me say that we cannot address decriminalization without addressing something else at the same time. As regards the issue of decriminalization, I feel that the minimum sentence of four years is unconscionable. To provide a minimum sentence of four years for certain offences committed with a firearm is to yield to the gun lobby.

Why remove the courts' discretionary power? Why remove the discretion which judges can use, given the evidence before them? The government argues that, on average, the courts currently impose a four year sentence for such offences. But why force them to automatically impose that sentence? Why not let them weigh the evidence? Why not trust the courts and the appointed judges, who are supposed to represent the public?

Why not let them weigh all the evidence and then impose the sentence which they feel, is the most appropriate, given the evidence before them? This is an aspect which the Minister of Justice should look at very carefully, to comply with the existing legislation and to promote Canada's objectives in that respect.

There is also the issue of universal appliction of the act in Canada. The Minister of Justice repeatedly said that the act would apply everywhere in Canada. I hope it does, including on Indian reserves. If this act is going to be implemented everywhere, why does clause 110, among others, provide that the government can exclude a person?

• (1625)

Since the past is indicative of the future, we are well aware that some people, particularly aboriginals, will be excluded because hunting is an important activity for their survival.

Why not pass legislation which will not only apply everywhere, but also to everyone? In conclusion, if the government is prepared to listen to Canadians, including Quebecers, it will accept the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois regarding decriminalization. This would ensure that people are really treated fairly, and it would also ensure that the legislation targets those who should be targeted, which is not the case right now.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I will just take a few minutes to address my amendment here. It has to do with the subject of decriminalizing the offences that are now in the Criminal Code.

If we look at sections 91 and 92, we see that the penalties under indictment of both of those sections are absolutely draconian. Section 92 allows for an individual who knowingly refuses or neglects to register his or her firearm to be sentenced to a term of ten years. Under section 91 if they proceed by way of indictment they can be sentenced to imprisonment for a term of five years.

There has been a new section put into the act at committee stage, I think it is 107.1, which makes it a summary conviction offence. However, the police will have the authority to arrest anyone in possession of a firearm under any of those sections, even the most draconian, which is under section 92. They can arrest them. It is an indictable offence. They can charge them, fingerprint them, and then they can reduce or withdraw the charge afterwards, while that person's fingerprints are on file.

We see the same kind of thing occurring to a certain degree under section 85 of the Criminal Code, where they lay charges against individuals for using a firearm in the commission of an offence and then later withdraw those charges as a plea bargaining tool. I see the same kind of power and authority being granted through these sections.

Therefore, the purpose of our amendments is to eliminate the draconian measures and penalties that are included in this bill. I might bring to everyone's attention that the idea of sentencing someone or making them liable to a penalty of ten years for

deliberately neglecting to register their .22 or their shotgun is absolutely absurd and unacceptable.

We all remember Mr. Lortie, who went into the Quebec assembly and murdered three people. He served ten years. To equate that kind of an act and that kind of punishment with the failure to register a rifle or a shotgun is to me beyond comprehension and absurd.

These amendments are designed to decriminalize offences where there is no mens rea involved, no intent and no overt act to endanger anyone. It is simply that they have failed, whether deliberately or inadvertently, to fulfil an administrative act, which is to register. It should not be a criminal offence and there should be no means whereby the police can arrest the person under those circumstances and have that person face an indictable offence where the punishment is as much as ten years or five years, depending on whether it is under section 92 or 91 of this act.

Those are my comments on that.

• (1630)

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to the amendments to Bill C–68. The reason I am so delighted is that since the government invoked time allocation last Thursday, I find myself being one of the chosen few who will be able to speak at report stage.

The government's motive is one of fear. It knows that many of its backbenchers are already going to vote against the bill and they are afraid that if Bill C–68 is not dealt with before summer, many more of their backbenchers would find themselves having to commit that greatest of all sins a Liberal member can commit, the sin of representing one's constituents.

That is what I am attempting to do with this bill. I am trying to gauge the sentiments of my constituents. The bill is one of the few issues where people have expressed a great deal of interest. In my recently released householder I provided each side of the argument with the opportunity to state the case for or against the bill. Representing those who support the bill is none other than the Minister of Justice.

My householder is in the homes of my constituents. While I have started to receive responses, the government's artificial deadline will prevent many of their voices from being heard. If the majority of my constituents wanted registration, given the opportunity, I would support the registration portion of Bill C–68.

It seems the government wants as few voices heard as possible. The bill has been rushed through the entire process. The schedule to hear witnesses was fixed in advance, ignoring hundreds of requests by groups and individuals to appear.

The timeframe to enter amendments was rushed, not allowing sufficient time to have legislative counsel prepare amendments. The clause by clause consideration was rushed, forcing the committee to sit until one o'clock in the morning.

What can one say about report stage and third reading? The tactic of introducing time allocation before debate even starts is a tactic that would have made the Mulroney administration blush.

The Liberals always complained when the Tories introduced closure but they have fully embraced the concept themselves. What is interesting is that there has never been a hint that the Reform Party or anybody else was attempting to filibuster the bill.

We have played by the rules, trying to improve a poorly drafted bill in case it passed third reading. How badly drafted was this bill? Let me say that during the clause by clause consideration the member for Crowfoot noticed that the wording of one clause would make it necessary for anybody wishing to buy a box of ammunition, even a box of .22 shells, would have been required to obtain prior approval of the chief firearms officer of the province.

It was interesting to see the look of confusion on the faces of the parliamentary secretary and the assistant deputy minister when they quickly realized that that was not their intent.

The bill has been amended but this is an example of the poor quality of legislation that goes through when Parliament rushes. Another example of the quality of this bill is the list of 37 amendments that the Minister of Justice is making at report stage. This is in addition to approximately 80 amendments that the government made in committee during clause by clause.

Government members say: "So what? Who cares? We are sitting so high in the polls". One wonders if they will remember that the Ontario Liberals went into their provincial election riding high at 53 per cent in the opinion polls as well. Probably not, since Liberals have very short memories. After all, it was only in the last Parliament when Liberals were loudly protesting over rules by the Tory government to introduce more legislation where Parliament would be bypassed with orders in council.

However, these protests are now silent as the government has created unprecedented provisions for government by order in council. There are 75 instances in this bill that call for regulations to be introduced. The government's attitude is forget Parliament, the cabinet knows what is best for Canada. After all, if amendments had to come through Parliament there may be

more of those Liberal backbenchers who may try and represent their constituents. The government would not want that to happen, would it?

Its attitude is: "Trust us. We know what is best". Having sat through the committee hearings on Bill C–68, it is apparent that the government does not know what it is doing.

The pretence under which this bill was introduced was that it would reduce crime and save lives. Unfortunately there was no such substantive evidence presented that indicated this bill would do either. The bill was purported to go after the criminal use of firearms, yet most of the bill is directed against the ordinary law–abiding gun owner.

• (1635)

Those aspects of the bill that do deal with the criminal use of firearms are insignificant. That is why I have introduced the amendments I have.

The government chose to identify 10 serious crimes such as manslaughter, attempted murder, aggravated sexual assault, robbery and to create a minimum four year sentence if a firearm was used. However, what difference will these minimum sentences make? Not very much because the down side of minimum sentences is that they all too often because maximum sentences. Unless the minimum sentence is raised to a level that is sufficiently higher than the current average sentence, there will be no deterrent effect.

Will a four year minimum sentence for manslaughter with a firearm prevent any deaths? The average sentence for manslaughter in British Columbia is currently four years. Under current law, if a firearm is used in a death an additional one year sentence is added under section 85. How is it possible that a four year minimum sentence could have any deterrent effect when the average sentence is already five years?

That is why I have entered amendments that would increase the minimum sentence for manslaughter to eight years. For eight other crimes it would be increased to six years and for one crime, criminal negligence causing death, we are suggesting the minimum sentence should be reduced.

Another flaw in the bill is that under these 10 specific crimes, it is necessary to prove that the object used in the crime is a firearm. While this may not be difficult in manslaughter cases or those charged with causing bodily harm, what about cases involving sexual assault, kidnapping or robbery? If the gun is not fired or if it is not recovered, how does the crown prove that the object used meets the legal definition of a firearm? The short answer is that it cannot. Thus, in many of these cases there will never be a charge of using a firearm because the crown simply will not be able to prove that a firearm is used.

That is why I am moving the second set of amendments. It will no longer be necessary to prove whether the object used was a firearm or just an imitation firearm. The victim of a sexual assault may not know if the object used is a real firearm or just a replica. The terror is equal in any event. To let a sex offender walk away from this crime because the victim is unable to state whether it was a real firearm or just an imitation is wrong. These clauses must be amended.

Bill C–68 is bad legislation. It does not do what it sets out to accomplish. If this law is not bad enough, the way the government has handled it is even worse. How can anyone justify closing down debate before it even started on legislation that will not come fully into effect for another eight years? They cannot. Arrogant governments believe they do not have to explain anything, except when they try to explain to themselves why they have been rejected by the voters and have fallen into oblivion.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in listening to the debate I cannot help but wonder why the opposition is all of a sudden so exercised about time allocation when in fact we dialogued about this bill for almost a year.

The Minister of Justice went from coast to coast to coast speaking to groups on the bill. The subject matter of the bill was brought forward on November 30 and the bill was brought forward based on that subject matter on February 14, 1995. There has been a lot of dialogue and a lot of consultation.

The committee has met, but not all the witnesses who wanted to appear could appear. There was a restriction on the number of witnesses, but it was done with the belief that those witnesses would have their points of view brought forward by either a national organization to which they belonged or a similar organization which would speak for the the interests of witnesses. There were individuals who wanted to come forward. That was not possible.

• (1640)

Many people wanted to speak to the bill as with most important bills. It is not democracy to hear everybody. That is not the way it has been practised since Athens and the days of Pericles. The way it is done is to choose representatives to come before the committee.

Also, we are talking about the amendments today at report stage. In some cases we are getting a point of view on these amendments and in other cases we are not. The fact of the matter is we have third reading yet to come.

Perhaps not everybody who wants to speak at third reading will be given the opportunity to do so. At committee stage we allowed members to have five minute interventions on points before the committee, which was requested.

Members will know that as speakers come before the House and speak at third reading that the first speeches are 20 minutes and then the other speeches are 10 minutes. Many members are giving those 10 minutes speeches here today.

Relating to the last speaker on minimum sentences, this area has been given a great deal of attention. The member is not satisfied that in 10 very serious offences the minimum sentence would be four years. She wants it increased to eight years in the case of manslaughter and six years in other cases. That is one point of view.

We have had witnesses before the committee who felt that a 10 year minimum, and in fact the previous speaker from the Bloc condemned the government for having a four year minimum in these cases, saying that the discretion should be allowed to go to the courts as is the case at the present time. We have heard it from both sides. We feel four years is a period of time that is defensible in this case.

Minimum sentences are never something that a government wants to bring forward because it takes discretion away from the courts. The courts are put in place to judge the actions of our fellow citizens in relation to the laws, both statute and common law. They are to use their discretion and they are trained professionals in the law and with experience on the bench.

To say that we are going to implement minimum sentences is a curtailment of that discretion and to say that we are going to have a minimum sentence of eight years is an absolute affront to that discretion. The question is, would a minimum sentence of that extent in fact not be challenged under the charter of rights and freedoms. Frankly I feel that it would.

We have have a minimum sentence for those 10 situations. We have a minimum sentence of one year for illegal importation and exportation of a firearm and also for other criminal offences as well. We have attempted to impress on Canadians the seriousness of the wrongful use of a firearm with these minimum sentences. There is a limit to how far we can go and many people and institutions have told us we have gone too far already. We do not think so but we do not think that going further will gain any respect for the law. It is only going to lead to a complete and utter disrespect for the law where the law arbitrarily is imposing extremely harsh sentences without the judge being able to have some latitude.

We talk about section 85 and plea bargaining and also about section 85 with respect to an imitation firearm. If we are going to give four years for a firearm, it is awfully hard to give four years to an imitation firearm that is not a danger to the person on the other side of the counter. There has to be some discretion. It is still possible for the judge to give a stronger sentence. That imitation firearm would still come under section 85 where robbery is included. There would then be a subsequent one year sentence for the imitation firearm.

• (1645)

The case is also put to the attorneys general and provincial ministers of justice as to why these extra charges are plea bargained away. This area is within their discretion. It does not have to happen in the provincial jurisdiction because the provinces have control over the administration of justice. As in the case of dangerous offenders they have to say these offences are not to be plea bargained away.

I want to mention Motion No. 133 as brought forward by a member of the Bloc Quebecois. Motion No. 133 would impose a simple fine for first and second offences. These are offences that would be under clause 107.(1), the new offence under the firearms bill which takes the possession of unregistered long guns out of the Criminal Code and puts them into the firearms act.

The member suggests a simple fine for first and second offences of not only illegal long guns but also for possession of prohibited fully automatic firearms, silencers and prohibited ammunition such as armour piercing bullets. Such a lenient offence would be a mockery of what we are attempting to do under this legislation. Clause 107.(1) attempts to treat leniently and with some kind of compassion those who honestly did not register their long guns. It is certainly not an intent to excuse people with prohibited fully automatic firearms from non–registration.

The penalties the member would impose under Motion No. 133 are much less severe than is the case right now. It would say to someone who blatantly violates the law that they would not be convicted of a criminal offence. As I mentioned, it would trivialize the severity of possessing firearms without a licence and a registration certificate.

We have attempted to bring forward laws and eventually regulations that will not minimize the seriousness of the offence but which will honestly recognize the honest mistake of non–registration. They will also allow those who are in charge of enforcing these laws to deal with the offences in a humane and a compassionate way relating to the facts of the situations as they see them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Waterloo—national defence.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the motions before us in group No. 4, if I am not mistaken. I would like to point out that the Criminal Code currently provides a number of mandatory minimum punishments. The one of interest to us today is set out in section 85 of the Code. It reads as follows: "Everyone who uses a

firearm while committing [—]an indictable offence [—]is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment, in the case of a first offence, [—]for not more than fourteen years and not less than one year, and, in the case of a second or subsequent offence, [—]for not more than fourteen years and not less than three years".

• (1650)

As we can see, the Criminal Code already provides a mandatory minimum sentence of one year for the use of a firearm with criminal intent. It also provides a minimum sentence of three years for all subsequent offences. These sentences are served consecutively to any other sentence. That means that an individual found guilty of robbery, for example, would be sentenced for the principal offence—the robbery itself—and would then have this sentence extended by one or three years, as the case may be.

The proposal by the Minister of Justice to increase the minimum sentence to four years would not improve the situation in any way. At best, individuals would be given only the minimum sentence of four years. At worst, the Supreme Court would consider the provisions setting the mandatory minimum punishment at four years unconstitutional, because it would consider such punishment cruel and unusual under section 12 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

At the moment, an individual found guilty of one of the offences set forth in the new section 85 could very easily be sentenced to a term longer than that contemplated by the Minister of Justice. In fact, the combination of a consecutive mandatory sentence and sentencing for the principal offence could easily exceed four years.

Section 85 of the Criminal Code is therefore amended in Bill C–68 with the addition of a list of ten violent offences to which the provision will apply. We have wondered about the seriousness of the minister in establishing this list. It includes manslaughter, a crime without criminal intent, but it does not include armed assault. Is punishment to be the same, regardless of whether the victim survives his or her wounds?

Forcible confinement is not on the list either, although kidnapping and hostage–taking are. I must say I have serious doubts about the deterrent effect of an increase in the minimum sentence provided in section 85 and related sections.

I would like to point out that the working document prepared by the Department of Justice on the present section 85, in particular, and on the imposition of minimum sentence in general, concludes that the public as a whole is not aware which offences carry mandatory minimum sentence. It is hard to see how such a measure would deter potential delinquents, since they generally do not know what the minimum sentence is.

In addition, the same document that the Minister of Justice should have examined more closely concludes that mandatory minimum sentences probably have very little effect as deterrents and on the rate of the commission of serious crimes. Robbery is a prime example. And what is worse, apparently juries are less inclined to find someone guilty if they know that the crime the defendant is accused of committing carries a mandatory sentence.

If judges choose not to allow sentences for multiple offences to be served concurrently, the result would be a substantial growth in the prison population. In fact, the minimum sentence of four years would be the starting point to which any additional period of detention necessary would be added, depending on the circumstances surrounding the offence.

Obviously, an individual accused of several offences could serve sentences consecutively. The Minister of Justice seems to believe naïvely that detention centres will be able to hold more inmates. He argues, in fact, that his bill will be a deterrent and will decrease the number of crimes perpetrated with a weapon.

He has no way of knowing what impact his bill will have on the number of convictions made under his reformed system in the future. Let us not forget that a chain is only as strong as the weakest of its links.

• (1655)

If we increase the minimum sentence provided for in section 85 of the Criminal Code, we must expect the prison population to swell although we do not have the facilities needed to accommodate the new inmates.

The warning issued by Université de Montréal Professor Pierre Landreville is worthy of consideration. In an article published in the December 23, 1994 edition of *Le Devoir*, Mr. Landreville outlines the danger of such legislation, and I quote: "[—] every year in Quebec, some 1,500 individuals are convicted and could eventually be sentenced to a minimum of four years in prison, in addition to the sentence given for the main offence. Quebec's prison population, which is now around 4,000, would almost double in the first four years following the implementation of this measure".

The increase in the prison population would lead to an increase in related costs. Did anyone bother to find out how much Bill C–68 would cost, when we know that, in 1992–93, the annual cost of keeping a single inmate averaged $56,000 in maximum security and $36,000 in medium security?

The mandatory minimum sentence is the minimum number of years to be served. In a so–called clarification effort, minimum punishment was included in the wording of the offence itself. That is why we find the phrase "to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of four years" in 10 different clauses

listing possible sentences for the offences in question. I am talking about clauses 135 through 144 of Bill C–68.

The amendments put forward by the Bloc Quebecois in Motions No. 182 and following are all aimed at eliminating the mandatory minimum sentence by revoking these clauses. Significantly increasing mandatory minimum sentences is an ill–advised public relations exercise. There is no better way to score points.

The Minister of Justice wanted to ease the fears of a generally misinformed public and to make the pro–gun lobby swallow the pill by claiming that Bill C–68 does not deal with the registration of long guns. He failed miserably in both cases.

Increasing mandatory minimum sentences involves far too many uncertainties, considering eventual tangible benefits. Bill C–68 is a bill on public safety and not a marketing operation. The Minister of Justice would have been better off explaining his bill and answering gun owners' legitimate questions. Had he done so, he would not have provoked such a general outcry.

I therefore urge the House to support the Bloc motions, which reflect the kind of society we all want to live in.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity today to express my support for the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois and put them into the context of this debate.

In this instance the emphasis is mainly on decriminalization, and that is entirely in line with the position taken by the Bloc Quebecois which is to make this a balanced piece of legislation. This seems to have been a rather difficult debate, with some very active lobbies on both sides, and I must say that in my case, I got some firsthand experience of this in my riding, and with citizens who want to make sure that this process produces some effective results.

So with this in mind, the Bloc worked on this bill and tried to come up with some satisfactory results.

What is the primary objective? Basically, to improve gun control. Prevention is the main thing, in other words, we want to ensure that now and in the near and not so near future, we can improve the situation. Through better control, we also want to reduce the number of guns that are out there but are not being used, and a number of examples come to mind. Everyone knows people who, somewhere in a closet, have a gun they inherited and which they still have but do not use. They still own it but hardly ever use it. There are a lot of guns around.

• (1700)

This bill is rather well received by the general public, especially in Quebec. However, the groups that are directly affected are more sceptical. They have expressed certain reservations and, in some cases, out and out dissent. Generally speaking, the people most likely to be affected—and I am thinking of hunters, of whom I represent a certain number in my riding—are wondering what will happen. There are a lot of rumours about what it might actually cost them. They have sometimes felt that the government was out to get them.

Many people who use guns, either hunting rifles or revolvers, use them responsibly. So we do not really want to brand them as criminals, and that is why we would like to see some flexibility with respect to criminalization. We are suggesting ways to make this position more flexible.

In the case of Quebec, the registration of firearms, including hunting rifles, has been in effect for a number of years. The problem is how the process is used. Now the government wants to create a national registry. I realize some people are going to say that it is like starting all over again. They say: when I bought my gun at the store, they took down the serial number and all that. Now, when they want to set up a national registry, for Canada, in this case, we have to more or less repeat the same process. I agree there are some costs involved in implementing the system. The bulk of the cost would be during the start up phase, but subsequently, we can assume that the system would become much simpler and far more flexible. Nevertheless, there are some questions about these new measures.

I want to make it clear that we in the Bloc Quebecois support the principle of improving gun control. However, we want to minimize the impact on the individual, and in this case, the user. Since this bill is intended to benefit the general public, it would perhaps make sense for everyone to contribute to the start up costs. I do not own any firearms and it would not bother me to contribute as a citizen, as a taxpayer, to this system's start up or to pay for a firearm's registration, if one day I decide to purchase one, on the condition, of course, that the fees are reasonable.

Throughout the process, we have maintained pressure on the government to banish the rumours regarding figures and to reassure people that the cost would be reasonable. Because a bill is just a bill, its effectiveness relies on the decision of individuals to respect the system and the law. It is they who ultimately determine how effective a law is going to be. When the majority of people respect it, it becomes a standard for society. At that point, it becomes easier to enforce. The best way to have people respect a law is peer pressure.

Therefore, I agree with the statement that we all have to contribute and that users also have to do their part. Under the current proposal, a $10 fee will be imposed for the registration of the first 10 firearms. Most Canadians do not own more than 10 firearms. These fees seem reasonable. Some people do have more than 10, for example collectors, but there are special provisions for them. Now, an ownership certificate is also involved. To be able to own a firearm, people will have to purchase a certificate at a cost of approximately $10 per year, payable for a period of five years. It is important to note that this

ownership certificate replaces a certificate that already exists, the firearms acquisition certificate.

For a good many people, the only fee involved will be the initial cost of registering their firearms, $10. I think that this is reasonable and so do a good number of my constituents. The fear they have is that an amendment will be introduced later which will raise costs exponentially. They want reassurances, like the one discussed in committee, that the government will not pull a fast one on them.

• (1705)

In this regard, we suggested indexing it to the cost of living, which would appear to be one of the most reasonable proposals made. We cannot, however, use the same formula, because of the way the House works. So, I now propose, instead, that these fees be frozen for 20 years, although I still think our first position was better and more acceptable to the government.

However, we make the point again to the government that this would be one way it could ensure the greatest support and the least resistance for its bill. I think the people in my region and in other regions will accept this system, so long as it means the least possible inconvenience for them, including any financial inconvenience that may be involved. The registration fee must not be seen as a disguised tax on firearms.

The other point is to ensure as well that an inefficient bureaucracy is not created with the legislation. As members of the opposition, we must ensure over time that the system exists without accompanying machinery of no practical value and that the people working in the system do what they are supposed to be do, that is, control weapons, so that we do not end up with a system costing more than it should.

If these points can be assured, I think the bill will be more saleable. Of course, there has been considerable debate about the effectiveness of registration. Will it really meet the prevention goals? This is, I admit, where debate was perhaps the most difficult. People, experts from both sides testified for and against registration. We as legislators must make up our minds after listening to experts who disagree on this subject and to people from both sides who lobby hard to get their message across. Some of them even resort to threats, linking this to election and political issues, which I find somewhat regrettable because there are other, more important matters.

That said, we must make up our minds, and I am now one of those who have come to support this bill, because I think that we must take this step in our social development. Although we may have some doubts, are these doubts enough to abstain, in my case, or dissent? I think not, and that is why we must support this bill.

But—and I will conclude on this—we are asking the minister to be a little more flexible to ensure that people will rally behind this bill, and that any negative impact on those affected will be minimal. In this regard, I think that their only concern at the present time is the matter of costs. I feel that going along the lines of the amendments that follow would allow us to take a very important step while being a little more flexible on decriminalization.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I heard earlier in a speech by one of the government members that the objective of the legislation was to improve public safety on the streets and in our homes. Every single Reform member in the House is out for exactly the same objective, to improve public safety on the streets and in our homes. Unfortunately the bill has very little to do with that.

I have asked a number of people, including members of the House, to explain what they think the bill is all about. One member suggested that it was the warm fuzzies, the warm fuzzies simply being that it makes us feel good, that it makes us feel better.

The justice minister has been very interesting in coming forward with a figure of $85 million to make his creation work, $85 million to register seven million guns. We are taking at look at the imposition of registration and we are taking a look at the expenditure of $85 million. It reminds me an awful lot of the idea of what it would cost for transportation of a particular entity.

• (1710)

If we take into account only the capital cost of the car and not any of the actual running expenses, we might get a rather distorted picture.

I do not buy the justice minister's estimate of $85 million by a long shot. I do not think it is anywhere even remotely close. At best, even if that was the federal cost, what about the provincial cost?

I asked the justice minister about a situation where environmental activist Paul Watson talked about the fact that he had used a stun gun in either New Brunswick or the province of Quebec, I cannot recall. He rose in the House and made the very clear point that the administration of justice was a provincial issue, a provincial responsibility.

Even if the $85 million figure were believable, which I do not think it is, the real cost of administering this useless program will fall to the provinces.

I also cite from page 13480 of *Hansard*, June 8, wherein the Speaker of the House made a ruling on a point of order raised by the House leader for the Reform Party. I recognize that clause 98 was dealt with in Motion No. 3. Nonetheless this is germane to my argument. He said:

> Clause 98 as introduced in the House had the concept of "police officer" for which the concept of "inspector" has been substituted by the committee. It still remains a provincial ministerial responsibility as to which class of individuals shall be so designated. It may well be that a provincial minister decides to recruit an entirely new class of individuals for the purpose of clause 98, but it clearly remains the decision of the provincial authority to do so. Whether the class of individuals are called inspectors or police officers has no direct impact on the royal recommendation attached to the bill.

He was ruling on the fact, in the judgment of the Speaker, that the costs of the program were actually going to be borne by the provinces in the same way as the cost of driving the automobile once it is purchased are borne by the owner. In actual fact the cost to the Canadian taxpayer, even if we could believe the $85 million as a starting point, is $85 million to buy into the initial registration of the program. The enforcement of the program will be something quite different.

Let us deal with the $85 million figure. I want to restate for the third or fourth time that I do not buy the $85 million figure even at the federal level. What could we do with money equivalent to that?

I read in the June 10 *Gazette*:

> The RCMP will spend $68 million over the next few years in an attempt to curb smuggling along the 700-kilometre border between Quebec and the U.S.
>
> The largest number of new officers will go to the Valleyfield detachment, near the Akwasasne Mohawk reserve.
>
> Akwasasne, which straddles the Canada-U.S. border and incorporates parts of Quebec and Ontario, is considered a key crossing point for contraband.

If we are to spend $68 million in that case or if we are to spend, as the justice minister has suggested, this impossible figure of $85 million, would it not be good if we could actually spend it on something that would accomplish that for which it is being spent?

It seems rather illogical when one refers to the polls that the justice minister and parliamentary secretary keep referring to. They say that 60 per cent, 68 per cent or 75 per cent of people are in favour of registration. That is terrific, except invariably—and I will make up a figure—68 per cent of people are in favour of registration but 72 per cent of people do not think it will do anything. What is the point of the registration program if in the belief of Canadians it will not do anything? Why are we getting into it in the first place? Why are we harassing ordinary law-abiding Canadians?

• (1715)

With respect to the source of weapons coming into Canada, I will read a small part of a very profound report by the MacKenzie Institute. It is rather detailed but is also quite enlightening.

> By the time of writing, 102 weapons which have been sold to the four Mohawks were recovered by Canadian police forces. Details on these firearms include the following: 65 light semi-automatic pistols; 32 semi-automatic pistols; four revolvers; one submachine gun; at least another 21 light semi-automatic pistols, 39 semi-automatic pistols and four Cobray submachine guns pass through this connection into Canada.

What possible effect did or would the registration program have on the passage of this arsenal?

> Other weapons that were not traced to Vermont but were seized along with those 102 weapons included five assault rifles, two submachine guns, a sawed off shotgun, 14 other pistols and 23 unspecified weapons. At least five of these were also smuggled in from the United States. Of the 102 weapons, various Canadian police forces have provided information on the crimes the firearms were associated with, and/or the history of the suspects who had been in possession of the firearms.

The arms provided by the four Mohawks were linked to the following crimes and criminals. Again, I am only going to read a small part of the list. "Thirty-five were associates and/or members of the Russian Mafiya, Armenian thieves", and it goes on and on.

The connections are amazing. The point I am trying to make is that our border at this point is no bar to guns. A registration program is going to have no effect in changing that situation. This is underscored and underlined even by the Canadian Police Association.

My point is why are we going after targeting law-abiding Canadian citizens when the surveys themselves which supposedly support registration say that people recognize registration will make no difference. We are going after the wrong people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am far from happy with Bill C-68 in its present form. As usual, I think the government has turned a deaf ear to the various motions in amendment put forward by the Bloc Quebecois. Once again, the government has missed a wonderful opportunity to improve its bill by incorporating the findings of the various committees, the conclusions reached at public hearings or quite simply the views contained in letters sent in by our constituents throughout this country.

One thing is for sure: for or against, this bill leaves no one indifferent. I have said it before, and I will say it again, although this is a very controversial bill, it is, in my view, essential and in the interests of all Quebecers and Canadians that the govern-

ment pass it so that citizens are better protected against the upsurge in crime and violence that can strike anyone at any time.

I cannot, at this time, go into all the details of this bill, but it is clear from the controversy surrounding it that it has some major flaws. I will mention just two in particular. First, in a move designed to impress the public, the Minister of Justice included in his bill a minimum sentence of four years, in lieu of the provisions of section 85 of the Criminal Code. In its present form, section 85 provides that a criminal who uses a firearm while committing an offence will have to serve an additional consecutive sentence of one year. In the case of a second or subsequent offence, the additional sentence is three years.

• (1720)

Surely the Minister of Justice cannot seriously think that a minimum sentence of four years on top of the original sentence will have a dissuasive effect. It will not. It will merely serve to worsen the already serious problem of overcrowding in Canada's prison system.

Furthermore, I would remind you that members of the Quebec bar told the committee that a minimum sentence of four years for use of a firearm in committing an offence could result in something like an additional 250 people a year joining the prison population. When you think about how much it costs taxpayers to keep one offender in jail, I do not know whether this country, which is bankrupt, currently has the means to support another 250 people in jail. The auditor general also spoke of this subject.

My colleague, the hon. member for Saint–Hubert, the Bloc Quebecois justice critic, is proposing to simply drop clauses 135 to 144, which merely list ten crimes with a minimum sentence of four years. I think that we should stick to the current rules established in the Criminal Code. It should be up to judges to set the sentences for the various crimes committed by offenders.

Would it not be wiser to follow Quebec's example in justice matters, and to channel our efforts towards better understanding, by putting emphasis on prevention and bringing in measures which promote rehabilitation, instead of giving in, like this government has, to repressive movements from all over the country, which are expounded mostly by the Reform Party.

Another point that is of particular concern to me is that section 106 of the current Criminal Code stipulates that people who make a living from hunting do not have to pay the licencing fees related to firearm ownership.

I know very well that we have grown accustomed to the government's double standards over the past two years, but this bill is too serious and important for that kind of game. Clause 110 of the bill would effectively allow the governor in council to introduce discriminatory regulations uniquely for the benefit of aboriginal peoples. I fail to see why belonging to a certain class of persons changes the application of the legislation.

It is therefore imperative that any person who owns a firearm be obliged to pay registration fees, whether that person lives off the proceeds of the hunt or is a native. This government must not allow the creation of different classes of citizens. It is not helpful at all and merely creates conflicts within our society.

Guns must be controlled and regulated by laws that are logical, sensible and apply to all citizens of this country, irrespective of their age, sex, occupation or cultural heritage.

I know this bill does not enjoy unanimous support, but we must remember that as elected representatives, it is our duty to protect our constituents, often from themselves.

This bill should respond to the main concerns which have been raised constantly in the past five to ten years with respect to gun control.

• (1725)

We know this bill is not a panacea for the crime and violence that exist in our society. However, it is time to acquire the additional tools we need to deal with these problems. I think this bill is a tool that will help society evolve, and that a few years from now, it will be too late.

Finally, I may recall that at the present rate, there will be about four million guns of all kinds in less than ten years. We cannot afford to leave this legacy to future generations. It is time to act now. This has gone on long enough.

[*English*]

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to discuss report stage of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. This is perhaps the most controversial piece of legislation the House has seen since the implementation of the GST. It is also a piece of legislation which has caused a great deal of debate and at times heated discussion since this issue was first raised in the House.

I have learned there is little or no middle ground on the issue of gun control. It is an issue that Canadians either do or do not support. I surveyed my constituents of Edmonton—Strathcona twice to gauge their feelings on this issue. I did this through household surveys and received conflicting results. Some individuals suggested the first question was too broad and all encompassing and others felt the second question was too narrow. This is a problem in which each side is divided into black and white; there does not seem to be any shade of grey.

How do we resolve this conflict in order to vote according to the wishes of the majority of our constituents? I felt the best way to resolve the problem was to bring in an independent third party. In this case it was an independent pollster. This polling

firm's objective was to find out how my constituents truly felt on the issue of gun control. The results were as follows.

Just under 50 per cent of the respondents said they believed the government's proposed gun control legislation should not be passed without modification or amendment, while only 28 per cent said it should be passed. Over 55 per cent believed that the potential benefits of the proposed legislation would not justify the cost of the bureaucracy required to enforce it compared with 30 per cent on the yes side. An astonishing 70 per cent believed that the authorities would be granted too many powers concerning the issues of search, seizure and compensation, while less than 25 per cent felt that the new powers would be justified. Finally, almost 80 per cent of the constituents from Edmonton—Strathcona believed that criminals would not comply with the justice minister's proposed gun control legislation compared with only 11 per cent who said that criminals would.

It is also interesting that this government seems to be travelling down the same road as the previous Conservative government. There was an outcry of self–righteousness from the Liberals while they were in opposition over the Conservatives' use of time allocation to ram through legislation.

The Liberals had managed to make the most faithful individuals of our democratic process turn into pessimists. This Liberal government is trampling on Canadians' democratic rights by limiting the time in which we as parliamentarians can debate legislation put forward in this House.

• (1730)

The Mulroney government used time allocation 35 times to pass 200 bills. That is 17 per cent of the Mulroney government's bills, which is shamefully unacceptable, as was indicated by the other side.

Now let us look at the government's record, in which time allocation has been used an unprecedented 14 times on only 59 bills, including this one, Bill C–68. On this bill time allocation has been used not once, not twice, but three times. In other words, the government has used time allocation 24 per cent of the time, 7 per cent more than the Mulroney government. That is totally unacceptable to me and to the constituents of Edmonton—Strathcona and I believe to all Canadians.

The government must start to listen to the people and not the spin doctors, or else it as well will be able to hold its caucus meetings in a phone booth.

The people of Edmonton—Strathcona have spoken out on this issue, and the majority concur with the Reform Party's position that registration is not the means to an end in which the end is a decrease in crime. It is for this reason that the Reform Party has brought forward amendments to split the bill during second reading. We would have passed the crime control measures immediately, which would have allowed us more time to spend debating the merits and pitfalls of a full scale registration plan.

We as a caucus applaud the justice minister's endeavour to curtail the deliberate criminal misuse of firearms. He has done this through increased penalties for criminal misuse of firearms and through an increased effort to further enhance controls on illegal border crossings.

Unfortunately certain aspects of Bill C–68 will have a detrimental impact on the competitive sports shooting group. If we are to believe the majority of shooting organizations, they feel there is a real possibility of the loss of Canada's sports shooting structure. Prohibiting or restricting firearms that are commonly used in legal, legitimate, recreational circumstances such as casual target shooting or in formally organized competition does not prevent criminal acts. It only further restricts the rights and freedoms of law–abiding citizens.

As the Reform Party's critic for amateur sports, I feel obligated to speak directly to the specific sections of the bill that have the most direct effect on sports shooting organizations across Canada. We proposed amendments in committee that would have allowed those individuals who are members of the registered recognized shooting associations to be exempt from Bill C–68, and this was defeated. Our position is that we do not want to prohibit guns that are used specifically for competition and thereby prohibit those at the entry level from entering the sport.

Our reasoning is that you do not come into the world of competitive shooting with a $5,000 or $6,000 target pistol. You start off at the entry level with a very inexpensive firearm. You join a club and you take up shooting. Invariably these firearms tend to have barrel lengths of four inches or so and to be .32 calibre, which is what the Olympic shooters use.

It is a concern for me that the proud tradition that Canada has in competitive shooting may be lost. A perfect example was during the Commonwealth Games last year, an event that resulted in 43 medals for Canada. Twenty–two were shooting medals. That is over 50 per cent of Canada's total medals awarded. Under this bill, that number will decline dramatically.

Bill C–68 prohibits two–thirds of the pistols owned by law–abiding citizens. Many of these are collectors' items or are target pistols in current use in competitions such as the Olympics and Commonwealth Games. Some of these firearms may be grandfathered, but that is simply a delay.

• (1735)

The majority of my constituents feel that Bill C–68 is an ineffective and intrusive piece of legislation. What Canadians, both rural and urban, want is crime control, plain and simple.

Until these types of problems which I, the rest of the Reform caucus, the people of my constituency and the people of Canada have raised are dealt with, we as a party and I as an individual cannot support this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wanted to rise and speak on these amendments to Bill C–68, first because we supported the bill at first and second reading. We supported the principle, because we believe virtue is unassailable.

Surveys reveal that 79 per cent of Canadians and Quebecers agree with the adoption of measures making it more difficult to obtain firearms. We see this as a modern measure with an eye to the future. We want to take steps to limit violence, and this is why we approved the bill at first and second reading.

We also want to continue to support this bill. However, some amendments seem reasonable, and the government should permit some changes to the bill. In some cases, the changes sought are even more stringent than what was proposed. We want legislation that is more balanced and fairer for people.

It must be credible. The people governed by it must believe that it will improve things. If people do not believe in it, it becomes like other oppressive legislation, like burdensome taxes, which we already know about. When taxes become burdensome, what do people do? They start smuggling and black marketeering. They find a way to get around the law.

If people see this legislation, which is so important, as exploiting them, if some people, such as hunters, feel they have to pay a hidden tax, they, and there are more of them than any other group covered by the legislation, will probably be less likely to comply with it, because they find it oppressive.

We therefore proposed certain amendments, on decriminalization among other things, because someone who forgets to register a weapon is not a criminal. This person presents no danger to society. This person does not deserve to go to prison, as someone said before me, at a cost of $50,000, $60,000 or $78,000 a year in a federal penitentiary. This is what it costs to keep a person in prison.

It seems to us that certain sentences are not consistent with their intent or with the offence committed. We understand that a punishable offence must be tied to a reasonable sanction. The proposals we are making, however, seem more reasonable than what the bill currently provides.

We do not think that, if these amendments are voted down tomorrow morning,—or tonight, because we will probably vote tonight—that we will vote against the whole bill. No, that will not be the case. We want to play fair. We therefore propose to the government that it accept some of the amendments that will make it easier for people to accept the bill without putting their peace and security at risk and that will enable it to co–operate, to accept some help from the opposition so that this legislation may be civilized, modern and fair to everyone.

• (1740)

Other inexpensive measures could be implemented. Hunters have never been opposed to safety measures. Quebec already has a law requiring people to store firearms in a separate, locked cabinet, and to keep bullets in another room of the house. We proposed in amendment an inexpensive locking device that can be obtained for $10 or $15.

If the manufacturer were required to supply this device with the firearm, it would cost even less. The purchaser of a firearm would automatically have the locking device and citizens would be safer. This is a small, one time outlay, but the continuing costs of licences or registration certificates are much less acceptable to hunters. If, however, sportsmen in Quebec and in the rest of Canada were certain that, despite the cost to them, the bill would save lives, I think that they would throw their support behind it tomorrow morning. While there is still time, let us take the action that will make it easier for people to comply.

I hope that the government will see the validity of the amendments put forward by the official opposition and that it will vote in favour of these amendments this evening.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that the Liberal government has bitten off a lot more than it bargained for as it proceeds to ram Bill C–68 through the House.

The government contends its gun control bill will do wonders to prevent gun related crimes. The government contends that Canadians from coast to coast want Bill C–68. The government contends that the cost for tighter gun control is minimal. While the government contends, Canadians are learning the facts about gun control and the facts about gun related crimes.

Let us start with the government's premise that gun control will reduce violent crime. Statistics Canada reported in 1991 that a total of 753 homicides were committed. Two–thirds of the murderers had prior criminal records. Almost half, 46 per cent, of those homicides were committed during the perpetration of another criminal offence, and only 36 per cent of these homicides were committed with firearms, half of which were committed with handguns, which are already required to be registered. If we look further into the statistics we see that 71 per

cent of these homicides were committed by individuals who could not even legally obtain a firearm.

Despite the fact that Canadians have been required to register their handguns since 1934, gun related crime has remained relatively constant over the years. That is because those restrictions have not prevented criminals from getting handguns. Tougher gun control will merely drive up the street value of weapons, making gun smuggling more lucrative than ever.

Bill C–68 in all likelihood will actually increase the criminal element in our society instead of reducing it.

It is worth mentioning that New Zealand abandoned firearms registration in 1983 after the police there said that registration diverts police away from more important duties. In Australia more than 40 per cent of firearms have not been registered, even after decades of requirements that they do so. The justice minister would do well to look at the experiences with gun registration in other countries.

The Liberals also contend that Canadians from coast to coast want Bill C–68. The Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Bar Association, and a host of provincial governments are not in favour of the very contentious provisions of Bill C–68.

• (1745)

Polls show that as more people learn about Bill C–68 the support drops. That is why the government is ramming Bill C–68 through the House by invoking closure.

There is the cost of universal registration of guns. The Liberals will have Canadians believe that registration will only cost $85 million. That is totally and completely erroneous and the justice minister knows it. The government bases its cost on the premise that there are only about 6.5 million firearms which would need to be registered at a cost of $85 million. The facts speak for themselves. Why does it currently cost $82 to register a handgun and why would it be only $13 to register long guns?

In 1976 the Solicitor General of Canada estimated Canadians owned ten million firearms. Each year approximately 200,000 additional firearms are legally imported into Canada, suggesting there should now be at least 14 million guns.

A 1992 United Nations survey found that over seven million Canadians, 26 per cent, own firearms. At the same time a justice department study showed that each owner had an average of 2.7 firearms for a total of 19 million. In April 1995 the deputy commissioner of the RCMP stated that there could be as many as 25 million firearms in Canada, two and a half times the 1976 figure.

If high firearm numbers equate with high crime then the crime rate should be two and a half times higher than it was in 1976. In fact, justice department statistics show that the crime rate in all categories has been stable with only minor fluctuations over the same period. Despite the claim that gun control impacts directly on crime, neither Bill C–51, the Trudeau bill nor Campbell's Bill C–17 have had any observable affect on this trend. What is the justification for more gun laws?

The people of Yellowhead want a criminal justice system which works for them. They want tough laws to deal with young offenders and they want tough laws to deal with the criminal element. They want their property and their rights protected. They will not be punished for not registering their firearms. They want the bad guys punished.

Under this terribly misguided gun control bill those who inadvertently fail to register their firearm face a summary conviction offence which would result in, at the very least, a criminal record, and at the most it could end up in a five year jail sentence. If a person knowingly fails to register their firearm they could face a maximum of 10 years in jail. That is for law–abiding citizens, but the thugs who steal firearms face a maximum of two years in jail. What kind of country are the Liberals building for the future?

Section 99 of this ill conceived Bill C–68 puts at risk fundamental liberties handed down from the Magna Carta, going all the way back to 1215. Section 99 allows for warrantless searches to be conducted. Section 107 criminalizes non–co–operation with police. Sections 91 and 92 enforce harsh penalties for non–compliance with gun registration. All of these single out law–abiding citizens. So much for almost 800 years of judges and scholars; 800 years of jurisprudence. This firearm legislation has the potential to abrogate and trample Canadians' liberties and freedoms, not only for gun owners but non–owners as well.

I speak on behalf of the majority of my constituents when I say that the bill will do little to protect them from the criminal use of firearms. I have stacks of anti–gun control letters and scores of petitions signed by thousands of constituents who want the government to reconsider the legislation. I will quote from a couple of these. Mrs. Dorothy Harrison of Barrhead, Alberta writes: "The criminals will not register their guns and law–abiding citizens will be penalized. The present justice industry is a gold mine for lawyers and totally inadequate".

• (1750)

Mr. John Rae of Whitecourt, Alberta writes: "As a concerned citizen of the Yellowhead riding, I am alarmed at the number of

flaws in the gun control legislation that will turn law–abiding citizens of this country into law breakers".

This bill is more than just about firearms legislation. It is really about raw political power exercised by the state over its citizens.

If the government was really serious about reducing crime it would look at the causes of crime and the causes of urban violence. But to do so, the government would have to tackle some very holy sacred cows, sacred cows that this government along with previous governments helped to build.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, this will be the only opportunity I have to address Bill C–68 in the Chamber. I was not able to speak to the bill at second reading because there was time allocation then. Now there is time allocation at report stage and time allocation again at third reading. There has been time allocation at every stage of the bill. It is unfortunate that in the end most members will be lucky to have 10 minutes to speak to this bill.

It is my intention to oppose the bill at report stage and at final reading unless substantive amendments are made. I have mentioned before that in the last election I made certain commitments to represent Calgary West in the House of Commons and to do so on the basis of Reform principles and policies. All Reformers ran on those principles.

Among those principles and policies is a commitment to ascertain the views of our constituents and to vote those views where they can be ascertained. Specifically, on moral issues and on the issue of gun control, I have made a particular commitment to discover and to vote the wishes of my constituents. I have followed a process in attempting to do that.

Through my householder I surveyed the general opinions of my constituents on gun control prior to the tabling of Bill C–68. That survey covered three general areas that are included in the bill. It covered the area of registration of all weapons, tougher penalties on gun crime and also the area of further restrictions and prohibitions on various classes of weapons. All of those things were supported in principle by a large majority of those who responded to the survey. That was prior to the tabling of Bill C–68. Consistent with that I supported Bill C–68 at second reading despite my own misgivings about some elements of it.

At that time I sent out a second survey to my constituents giving a little more information on the bill and asking very specific questions about the contents of Bill C–68 as well as giving my own views on it. Those questions, which were much more complex, asked about elements of the bill. As well they asked for their overall feeling on the bill. It came back with a somewhat different result that I think reflects not only greater knowledge of the bill but a change in public opinion that has occurred in Calgary in the past few weeks.

While some elements of the bill remain strongly supported by the population I should say that both my householder survey and the scientific survey I have conducted have indicated that there is still broad support for the general principles of the bill. However there are some very severe concerns about specific matters, about some of the penalties for non–registration, the confiscatory elements of the legislation and the cost concerns.

Some areas are supported and some are not. In the end the households that replied indicated about 60 per cent overall disapproval of the bill. I will reflect that in my vote.

• (1755)

From my own personal standpoint I believe there are elements of gun control and specifically of this bill that could be helpful. The government has over reached in a number of areas of the bill and it is unfortunate that we cannot get a more modest package.

Let me make some comments from my perspective as intergovernmental affairs critic of the Reform caucus because there are several areas of the gun control package that deserve some comment. We know that the Department of Justice retains overall responsibility for gun control but the program is predominantly administered by provincial and territorial governments, through chief firearms officers and local police agencies.

In 1993, the auditor general concluded that delays in reaching financial agreement with the provinces and territories under the authority of section 111 of the Criminal Code could well weaken the gun control program. Financial agreements had been initiated in 1979 and extended several times. The agreements expired on March 31, 1993 and now new agreements have been signed only with the maritime provinces.

I have been told the funds that the provinces received are not adequate to cover their costs. For example, in the case of Saskatchewan, it has not received payment for its administration of existing gun control programs since April 1, 1993 and it appears that little progress toward resolving this conflict has been made.

The federal government's latest offer amounts to only about two–thirds of the actual cost incurred for these programs. Agreements with the provinces are also mandated under section 108 of the Criminal Code to ensure maximum co–ordination with regard to administration of gun control.

We know that several of the provincial and territorial governments, and I include here Alberta, Saskatchewan, the Yukon territory, the Northwest Territories and now Ontario are not supportive of the bill. Clearly a high degree of provincial support is needed if this program is to be implemented with any degree of success.

Many amendments have been suggested to the bill, including the creation of a new level of bureaucracy, gun control inspectors, for which no cost estimates are available and about which all provinces are very concerned.

It would seem to me that a government that wanted to have its provincial counterparts on side would slow down and consult with them more on the bill, on the amendments and on its implementation. Instead we have a situation where at least two provincial governments, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are considering constitutional challenges or perhaps even refusing to administer gun control programs. That is unfortunate but it is part of what I talked about earlier in my speech where we have a situation where in many areas the government has over reached itself. In some cases it raised some very legitimate areas of concern and in other areas raised concerns where concerns were not necessary.

My own feeling, having talked to many people in my riding about this, people who own guns and do not own guns, people who are for the bill and who are against the bill, gun owners who are for and gun owners who are against, non–gun owners who are for the bill and non–gun owners who are against it, is that there is a fairly broad consensus on the kind of gun and crime control that is needed.

Many citizens would be more than willing to register their weapons and co–operate with police if they felt that in so doing this would affirm the legitimacy and respect for their responsibly used property rights and for responsible gun ownership.

Unfortunately there has been a pattern of legislation in the past decade where registration has been followed by increased regulation, ultimately by restriction, prohibition and then by confiscation, often without compensation. This has led to fears that some may say are unfounded but which do have their grounding in people's experience with gun laws.

These are people who have tried consistently to obey the law. That is unfortunate. Government has reinforced that impression by concentrating on the issue of gun control. Most people see a role for gun control but we have a government that refused to move in most areas of criminal justice reform.

The Young Offenders Act remains unreformed. Sentencing remains not reformed satisfactorily. We have ongoing debates about capital punishment and other areas of the criminal justice system which the government has not touched at all.

All in all, the government's fairly one dimensional determined agenda in this area has probably cost it the support of many Canadians who might otherwise support this legislation.

• (1800)

I will be the first to admit that it is very difficult to measure public opinion on this bill. Certainly when this bill was originally brought before the House my constituents were overwhelmingly in favour of its general direction. There has been a shift in public opinion. That shift has been away. The fact of the matter is that no clear consensus now exists for many of the measures in this bill. For that reason, I will be supporting a wide range of the amendments to the bill, and if those amendments are not adopted I will oppose the bill on the final vote.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to participate in today's debate at report stage of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. I already had an opportunity to speak on February 16, during the second reading debate on this bill. I then supported this bill and I—like my party, the Bloc Quebecois—continue to do so. I would, however, like the House to adopt the amendments proposed by my Bloc colleagues, the hon. members for Saint–Hubert and for Berthier—Montcalm.

These amendments would decriminalize the failure to register a firearm, impose a 20 year freeze on licensing and registration fees, ensure that all parties are treated fairly in this matter, and eliminate the minimum four year sentence for some criminal offences involving a firearm.

I generally agree with the institution of a national system to register all firearms and the inclusion of new offences in the Criminal Code, except for the amendments proposed by my Bloc colleagues. I think that we must staunch the illegal flow of firearms into and within Canada and tighten border controls. We all know that enormous quantities of firearms are imported into Canada every year.

The debate on Bill C–68 has been and still is too emotional, in my opinion. The discussions so far have been very heated. I have received hundreds of letters, protesting this bill I must admit, most of which are from English Canadians. I think that the campaign against this bill was mostly orchestrated by the firearms industry. I also believe that the Reform members gave in too easily to the lobbying of firearms manufacturers.

I consulted my constituents in the riding of Bourassa. An overwhelming majority recognizes the need to bring in stricter gun control laws. Over the past year, firearms were used in some crimes in my riding, which has swayed public opinion towards better protection of the public. Of course, stricter firearm controls cannot in themselves resolve the problem or all of the problems associated with criminal activity. We must admit however, that they will, however, be of great help.

The registration of all firearms is a positive move. Gunowners will also have to find ways of storing them safely. I support Motions Nos. 84 and 135 in particular, which were proposed by the hon. member for Saint–Hubert, and which would oblige the manufacturer, importer or exporter of firearms to equip them with a safety lock.

• (1805)

I think that these amendments markedly improve this bill and would be relatively inexpensive to enforce. After consulting with the citizens of my riding, I can state that they support the main points in this bill. I think that this piece of legislation is a step in the right direction, despite its omissions and shortcomings.

The number of deaths caused by firearms is unfortunately still too high. In Quebec alone, between 400 and 450 deaths are caused by firearms per year. Firearms are the weapons used in most homicides and in three out of four suicides in Quebec, which total approximately 300 per year.

Therefore, we must combat the criminal use of firearms more effectively. According to the polls, Quebec shows the strongest support for gun control. This is particularly true within the labour movement where I come from. Quebec's three labour congresses support the broad principle of this bill, as do the municipalities, the Quebec Bar Association and public health experts.

However, I have serious reservations about several provisions in Bill C–68, especially those dealing with procedures and registration costs. The government claims it will cost $85 million, spread over seven years, to set up this system. However, the Government of Quebec has already indicated that in Quebec alone, it will cost more than $300 million.

Why does the Minister of Justice refuse to give us the figures for the real cost of registration? The minister said that on average, a woman dies of gunshot wounds every six days in this country. Guns are used in most domestic murders.

The government has a right and a duty to protect citizens against the unlawful use of firearms. Public safety must be better protected. I will therefore vote in favour of the amendments presented by my colleagues in the Bloc Quebecois.

[*English*]

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I want to make a few remarks with regard to Bill C–68 and the amendments put forward by my colleagues.

On time allocation, we must understand in this assembly that there are many Canadians interested in this subject, and to set a time limit on the amount of debate when we have such an important bill before us is not the act of a responsible government.

Look at the number of amendments that have been placed before this Parliament. There are 267 different motions before us right now. What does that say about the bill? In a very clear way, this to me says that the bill is inadequate. It says that the bill does not meet the needs of Canadians. From those 267 amendments that are before us, there are all kinds of ideas that are expressed by Canadians as to ways and means by which the bill could be adjusted to better meet the objectives, whatever they are.

However, the government has not listened to the 267 motions that are here. We have had very little debate today by the Liberals. They have made up their minds. They are determined to ram this thing through and put closure on it. Tomorrow we will have third reading. The bill will then go on to the Senate, and supposedly the government has done its job. It has not. That is one of the things I have concern about.

• (1810)

The second thing is who really asked for this legislation? What were Canadians asking for? They were asking during the last campaign for legislation that would be tougher on the criminals. That was their major objective.

If we listen to all the debate that is going on in this House, what are we talking about? We are talking about the registration of guns, which is a major concern supposedly, but it is not the first priority. It has been the focus of the discussion. We have set aside a major, thorough, knowledgeable, good discussion on the first priority of Canadians, and that is legislation and laws in the country and actions of the court that will punish the criminal and protect the responsible citizens of this country.

We have mixed up the priorities. We have before us poor legislation, which is not doing the job. We have a government that is focused on registration, which is unacceptable to the Canadian public and is not meeting the needs.

There are three areas I will concentrate on. First, we have to look at the question, which has been raised in the House a number of times, of whether it will prevent crime. Will this legislation prevent any harmful act occurring to another citizen? Second, what about the cost of this legislation? Will this registration be worth the cost to the Canadian taxpayer? Whether they pay it because of their licence fee, whether they have to pay money for registering their gun, it is still a tax. It is still a cost to the Canadian taxpayer. Is that cost going to be worth while and bring about the benefits we want? Third, what about the freedom of responsible individuals in Canada? Does this legislation infringe on their rights and their freedoms to act as responsible citizens? I would like to address those three items

with regard to this legislation and also relative to the amendments that are before us today.

First, will registration of long guns really fight crime and prevent crime? The answer is clearly no. That has been reinforced by the minister, not only in this House. It has been reinforced by the Minister of Justice making comments on radio, television, and through the written media that he can produce no evidence that registration will prevent crime and stop any harmful act in the streets of Canada, no evidence at all. So why are we doing it? There has not been any justification.

Second, has registration in the past of handguns prevented crime from happening in the streets? Has it controlled the use of these weapons in an offence? We had very strict comprehensive gun control legislation brought into this assembly in 1977 and again in 1991. We have found that legislation has had no effect, that the rate of crime has gone up. It has had no impact on the incidence of homicides, on suicides, on violent crime or crimes committed with firearms. It has had no effect at all.

Today we are trying to put another layer of legislation in that requires registration and licensing of Canadians who have guns, and no one has answered that basic question: will it help to fight crime and to reduce the amount of crime or the harm that occurs to individuals? Nobody can answer that. I am sure at the moment there is no answer.

We have been convinced as the Reform Party that registration is not the answer to crime control at all. I know many Canadians tell us that in a very clear way.

• (1815)

I wish to cover a second point with regard to cost. The conclusion is very clear. The registration of guns will be a huge waste of taxpayers' money. Whether taxpayers pay $85 million directly, whether taxpayers have to pay a licensing fee or a registration fee for one gun or a number of guns, it will be a huge cost to Canadians.

Estimates are $500 million. Others estimate it to be even more. It will be an unnecessary huge cost at a point in time when Canadians have a limited amount of money to spend on the extra things government would demand of them. It seems to be a very useless exercise to spend money on something that does not have results.

One of the authorities of the country who has been mentioned a number of times in this assembly, the auditor general, has said very clearly that before we pass new legislation we should look at past legislation to see whether it has met its objectives and has been cost effective in any way.

I have already cited the 1977 legislation and the 1991 legislation passed by the House. From all estimates or judgments the expenditure of money out of the public purse to put that legislation in place has not brought about the results Canadians want. It has not lowered the rate of crime or reduced it or stopped the number of killings that have been going on. It has done nothing.

Again Canadians are being asked to spend millions and millions of dollars, over half a billion dollars most likely when the bill is tallied, to try to register them and then supposedly reduce the amount of crime. It has not happened in the past and it will not happen in the future.

I asked my constituents, like everybody else has, what they thought of registering guns. Thirty–one per cent said that stiffer gun control would be effective, in other words registration, in reducing crime or crime related activities. Sixty–nine per cent said that it would not. Thirty–six per cent agreed with registration.

That was a reflection of southern Alberta attitude that was very accurate. When I walked around my constituency and went door to door, business to business, I found that 99 per cent of my constituents—and I talked to at least 200 or 300 of them on the street—came to me on a volunteer basis to say clearly that registration was not the way to go and that I should vote against it in Parliament.

With the government invoking closure, a government that has not allowed us to discuss it fully, how else can we vote?

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to make a couple of brief comments that I think are relevant to the debate as many Canadians are watching the deliberations of the House on Bill C–68.

The previous speaker mentioned that some 267 amendments would be considered at report stage. I took out the Order Paper and Notice Paper for today to find out the exact source of all the amendments. I found, even when reviewing the last 60, that some 45 of them were put before the House at report stage by two members of the Reform Party who were also members of the justice committee that dealt with the bill.

Motions at report stage are admissible if the committee has not dealt with the matter. I think there is another condition. However it raises an interesting question.

• (1820)

The previous speaker tended to indicate that all these items had to raised. If many of the amendments that have been raised before the House at report stage are still to be addressed by the House, it begs the question why members of the committee who were there to discuss the bill did not raise these questions and motions at the justice committee. Why are they now tying up the time of the House?

As I stated earlier, if all 267 motions were to be debated in the House with all the time members would want, we would be here until next Christmas. Frankly I think Canadians are saying that we have consulted more than enough on the gun control legislation.

The member also referred to the government ramming legislation through. It has been almost a year since the discussion documents were tabled by the justice minister. He has travelled from coast to coast. He has talked to Canadians about the issues. As a result of the committee work the justice minister has brought forward many extremely important amendments that respond to the concerns of Canadians. One example would be with regard to first time offenders and the non–registration of weapons. Those were positive and constructive changes with regard to the messages the justice minister heard.

Throughout the day I have seen the justice minister in the House and in the lobby. He has followed the debate very closely. He has listened to all hon. members whether it was in committee or in the House. He has certainly listened to Canadians.

I had an opportunity to be with the minister in Toronto. We went to Regent Park, a subsidized housing development, where there were ordinary people from a number of walks of life, gun owners and non–gun owners alike, who all had an opportunity to speak. It was a very interesting meeting. We heard from the people in that community that it was commonplace for them to hear a gunshot at night when their children were playing in the streets. They were very scared and concerned about what was happening to safety in our communities.

Considering the priorities of Canadians, community safety is certainly an important issue. One issue I keep hearing about from members of the Reform Party is the issue of registration. They proposed initially that registration and addressing the crime element should be separated, but the minister has explained clearly that there is an important and integral relationship between registration and crime control. One example concerns the importation of firearms.

Recently in Toronto there was a case where a gun dealer legally imported firearms but subsequently marketed them on the black market. Registration under the legislation, for instance, would require that on importation the weapons would be registered by the importer. There would be a clear trail of the weapons from the time they enter the country.

Another aspect concerns the importance of the relationship between Canada and the United States. Many members have suggested that we have to go after the criminals and those who are smuggling in firearms from the United States. Members know well that some 1,400 guns are reported lost, missing or stolen each year by Canadians. We can imagine how many weapons are actually lost, missing or stolen. Clearly those weapons are in the hands of the criminal element.

Therefore it is important to ensure that all Canadians who have firearms and register them are well aware of their responsibilities. In talking with gun clubs and other large gun owners I have found that the educational aspect of the consultative process has been extremely valuable to the Canadian public. Only about 10 per cent of Canadians actually own firearms. The other 90 per cent are probably not very familiar with the rules regarding firearms.

• (1825)

The comfort level of Canadians at large has been improved substantially because of education, knowing that there is licensing, knowing that there are courses, knowing that there are restrictions on transportation and ammunition sales, and knowing that registration will ensure gun owners have an opportunity to show they support law, order and safety in communities.

The whole issue of crime control comes down to whether we wait until we have a problem in Canada with regard to safety and crime in our communities or whether we respond proactively. If we took into account that for every one incident of a firearms related crime in Canada there are 100 incidents in the United States, and if we took into account the population differential of ten to one, for every incident in Canada there are ten in the U.S. on a per capita basis.

Could we imagine what the reaction of the Canadian public would be if the crime rate due to guns in Canada were to double? That would mean there would be only one incident for every five in the U.S. I dare say that most certainly the Canadian public would be extremely upset about the decay within society.

We have something in Canada of which we are very proud and must protect, that is safety in our communities. As we all know, the Prime Minister has boasted about safety in Canada. We can safely walk in our parks. As a result of initiatives such as this one we will ensure that Canada remains a safe country in which to live and a safe country for our children.

I do not think the honest hunter, gun collector or target shooter will be impacted in any material way by the legislation. The cost is not an issue. Ten dollars for 10 guns for five years is not an issue.

People in my own riding have come to see me and I have asked them how it would affect them. After we got over the cost issue it got down to the issue of confiscation. There are questions about confiscation. My constituents continue to raise the spectre that the government wants to register guns because it wants to take their guns away.

The justice minister has made it very clear that confiscation is absolutely not an objective of the government. Canada has a very vibrant economy in hunting, target shooting and collecting that will remain. When it gets down to paramilitary weapons, automatic weapons and guns that have absolutely no purpose except to hurt people, they are the ones Canadians say should be off the streets and out of the hands of those most likely to cause harm to our community.

It is clear the amendments brought forward by the committee are constructive. The vast majority of the 267 amendments presented by the Reform Party at report stage are nothing more than a disruption of the House of Commons.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in the words of my colleague, I should like to straighten out the previous speaker from the Liberal Party on a couple of issues.

He suggested that we were tying up the time of the House on the bill. He more or less said that it was terrible for us to do so and that it was not all that important. In my community and in communities across the country it is important to people. If the hon. member wants to look back at the number of petitions presented in *Hansard*, he would see that the numbers of names on them are extensive. If he says it is not important he is missing the boat.

He also said that we have been debating the issue for over a year. It is my understanding that the bill was introduced on February 14. It must be another short year for the Liberals.

There were amendments to the gun laws in 1977 and 1991. Many people ignored those changes. I have evidence from several studies which indicate that is exactly what will happen next. As much as these folks are insisting on putting these things in, a lot of people are saying it is hogwash and will not work.

• (1830)

There is something about the costs they say are small but I wonder about the costs of all the policing, of this whole exercise, of making sure all the law-abiding citizens remain law-abiding citizens or perhaps trying to find them as being criminals.

The cost of their time spent enforcing gun laws as opposed to time looking at the more severe problems of drugs and so on is extra ordinary cost. For a member of the other party to put that swing on it is absurd.

I recently competed in a politically correct competition with the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club in my riding. If I could not use a prop—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am very sorry to interrupt the member. Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Gray under government business No. 25.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 251)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Sheridan	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)

Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Zed—174

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Benoit
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	de Jong
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jennings	Johnston
Kerpan	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	White (Fraser Valley West)—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

• (1855)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 4.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, before the vote I talked about the closure issue. Closure was forced upon the democratic principles of the House by the Liberal government before debate really took place on the Bill C–68 gun issue. Although the justice committee talked about the gun control legislation, there is more to it than that. The public has a right to hear from all members, all of its representatives from across the country on this issue. I do not think what the Liberals have done is in the least bit democratic. Back in my riding people are asking why such an imposition has occurred on this particular bill.

In fact, the Reform Party introduced 138 amendments to Bill C–68. I would like to ask the government, with closure limiting debate to six hours at report stage and another six hours at third reading, how on earth is it possible to debate 138 amendments? It surely does not allow the members of the Reform Party to accurately describe what is wrong with Bill C–68. This is forcing an anti–democratic bill through the House and it is wrong.

That is in part what is wrong with a majority government. This government has not taken the hint from the last government that was in majority in this House of Commons. It got arrogant. It got overconfident. In the early stages, those are the signs we are seeing from this Liberal government. That is unfortunate, but fortunate for the rest of the land because we only have about two years to put up with this nonsense.

• (1900)

There are two other bills of particular note going through here on the basis of closure, and they are Bill C–41 and Bill C–85, the criminal justice system and MPs' pensions. Again, this government invoked closure on perhaps the most important legislation they could dream up since Parliament opened. They forced closure on it. It is absolutely unbelievable.

I can tell members that there are many people across this land who do not understand why, including myself. They make jokes about it here as I talk. We will see where the jokes go two years from now when we hit the election.

Before the votes started I was about to talk a little about the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club, one of many rod and gun clubs in

this country. I had the privilege of participating in a shoot in that club about three weeks ago. I won one of the competitions. It was on a politically correct gun competition with pistols and politically incorrect guns. I had never really shot these pistols before, although I am a gun owner myself; I have three rifles. What surprised me in particular about this competition was the level of pride and satisfaction these members had. There was an extreme level of competence these people had.

One of the members who spoke here previously from the Liberal Party said that these people do not mind Bill C–68. Every person at the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club was extremely upset at it.

I do not understand how a government that invokes closure on this bill, says it is not costly, and whose members say that people agree with what they are doing could be so wrong. I guess what we are going to see is a lot of this Liberal arrogance for the next two years. It is going to catch them and it is going to catch them hard.

These people at the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club, I have admiration for people who have collections of any sort. There were several people there. One fellow had one of the better collections of Enfield rifles in Canada. He was asking: "Why are they doing this? What is this for? Come and look at my collection. I will show you what safety is all about". I did not get to see the collection, but as far as safety goes with these folks, they are probably number one in the country. They know what gun safety is all about.

I do not understand what the direction is here. I thought we were after crime and criminals. These people are not criminals. These are not crime makers unless a government chooses to head them in that direction by way of calling them criminals by virtue of non–compliance with Bill C–68.

An hon. member: It is not going to happen.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): I hear over here that it is not going to happen. If not, why does the government not allow us to debate this issue instead of calling closure on it? The government is saying it can read the Canadian people so well, but it is absolutely wrong. It is wrong on Bill C–68, on Bill C–41, and on those preposterous MP pensions on Bill C–85, which it is insisting on bringing in.

The Ontario Handgun Association I believe wrote all MPs letters. I will give members information it provided to us.

• (1905)

Recent survey data indicate that a minimum of one–third of Canadian gun owners will refuse to comply with the proposal by the Minister of Justice to register all firearms. In the 1995 gun control survey organized by Professor Gary Mauser of Simon Fraser University, Canadian firearm owners were asked the following question: "If the government's proposal to register all firearms becomes law, do you plan on registering all, some or none of your firearms?" The response to this question is in the final analysis nearly one–third of all Canadian firearm owners candidly admitted to a stranger over the telephone that they would not register their firearms.

What is wrong with a government that puts through closure on such an important issue when Canadians will tell it to stick it in its ear?

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to on Bill C–68 under protest to the closure limiting the members in this House to a six–hour debate on report stage.

The constituents in Mission—Coquitlam want crime control, not gun control. We have gun registration now and we have laws now that would help control crime in our country. However, the courts do not enforce many of our laws and often our police are frustrated at the lack of substance in sentencing.

Bill C–68 as it now stands will not prevent abuse with a firearm. It will, however, punish many good, law–abiding Canadians who are gun collectors, hunters, and gun club members. To force a national registration on these law–abiding citizens I believe is a waste of time and money and a waste of the necessary manpower we will need to put this registration into permanent record.

The justice minister tells us that there are pretty scary statistics out there dealing with the use of guns. Every six days a woman is murdered by a gun. Over 1,000 suicides per year are the result of gun usage. After reciting these statistics, we are also told that these are the reasons we need gun control. We are never told two things: first, how will the registration of rifles and shotguns reduce these numbers; second, what percentage of these acts takes place with guns that would would be required to be registered under this legislation?

The Reform Party's position is crystal clear on law and order. The party stands for tougher laws to deal with criminals and more protection for potential victims of crime. The party has stated on many occasions that Canadian laws need to be tougher on criminals.

The gun registration system proposed by Bill C–68 will do nothing to prevent the use of handguns and rifles in the commission of crimes.

When analysing the part of the bill dealing with gun registration one has to go back to first principles of what problem this legislation is trying to address. The problem is a proliferation of firearms, both handguns and rifles, and their use in criminal activities. This being the problem, it is difficult to see how a system of national gun registration would be of any benefit.

All can appreciate that criminals are not going to register illegal weapons or weapons acquired illegally. The registration of a weapon will not stop its use in a domestic quarrel. Recently here in Ottawa we had the tragedy of the shooting of a young boy and a young girl. Registration of that firearm would not have prevented that tragedy.

Some of the problems can be addressed through action taken at the United States border, allowing customs officials to stop the importation of guns, and stiffer penalties for those who commit crimes with guns. The bill addresses both of these issues, although not in sufficient depth to suit the Reform caucus. Customs officials should be empowered to prohibit the importation of firearms, and any crime committed with a gun should result in an increased sentence, which is mandatory and cannot be plea bargained away.

I also am in support of those parts of the bill that would attack the problem of gun smuggling in Canada. It is vitally important that those who patrol our borders be given real powers to deal with those who would import guns illegally into Canada. Again, I think this is something the justice committee should look at in detail. Should the people who patrol our borders be given powers to be more than revenue collectors? Should the provincial police or RCMP in particular provinces be required to maintain a presence at the borders? A true police presence at our borders would, to my way of thinking, reduce smuggling. I am not saying we should arm our customs agents, but they should be backed up with trained police.

I am also concerned because the registration system will be computerized. We all know that sophisticated criminals can break into virtually any computer system constructed, especially with the availability of Internet and World Wide Web. There is the distinct possibility that criminals will be able to break into the computer code and the registration system to determine where the guns are. It will be like shopping at home for criminals. It will mean that those who register guns will not be safe and will be under the constant threat of being broken into by criminals to steal their guns. Gun registration will not save lives, but tougher laws to deal with criminals will.

• (1910)

To reiterate, here are ten points I feel we have to address regarding the registration system.

The registration section does not stand up to a cost–benefit analysis. That is, the lowest cost estimate is now at $85 million, without any indication from the government as to its beneficial effects on crime. Legislation should not be passed when the government cannot tell taxpayers how much it will cost to implement.

The analysis of the cost and effectiveness of gun control legislation already in place has not been completed, as requested by the auditor general in 1993.

It is argued we must have registration because the chiefs of police support it. The chiefs also support capital punishment and repealing the section of the Criminal Code that grants murderers the opportunity for early parole. The Liberals do not support these positions. Either the chiefs are right or wrong. Liberals cannot cherry pick to suit their purposes.

Proposed clause 112 of the bill states that regulations made pursuant to the bill will not have to come before Parliament for scrutiny. This is objectionable. What is the government trying to hide?

Proposed clause 117 allows police to search your car, house, et cetera, without a warrant if they believe you have a weapon that was used in a crime. However, if during the search they find an unregistered gun, it may be seized.

With reference to the arguments raised regarding the number of suicides in Canada and domestic violence, this bill does nothing to address the root causes of either of those problems. These are social problems, which will not be resolved through a registration procedure.

In the polling results showing public support recited by advocates of this bill the questions regarding support for gun control usually link it with a question: "Are you in favour of legislation to reduce crime?" That also affects the response one gets to that question.

The car licensing analogy is used to justify registration: if we register cars then we can register guns. If the analogy is to be complete then legislation should be changed to require safe storage of cars, and any accidents caused by stolen cars should be the responsibility of the owner. Alternatively, has vehicle registration done anything to prevent drunk driving or the prevention of accidents?

There has been no answer from the government to those who argue that a computer registry of guns could be accessed by a computer hacker. This would give potential thieves the location of virtually every gun in Canada.

Handguns have been subject to registration since 1934. There is no evidence and it is the government's argument that this has had no effect on reducing the criminal use of handguns.

The justice minister knows very well that a registration system will not reduce the number of murders or suicides by firearms one bit. He should know that Canada is a large and diverse country, which in many ways starts at the borders of metropolitan Toronto. This country is not metropolitan Toronto.

The justice minister should read the legislation that is presently in place in relation to gun control. He will find the present laws in Canada are among the toughest in the world with respect

to firearms. Therefore I urge members opposite, members from outside of metropolitan Toronto, to look at Canada and see it for what it is: a vast country where hunting and outdoor activities are a way of life to some and a recreation to others.

The registration system proposed in this bill will not accomplish the goals set forth. Therefore, when it comes time to vote for the bill, vote it down until the necessary amendments are a part of the bill.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I will talk for a minute about why I joined the Reform Party. Obviously my colleagues and I supported other political parties in the past. What caused us to join the Reform Party?

We recognized a long time ago that we needed to change the system. I do not think Prime Minister Trudeau ever made a more accurate and truthful statement than when he said that MPs are nobodies. I think no MPs in this House should know that and feel that more than the backbench MPs on the opposite bench. They are nobodies. When they stand up to speak out and vote against the government on a bill, they are chastised, reprimanded and punished for representing their constituents. That is what we are here for; we are here to change the system.

• (1915)

The Conservatives under Prime Minister Mulroney wanted to get the GST through this House. What did they do? They cracked the whip and got their backbench MPs, even though their constituents solidly told them they did not support the GST, to vote in favour of it. Where are the Conservatives now? I do not see them around this House. That is where these people are going to be after the next election as a result of the kind of activities they have engaged in over the last few days. There is no change in sight.

I would like at this juncture to take a minute and commend those Liberal MPs who had the courage, the fortitude and the tenacity to stand up and vote against this bill even though they knew they were going to be punished for doing so. They were being true to their constituents. They were representing their constituents which is what they were elected to do. In the face of adversity they were prepared to do it and I commend them for it. We may have differing views and different philosophies but by and large I can admire people who are prepared to stand up for their constituents.

Reformers will be in every Liberal riding at the next election. We will remind the constituents how the Liberals treated parliamentary democracy in this session, what they did to ram through these government bills and how they abused their power and position.

It has been said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. This goes back to the heart of why we need to change the system. We need to take some of the power away from cabinet and away from the Prime Minister and distribute it among the MPs. We would then have the opportunity to see real democracy in action and not the executive kind of authoritarian democracy we have had in Canada, these democratic dictatorships we have had over the last 30 or 40 years.

In speaking to the bill itself, it is an established rule that justice should not only be done but should be seen to have been done. In other words the law must not only be just but it must be seen to be just. Can this be said about Bill C–68 and the agenda behind it? I do not think so.

Gun control is a controversial subject. It is clear that real and serious disagreements exist in Canada over it. I am aware and I acknowledge that the opinion polls show a majority of Canadians tentatively support the government's position at the present time. I would caution my colleagues opposite that the more and more people find out about it, the less supportive they are.

I also caution that in the words of Thomas Jefferson, great initiatives should not rest on slender majorities. If a majority supports something but does not feel very strongly about it and a minority opposes it very strongly, it undermines the rule of law to ram it through.

There is something else that undermines the rule of law even more directly and that is when governments say one thing and do another. It erodes the very foundation of our society if governments misrepresent. That is why I want to ask my colleagues opposite to do a little soul searching on this bill. I want them to look at themselves in the mirror and ask this question: Is this legislation a prelude to confiscating citizens' firearms entirely? I do not expect them to concede that in this House.

Let me point out a couple of quotations that worry me. First, when this whole business began the Minister of Justice said openly that in his view only agents of the state, police and soldiers, should have weapons. He has since stopped saying it, but has he stopped believing it? His assistant, Darryl Davies, recently said that hunting is a barbaric and murderous activity and should be banned in Canada. He also said nobody in a civilized country needs a gun. This is a high level official working in the minister's office.

• (1920)

The minister has not to my knowledge repudiated either of these remarks. Can we believe the assurances that hunters and hunting are not targeted by this bill with these kinds of statements made by such senior people in the minister's office?

Other prominent gun control advocates including former Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board chair Susan Eng have made it quite clear: "Gun registration will start the process of stigmatizing gun use, just like drinking and driving. In their hearts, gun owners know this and this is what makes them so mad". We know what Ms. Eng is up to here and we know what

the real agenda is behind the legislation when we hear these kinds of statements.

Manitoba Liberal leader Lynda Haverstock said in May 1994: "I think what we should be doing is ensuring there is less and less and less availability to having guns", which she justified on the grounds that "sometimes our overall responsibilities have to override individual rights".

I know my colleagues opposite and my colleagues on this side of the Chamber have very serious differences about the bill as it now stands. The sweeping powers it gives the police worry us. The security of the universal system of registration worries us. The severe penalties for infringing this law in a society where murderers are free to go out on the street a short time after they are convicted strike us as unbalanced. The implied assault on the way of life of millions of Canadians troubles us.

What worries me most at this moment is that this entire bill is a massive fraud. I am concerned that all the pious assurances that confiscation is not contemplated are just a smokescreen behind which the legislation permitting confiscation can be put in place. Then the very people who say no private citizen should own guns will act on that belief.

Perhaps my colleagues opposite have not given this much thought. Perhaps they have accepted the smooth assurances of the Minister of Justice. I hope they will take the time to consider before voting on this whether the real agenda is outright confiscation at some time in the future. If it is, then I challenge them to either put it on the table openly right now and let us debate it, or put it aside and put the legislation aside that will make it possible.

This bill is bad enough as it is. What we really wonder is why the Minister of Justice is so determined to pass it when it is well established that there is no correlation between rates of violence and gun crime and laws respecting firearms ownership.

What is the real purpose of the bill? If it is a prelude to confiscation then it is extremely dangerous to the credibility of our government and to the notion of the rule of law in Canada if the government does not come forward and is clean with people right now telling them that is what is on its mind.

I hope my colleagues opposite will not vote to pass such a bill. I can assure them if they do, we will be there at the next election to remind their constituents how they voted today on closure, how they voted last Thursday morning on closure and how they voted on this very, very important piece of legislation, Bill C–68.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to address the House on Bill C–68 this evening. I say it is a pleasure because I am one of only three Reform MPs who has had the opportunity to address the House on this very important piece of legislation three times in the past. The first time was at second reading, the second time was on the Reform amendment to split the bill which was also at second reading before the government enacted time allocation and the third time is tonight.

As has already been said by many of my colleagues, we find it absolutely deplorable that on such a crucial piece of legislation which has elicited such high emotions across the land, we find the government has yet again enacted time allocation at report stage and at third reading.

• (1925)

The government limited the debate at second reading and forced the bill to the committee. It gave assurances that all of the pertinent facts, data and arguments could be brought forward at committee. Today in arguments put forward by Liberal members we were questioned why we were bringing forward these amendments at report stage. We were asked why we wanted, in their words, to tie up the House debating this legislation when we could have done it at committee stage. Those of us who participated at committee stage know that the exact opposite happened. There simply was not time to adequately address all of the concerns.

The Liberals limited the number of witnesses who could appear before the committee. Today I heard that while all MPs had the opportunity to appear before the committee they were limited to five minutes to make their points. As anyone who has ever made a public address knows, five minutes goes very quickly, especially when one is trying to make points on as many issues as are encompassed by this comprehensive piece of legislation known as Bill C–68.

Bill C–68 is a very detailed, lengthy and intricate piece of legislation with some 132 clauses in the firearms act and amendments to another 100 sections in part III of the Criminal Code. For the government to suggest we can get through that and bring forward all the pertinent points by concerned constituents and concerned Canadians across this land in a few hours of debate is absolutely ludicrous.

I find it deplorable that the government would enact time allocation and ram this through the House. That is exactly what is happening tonight. It is exactly what will be happening in a day or two when we are limited to six hours of debate at third reading as well.

I would like to speak about our amendment at second reading stage to split the bill. The Reform Party feels very strongly that we are dealing with two completely separate issues in Bill C–68. One issue is further regulation and restrictions on law–abiding firearms owners. The second issue is what to do and how to get

tough with criminals who misuse firearms and actually use them as weapons.

It is interesting to note that one of the Liberal members earlier today suggested an amendment to actually change the name of the act to "an act respecting firearms and other related matters" rather than "an act respecting firearms and other weapons" as it is presently named. I would certainly support that amendment.

As I have travelled throughout my riding, a lot of people have expressed concern that people do not differentiate between a firearm and a weapon. It is an important distinction to law–abiding firearm owners that a firearm is only a weapon at such time as it is used in the commission of a criminal offence. Prior to that it is simply viewed to many people as a tool, or something used in a hobby if they are a shooter. It is not considered by them to be a weapon. It is merely private property. It is an important distinction.

Some of my colleagues have talked about the fact that what we are discussing here is the fourth group of amendments. It is interesting to note that we are being asked to debate in a few short hours some 267 amendments to this legislation. How can we do that justice? How can we adequately debate the pros and cons of those individual amendments? We simply cannot. For the purpose of debate some of them have been grouped. Group No. 4, for example, which we are currently debating has 33 individual motions. How can we do them justice and adequately discuss them in that short time frame?

I am very concerned with the erosion of democracy. The Reform Party feels very strongly that the primary purpose of members of Parliament, which I have spoken about before in the House, is to properly and effectively represent the wishes, concerns and views of the majority of their constituents where that view can be ascertained.

• (1930)

How can I do that? I have made that point as well. How can I do that on this piece of legislation when it deals with two distinctly separate issues?

The constituents of Prince George—Peace River have made it very obvious to me that they want to get tough with criminals. They want to bring in tougher sanctions on the criminal elements in the country. Therefore I support the part of the legislation that deals with the amendments to part III of the Criminal Code.

At the same time my constituents are telling me that they want to have no part of registration. Why do they not want to have registration? We hear ludicrous arguments that we register our dogs and our cars so why should we not register our firearms?

They are concerned for three main reasons. One is the cost and we have talked about that before. They are concerned about the paperwork time and the cost to police forces that are already stretched to the limit. Hundreds and thousands of useless hours will be spent compiling the information.

We pointed out in committee as well as in the House that the mailing system proposal of the justice minister will not work. How can a firearm be identified if it is not actually physically seen and inspected? It is interesting to note that Quebec has indicated that it wants $300 million if the government goes ahead to administer the registration program in that province. Yet the justice minister is still clinging to his $85 million total cost, which is obviously far from accurate.

Constituents are concerned and law–abiding gun owners are concerned about the cost recovery that has been bandied about from the other side. What will that mean in the future? What will the costs of paying an annual ownership fee amount to if they want cost recovery?

The second issue in addition to cost is the security of the list that some of my colleagues have addressed. I spoke about it earlier in the House. Will this not provide a shopping list for criminals? We all know that hackers break into computer systems practically on a daily basis across the nation and around the world. If they can break into IBM and can break into the Pentagon, what makes the justice minister think they will not be able to break into this computer system to get a hold of the list? It will provide criminals with a list of where the firearms are and what types of firearms they are so that they can steal the firearms they want to use. It will also by omission provide them with a list of what homes in which communities do not have firearms and therefore the home owners are defenceless.

The third issue on registration is future confiscation with which some of my colleagues have dealt. Above all is the statement that it will not be effective. New Zealand, Australia and other countries have tried it. I note that draconian gun controls brought into effect in the United Kingdom in 1988 were followed by dramatic increases in crimes involving firearms. They were not effective. It has been proven around the world that registration and stiffer gun controls are not effective.

I will make a point, which my constituents make to me on almost a daily basis, to the Liberals opposite because they will know about it pretty soon. There is another election before registration becomes mandatory and the voters will be there to remind them about this legislation.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to take but a few minutes to set a few facts straight in the House and possibly to assist or enlighten some of my colleagues across the way. While we will try to enlighten the people across the way, I recognize it may be a major challenge. Nevertheless let us spare no effort in the noble cause of enlightening the people across the way who say that it is undemocratic to propose this bill.

• (1935)

The bill is supported by the vast majority of Canadians in every province. Furthermore the bill is proposed by a government elected under a program including the bill among others.

According to the opposition we have the following proposition: "The majority of people want it. The majority of Parliament want it. The majority of people have asked the majority of Parliament to enact it but it does not matter. It is undemocratic for us to be voting for that which the people want". However, in the eyes of the Reform Party, it is far more democratic to agree with the leader of the Reform Party because he said so.

There is something wrong with that way of thinking by the people across the way. Then members of the Reform Party say that they have not had enough time to debate the bill and that the use of time allocation is wrong.

I invite colleagues across the way to pay attention because we will be asking questions later. This is the way it works. A few weeks ago we had in the House a bill regarding no less an issue than the rail strike in Canada. At that time two of the three parties in the House proposed time allocation, and the Reform Party was one of the two parties. If the use of time allocation is not proper, why was it proper on an issue the Reform Party liked as opposed to one they disliked?

Mr. Abbott: It was a national crisis.

Mr. Boudria: I hear a bit of heckling from across the way. I do not think I am being particularly provocative on the issue. Nevertheless let me submit this to you, being far more objective than I am and seeing it through the neutral eyes of Madam Speaker, that they say they have only had a few short hours of debate. The bill has been debated longer in the House and in committees than the throne speech, budget speech and all the budget bills put together. All that debate combined is not as long as debate on the bill dealing with guns, and for them it is still not long enough.

The last member of the Reform Party who spoke said: "I need much more time to speak on these profound amendments". Most of the so–called profound amendments would delete all the clauses in the bill. How much time does one need for that kind of nonsense?

The Reform Party argues it is more democratic to allow it in the minority more time to remove the clauses supported by the majority of members of Parliament and the majority of Canadians. This is Reform Party logic. It makes sense to a few people but a very small and decreasing number of people. That is what is wrong with that logic.

I do not want to be too provocative about it but members of the Reform Party are trying to prevent the majority of Canadians from having legislation they want. They are against the democratic principles they pretend to espouse.

[*Translation*]

And this is what is wrong with the Reform Party. I know that the members of the Reform Party tend to kick up a fuss from time to time. We hear their cry from time to time in the House. Nevertheless, the members opposite are not in a bit of a state because the majority of Canadians are supporting them.

[*English*]

One member said a little earlier tonight that gun registration would not have eliminated a particular crime. The member described victims of a particular criminal incident and said that registering the guns would not have had the desired effect in that case. That is about the same as asking—and I have had a few people ask me about it—how many lives the registration of guns would save.

Mr. Abbott: Zero.

• (1940)

Mr. Boudria: That is a good point. I am glad the hon. member across the way is wide awake and listening. It is about the same as asking how man lives licence plates on motor vehicles will save.

If we do nothing else of course it will not save any. Who says it is not in the interests of society to do anything else? It is the same with licence plates on motor vehicles. It permits one to determine when cars are being used in an inappropriate way, to chase them down, to give tickets and to take other measures to provide greater safety for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

It is the same thing with gun control. It is the same thing. The members in this party and most Canadians want laws in this country that differentiate us from our neighbours to the south, in the United States of America. I have a great fondness for the United States, a great land of prosperity. However, the Americans have laws that permit people to bear arms in the street in some states, like Texas, for example.

Now this is not the sort of society we want in Canada. I say this to the members opposite over the outcry and all the noise the Reform Party is making—we do not want this sort of society. This is not at all what we want.

We want a society in which we will—

[*English*]

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sure hon. members would be interested in hearing the final moments of the speech of the government whip.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that I am trying not to be provocative, it is getting a few members across the way a bit more than excited. Nevertheless this is a serious piece of legislation proposed by a minister who has travelled the country to listen to the views of Canadians.

We have debated the bill longer than any other piece of legislation has been debated since we have been in office. We debated the bill, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, longer than we debated the throne speech, the budget debate and all the budget bills combined. We have nothing to apologize for. Canadians have been consulted.

Now that they have been consulted, the time for decision has come. This is a government that does not hesitate to make decisions. The government will make the necessary decisions. The government will enact the legislation necessary to make this a better, finer and safer society for all.

In a few years from now some of the members across the way in the Reform Party will be apologizing to the people of Canada for the wrongheaded decisions they are taking today. They will be apologizing for those blunders, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands put eloquently. That is what will happen. I say to members across the way that it is still time for them to change their minds. There is still time to vote for the legislation the people of Canada have asked us to enact. There is still time to do what the majority of Canadians want.

If members across the way think they are behaving in a way that is deserving of the support of the majority of the people they pretend to represent, now is the time to show it. Now is the time to vote on a measure the people of Canada want.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill as every bill is to make the country a safer place. I will indicate how the bill will do the exact opposite. It will make our streets less safe in the future.

As I only have two minutes I will be very brief. I will dispense with all the rhetoric and take the minister's argument a part piece by piece.

When passed the legislation will cost between $85 million and $500 million. That money has to come from somewhere and will be taken away from the functional arm of justice. There is something called opportunity cost. When it is pulled away from one arm of justice to another it should be put into an area with better efficiency. Unfortunately it has been proven that gun registration does not work and will not make our streets safer. Studies have been done in Australia, New Zealand and other countries.

The minister says that we will have less homicide. The reality is that of the 720 homicides in the country last year 220 were committed with firearms and 5 were committed with legally owned handguns. The minister says that we will have less suicide. Persons who are going to commit suicide do not go out to get a gun registration or an FAC. They do not go through all the loops necessary to get a gun. They kill themselves or attempt to kill themselves with whatever is available.

In short, that is why the registration aspect of Bill C–68 will not work. It will make our street less safe because it will take money away from the functional arm of justice.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 7.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(2), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Pursuant to agreement made earlier, all motions in Group No. 4 are deemed put and recorded divisions are deemed requested and deemed deferred.

Pursuant to agreement made earlier all the motions in Group Nos. 5 to 11 are deemed proposed and seconded, questions put, divisions requested and deemed deferred.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–68, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 5, with the following:

"safety of any other person, that the".

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–68, in Clause 5, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 13, on page 6, with the following:

"against any other person; or"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 17, on page 6, with the following:

"other person."

Motion No. 38

That Bill C–68, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 35 and 36, on page 16, with the following:

"desirable, in the interests of the safety of any other person, that the".

Motion No. 209

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 23 and 24, on page 90, with the following:

"ble in the interests of the safety of any other person, to make an order".

Motion No. 211

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 17 and 18, on page 91, with the following:

"the interests of the safety of any other".

Motion No. 217

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 40 and 41, on page 99, with the following:

"desirable in the interests of the safety of any other person, for the person";

(*b*) by replacing lines 4 and 5, on page 100, with the following:

"in the interests of the safety of any other person, for the person to possess any"; and

(*c*) by replacing line 11, on page 100, with the following:

"safety of any other person, it".

Motion No. 219

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 27, on page 101, with the following:

"interests of the safety of any other".

Motion No. 258

That Bill C–68, in Clause 147, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 114, with the following:

"n the interests of the safety of any other person."

Motion No. 260

That Bill C–68, in Clause 151, be amended by replacing lines 4 and 5, on page 116, with the following:

"the interests of the safety of any other person, to include as a condition".

Motion No. 262

That Bill C–68, in Clause 169, be amended by replacing lines 21 and 22, on page 123, with the following:

"interests of the safety of any other person, to make an order prohibiting the".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C–68, in Clause 6, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 30, on page 6, with the following:

"6. A person is eligible to hold a licence"; and

(*b*) by deleting lines 36 to 39, on page 6.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C–68, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 34, on page 7, with the following:

"restricted firearms only if the individual successfully completes a restricted firearms safety course that is approved by the attorney general of the province in which the course is given."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C–68, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 42, on page 8, and lines 1 and 2, on page 9, with the following:

"dividual against whom a prohibition order was made merely because another person against whom a prohibition order was made cohabited with, or was an associate of, the individual."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Clause 8 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 29 and 30 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"individual has consented, in writing or in any other manner that is satisfactory to the chief firearms officer, to the issuance of the licence."

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C–68, in Clause 62, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 10, on page 33, with the following:

"individual who is eighteen years old or older remains valid unless revoked pursuant this Act."

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 102

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 19, on page 38, the following new Clause:

"70.1 (1) A chief firearms officer shall not revoke or refuse to renew the licence of an individual to possess a restricted firearm, or a handgun referred to in paragraph 12(6)(*a*), where the individual

(*a*) is not eligible to hold the licence or have it renewed by reason only of illness, travel or other valid reason; and

(*b*) lends the firearm or handgun the Her Majesty, a police force or other borrower, in accordance with this Act, for the period of the ineligibility.

(2) The Registrar shall not revoke the registration certificate for a firearm or handgun in the circumstances referred to in subsection (1)."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Clause 9 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 14 to 21 on page 10 and substituting the following:

"holder to acquire restricted firearms.

(3.1) In subsection (3), "firearm" does not include a partially manufactured barrelled weapon that, in its unfinished state, is not a barrelled weapon

(*a*) from which any shot, bullet or other projectile can be discharged; and

(*b*) that is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to a person."

Motion No. 22

That Clause 9 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 31 to 35 on page 10 and substituting the following:

"(a) who, in the course of duties of employment, handles or would handle only firearms that are designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, antique firearms, and who has been trained to handle or use such a firearm; or"

Motion No. 33

That the French version of Clause 17.1 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 27 and 28 on page 15 and substituting the following:

"(iii) désire la transporter aux fins de réparation, d'entreposage, de vente, d'exportation ou d'évaluation,".

Motion No. 34

That the French version of Clause 17.1 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 32 on page 15 and substituting the following:

"d'armes à feu."

Motion No. 36

That the French version of clause 18 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 7 and 8 on page 16 and substituting the following:

"(iii) désire la transporter aux fins de réparation, d'entreposage, de vente, d'exportation ou d'évaluation,".

Motion No. 47

That the French version of Clause 29 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 5 on page 21 and substituting the following:

"ques, techniques ou scientifiques relatives".

Motion No. 57

That the French version of Clause 33 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 13 on page 22 and substituting the following:

"bées, de dispositifs prohibés, d'armes à autorisation restreinte, de"

Motion No. 72

That clause 43 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 23 to 28 on page 27 and substituting the following:

"(*c*) holds a licence authorizing it to possess those goods, except where those goods are to be shipped in transit through Canada by a business that does not carry on business in Canada;"

Motion No. 74

That the French version of clause 44 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 36 on page 27 and substituting the following:

"l'autorisation d'exportation à l'agent des"

Motion No. 80

That the French version of clause 48 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 6 on page 29 and substituting the following:

"tion de marchandises visées à l'article 42 doivent faire l'objet d'une autorisation"

Motion No. 89

That the English version of clause 54 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 13 and 14 on page 31 and substituting the following:

"54. (1) a chief firearms officer is responsible for issuing licences."

Motion No. 90

That the English version of clause 55 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 20 to 22 on page 31 and substituting the following:

"55. a chief firearms officer is responsible for issuing authorizations to carry and authorizations to transport."

Motion No. 171

That the French version of clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 33 on page 70 and substituting the following:

«exporter» Exporter hors du Canada, notamment exporter des marchandises importées au Canada et expédiées en transit à travers celui–ci."

Motion No. 172

That the French version of clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 37 to 40 on page 70 and substituting the following:

«importer» Importer au Canada, notamment importer des marchandises expédiées en transit à travers le Canada et exportées hors de celui–ci.»

Motion No. 227

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 36 and 37 on page 108 and substituting the following:

"prohibited device or prohibited ammunition if, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, the thing to be prescribed is reasonable for use"

Motion No. 261

That clause 161.1 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 32 on page 118 and substituting the following:

"(*d*) have been taken as a sample or seized under the Firearms Act or any other Act of Parliament; or"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Bill C–68, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 20, on page 13, with the following:

"and for which on".

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C–68, in Clause 12, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 44 to 45, on page 13, with the following:

"1977 if the particular individual is the spouse or a brother, sister, child or descendent of an"; and

(*b*) by adding after line 2, on page 14, the following:

"(7.1) Where the particular handgun referred to in subsection (6) was manufactured between 1945 and 1977, the particular individual referred to in subsection (7) is only eligible for the licence if the individual submits, with the application for the licence, a statutory declaration declaring the handgun to be a family heirloom and stating the reasons for that belief."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 159

That clause 113 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 19 to 25 on page 59 and substituting the following:

"tion certificate;

(*b*) in the case of an individual referred to in subsection 12(2), (3), (4), (5), (6) or (8), to acquire and possess any prohibited firearms referred to in that subsection that are acquired by the holder on or after the commencement day; and

(*c*) in the case of a particular individual who is eligible under subsection 12(7) to hold a licence authorizing the particular individual to possess a handgun referred to in subsection 12(6) (pre–February 14, 1995 handguns) in the circumstances described in subsection 12(7), to acquire and possess such a handgun in those circumstances, if the particular handgun is acquired by the particular individual on or after the commencement day."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 160

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 40, on page 59, the following new Clause:

"113.1 (1) Every person who, immediately before the coming into force of any of subsections 106(1), 106.2(1) and 106.4(1), possessed a firearm without a firearm acquisition certificate because

(*a*) the person possessed the firearm before January 1, 1979, or

(*b*) the firearm acquisition certificate under which the person had acquired the firearm had expired, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2001 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm.

(2) Every person who, immediately before the coming into force of any of subsections 106(1), 106.2(1) and 106.4(1), possessed a firearm and was the holder of a firearm acquisition certificate shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2001 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm.

(3) Every person who, at any time between the coming into force of subsection 106(1), 106.2(1) or 106.4(1) and the later of January 1, 1998 and such other date as is prescribed, possesses a firearm that, as of that date, is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2003 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a registration certificate for that firearm."

Motion No. 168

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 69, with the following:

"(*a*) a handgun that has a barrel equal to or less than 105 mm in length".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 169

That clause 133 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out line 34 on page 69 and substituting the following:

"a 25 or 32 calibre cartridge,"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 226

That Bill C–68, in Clause 133, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 32, on page 108, with the following:

"(2) Subject to subsection (3), in making regulations, the Governor in"; and

(*b*) by adding after line 38, on page 108, the following:

"(3) The Governor in Council may not prescribe any handgun that is designed or adapted to discharge a .25 or .32 calibre cartridge to be a prohibited firearm."

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 26

That Bill C–68, in Clause 12, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 21, on page 13, with the following:

"February 28, 1995 a registration certificate"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 25, on page 13, with the following:

"(*a*) on February 28, 1995".

Motion No. 37

That Bill C–68, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 19, on page 16, with the following:

"12(6) (pre–February 28, 1995 handguns) may".

Motion No. 44

That Bill C–68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 19, with the following:

"subsection 12(6) (pre–February 28), 1995".

Motion No. 46

That Bill C–68, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 26, on page 19, with the following:

"12(6) (pre–February 28, 1995 handguns) or".

Motion No. 86

That Bill C–68, in Clause 52, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 30, with the following:

"in subsection 12(6) (pre–February 28, 1995".

Motion No. 94

That Bill C–68, in Clause 63, be amended by replacing line 3, on page 34, with the following:

"12(6) (pre–February 28, 1995 handguns) for".

Motion No. 96

That Bill C–68, in Clause 65, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 10, on page 35, with the following:

"(pre–February 28, 1995 handguns) a chief"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 26, on page 35, with the following:

"(28, 1995 handguns) that are possessed by an".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C–68, in Clause 16 be amended by replacing lines 1 to 4, on page 13, with the following:

"16. (1) A registration certificate for a prohib–ited firearm or a restricted firearm may be issued to only one person.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for which a registration certificate".

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C–68, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 42, on page 14, with the following:

"of a firearm where

(*a*) two spouses, who each hold a licence to possess the firearm, apply to have the registration certificate issued to them jointly; or

(*b*) a registration certificate referred to in section 121 was issued for the firearm to more than one person."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 114

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 80.

Motion No. 115

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Motion No. 116

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 83.

Motion No. 118

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 84.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 85.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 86.

Motion No. 121

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 122

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 88.

Motion No. 123

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 89.

Motion No. 124

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 90.

Motion No. 125

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 126

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 92.

Motion No. 127

That Bill C–68, in Clause 93, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 24, on page 46, with the following:

"registration certificates and authorizations; and".

Motion No. 128

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 97.

Motion No. 129

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 98.

Motion No. 130

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 99.

Motion No. 131

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

Motion No. 132

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 101.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C–68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing line 44, on page 55, with the following:

"(*p*) subject to section 110.1, prescribing the fees that are to be paid to".

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 149

That Bill C–68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing line 44, on page 55, with the following:

"(*p*) prescribing, after consultation with the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to justice, for a period of twenty years following the coming into force of the regulations, the fees that are to be paid to".

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 150

That Bill C–68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 5, on page 56, with the following:

"(q) prescribing, in a manner that is equal and fair for every one, the method of payment for the fees payable under paragraph (p);".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 151

That Bill C–68, in Clause 110, be amended by deleting lines 12 and 13, on page 56.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 152

That Bill C–68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 33, on page 56, with the following:

"provision of this Act or the regulations applies;".

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 153

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 26, on page 57, the following new Clause:

"110.1 (1) The fees referred to in paragraph 110(p) shall not be increased during any period by a percentage greater than the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the same period.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the Consumer Price Index for a period means the average of the Consumer Price Index for Canada, as published by Statistics Canada under the authority of the Statistics Act.

(3) No fee shall be prescribed under paragraph 110(p) for the transfer of a firearm by an individual to an immediate family member."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 155

That Bill C–68, in Clause 111, be amended by replacing lines 44 to 46, on page 57, and lines 1 to 5, on page 58, with the following:

"(3) A proposed regulation that has been laid pursuant to subsection (1) may be made

(*a*) on the expiration of thirty sitting days after it has been laid; or

(*b*) at any time after it has been laid, where the federal Minister is of the opinion that the making of the regulation is urgent."

Motion No. 156

That Bill C–68, in Clause 111, be amended by adding after line 5, on page 58, the following:

"(3.1) A regulation shall be made subject to affirmative resolution of Parliament."

Motion No. 157

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 112.

Motion No. 161

That Bill C–68, in Clause 121, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 43, on page 62, and lines 1 and 2, on page 63, with the following:

"(2) For greater certainty, a registration certificate that is deemed to be a registration certificate issued under section 58 is valid until it expires by virtue of section 64."

Motion No. 162

That Bill C–68, in Clause 123, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 44, on page 63, with the following:

"(3) A permit expires on the expiration of the period for which it was expressed to be issued."

Motion No. 263

That Bill C–68, in Clause 169, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 43, on page 123.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C–68, in Clause 29, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 5 and 6, on page 21, with the following:

"relate or distinguish the one or more restricted firearms or handguns in his or her collection;"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 10, on page 21, with the following:

"handguns collection is to be kept; and".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C–68, in Clause 31, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 21, with the following:

"sections 20 to 27, 29, 30, 39 to 41 and 45 to".

Motion No. 61

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 34.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 62

That Bill C–68, in Clause 34, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 24 and 25, on page 22, with the following:

"licence may import a restricted firearm if, at the time of the"; and

(b) by replacing lines 34 and 35, on page 22, with the following:

"(iii) produces an authorization to transport the".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 63

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 35.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C–68 be amended by deleting Clause 36.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C–68, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8, on page 24, with the following:

"licence may export a restricted firearm that was imported by".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 66

That Bill C–68, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 5, on page 25, with the following:

"(ii) produces his or her licence and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a re–stricted firearm, the registration certificate for the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm and the authorization to transport the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm; and".

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C–68, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 3 and 4, on page 25, with the following:

"and an authorization to".

Motion No. 68

That Bill C–68, in Clause 39, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 27 to 29, on page 25, with the following:

"accordance with that section and an authorization to transport the"; and

(*b*) by replacing lines 31 and 32, on page 25, with the following:

"(*c*) in the case of a restricted firearm for which a registra–".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 75

That clause 45 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 8 to 13 on page 28 and substituting the following:

"(*a*) holds a licence authorizing it to acquire and possess those goods, except where those goods are to be shipped in transit through Canada by a business that does not carry on business in Canada;"

Motion No. 83

That clause 51.1 of Bill C–68 be amended by striking out lines 26 to 34 on page 29 and substituting the following:

"51.1 No business shall import a prohibited firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition that is to be shipped in transit through Canada and exported."

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 84

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding immediately after line 34 on page 29 the following the new article:

"51.1 (1) A person shall not import or export a firearm that has not been rendered inoperative by a secure locking device.

(2) For the purposes of this section, "secure locking device" means a device that

(*a*) cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock; and

(*b*) once installed on an unrestricted firearm or a restricted firearm, prevents it from shooting.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(4) A person who has been convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(5) An offence referred to in subsection (1) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(6) For greater certainty, notwithstanding sub section (4), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in subsection (1).

(7) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in sub– section (1).

Motion No. 135

That Bill C–68 be amended by adding after line 24, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"103.1 (1) A person shall not complete the assembly or manufacture of a firearm without equipping the firearm with a secure locking device.

(2) For the purposes of this section, "secure locking device" means a device that

(*a*) cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock; and

(*b*) once installed on an unrestricted firearm or a restricted firearm, prevents it from shooting.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under sub section (1) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(4) A person who has been convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(5) An offence referred to in subsection (1) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(6) For greater certainty, notwithstanding sub section (4), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in subsection (1).

(7) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in subsection (1).

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 229

That Bill C–68, in Clause 134, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 109, with the following:

"ing knowing it is unauthorized)"."

Motion No. 257

That Bill C–68, in Clause 145, be amended by deleting lines 3 and 4, on page 113.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

• (2005)

And the division bells having rung:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you were to seek it I think you would find unanimous consent to deal first with report stage Motion No. 267 and then to deal with the motions in the order in which they are listed on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, I recognize the hon. member for York South—Weston.

[*English*]

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note there are some 267 amendments. It would be helpful if we were to receive a brief explanation of what the purpose of each amendment is.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to disappoint the hon. member for York South—Weston but it would take up a great deal of time for the Chair to try to explain each amendment.

If the hon. member is rising on the same point of order, the Chair has already dealt with it. If it is a different point of order, I will recognize the hon. member for York South—Weston.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I understand you are requesting unanimous consent. I am simply indicating that members need to vote intelligently on these amendments. When bills are presented to the House there is an explanatory note. For those of us who did not sit at the justice committee or sit through the evidence this is the first opportunity for the House to consider 267 amendments. I am not asking that each and every amendment be dealt with in great detail but for a brief explanation as to what the effect of the amendment would be.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the Chair take it the hon. member is not giving unanimous consent to deal with Motion No. 267 first?

Mr. Nunziata: I am content to deal with Motion No. 267 first but I would like someone to explain in 30 seconds what amendment 267 is all about.

The Deputy Speaker: I take it there is unanimous consent to deal with Motion No. 267 first. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 267.

(The House divided on Motion No. 267, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 252)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Bélisle
Culbert
Daviault
de Jong
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
MacDonald
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
Mitchell
Nault
Nunziata
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ablonczy
Arseneault
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Bridgman
Bélair
Caron
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Finlay
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
Loubier
Manning
Mayfield
McCormick
Mills (Red Deer)
Murphy
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rideout
Ringma
Sauvageau
Serré
Solberg
Speller
Steckle
Strahl
Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
White (Fraser Valley West)
Riis
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Silye
Speaker
St. Denis
Stinson
Taylor
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne
Wood—96

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harvard
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Murray
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Zed—123
Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Flis
Fry
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Harb
Hickey
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Robillard
Rompkey
Sheridan
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

• (2020)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 267 lost.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member for Mississauga East voted twice on the motion. Am I correct in assuming that the House would count her first vote in support of the motion?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary rose to explain that she had been counted in error and therefore she was counted with her second vote.

The next question is on Motion No. 1. The Chair's understanding is that the Chair is not going to have to read each of the motions, that the number is sufficient.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, it appears that only two members are voting in favour of the motion. Perhaps I could ask for unanimous consent that the members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting nay, with the exception of one or two who could rise to ask that their vote be recorded as yes.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent to that motion.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a bit of misunderstanding on how you vote on these issues. The clerk has looked on both sides of it. Can you explain to members which side you will be looking at first when you are voting?

The Deputy Speaker: Actually, neither side. The clerk has to do the counting. We try not to look on either side. We look wherever somebody is standing.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 253)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Mayfield
Mitchell	Nault
Riis	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Ur	Wappel
Wood—17	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Benoit	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Harvard
Hermanson	Hickey
Hoeppner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald

MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Sheridan
Silye	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wells	White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—209	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

• (2030)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

[*English*]

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was voting in favour of the motion and I inadvertently got a vote ahead. I want to make sure that my name was not recorded twice in error.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 10.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save a bit of time, I wonder if there would be a disposition that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay. Perhaps the mover of the motion and others could stand and indicate if they wish to vote differently.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc members will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. As the member for Calgary Centre, I wish to record my vote as a yea.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote nay on this motion, including the member for Kamloops who had voted yea on the previous motion.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent among all the members to proceed as has been proposed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (2035)

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It would be helpful when the government whip rose if he stated which motion number it was applying to.

The Deputy Speaker: It is Motion No. 10. That has been agreed to and the vote will be counted shortly.

Mr. St. Denis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if we have finished the count, but I want to be shown as being in favour of Motion No. 10.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, do we get up on a point of order and indicate that or do we just stand up? Please explain. I was voting in favour of the motion. Do you require us to get up on a point of order to do that or do you just look to either side to see who gets up?

The Deputy Speaker: That is a good point. Is anybody not satisfied that their vote has not been indicated by what was said or by what they have done?

Mr. Nault: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 10, if that is the motion we are voting on now.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear as well that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 10.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Miramichi on a point of order.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, we know the Miramichi is a great river, but the Restigouche is even greater. I would be voting in favour of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing and the hon. member for the great river of Miramichi.

Mr. Hubbard: No.

Mr. Wood: I am voting in favour, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 254)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Debien
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Hubbard
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Mitchell
Nault
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Silye
St. Denis
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wood—39

Bellehumeur
Bouchard
Bélisle
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Hopkins
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Ménard
Nunez
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Shepherd
Speller
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky

Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—187

Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Serré
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel

Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

[*English*]

The House is now voting on Motion No. 158.

• (2040)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House would concur to apply the result just taken on the vote on report stage Motion No. 10 to report stage Motion No. 158 which is the one we are now dealing with. The votes appear prima facie at least to be identical. Perhaps the House could seek that and any member wishing to indicate otherwise could rise at that point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. McCormick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it recorded that I voted in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Finlay: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Dromisky: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Serré: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Steckle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record my vote as being in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Shepherd: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on the motion.

Mr. Verran: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the motion.

Ms. Ur: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Skoke: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make sure that my vote is recorded as a nay for Motion No. 158.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be recorded that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

I think part of the problem is that the sheet the Speaker is using which has grouped the votes is not available to the members which may be slowing down the vote. Perhaps if the Speaker could give us the list of motions as they are in groupings, that would allow us to get the votes done a little quicker because we will be able to anticipate what the vote is going to be on.

The Deputy Speaker: Anything that would speed things up would be fine.

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

(*Division No. 255*)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Dromisky	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Finlay	Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay	Hopkins
Hubbard	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loubier
MacDonald	McCormick
Mitchell	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Serré	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Venne
Verran	Wappel
Wells	Wood—50

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie

Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Murray
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye
Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Vanclief
Walker
Zed—177

Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Solberg
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Valeri
Volpe
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette–Maltais
Walker
Young

● (2045)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 167.

Mr. Silye: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put some order back into this evening's proceedings. This is at the prompting of some of the ministers of the crown on the front benches.

I suggest we have a stand up vote on Motion 167 and we duly record everyone's wishes. I think it will follow what we have agreed to beforehand as the whips. If that is the case, then we can proceed with the applied votes and reverse applied if it works out that way.

The Deputy Speaker: Anything for order, I am sure we are all for that.

The House divided on Motion No. 167, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 256*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Shepherd
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)—50

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi

Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Zed—175

Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

● (2055)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 266.

(The House divided on Motion No. 266, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 257*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Assad
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Daviault
de Jong
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Ringma
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Speller

Ablonczy
Arseneault
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Finlay
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mitchell
Ménard
Nunziata
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Riis
Robinson
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Stinson

Strahl
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)—86

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Walker
Zed—137
Alcock
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Murphy
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Wells

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette–Maltais
Walker
Young

● (2100)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 266 lost.

[English]

Moving on to group No. 2, the next question is on Motion No. 5.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 258)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson

Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—152

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Ablonczy
Benoit
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bryden
Caron
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)—74

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

● (2110)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 145.

The House divided on Motion No. 145, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 259*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Cowling
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—153
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman
Brien
Bélisle
Caron
Cummins
Daviault
Debien
de Savoye
Duceppe
Dumas
Duncan
Epp
Fillion
Forseth
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Guay
Hanger
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner
Jennings
Johnston
Kerpan
Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Nunez
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Pomerleau
Ramsay
Ringma
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Strahl
Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)—71

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bachand
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder
Canuel
Copps
Crawford
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies
Discepola
Dubé
Dupuy
Easter
Godin
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Irwin
Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Mercier
O'Reilly
Proud
Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons
Walker
Whelan
Young

● (2120)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 145 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 4. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6 and 154.

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

(*Division No. 260*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Ablonczy
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman
Culbert
Cummins
de Jong
Duncan
Epp
Forseth
Frazer
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Hanger
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner
Hopkins
Hubbard
Jennings
Johnston
Kerpan
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Morrison
Murphy
Nault
Penson
Ramsay
Riis
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Silye
Skoke
Solberg
Speaker
Speller
Stinson
Strahl
Taylor
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood—60

NAYS

Members

Adams
Alcock
Allmand
Anawak
Anderson
Arseneault
Assad
Assadourian
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Barnes
Beaumier
Bellehumeur
Bellemare
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bethel
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar
Bonin
Bouchard
Boudria
Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett
Bryden
Bélair
Bélanger
Bélisle
Caccia
Campbell
Cannis
Caron
Catterall
Cauchon
Chamberlain
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy
Cohen
Collenette
Comuzzi
Cowling
Daviault
Debien
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Duceppe
Duhamel
Dumas
Eggleton
English
Fewchuk
Fillion
Finestone

Flis	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Ianno
Jackson	Jordan
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murray	Ménard
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Zed—163	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

• (2130)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. Motions Nos. 6 and 154 are also therefore negatived.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 23 I am told only ensures that the French and English texts are the same. Perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, could ask if there are five members who actually desire a vote on this. If not, we could then deal with it accordingly.

The Deputy Speaker: Members have heard the words of the whip of the government. Are there five members who are concerned about this matter? It would seem not.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

(Motion No. 23 agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24.

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

• (2140)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 negatived.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 28. A vote on Motion No. 28 applies to Motions 29, 43, 49, 51, 60, 69, 71, 76, 79, 92, 95, 100, 207, 215, 216, 218 and 225. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 28 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 50. A negative vote on Motion No. 28 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 50.

All those in favour of Motion No. 28 will please rise.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find that Motion No. 76 should not be included in the grouping.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that acceptable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save time let me try again to see if there would be unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 24, in other words the last one, to report stage Motion No. 28, which is the one now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Members have heard the terms of the proposal. Is there unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken to the motion now before the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it understood that all of the motions that were indicated earlier would also be affected by the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 261*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 28 negatived. Therefore Motions Nos. 29, 43, 49, 51, 60, 69, 71, 76, 79, 92, 95, 100, 207, 215, 216, 218, 225 are negatived.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent success, let me ask for unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on the last motion to Motions 50, 41, 42 and 45. They all stand in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I can try for a few more if the House is so disposed. We can also try to determine whether or not there is agreement to apply the same vote to report stage Motions Nos. 87, 88, 8, 174, 187, 189, 191, 197, 199, 223, 134, 136, 146, 147, 164, 166, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 196, 202, 228, 231, 240, 13, 15, 17, 93, 102, 25, 27, 160, 31, 161, 53, 61 and 66.

• (2145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 261*]

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 50, 41, 42, 45, 87, 88, 8, 174, 187, 189, 191, 197, 199, 223, 134, 136, 146, 147, 164, 166, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 196, 202, 228, 231, 240, 13, 15, 17, 93, 102, 25, 27, 160, 31, 161, 53, 61 and 66 are negatived.

(*Division No. 261*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)—49

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri

Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Robichaud
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Wood
Zed—173	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 78.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent to apply the result just taken in reverse to the motion now before the House, Motion No. 78.

I believe you would also find unanimous consent to do the same on Motions Nos. 109, 111 and 169.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent by all members to what has just been proposed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 262*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Brien	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee

Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—173

Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)—49

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 78, 109, 111 and 169 are agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 54.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to determine if there is unanimous consent that the members who voted on the motion just prior to this be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House in the following manner, with Liberal members voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Quebecois are also in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that Reform Party members will vote no to this motion, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

• (2150)

The Deputy Speaker: If any members wish to vote otherwise indicate so now.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 263*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélanger

Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Jong
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—180

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—42

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 54 carried.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the same vote to Motion No. 103.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: The same could be done on Motion No. 220 if we are seeking unanimous consent and for Motion No. 75.

The Deputy Speaker: We are only dealing with Motion No. 103 at the moment.

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. The member for Swift Current may wish—

The Deputy Speaker: Would the Reform Party members who wish to vote otherwise please indicate so now.

Mr. Taylor: We vote in favour, Mr. Speaker.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 263.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 103 carried.

Is there unanimous consent to apply those votes as indicated?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 263.*]

The Deputy Speaker: Therefore Motions Nos. 220 and 75 are agreed to.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 7. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 133, 173, 181, 198 and 222. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 7 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 137, 144, 163, 114, 182, 184, 192, 197, 199, 201 and 223.

• (2155)

A negative vote on Motion No. 7 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 8, 174, 184, 197 and 223.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent that the members who just voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting against this particular motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The members of the Bloc Quebecois support this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members are against this motion and vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yea unless otherwise noted.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 264)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bellehumeur
Blaikie
Brien
Caron
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Nunez
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Bélisle
Daviault
de Jong
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Riis
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—34

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bethel
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay

Reed
Richardson
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—189

Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 rejected. Consequently Motions Nos. 133, 173, 181, 198 and 222 are negatived.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could seek unanimous consent that the same result apply to report stage Motions Nos. 200, 148, 149 and 150.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 264.*]

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 200, 148, 149 and 150 are negatived.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent that members voting on the previous motion could be recorded on the present motion with Liberal members voting nay on Motion No. 184.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Quebecois support this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members vote yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

● (2200)

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats vote yea.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 184, which was negatived on the following division;)

(*Division No. 265*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Daviault
de Jong
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)—77

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Penson
Pomerleau
Riis
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan

Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Zed—146

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent to apply the same vote to the following motions: Motions 35, 165, 239, 16, 30 and 155.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 265*]

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 35, 165, 239, 16, 30, and 155 are negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 182.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find agreement that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the present motion.

Liberal MPs will be voting yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Quebecois will vote nay.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party vote yea, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote yea on report stage Motion No. 182.

(The House divided on Motion No. 182, which was agreed to on the following division.)

(*Division No. 266*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare

Benoit
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—195
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bouchard
Bélisle
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Nunez
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Debien
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—28

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette–Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 182 agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 183.

Before calling on the government whip, an affirmative vote on Motion No. 183 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 187, 189 and 191. A negative vote on Motion No. 183 necessitates the question being put on Motions 187, 189 and 191.

• (2205)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you could find unanimous consent to record the votes in the following way: Liberal members will be voting nay on this motion.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record that I will be voting in favour of that amendment.

Mr. Murphy: Yea, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, we will vote nay on Motion No. 183.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will probably vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 183, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 267)

YEAS

Members

Mitchell — Murphy—2

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—221
Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Benoit
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Daviault
de Jong
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Epp
Fillion
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 183 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 186.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you would ask it, I believe you would find there is unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting as follows on the motion now before the House: Liberal members will vote yea.

Again, if you were to ask it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the same result to Motions Nos. 188, 190, 185 and 159.

Mr. Duceppe: Bloc members will vote nay on all these motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, and the Reform Party members vote no.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats agree and we would vote yea.

(The House divided on Motion No. 186, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 268*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—152

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)—71
Ablonczy
Benoit
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Penson
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette–Maltais
Walker
Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 186 carried. Therefore, Motions Nos. 188, 190, 185, and 159 are also carried.

• (2210)

The next question is on Motion No. 201.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the result in reverse taken to Motion No. 182 to the vote now before the House.

I think you would find unanimous consent as well to apply the same results to Motion No. 230 and Motion No. 84.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion proposed. Is that agreed?

Mr. Duceppe: D'accord.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed, with unanimous consent.

(The House divided on the motion which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 269)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bouchard
Bélisle
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Nunez
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Debien
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—28

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman

Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—195

Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

[*English*]

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting yea on Motion No. 230.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 201 negatived. Consequently Motions Nos. 84 and 230 are negatived. The vote on Motion No. 230 applies to Motions Nos. 232, 234, 236, 238, 242, 245, 248, 251 and 254.

The next question is on Motion No. 179. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 259.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find there is unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting as follows: Liberal members will vote nay on this motion.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Quebecois will vote nay. I believe the results of this vote could also be applied to Motion No. 208.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members vote yea except for those members who wish to vote otherwise on both motions.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote no to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 179, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 270*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)—43	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson

Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Riis
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—180

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 179 negatived. Therefore Motion No. 259 is also negatived.

• (2215)

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 18.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, before putting the question on the motion you just mentioned, could you seek unanimous consent to apply the vote just completed on Motion No. 179, but in reverse, to Motion No. 220?

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent it is so ordered.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 271*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Jong
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney

Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—180

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—43
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 18, if you were to seek unanimous consent I think you would find that the Liberal members will be recorded as voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Members of the Bloc Quebecois will vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: With respect to Motion No. 18 by unanimous consent it is so ordered, as was indicated by the whips.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 266*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 21. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172, 227 and 261.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair to determine whether five members wish to rise and ask for a recorded division. In other words, if the Chair would seek the yeas and nays, the Speaker might find that members do not wish a recorded vote on this motion for the same reason as the other item earlier today.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

• (2220)

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of clarification. These are all government amendments. I am in favour of them all except Motion No. 227 which would have the affect of overturning an amendment carried at committee. If I vote in favour of Motion No. 21 can I still vote against Motion No. 227, or am I precluded from doing so?

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit the hon. member to vote as he has just outlined?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, I too want to be noted as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would also like it to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Nault: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227 as well.

Mr. St. Denis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227. Could I also record that I am in favour of Motion No. 102?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record likewise with regard to Motion No. 227, that I would vote against it.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification on the motion. We cannot find it and we do not know what it is. We would like it to be read, please.

The Deputy Speaker: It is Motion No. 21 in Group No 7. Mr. Rock, seconded by Mrs. Marleau, moved:

That clause 9 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 14 to 21 on page 10 and substituting the following:

"holder to acquire restricted firearms.

Does the hon. whip of the Reform Party want Motion No. 227 read out as well?

Mr. Silye: Yes.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I understood the House to be voting on report stage Motion No. 21. Perhaps the Chair could just ask for the vote on Motion No. 21 and we will deal with it accordingly. The other motion is not even before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. whip of the Reform Party was going to consult. Does he have a further point he wishes to make?

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is in favour of Motion No. 21 but we are against Motion No. 227 and I do not know why you have Motion No. 227 grouped with Motion No. 21.

The Deputy Speaker: It is a consequential ruling by the Chair that the vote would apply to Motion No. 227 as well, along with a number of others.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of efficiency here I would like to clarify that the Reform Party members will vote yea on Motion No. 21 and nay on Motion No. 227.

• (2225)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc members will vote in favour of Motion No. 21, but against Motion No. 227.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other permutations or combinations?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 21 New Democrats would vote yea, but I believe the whip of the government should be informing the House on why Motion No. 227 is not before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The table officers who have been terrific will try to figure all that out and give us the count on Motions Nos. 21 and 227.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you clarify whether we are also voting on Motion No. 227? If that is the case I should like to be recorded as being opposed to Motion No. 227.

The Deputy Speaker: I gather there is no consent to do what we have been trying to do for the last 15 minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, if there is no consent to function as logically as we have just done, I would propose that the whips of each party indicate how the members of their respective parties will vote on Motion No. 21 and the subsequent motions and that the party whips be asked to indicate how their party will vote on Motion No. 227, more specifically.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The problem has been caused by the fact that in the confusion we were voting on Motion No. 21. The vote on Motion No. 21 also applies to about 15 other motions including Motion No. 227.

Apparently the Table can figure out how we have all voted if the government and all the other party whips will permit us to do the calculation and come back with an answer. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, there is some difficulty with what is happening at this point.

We were told that we were voting on report stage Motion No. 21. I believe, if you were to seek it, you would find the respective whips would indicate that probably everyone is voting for that motion.

However the difficulty is the following one. I believe the Chair is seeking, at the request of one member, to split the decision already taken by the Chair earlier today, which would have the effect of voting separately on Motion No. 227 and then on all the other motions grouped in that list of some 10 or 15 motions indicated earlier by Mr. Speaker.

I never understood that we could split a decision made by the Chair. If the Chair could explain that to us we could proceed.

The Deputy Speaker: The point is one that I think can be accepted. The Chair has made a ruling that the vote on Motion No. 21 will apply to all the other ones.

As the whip indicated, the hon. member for Scarborough West wished in effect to vote differently. However we are bound by the ruling of Mr. Speaker and therefore we will have to take a vote, I suppose on Motion No. 21, and it will be applied to all the others as indicated by the ruling of the Chair.

• (2230)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, we could certainly quite reasonably follow a logic that does not stand up in order to follow procedure, because we support Motion No. 21 and the subsequent motions, except Motion No. 227. We could, therefore, battle over procedure, and all those watching us this evening would conclude that we are procedural experts rather than people who vote responsibly.

I therefore suggest that the House decide unanimously to vote on Motion No. 21 and the others and to vote on Motion No. 227

separately so we can do this a bit logically and so that people understand what we are doing here tonight.

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, is there unanimous consent to vote on Motion No. 227 separately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: So we will vote on this motion separately.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, now that we have separated the two matters, I think you could ask the House whether five members wish to rise and ask for a recorded vote on the group of motions you have listed, with the exception of Motion No. 227, which we will vote on shortly.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the motion of the government whip. Do five members wish to rise as indicated?

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

As there are no nays, Motion No. 21 is adopted. Accordingly Motions Nos. 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172 and 261 are agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 227.

(The House divided on Motion No. 227, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 272*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hubbard
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Murphy
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Walker—132

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Arseneault
Benoit
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Cummins
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mitchell
Ménard
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Wells
Wood—85
Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Culbert
Daviault
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Nault
Nunziata
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

● (2240)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 227 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 26, but there may be some confusion. Do any of the whips wish to make representations?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on further consideration, I think the Chair will have to seek the vote directly from the floor.

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 273)

YEAS

Members

Hopkins	Mitchell
Murphy	Nault
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Wood—8

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guarnieri	Guay
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Kerpan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murray	Ménard
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)—213	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

• (2250)

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be registered as voting nay on this motion.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 26 lost. Consequently Motions Nos. 37, 44, 46, 86, 94 and 96 are also lost.

Perhaps the government whip might indicate whether he thinks Motion No. 32 has been voted on. It appears it has not.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in the essence of time and co-operation I believe there would be a disposition to apply the result of the vote just taken on the following motions proposed by the same hon. member: Motions Nos. 32, 48 and 62.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: See list under Division No. 273*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 32, 48 and 62 rejected.

The final question is on Motion No. 75. The vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 83.

• (2255)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who have just voted be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members will be voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote nay, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent all those votes are cast as indicated.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 75, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 274*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Ianno
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)

Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wood—178

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—43
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan
Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 75 agreed to. Consquently Motion No. 83 is also agreed to.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(*Division No. 275*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guay
Harvard
Ianno
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan

Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel

Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells—170

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Plamondon
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Collins
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ramsay
Ringma
Serré
Silye
Speaker
Stinson
Taylor
Ur
Wood—58

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

[*English*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adjourn?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 13, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of the information commissioner for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1995, pursuant to section 38 of the Access to Information Act. Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this document is permanently tabled with the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I set my document down upstairs. I expect to have it in a few moments. I am sure that given the importance of the documents the hon. members opposite will consent to me reverting to those in a few minutes. Perhaps after the petitions are done that could be done.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present this morning.

The first petition that I have the duty to present is signed by quite a number of constituents from the communities of Meadow Lake, Loon Lake, Rapid View, Makwa, St. Walburg, and Dorintosh in The Battlefords—Meadow Lake constituency.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that the majority of Canadians are law-abiding citizens who respect the law and that the majority of Canadians believe that physicians in Canada should be working to save lives, not to end them. Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): The second petition I have today, Mr. Speaker, is signed by Canadians who live in the town of Wilkie and the area surrounding the town of Wilkie in northwest Saskatchewan in The Battlefords—Meadow Lake constituency.

The petitioners note that the subject of pornography is a very controversial and complicated one, which poses a great threat to family life in Canada through negative images of women, men, and children, and note that the violent behaviour depicted by various media such as killer cards and video games have the potential of negatively affecting the attitudes and behaviour of children.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to take action toward ending pornography in all its various forms and call upon Parliament to pass legislation that contains clear definitions reflecting the advanced technological and rapidly changing nature of Canadian society and reflecting local community standards of tolerance.

• (1010)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada.

This petition originates from the Surrey and Delta regions of Canada. The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession, which has not been recognized for its value to our society. They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families who make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition signed by numerous residents of Toronto, Ontario, who call upon Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 137 and 191.

[*Text*]

Question No. 137—**Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):**

How many full time and part time staff are involved in and what is the total cost of administering the current firearms laws and regulations for all of Canada and what share of the costs is borne by the three levels of government: Federal, Provincial and Municipal?

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): The federal cost of administering the current firearms control program is borne mainly by the Department of Justice Canada and the firearms registration and administration section of the RCMP. Federal expenditures and the number of staff in 1993–94, the last completed fiscal year, are shown in the following table. The provincial and territorial governments and the municipalities should be consulted directly in order to obtain their cost information.

1. Department of Justice Canada

Staff (Full time and term employees)—10

Operating budget (including salaries)—$5.7 million

Money transferred to provinces—territories pursuant to financial agreements—$8.4 million

(2) Firearms registration and administration section, RCMP

Staff (Full time and term employees)—47

Operating budget (including salaries)—$1.4 million

Total federal cost—$15.5 million

1. This figure includes certain one time only cost. Approximately $2 million were invested in the development of the Canadian firearms safety training course: a 1.2 million grant to provinces and territories to initially set up their safety training program and $1.4 million was spent on the development and implementation of the automated system for firearm acquisition certificates and accompanying forms.

2. This amount represents the compensation to provinces and territories for 1993–94 as per new agreements.

Question No. 191—**Mr. Hanger (Calgary Northeast):**

Of all the people travelling in their country of origin and referred by airlines to Canadian authorities abroad for the purpose of document verification in 1994, how many, in each country where such document verification took place, were, (*a*) permanent residents landed in Canada as convention refugees, or (*b*) persons residing in Canada after having made a refugee claim?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Canadian authorities abroad do not routinely maintain statistical information on the number of persons referred by airline companies for the purpose of document verification, although it is true that certain individual missions abroad may choose to compile figures in order to audit their own workload, where such verifications constitute a significant proportion of mission immigration activities.

Consequently, the government is not in a position to provide country by country figures on the number of referrals involving convention refugees or refugee claimants in their countries of origin.

However, we can say that referrals either involve persons whose documents are subsequently found to be inauthentic and who are attempting illegal travel to Canada, or involve persons about whose documents there are doubts for one reason or another but who are later confirmed to be properly documented travellers. This latter group includes foreign visitors, foreign students, permanent residents and Canadian citizens. While some of those who are confirmed to be permanent residents are persons who were landed as convention refugees or are persons who had earlier made refugee claims, others are persons who were landed as independent immigrants, business immigrants or members of the family class. In addition, it must be appreciated that persons holding Canadian permanent residence documents, whatever the category of landing, are also referred for other reasons altogether, for example to establish whether following an extended absence from Canada they are still entitled to Canadian resident status.

We have no reason to believe that the numbers of referrals involving persons who were landed as refugees or who had earlier made refugee claims are in any way disproportionate to their share of the overall immigrant movement.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: I note that Question No. 137 stands in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. I know that he has been very anxious to get this reply before consideration of third reading of Bill C–68 is complete. I am very pleased that I am able to comply with his request and provide the answer today. I recognize that it is late, but we wanted a thorough, complete, and accurate answer for the hon. member.

While I am on my feet, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand and I ask for consent to revert to tabling of documents for the purpose of tabling answers to certain petitions.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for that information. I look forward to receiving it. It may be a little late for the debate today, as I see that Bill C–68 is

on the Order Paper, but maybe we can pass that information on to the Senate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Regarding the unanimous consent of the parliamentary secretary to revert to tabling of documents, is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to five petitions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this morning we embark on the final stage of a process begun over a year ago by which members of this House of Commons have studied and debated questions dealing not only with the regulation of firearms but questions that in a broader sense touch upon the kind of country we want for ourselves and for our children.

It is little wonder that the debate about firearms has at times been spirited, often clamorous, and sometimes divisive. There are many voices that want so much to be heard: the farmers, the ranchers, who must be permitted to continue to use their firearms as the tools of their trade; the hunters and the target shooters, whose choice of sport demands our respect; the outfitters and the townsfolk whose livelihood depends on the success of the hunting season; the sustenance hunter, who feeds a family with a firearm; the police, who like all law–abiding Canadians want the means to deter, to detect and to punish those who would use guns in crime; and Canadians everywhere, who want the government to preserve the civil character of our society and strengthen the values that have always set us apart as a nation, Canadians who have watched the American experience with sadness and who want our national government to chart a different course for our future.

• (1015)

I sincerely believe Bill C–68 now before the House has fashioned an instrument that will ensure a future in which we can preserve those unique Canadian values while respecting the legitimate interests to which I referred while also dealing effectively with the use of guns in crime.

[*Translation*]

The government believes that the primary objective of regulating firearms should be to ensure that Canada remains a peaceful and civilized country. Canadians firmly intend to safeguard and strengthen the exceptional civility which has always been their hallmark. Our policies attest to this government's commitment to this objective.

The components of Bill C–68 that we will be focussing on today are as follows: firstly, strict measures to counter the criminal use of firearms; secondly, specific penalties to punish those engaged in the smuggling of firearms; and thirdly, broad measures to define what constitutes the lawful use of firearms in a manner that poses no threat to public safety.

In the case of each component, universal firearms registration is a fundamental requirement for achieving the stated objectives.

[*English*]

The government has been consistent throughout in its defence of Bill C–68 with respect to the core principles of the legislation. We have made changes to reflect our response to constructive criticism when it has arisen and to respond to well founded concerns.

May I today express the gratitude I feel toward members of the Liberal caucus who have through their efforts reflected concerns in their communities and have caused us to make many constructive changes to this proposed legislation. May I also acknowledge the hard work done by every member of the justice committee of the House of Commons. Colleagues from all parties in their painstaking work examined clause by clause every aspect of this bill and brought their own scrutiny to bear. I am very grateful for and admire the work they did.

We have made many changes along the way. We have created a new Firearms Act to take the process of regulation out of the Criminal Code to respond to the concerns of firearms owners. We have changed the rules with respect to the use and disposition of those firearms that are prohibited either as handguns or otherwise so they can be traded within the class of existing owners.

We have phased in the process of licensing and registration over eight years to minimize inconvenience for firearms owners. We have changed the nature and effect of the penalty for the first time a person inadvertently fails to register a firearm under the scheme. That will only become compulsory in 2003.

We have changed the inspection powers to respond to those who saw room for abuse. We have provided for relics and heirlooms to be passed down from generation to generation and kept in families for their sentimental or historical value.

The core principles of this legislation have remained constant: stiff criminal penalties for those who would use guns in crime; the longest mandatory minimum penitentiary terms in the Criminal Code for those who use guns in any one of 10 listed serious crimes; cracking down on smuggling by reinvigorating our efforts at the border, by investing in means to reduce smuggled firearms coming into this country; taking handguns out of circulation that have no place in legitimate sports and target shooting; providing for renewable licences for those who own firearms; and the mandatory universal registration of all firearms. We have done this so that as a nation we might have some meaningful control over guns while respecting the legitimate uses of firearms for traditional purposes.

• (1020)

It is the registration of firearms which has attracted the most intense controversy. Many criticisms have been levelled, unfortunately too often without foundation in fact. It is said that before we proceed with such a measure the government must satisfy a heavy onus of proving beyond a shadow of a doubt that mandatory universal registration will reduce the crime rate, that we must establish how many lives will be saved by such a measure.

I reject that false premise. I say it applies no more to this proposal than to any other. The government has by the evidence it has proffered to the committee, to the Commons and to the public, met any reasonable standard of proof required to justify legislation which would regulate the conduct of human affairs.

We tender the evidence of the chiefs of police. We rely upon the views and the opinions of the Canadian Police Association. We put forward the convictions of the Canadian Association of Police Boards. We stand with the victims of violence who have lost family members to crime. We stand with the physicians in the emergency rooms of this nation, with the trauma doctors, with suicide therapists, all of whom contend with one voice that mandatory universal registration of all firearms is nothing more than common sense in the regulation of property in this country.

There are those who attack the concept of mandatory universal registration by trafficking in fictions, and those fictions must be addressed. It is said that registration means nothing because criminals will not register to which I respond: That is the very point. Criminals will not register and by that act will identify themselves. When universal mandatory registration is fully in place as a seamless system for the registration of firearms, the criminals will be identified by exception.

I refer to an anecdote described to me by my colleague, the hon. member for Waterloo. He spoke last week in his riding about an incident where police entered a place on a raid because they had reasonable grounds to believe there was criminal activity going on inside. They found long arms and they were unable to tell whether those long arms were possessed unlawfully or whether they were lawfully in the possession of the people who were arrested. With registration the authorities will have the means to determine just that.

I call to mind the jury in the inquest into the death of Jonathon Yeo who was implicated in the shooting death of Nina de Villiers, the young woman whose life was tragically taken in her youth by crime. At inquest the jury heard months of testimony about those events. Among its many recommendations for strengthening the system to prevent such tragedies in the future, that jury recommended the mandatory registration of all firearms including rifles and shotguns.

While they are trafficking in fictions, those who oppose registration contend this is an effort to solve an urban concern about crime on the backs of the rural part of Canada. I point out that time after time it has been shown that the fatality and injury rates from firearms are significantly higher in rural areas in this country than they are in the cities.

The majority of the people in this country, when they die by firearms, die at the hands of someone they know. Preponderantly firearms are used as the weapon of choice when there is death in the context of domestic violence. On average a woman is shot to death every six days in this country, almost always in her home, almost always by someone she knows, almost always with a legally owned rifle or shotgun.

What has that to do with registration? The police tell us that with a mandatory system of universal registration in place over time they will have the means to enforce court prohibition orders made against people who have shown a propensity for violence. Lives will be saved if those guns are collected in that kind of situation.

• (1025)

Those who would oppose this system traffic in fictions by pretending that the cost is an impediment. They throw around numbers like $1.5 billion to establish the system, $100 or $300 per rifle to register. They are trafficking in fictions.

Someone on the west coast did a study for the Fraser Institute pretending that the cost of registration would be $1.5 billion because the cost to register a handgun under the existing system is on average $82. Factoring in the present antiquated system and individual police inquiries about the background of the applicant, it works out to $82 per handgun on average.

That person has taken that number and applied it directly to the six or seven million long arms in the inventory existing in Canada today. However, he has overlooked the fact that in the registration of the existing inventory of long arms we are going

to ask only that the owners mail in a card to identify themselves and their firearms. There will be a simple CPIC check to ensure that there is no order prohibiting the owner from having firearms and then he or she will be licensed and registered. This will cost nothing like the $82 which this man pretends is going to be the cost of registration in Canada. This is trafficking in fictions and not meeting the point on the merits.

It is also said by those who oppose registration that the system has been tried in New Zealand, Australia and elsewhere and has been found not to work. That is not so.

In New Zealand the registration system was established in 1920. It was carried out through handwritten cards. It was abandoned in the early 1980s when the volume overwhelmed the system. In any event, New Zealand does not sit on the border of the world's most gun preoccupied country. It does not have to deal with the challenges we face in Canada. The system in New Zealand was rejected for reasons that have nothing to do with the merits of the argument in Canada.

As for Australia, five of the eight states and territories have mandatory registration of long arms now. In 1990 a national committee on violence recommended it be extended to the whole of the country. Those are the facts. It is time we stopped trafficking in fictions.

Testimony before the House justice committee established that in those European countries where mandatory registration of all firearms is in place, the accident, injury and death rate from firearms is lower compared to countries where that is not the policy.

As to confiscation, those who oppose registration allege that it is the first step to confiscation. To them I respond that in 1940 the government of this country introduced mandatory registration of rifles and shotguns as part of the war effort. There was compliance and no confiscation. To those persons I say that in 1977 when the present system of firearms acquisition certificates was introduced, the voices again were raised that confiscation would be the inevitable result, but there was no confiscation. This is the position of the people who have run out of real arguments against gun control. They are trafficking in fictions.

I would like to spend just a moment on those who have made themselves conspicuous in this House by their opposition to this bill. I speak of course about members of the third party. I bear in mind as I do so that the third party came into this House 18 months ago as the party of the people insisting that the positions its members took, the policies they supported and the views they expressed would reflect the values and views of Canadians in general.

I well recall the days sitting in this place when hon. members of the third party would rise in question period to put questions that were inspired by members of the public. They wanted so much to reflect the views of Canadians in the work they did in this House of Commons.

Some of the members of the third party have stuck to those principles and are going to stick with them. They are going to vote for this bill because they know the majority of the people in their riding support it. To those members I offer my congratulations for their consistency in their principles.

However, the third party, the party of the people, the party of law and order, the leader of this third party and the majority of its members have said they will vote against this bill and against what the majority of Canadians want. As recently as two weeks ago a poll showed that 74 per cent of the people in British Columbia, 58 per cent of the people in Alberta, and 72 per cent of the people in Ontario support registration. Two weeks ago an Angus Reid poll demonstrated consistently that the people of Canada want Parliament to pass the legislation.

• (1030)

Mrs. Chamberlain: We represent Canada.

An hon. member: Alberta is 50:50.

Mr. Rock: I call on the third party to stand with the government, with the police, with the emergency room physicians, with the victims of crime, and support this bill in the name of the people of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity, on behalf of the Parliament of Canada, to speak out on the kind of Canada we want for ourselves and for our children and on the efforts that we are prepared to make to preserve the peaceful and civilized country in which we take pride, and to show just who exactly controls firearms in Canada. Is it the groups who support firearms or Canadians in general?

[*English*]

Today, June 13, I have two little boys who are turning eight years old. They join with their 10–year old sister in wanting to grow up in the kind of country we enjoyed in our youth, a country that is safe, a country that is civil. Those qualities can slip away so easily. They slip away incrementally over time. They require constant reaffirmation of our basic principles as a nation if we are going to keep that unique quality that sets us apart. We must always focus on what is the predominant value for Canadians.

In Bill C–68 we have just such an opportunity to focus on those values. The bill is respectful of the legitimate interests of those who use firearms, but its predominant purpose is to preserve what is uniquely ours. My children, all of our children

and our grandchildren deserve nothing less for their future in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that a bill before the House generates the kind of public debate that we have seen in the past few months, a debate that will end with the vote scheduled for the end of our proceedings today.

This bill has prompted a public debate because it brings into focus the values that we hold as a society. Before I go any further, let me say—and I am certain there will be no disagreement—that our society is undergoing rapid change, and not always the kind of change we want to see. Violence is on the rise.

This debate is taking place because we are cognizant of the fact that danger threatens our society at every turn. Danger is not a problem found only in cities. It affects people everywhere. It is a problem observed not only here in this country, it also touches our neighbours and friends to the south. In the United States, increasing social problems have led to an upsurge in violence and we are now beginning to witness the same phenomenon here. This is not a trivial matter that we are discussing, nor something that should leave us indifferent. It is an extremely important issue, both for the present and for the future.

Violence can manifest itself in many ways. The use of firearms is not the only factor associated with violence. Very serious social problems can lead to a sense of frustration which in turn, can breed various forms of violence. Psychological, domestic, personal and community problems can all lead to the use, among other things, of firearms.

• (1035)

However, there is nothing trivial about firearms. They represent one of the most significant ways of manifesting the violence to which I alluded. I think we would all agree on this, regardless of the party to which we belong, that a society such as ours which claims to be reasonable, vigilant and civilized, has a responsibility to ensure that the use of firearms is better controlled.

So far, so good. I do not believe that even our friends in the Reform Party would oppose legislation that gives the state the ability to control violence and to intervene to stop its spread. If they would oppose it, I am certain that they will let us know. In any event, I would be surprised if the Reform Party opposed some control over firearms, given the social context. In a society such as ours, it is essential that the state be allowed to step in and assume its responsibilities in the area of gun control.

The bill now before us is a reflection of the government's vision of gun control. What course of action is the government advocating? The key feature of its proposed legislation is firearms registration. Many of the bill's provisions relate to registration. Some reforms were introduced in 1992, primarily to ban certain types of assault, prohibited and military weapons. Some administrative controls regarding storage and so forth were also introduced. This series of reforms will complete the cycle of government action in this field. The central element of the reform is the universal registration of all firearms, essentially those used for target shooting, hunting and so forth, since other kinds of weapons are already prohibited.

The debate has, without a doubt, been controversial, since very opposite views have been voiced. I do not think that we can accuse anyone of failing to understand the validity of the other party's arguments. Clearly, we are dealing with a clash of two different value systems. On the one hand, we have an overwhelming majority of citizens who are concerned about violence in society and recognize the need to control guns, one of the instruments used to commit violence. On the other hand, we have those who perceive the intervention of the state and additional restrictions as an unnecessary attack on individual freedoms.

We cannot dismiss the reaction of the second group lightly. Honest citizens own firearms. The fact that they own guns does not make them any less honest. I would even venture to say that the vast majority, if not virtually all, of the citizens who own guns, who use them for sporting purposes and who have done so for generations, are upstanding citizens. The introduction of these measures has made them somewhat uneasy. They are upset to see the state interfere once again in their affairs and this has a great deal to do with their attitudes.

Although this country has existed for several hundred years, ours is still a young society, still close to its roots, to the time when vast territories had to be conquered and people had to tame, colonize and settle this vast land. Obstacles had to be overcome. Wild animals roamed the landscape and people needed to defend themselves. Trapping and hunting were important survival tools.

It is well known that beaver trapping was a very important activity in Canada. It was the basis of the country's economy. In other words, the country's origins are closely linked with firearms. To many, firearms symbolized—and I would imagine this still holds true today—freedom and man's dominance over an often hostile environment. The issue speaks to long-standing, profound values. Then there is the issue of hunting. The hunting instinct is one of the first known to man. Had men and women not been hunters, humankind as we know it would not have survived to this day.

Therefore, this issue is complex and it is understandable that the debate has been controversial and quite emotional. Another reason why opponents have reacted so negatively and have

expressed outrage from the moment the bill was tabled in the House is because the state has already intervened a great deal.

• (1040)

Individual freedoms have already been restricted considerably by the administrative and bureaucratic actions of the state, so much so that many citizens are quite fed up with what they view as government harassment and red tape.

Some dream of returning to the free, somewhat bucolic society of yesteryear in reaction to the excessively large public service and the systems and networks springing up everywhere. The bureaucracy has exploded, particularly in the last 20 years. People are very leery about more government intervention, particulary now when they feel that their civil liberties are been affected.

Moreover, many people live on large tracts of land or own farms. That was true of my ancestors and of my father. I myself was born on a farm. These people accept that there is a government, a country and law enforcement agencies, but their farm is their domain. When they are at home on their farm, they cannot fathom that someone should be able to interfere and restrict in any way their right to do whatever they want on their own property, their right to use firearms to hunt and so forth.

Along comes this bill which challenges long–standing beliefs and deep–seated cultural reflexes.

Here we must appeal to reason. It is alright for those who oppose the bill to say so. While the vast majority of people support the bill, the Bloc Quebecois included, we must try to convince those who are against it, particularly the hunters who are directly affected by its provisions. We must try to convince them to accept the government's intervention in this area for the sake of higher principles. The citizens of this country are all reasonable people and they will reflect upon this and understand. However, it still comes as a cultural shock.

When the use of seat belts in automobiles became mandatory, I remember clearly my reaction to this announcement. I was a young man at the time, driving my first automobile. All of a sudden, I was required to buckle up. As a young man, owning my first car symbolized freedom. Everyone remembers how important their first car was, what colour it was, how much it cost, and so forth. Not everyone was pleased, myself included, to see the government legislate seat–belt use.

However, I had to learn to live with the law. I have to admit that occasionally, in a moment of weakness, I neglected to buckle up. However, I have been using my seat belt for many years now and it has now become a part of our everyday habits. This decision was initially viewed and dismissed by many people as government interference. Over time, seat belt use was accepted because it was proven to be in the common interest. Large fines were also imposed.

The same will be true for firearms registration. Registration as such is not something new. People are accustomed to registering their automobiles, their bicycles, even their dogs. They may not have been too pleased the first time that had to get a license for their bicycle—imagine, a teenager having to get a license for his bicycle—but they accepted it.

People have come to accept many things because it is in the common interest and I am confident that this is one such issue. I am confident that the government will work hard to convince people to go along with registration. I have no doubt that the minister, who is an intelligent individual with a good understanding of society, will see to it that these measures are implemented properly, by appealing to people's sense of reason, not by using a strong–arm approach. I am confident that he will proceed in a civilized fashion and be respectful of individuals who have different opinions.

Registration may well be a bother, but fundamentally, this is not a transcendental debate. There are no fundamental principles at issue. The resulting inconveniences will be very minor. After all, people will only be required to register the firearms they own once in their lifetime. Only once! Furthermore, the process will only begin in three years' time. Therefore, we have three years to think about this, three years to discuss the matter, three years to calm down, three years to analyse the situation, listen to others and try to understand the reasons behind this decision. Once the process begins, people will have five years to register their firearms.

In my opinion, this will facilitate the implementation of the legislation and give people time to accept psychologically these measures.

Having said this, I do not believe and our party does not believe that the bill is perfect. On the contrary, we would have preferred something different.

• (1045)

We would have liked to have greater power of persuasion over the minister, in order to make changes we thought were required. However, I must acknowledge that some changes we requested were accepted.

We in the Bloc Quebecois tried not to address the issue from an ideological point of view, not to make it a debate on principle or a debate on religion because, in religion, everyone is right and everyone is wrong. We tried to address it from a pragmatic point of view and to make a party contribution, through the parliamentary process, to bringing in a balanced piece of legislation.

We are in agreement with government intervention, and with registration, and we wanted—or at least we tried—to bring a certain balance to the bill tabled by the government.

We were successful with some amendments, including one essential matter, one essential aspect of the bill: decriminalization. We think this aspect is important, because it is essential that good citizens, the vast majority of hunters, for example, not have the perception that the law lumps them together with criminals.

It is important for honest citizens to be sure that the government does not treat them like criminals, and that hunting and using firearms for sports activities do not make them criminals or people who are reprehensible in the eyes of the government or of society. This is a fundamental right which, to this extent, must be respected.

That is why we thought the government had to be persuaded to make a distinction between people who use firearms to commit crimes and people who use them to behave like normal citizens, for sports like hunting. That is where we got the idea of not making failure to register a firearm, in the case of a first offence, a crime as such. We have never claimed that there should be no penalties. We have never claimed that there be no sanctions, that the first offence of failing to register a hunting firearm, for example, should not make someone liable to punishment. That act had to remain something against the law, a reprehensible act to be punished under criminal law. But there is quite a distinction between criminalizing and penalizing that has not always gotten through to the public.

We would have liked the first offence, someone who fails to register for the first time, to be prosecuted—that is summary conviction procedure—and convicted if guilty, but fined. We would have wanted a first offence not to be a crime within the strict meaning of the Criminal Code, but to lead to a considerable fine, say, from $500 to $1,250, confiscation of the firearm, and a requirement to register it within seven days: briefly, something reasonable and severe—quite severe—, but something that indicated this distinction between a crime as such and an offence to be penalized.

The government did not accept the Bloc Quebecois vision but, on the other hand, it did take a step in the right direction. It made a first offence a new, special offence, ensuring that people will be prosecuted under a statute and not under the Criminal Code; the summary conviction procedure will be used, but the first offence will not be a crime as such—although it is not clear what will happen with the criminal record. There will not be a criminal record in the traditional sense, but it does seem that there will be a register in which offences, even first offences, will be noted. Still, this flexibility is welcome, since I believe it will also give the Crown an option when prosecuting. If a person who has not registered a firearm is a habitual criminal, it is not the same thing as if the person were an ordinary hunter; the Crown can prosecute under another statute. There is discretion that could make it possible to eliminate the aspect we criticized.

Another amendment we proposed has to do with that prohibition on a person who wanted to obtain a firearm licence, if the person was an associate of some other person prohibited from possessing firearms. There, the problem with the initial bill was quite far–reaching, since it had to do with association.

• (1050)

Basically, it was a problem of guilt by association. As soon as you were "an associate"—as defined, an extremely vague, very elastic expression that could have led to witch hunts—of a person who had been prohibited from possessing firearms, you could be prohibited from owning them as well.

So, what we proposed was to keep the expression "an associate", of course, but to specify an associate living under the same roof. If you live in a house where someone prohibited from possessing firearms lives, it would be rather stupid and irresponsible for you to be given a firearm, when the other person living there, in the same house, could have practically the same access to the firearm as you do—even though elsewhere the bill prohibits that person from possessing firearms. The government accepted this amendment.

By means of amendments we proposed two days before the government's amendments, we also persuaded the government that there should be a grandfather clause, that is, a clause recognizing firearms handling courses people have already taken. We know that Quebec in particular has had a system of firearms handling courses, as a prerequisite for firearms licences, for quite some time now. So these courses that people had taken had to be recognized. We must not require people who have already taken courses in Quebec—very well–designed courses, by the way—to take them again. So the federal government agreed to recognize these courses and not require people to take them again under the bill.

We also requested an amendment to tighten up the bill in order to limit the government's former discretion to make regulations allowing the purchase of non–prohibited ammunition starting in the year 2001, during the transition period. The government agreed to tighten up the bill and make those regulations much stricter.

Another aspect to which we drew the government's attention was the power of inspection contained in the first version of the bill. We were not the only ones to make this point; in our society and in all regions, a great many worries and complaints were expressed about the excessive extent of the power the bill conferred on police officers: they were given practically the power to search and seize, without being required to follow the procedures that limit the action they take in other situations, such as the requirement to obtain from a judge a warrant citing a reasonable ground for carrying out a search. Now, in the bill, no

warrant is required, but police officers' power is limited to places other than dwelling–houses, strictly to places where there is reason to believe that there are 10 or more firearms, and the ground must be a reasonable ground, not just an opinion a police officer might have before taking action.

But there are other amendments with which we were not successful. We regret that, although those amendments are not as significant; the issue of fees is an example. We would have liked the government to provide a legal control, a guarantee of its political commitment to act reasonably and not raise fees unduly. We therefore proposed an amendment adding to the bill a mechanism limiting increases to registration fees. We know that the government is in power and we know the present minister's intentions; but there are the public service, the apparatus of government, circumstances and changes in the situation. In five years, who is to say that a deputy minister will not convince a minister to double registration fees? There is no legal guarantee. We would have liked there to be one in the bill. The minister is showing the best of intentions. We hope they will be repeated, but we really would have liked there to be this kind of control; one possible way of providing it would have been, say, to index changes in registration fees to the consumer price index. But the government did not want any such hindrances, and we regret that that was the case.

We also proposed something we think made a lot of sense: a requirement to lock, to install a locking mechanism on, any firearm manufactured or sold in Canada, so that if you are a hunter and you show up in a firearms store to buy a .12 or a .20 or a .22 rifle, you will automatically be sold a firearm on which a locking mechanism has already been installed, for greater safety. We hear that there is nearly consensus on this point, and that even many organizations representing hunters agreed with it. The government did not agree to this request, and we wonder why not. Would the manufacturers' lobby have been that powerful? We do not know. It would have been advisable for this amendment to be accepted, but it was not.

• (1055)

We consider that another aspect of the bill raises an issue of principle, a much more important one: the legality of law enforcement. By means of this bill, the government is giving itself an arbitrary power to make regulations that would allow it, for example, to exempt aboriginal people from respecting the bill and from the constraints the bill imposes on other citizens.

I am not saying that the government will avail itself of that power and exempt aboriginal people but, since the bill includes express mention of this point, we fear that inequitable treatment of citizens under the same law will be set up. It would be a real shame, and terribly irresponsible, to do that.

I do not see how aboriginal people are threatened by the enforcement of this bill. If the bill is acceptable for other citizens, it is acceptable for them, too; they, too, have the right to ensure their safety. The problems of violence exist in their communities, as they do in ours. I do not see how the government can give itself that power. Why is the government giving itself that power?

That point makes me think—in a much less significant vein—of the debate that took place during the referendum on the Charlottetown Accord, when it looked as though the Charter of Rights and Freedoms would not apply in aboriginal communities. I remember that even Mr. Trudeau—on that point alone, I must admit—agreed with the Quebec sovereignists who were saying that made no sense.

We agreed that, under the rule of law, as is the case in Canada, where we favour law enforcement that is equal for everyone, there simply had to be equitable treatment of all citizens, and that it was inconceivable that we could accept that outrageous, incredible, irresponsible concession made by Mr. Clark and Mr. Rae in particular, excluding aboriginal people from the application of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We have somewhat the same thing here.

If this bill is so important, if it is so deeply rooted in respect for citizens' rights and obligations, why would aboriginal people be exempted from its enforcement? We were not successful on this point, but we do count on the government, and on the minister, to reassure us and tell us that citizens will be equal under this bill, as they are under any law, as is appropriate in any democracy.

Lastly, we would have liked to have another amendment passed, and we are very worried that it was turned down. We are really upset about that amendment; it raised considerable debate within the Bloc Quebecois. People in caucus took very strong positions on this point, and we understand them. This point is the requirement that any court impose a minimum four–year sentence on any offender who commits a crime with a firearm: a four–year minimum.

I consider that the minister has lapsed into political correctness and let himself be swept along by the lobbies that have sometimes gone too far. We are going to vote for the bill, but we, too, have been buffeted by headwinds. Outrageous things have been said by both lobbies. The pro–gun control lobby itself has sometimes gone too far.

I feel that, in this instance, the minister may not have maintained a balance. I feel that the minister should have resisted those excessive pressures, which are not at all progressive, which will fill up the penitentiaries with 18–year–olds with no chance of rehabilitation and, further, which will introduce inequity and disparity in sentencing.

Let us take the example of an 18–year old committing his first offence. We do not know what incites an 18–year old to hold up a corner store—we are not justifying it, it is completely unacceptable, serious things happen in those situations—but we do know that often these young people are grappling with drug problems, are in withdrawal, are in fact very well brought up—it happens everywhere—; for the first time in his life he goes and uses a firearm to hold up a corner store, and automatically gets four years in prison.

There is no possibility of the judge looking into the case, making distinctions, taking circumstances into account, or trying to give that young man a chance. When you are 18, you can be rehabilitated after a first offence and become a very good citizen. But with this bill, I tell you, I hesitated before taking a position. I deeply regret that the minister, who appears to be progressive in all respects, has made this abusive lapse, which will mean automatic prison sentences.

• (1100)

Incarceration becomes the only means of rehabilitating young offenders, of reintegrating them in society. That is serious. That smacks of a philosophical conception which worries me a lot. I am surprised that the gun control lobby would have steered the minister in that direction. I am truly astonished because I believe that the forces which impel us to adopt this bill are progressive forces, but not in this case. In this case, there is something absolutely deplorable and senseless, there are things that defy comprehension.

For example, if a sharp 12–inch dagger is held to the throat of a convenience store clerk to commit the same crime, the offender will get the minimum, not four years. I do not see the difference between a dagger and a gun—the clerk might not have his throat cut. It is the same thing with rape. These are dreadful acts. What is the difference between using a dagger or a gun to commit rape on a young woman? The two acts are absolutely abominable. And yet, in one case, it will be four years, automatically, and in the other not.

It seems to me that the minister in charge of developing the Criminal Code could have had a common sense reflex. It is not too late, by the way. I sincerely believe that this is something that should be fixed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bouchard: I know that opponents have their arguments, I have heard them many a time. All members of this House have been submitted to intense discussions with the lobbyists, but I do not think a bill has ever been better scrutinized, analyzed in such depth.

I know the arguments, for example those of the lobbyists. The arguments of those who oppose this bill are not all ridiculous, but I believe they can be refuted. For example, there are those who say that it makes no difference whether firearms are registered or not because criminals are not forced to use a registered gun to commit their crime. But there are criminals who can use registered guns too. A sawed off twelve–gauge shotgun becomes an extraordinary assault weapon. If the weapon is registered, it is that much easier for the police to conduct their investigation.

Do not tell me that police will not be helped by the fact that weapons are registered, that the owner can be identified, that his name can be instantly retrieved in the central registry, in the computer. This will obviously be a powerful tool in the hands of the police when investigating crimes committed with registered weapons.

Unregistered weapons are already banned. It is just a matter of putting in place the means of stopping the illegal importation and sale of prohibited weapons in Canada. To the extent that there are millions of legal firearms, let them be registered. And if, as happens so often, they are used to commit crimes, their registration will greatly increase the effectiveness of police investigations. That argument does not hold water.

All the more so since habitual criminals are not the only ones who commit violent crimes with firearms. We all know that in the case of family violence, acts of desperation, etc., legal weapons are used most often, weapons that are found in the house. Some will say that it makes no difference whether they are registered or not.

I believe that registration will have an extremely important educational value. If, after this great public debate, the bill is passed, there will be an immediate result in that people will no longer be able to take firearms for granted, to treat them as if they were commonplace objects like a slingshot. The attitudes toward weapons will not be the same, the perceptions will be quite different. People will know that the State treats weapons as dangerous instruments.

Indeed, contrary to cars and bicycles, for example, weapons are made to kill. Except for the few of us who practise shooting as a sport, a firearm, if we keep one at home, is used essentially to go hunting, to kill and it is very efficient at that. It is practically the most efficient way to kill.

• (1105)

One must realize that a firearm—and people will become more conscious of this fact, especially if they have to register it—is not an ordinary household object but a dangerous weapon which can easily be used to commit a crime or a violent act.

It is therefore false to say that ragistration will accomplish nothing. Indeed, if such was the case, then why did the powerful lobbies make so much noise? We also heard about costs which would be too high. We have here estimates provided by the minister. There is no reason to question them or to doubt that the minister and his department did their job carefully. The numbers

might vary slightly, since mistakes are always possible. But we are talking here of an average of $24 million a year over five years, for a five–year total of about $119–120 million. Once the registration system is in place and rolling, it will obviously cost less to manage.

Yes, it will cost, but its price does not seem disproportionate to its significance for society, compared to other initiatives which cost much more and amount to very little. Moreover, I was always a bit surprised by the intense opposition, given the benefits for individuals. Let us think about what this act means to an individual, a citizen, for someone who, for instance, goes hunting once a year or keeps three or four firearms at home, maybe a .12, .22 or .20 caliber shotgun. This worried citizen, perhaps made anxious by all the commotion raised by the lobbies, should know what will happen, what this act means.

If the act were passed tonight, what changes does it entail for this person who keeps three firearms at home? There will be absolutely no changes for three years, nothing in 1995, 1996 or 1997, right up to 1998. Then, starting in 1998, that person will have five years to register up to 10 arms all at once, for $10. Now tell me, is it worth putting a country to fire and the sword? There has been much exaggeration. Canadian citizens are used to dealing with much bigger complexities and to co–operate much more with government. This is not a case of undue harassment. This is within reasonable limits, in my estimation.

[*English*]

This debate has pitted people against each other in good faith. Without that, very important principles were at stake, collective principles: the need to address the issue of violence in Canada and in Quebec and, on the other hand, the propensity to protect individual rights. Those are very legitimate questions. All those people are very honourable people and they defend and protect quite legitimate values.

We have to make a judgment, an assessment of those values. In last resort when we think it over calmly and quietly as good citizens, we will have to conclude that it is the right law, the right move to make. It is not the best law. Many things could have been done to improve it. We tried. We succeeded in certain cases; we did not succeed all the time. On the whole there is a balance. If we want to protect our society against the rise in violence we have to do something like that.

For private citizens the negative effects will not be very great. It means that an individual who has three, four, five or ten hunting rifles at home will have nothing to do for the next three years. Starting in 1998 he will have to think about the fact that he will have to register his arms. He will have five years to do it from 1998. Once it is done it will be for life and it will cost $10.

I do not think there is a need for the kind of debate that we have on many other issues in Canada. There will be a much harsher debate this fall. It would be good practice now to accept this as a reasonable question to settle before addressing much more important questions.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

The Bloc Quebecois is not entirely satisfied with the act, but its members believe that respect is a matter of striking the right social balance and that, in the common interest, they must vote in favour of the act. This is what we intend to do tonight.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we sat here until eleven o'clock last night and voted on the final amendments to Bill C–68. In less than 24 hours we are into our final debate, third reading of the bill. It did not really give us much time to assess the consequences of the amendments which are now part of the bill. It reminds me a little of what happened in the clause by clause amendments that were hurried upon us with such short notice after the final witnesses before the committee had concluded.

I begin my address by telling the House and the justice minister of a firearms court case that was heard in Alberta. The judge was a man by the name of Judge Demetrick. In his decision he said that the definition of a firearm as contained presently in the Criminal Code was so convoluted as to be legal fiction and twice removed from reality. When I read that I was absolutely amazed that the Parliament of Canada was producing legislation that our courts are now declaring to be twice removed from reality. I am satisfied that we cannot have legislation that is twice removed from reality unless we have thinking behind the legislation that is twice removed from reality as well.

The present gun control bill is really not a gun control bill at all. It is not going to control guns; it is simply going to register them. When I looked at the bill I realized that it was not an aberration from the good sound thinking that has run the country for the last 25 years. It is not unlike Judge Demetrick pointed out. What has been guiding the country for the last 25 years? When we examine the debt, the Young Offenders Act, the parole system or the judicial system, and some of the disparities in those systems we wonder whether or not the thinking behind them is twice removed from reality.

How can we be in a situation where we are $600 billion in debt if the thinking behind our fiscal and monetary policy is not twice removed from reality? How can we have a Young Offenders Act when the justice system cannot deal with young offenders under the age of 12 for their criminal misconduct? How can we have

that unless the thinking of the creators of the legislation is completely removed from reality and the people it will impact?

Let us look at the parole system, the latest victim of which is Melanie Carpenter. The prime suspect in her murder, Mr. Auger, was paroled, was released, by way of statutory requirement after serving only two–thirds of his sentence, even though the officials felt that it would be a danger to release the individual into society. We have to ask what kind of thinking has produced that kind of legislation. Judge Demetrick told me a bit about that kind of thinking when he suggested that it was twice removed from reality.

• (1115)

This bill is not an aberration from the reasoning that has guided Parliament over the last 20 or 25 years. It is simply a continuation of thinking that is far removed from the impact it will have on the people. I often think the justice minister and his officials do not know what they are doing.

It is an attempt by the government to create the impression it is getting tough on crime and criminals. Yet when the justice minister had an opportunity to vote either for a safer society or against first degree murderers when a private member's bill came up to eliminate section 745 from the Criminal Code, everyone knows he voted in favour of the first degree murderer and against a safer society, in favour of the first degree murderer and against the Melanie Carpenters of this country. We should study carefully the motivation behind this legislation.

We have heard the minister speak today of things such as trafficking in fiction. I have the talking points sent from the Prime Minister's office to members of the Liberal Party on Bill C–68. The first item reads: "The government has reached an agreement with the official opposition to allocate time for debate on Bill C–68, gun control, and Bill C–41, sentencing". Is that not nice? They got together and decided to terminate any lengthy debate that would give an opportunity to all members to express the concerns of their constituents on these two very contentious bills.

The second item says: "Any reasonable person would have to agree that there has been extensive consultation and debate on this legislation". Let us examine this whole business of consultation for a moment and see who is trafficking in fiction.

In response to questions in the House the justice minister stated that he had been in continuous consultation with the attorneys general of the provinces. That has been directly refuted by the testimony of the attorneys general who appeared before the standing committee. In particular, I refer to the Attorney General of Manitoba. When we asked her, she commented that there was extremely little consultation with the justice minister and officials on the gun control legislation.

We heard from the Attorney General of Alberta. The Attorney General of Saskatchewan led a delegation made up of the Liberal leader, Lynda Haverstock, as well as the Conservative leader. They also refuted the whole concept of consultation. The Attorney General of Alberta indicated exactly the same thing.

We heard from the justice ministers of the Northwest Territories and Yukon. They refuted the whole idea that they were involved in any significant way in consultation with the justice minister in the development and creation of this legislation.

People like the president of the Olympic handgun competitors claimed there was no consultation whatsoever. This statement is supported by the fact that when the justice minister brought in his proposals before Christmas of last year he had such little knowledge of handguns that he was banning those used in world cup competitions. When we asked him if he would consider exempting the .32 calibre handgun, which is one of the handguns used in world cup competition, the record tells how much consultation really went on between himself and those groups of people.

• (1120)

He stated he would certainly not consider exempting the .32 calibre. Why? The barrel length was under 105 millimetres and those short barrel firearms are inaccurate and are made only for killing. That is basically the reason to justify the banning of 58 per cent of the legally held and purchased handguns.

When we talk about trafficking in fiction, who is trafficking in fiction? I ask the justice minister who really is trafficking in fiction? To carry on with this whole idea that the justice minister has consulted broadly, widely and in depth with people, groups and organizations involved with firearms is a little ridiculous. These consultations did not take place with the justice ministers of the territories or at least with the attorneys general of the provinces.

Several groups of native peoples also appeared before the committee. The James Bay Cree were represented. Representatives from the Yukon Indians appeared before the committee. Ovide Mercredi and a delegation from the Assembly of First Nations appeared. A group represented by Mr. Borin appeared. They all deny that there was any in depth consultation.

I have a copy of a letter which was tabled with the committee from Mr. Ovide Mercredi to the justice minister dated February 17. I will just quote from this. It states:

> Once again your government has acted in a manner that shows a complete disregard for the rights and interests of the people I represent. Your introduction of the gun control legislation without prior consultation with First Nations is a violation of your responsibility as Minister of Justice to uphold the fiduciary trust obligations of your government for all First Nations.
>
> In imposing your plan for firearms registration and regulation, you are breaching our treaties with the crown. You promised a consultation process with First Nations in our meeting on November 14, 1994. Where is that consultation process?

He ends by saying:

> For God's sake, respect our rights.

That is what the Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations wrote the minister.

During the committee meetings I asked if there had been consultations in the prescribed manner according to what amounts to the appendages to the Constitution with regard to the agreement that was made with the James Bay Cree. It was called the James Bay Cree and Northern Quebec Agreement. I also asked if there were consultations with the Yukon Indians who recently signed an agreement for self–government. The ink is hardly dry on that agreement. The officials of the department assured me and the committee that consultations had taken place in accordance with the constitutional requirement.

When I asked Mr. Mosley, the assistant deputy minister, to table with the committee evidence of such consultations, he agreed to do so but did not. When he next appeared before the committee I asked him about the agreement and the undertaking he had accepted to table documents from the department that would substantiate the claim that substantial consultations, in the prescribed manner, had been undertaken with the James Bay and Yukon Indians, he said that the minister would be tabling those documents when he appeared on the last day that witnesses were to appear before the committee on May 19.

When the justice minister appeared he tabled a half inch stack of documents. That did not give us a chance to examine them so we could prepare questions for the justice minister.

• (1125)

When I did have a chance to examine the documents they did not show evidence of consultation at all. It was evidence, at best, of letters of notification to the 630 bands that these proposals had been presented before Christmas. There was no evidence of consultation.

When the justice minister talks about broad consultations throughout the country with the various groups of people and organizations on which the legislation will impact, I ask, who is trafficking in fiction? There is no doubt in my mind who is trafficking in fiction. It is certainly no one from this caucus when it comes to these kinds of issues.

How in the world was it possible for the justice minister to overlook the requirement to consult with the aboriginal peoples of the country? How could he do that? He understands the law as well as any of us. As stated in the letter by Mr. Mercredi to him, he understands the constitutional requirements to abide by the consultative requirement when legislation is going to impact on the treaties or constitutional rights of aboriginal people or any other Canadian.

I am satisfied that the reason the justice minister and his officials did not first consult with the aboriginal people is because the aboriginal people would have told him exactly what they told the committee with regard to the gun control bill. They would reject the vast majority of it, particularly the licensing and the registration requirements.

Had he gone to them first they would have set the standard for all Canadians. That would not go far enough for the minister because he wanted to impose the restrictions and licensing requirements on law–abiding gun owners. He knew if he went to the aboriginal people first, as he ought to have done, he could not have refuted them and come forward with the kind of legislation he has brought forward today.

Had he gone to the aboriginal people first, they would have set the standard, the benchmark for all Canadians with regard to the manner in which their rights would be interfered with by legislation. He did not want to do that because he knew the aboriginal people would not accept it, as Ovide Mercredi said in his letter.

I refer again to his letter where he said when talking about his own people: "I know that they will not comply with any legislation that violates their treaty and aboriginal rights and I will encourage this non–compliance". That is the Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations telling the justice minister that they will not comply with these kinds of regulations.

The justice minister of the Northwest Territories told us as well that many gun owners in the Northwest Territories today are not complying with the firearms acquisition certificate requirements. He and his delegation explained in very straightforward and understandable terms why they are not. It is so impractical for them. He talked about isolated communities where there is no facility to obtain the passport photograph required to obtain an FAC.

Therefore, the present laws are not being abided by in those isolated communities. We heard the Grand Chief of the First Nations say that he will encourage his people not to comply.

• (1130)

There was no in depth consultation before this bill was tabled, because he would have heard the same thing. He did not want to deal with them before the fact; he wanted to deal with them after the fact. How is he going to do it?

Last night the justice minister put forward an amendment in Motion No. 5. That amendment states: "For greater certainty, nothing in this act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982".

What does that mean? It means that through section 110(t) he is going to be able to go back to the aboriginal people by way of regulations and orders in council and provide whatever exemption he wishes to provide. It is going to result in not all Canadians standing equal before this law. I heard the official opposition leader address this as well. It appears that we may have a two–tier system where there is one set of laws for the aboriginal people and a different set for the non–aboriginal people.

I submit that had he gone forward and obtained the consultation and the input from the aboriginal people first, then based upon those considerations we would all be happy and we could all support that legislation. But it would not have gone far enough for the minister, because he does want to register, he does want to license, he does want to impose those restrictions and those interventions upon the people of Canada.

He has put the cart before the horse and he is trying to finesse this whole thing by going back and saying that through the power of the regulations he has in this act he will be able to consult with aboriginal peoples and address their concerns on their treaty rights and their constitutional rights when it comes to hunting, trapping, and food gathering.

What is emerging here—and I hope I am wrong—is evidence that we are moving toward a two–tier system as far as gun legislation is concerned in this country. I regret that very much. If the minister had consulted with the aboriginal peoples in depth according to what I believe are their constitutional rights, this would not have happened. Now we are going to find ourselves perhaps in a situation where there are going to be constitutional challenges on the basis of discrimination. That is unfortunate. It ought not to be.

My own personal point of view is that in this case the aboriginal people are on the right track when it comes to the control of firearms. They are on the right track. The standard they are saying they want for the use, ownership, and the giving and lending of their firearms ought to be applicable for all Canadians. If that were the case a vast majority of Canadians would agree with it and support it. We should have started with the aboriginal people, used their needs and their requirements as the benchmark for all of our legislation in this bill. I submit that respectfully.

I want to touch on a couple of other points. I want to deal with this whole area of smuggling. I sat in the justice committee when the Canadian Police Association delegates were there. I listened to them carefully. They had basic support for a majority of the contents of the bill, but I remember very clearly what the president of the Canadian Police Association, Mr. Neal Jessop, said. He pointed out that the strength of this bill will be based upon the ability of the government to stop smuggling in Canada.

I have a document here that was produced by the MacKenzie Institute called "Misfire: The Black Market and Gun Control". They did an eight–month survey into firearms smuggling in Canada. They talked to police officers, aboriginal peoples, smugglers, taxi drivers, the whole host of people involved in the milieu of gun smuggling and illicit firearms trafficking. They concluded that if Bill C–68 goes through there is going to be an explosion of smuggling in Canada.

• (1135)

When I compare this to the report submitted from the justice department on smuggling, their report is a hollow whitewash compared to the information contained in this document. I will not take time to go through it, but it is here. It is here for anyone who wants to look at it.

We have real problems, not with the law–abiding gun owner but with the extent of gun smuggling and the smuggling of illicit firearms, prohibited firearms, these so–called assault weapons into Canada. We have a real problem. The authors of the MacKenzie report are saying that it is going to explode if this bill goes through. I just mention that.

I want to touch on the polls and the support. I do not place much support in polls because they go up and they go down, particularly on a bill like this, where the people who are being contacted really do not know the extent to which the guns are controlled now by way of legislation.

We have over 60 pages in the Criminal Code dealing with the ownership, acquisition and use of firearms. The legislation dealing with firearms in this country is very extensive. So when we have a 124–page document adding to that and we ask people on the phone what they think about gun control, adding more laws to the gun control bill, I am not sure how well informed they are when they respond to that.

I do know that if I received a phone call and someone was telling me the government was moving in a direction to extend greater control over guns, I would say that sounds to me like a good thing to do, because it is going to make the homes and streets and communities safer in Canada. If that were my belief, if I were led to believe that from the question asked, Mr. Speaker, you bet I would support it. I would support it today if I could see it in the bill, but I cannot see it. I can understand why the polls vary, depending on the questions and depending upon the extent of information they have at their disposal about the bill.

We can see very clearly that as more and more information gets to the people, not just about the gun registration but what appears to be the possible violation of civil rights, the extension of police powers in order to inspect or search and to seize and so

on, we see a broadening concern over this legislation and a drop in the support for the bill.

I might add that the clearest indication in terms of polling has to be the result of an election where gun control is an issue. We have had two provincial elections recently. I would like to mention at least the one in Manitoba, where the government headed by Premier Filmon publicly rejected the gun registration portion of this bill, as did the NDP in that province. The Liberal Party embraced it. It is interesting to note that a few weeks before the writ came down in that province for the election call the Liberals were very, very close in the polls to the Tories, the government, and it looked like they could form the government. We saw what happened. They lost over 50 per cent of their seats and the Liberal leader lost his seat.

• (1140)

I have an item in the paper here that quotes one of the Liberal candidates. He states that the Liberal campaign was badly damaged by unpopular federal decisions like gun control and budget cuts. He went on to say that it infuriated him to hear the justice minister say after the election that gun control had nothing to do with the Manitoba Liberals' poor showing. "He has his head in the sand" is what this defeated Liberal candidate from Manitoba said.

When we hear the justice minister talk about support and trafficking in fiction, we should examine it carefully. I wish the debate would be made on facts. We can look at the polls, but let us be honest about it and look at the real polls. In this country we now have at least five provinces whose premiers have concerns about this bill. We have the Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba premiers who are concerned about this bill. We have had the Liberal premier from New Brunswick express concern as well about the registration system. Now we have the new premier of Ontario, and I would like to hear further from him. I would like him to have a good look at this bill so that we hear from the premier of the most populated province in Canada. I would like to hear what he has to say now about this bill and whether there will be support from the province of Ontario for the registration system.

I want to end by discussing the cost. Members were accused on this side of trafficking in fiction when it comes to the cost. Let us look at the cost for a moment. The justice minister is indicating $85 million to set up the registration system. That is just to set up the registration system. We first have to register the three million gun owners. We have to license them before we can register a single gun they own. If they are not eligible to hold a licence, what is the point of registering their firearms? They will have to give up their firearms if they are not able to be licensed. What will it cost to license an individual?

Ms. Catterall: Ten bucks for ten guns.

Mr. Ramsay: Ten bucks for ten guns, if we talk about trafficking in fiction. I am talking about licensing the owner, not about registering the firearm. If we look at the cost to license three million gun owners, we can estimate the cost per individual by looking at what the cost is now to process an FAC, a firearms acquisition certificate, because the requirements are similar.

Under clause 5 of this bill, the chief provincial firearms officer is going to have to conduct a review of the criminal record of the individual, a mental health record, and perhaps a neighbourhood background check to see if there is any history of violence. That is not unlike the requirement for an FAC. They go through a similar background check.

The Metro Toronto Police Board analysed the cost to process a single FAC in 1994, and it was $185. That might be high, because it is in Toronto, where the costs are high. But if we take that figure and multiply it by three million gun owners who have to be licensed, what do we get? We certainly do not get $85 million. We get about $550 million. If there are six million gun owners, as some estimate, then it will be well over $1 billion using those figures.

If the Metro Toronto Police Board cost for the application of an FAC is the highest in the country, and we level it out to $100 per FAC across the country and take that as an average—I do not think we can label that as trafficking in fiction—we can get an idea of what the enormous cost is going to be to someone in this country, whether it is the gun owner, the taxpayer, or whoever. That is before a single gun is registered and we come in with the $10 cost to register 10 firearms. What can we register today for $10? It may cost me $10, but what does it cost the taxpayer? What does it cost the organization? What does it cost for the manpower?

• (1145)

I do not know what it will cost, but I am convinced it will not be $10. I do not know what can be processed today in that form for $10. My licence costs me more than that. The registration for my car costs me more than that. It cost me $5 to register my children's bicycles and I did all the work. I took it down to the police station where it was filed. That is what it cost me. I do not know what it cost the police to file it, process it and record it.

When it comes to the cost, $85 million may be a fair representation of what it will cost to set up the registration system, but it is not anywhere near the overall cost to set up a full–fledged universal registration system where individual gun owners will have to be licensed and have to bring in their firearms to have them registered. There is absolutely no way. When we talk about trafficking in fiction, who is trafficking in fiction?

The government has not provided a common sense justification for the registration of rifles and shotguns. I asked witness after witness who appeared before the committee how the registration of rifles and shotguns would reduce the criminal use of those firearms, and they were not able to answer. I have never heard a straightforward answer from the justice minister although I have asked him that question.

We have a handgun registration system that has been around for 60 years. We know it has not reduced the criminal use of handguns, because the handgun is the weapon of choice for the vast majority of street criminals. We see that it has been ineffective in this area and we ask why the justice minister would want to expand a failed system to include rifles and shotguns.

We have spent considerable time on the bill, but is it enough time? I say absolutely not. There was not enough time. When members are denied the right to express the concerns of their constituents in the House, those who want to express them, there is something wrong with the system.

I do not think we have had enough time either at the committee stage or at second reading stage. Time allocation was utilized. A deadline was placed on the number of days to hear witnesses. We went immediately from there into clause by clause study. We did not even have time to examine the testimony of witnesses on a day to day basis, because the time lag from the time they testified to the time we received the written testimony was four days. We did not even have time to fully draft our amendments, go over them with legal counsel and present them in proper form. The bill has been rushed and I ask why. If it is not to become mandatory for eight years, what is the big rush?

I make reference to a wonderful set of speaking points. At the bottom the Prime Minister said to his Liberal colleagues:

> The Reform Party says it needs more time to debate gun control, but cops on the beat say they need gun control now.
>
> It is very disturbing that Reformers are prepared to put the safety of police at risk in order to satisfy the gun lobby.

• (1150)

Talk about trafficking in fiction. I have not talked to a street police officer who has supported the bill although their political masters do. I have talked with colleagues all across western Canada. I have been all across the country from Kamloops in the west to St. John's, Newfoundland, in the east. I have talked with people who say that the bill is nonsense anyway.

My point is that if the cops on the beat need the bill now, why are we waiting eight years before bringing it in? It is not the Reform Party that is saying we should wait eight years; it is the government that is saying eight years.

As I said the other night, if guns are really dangerous and if this is not a hysterical response from people who do not know anything about guns and fear them, why are we leaving 58 per cent of the handguns that are supposed to be dangerous in the hands of the people? Why are we leaving them where they are?

In conclusion I would like to move the following motion:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word that and substituting the following therefor:
>
> "Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The amendment is in order. We will resume debate on the amendment and go to the next stage of debate where members will have an entitlement of 20 minutes and 10 minutes for questions and comments.

I ask members to indicate to the Chair if they will be splitting their time.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Liberal speakers will be splitting their time.

I am proud to rise in the House today in support of the bill. I believe gun control legislation will make our communities safer and will preserve and help Canada to evolve as a civilized nation where we can walk the streets and drive our cars with greater safety. It says a great deal about the kind of society we want to create for the future. Quite simply the bill seeks to prevent the killing of human beings.

There has been a great deal said about values in the debate. I have been concerned and have expressed my concern about the rhetoric of American values that seems to have permeated the debate. Let me give an example. Recently a survey was done in the United States among school children. When asked how they should respond if somebody tried to take something that belonged to them, the majority of American children said: "Kill them". When asked how they should respond to an insult, the majority said: "Shoot them".

An American senator on national television not too long ago suggested his mother should take out her gun and shoot if an intruder broke into her home, obviously not aware that in the majority of cases where that is the response to an intruder breaking into a home the home owner and not the perpetrator ends up dead.

As I said, the bill is about preventing death. Reformers have provided the strongest opposition to the bill yet their response is contradictory. They also say they are in favour of greater crime controls and greater punishment for criminals. Those are in the bill as well.

• (1155)

Let me just tell the party that says it is so concerned about the victims of crime what Steve Sullivan, a spokesperson for the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime, says. He believes better gun control laws would prevent similar accidents, for example the deaths of two young children from

shotgun wounds which took place in his community not too long ago. Mr. Sullivan said that many of the cases his organization heard about were crimes committed by ordinary people in nice communities rather than by criminals.

That is one main thought I want to leave with people this morning. While the bill is about crime control, it also deals with the fact that the vast majority of deaths by guns do not occur during the commission of a crime. They do not occur because a criminal, a stranger, shoots and tries to take something from someone or tries to perpetrate some other crime. The majority of gun related deaths and injuries happen in the home and are by someone known to the victim. That is the side of the legislation I want to address.

Let me give some facts. In this community in the last six months seven people have died at the hands of a family member: five of the deaths were caused by guns and two were school aged children. Five of the seven deaths were gun related yet probably less than 20 per cent of homes in this urban area have guns. That tells me a great deal. Of the 1,400 deaths in the last year caused by guns, 1,100 were suicides. That reflects in large part the accessibility of a gun to commit suicide.

Over 200 of the 1,400 deaths were homicides and the remainder were accidents. The majority of homicides, 86 per cent, are committed by family members, friends or acquaintances. Guns are a particularly serious threat to women. Almost half the women were killed by spouses or ex–spouses and almost half the women killed by their partners are shot even though half the homes in the country do not have guns. Also 78 per cent of the guns used in these killings are legally owned. The problem is not only illegally owned guns. The problem is legally owned guns, which is what the legislation tries to address in part.

Domestic and other intimate assaults are 12 times more likely to result in death if a gun is involved. I was serious when I said the bill is about preventing the deaths of human beings. We have significant evidence that a large number of offenders act impulsively, suggesting that the simple availability of a gun determines whether a homicide will or will not occur.

We cannot forget our children. Since 1970, 470 children have died in accidents involving firearms. If we truly believe in the value of our children we should do all we can to protect them, and this is one measure to do so.

The most contentious issue in the legislation is the registration of guns. Seven million firearms are held by approximately three million Canadians. We have no way of knowing how many guns are in the country at any one time, who the owners are, and whether or not the guns were legally or illegally acquired. Registration is designed to change that.

I realize I have very little time in the debate this morning. Crime control is important and the bill addresses that. It is also important to control legally owned guns in the hands of their owners, because those are the guns that are responsible for the majority of gun related homicides and deaths in the country.

A constituent who wrote to me said quite simply that she believed we should go ahead with the legislation and that it was important for people who owned guns to be accountable and held responsible for the use of those guns. Is that not what good citizenship is all about, accountability and responsibility as well as rights and privileges?

• (1200)

I urge all members of this House to consider the large number of deaths that occur in this country every year. Consider the role that legally owned guns play in those homicides. I urge members to consider whether they do not want to be part of making this a safer society.

The justice minister referred earlier to how important he feels this legislation is for his children. I want to make the same personal comment. Later this afternoon I am going to the airport to pick up my daughter and my six–week old grandson but I am not going home to have dinner with them. I am coming back here to vote for this legislation. I am doing it for my daughter and I am doing it for my grandson. I am doing it for the kind of society I want him to be able to grow up in.

In Canada, we have never believed either as a nation or as individuals that settling our problems by violence and by power is the way we develop. That is why Canada has become a nation that symbolizes around the world a peaceful resolution of problems. It is why we have evolved a reputation that has made our flag, which we will celebrate again in just a few weeks, a symbol to the world of how people can live in harmony.

It is because we have had a different sense of values than those more American values I have heard expressed in this debate. We have not felt we have to rely on weapons to evolve a civilized society. By peaceful means, by peaceful resolution, by collectively agreeing on control of the criminal elements in our society and by creating a safer environment we will have the kind of country we want to live in and that we want to leave to the next generation.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Ottawa West why her party decided to change the status quo, stipulating that, in the future, the restricted firearms safety courses mentioned in subclause 7(2) of the bill on firearms will have to be approved

by the federal minister? The way things are now, the attorney general of each province approves the courses. That is how things currently work in Quebec, for example, and I suppose that that is the way things must be working in other provinces. Since latitude was given to one province, it must have also been given to the others.

What I would like to point out to you is that, in Quebec, these courses are very well structured. Of course, I am still talking about restricted firearms safety courses. Our courses in this area are extremely focused. Some are specifically for target shooters. Others are specifically for security guards. The first course is 3.5 hours long; the second, 6 hours. They are really quite specific and have been very successful, up to now.

Therefore, we wonder why the government would not accept the amendment we proposed to have the attorney general of each province continue to approve these courses on the handling of restricted firearms.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the bill inside and out. I did not have the privilege of discussing the issue for several weeks in committee, as did the hon. member opposite.

• (1205)

It is very important, in my opinion, that this act contain provisions which apply uniformly across the country. For this reason, I feel that it is acceptable and important for the federal government to set the regulations, so that we know that they will be the same everywhere in Canada.

I hope that another hon. member from our party will be able to give a more detailed answer to the hon. member's question.

[*English*]

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as many other members on that side of the House have stated a number of times, the member stated she surely did not want to be like the Americans south of the border.

Many of my relatives live in various parts of the United States. Some live in areas where guns are completely prohibited and some live in areas where the only gun law is simply that no guns are allowed in school or in court. The variance in violence does not seem to make much difference across the country where these relatives of mine live. The violence is there regardless of what the gun situation is.

I would like to know where you get the information that would enable you to stand in this House and say—

The Speaker: Order. I would remind all hon. members to please address the Chair rather than each other directly. Could the hon. member rephrase his question.

Mr. Thompson: I apologize for that, Mr. Speaker.

Where does the member receive her news about the violence that occurs in the states? Where does she get her information that things are so terrible throughout the U.S. when I know for a fact that in many places they are not?

Mr. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly true that many places in the United States are not the same. However, for anyone who has spent any substantial amount of time in an American city, I know people who have come from the United States to live in Canada who are thrilled by the fact they can walk around a city at night. It was something they had never done before in their entire lifetime. Guns were an important part of that. The fact is that the rate of deaths by guns in the United States is 10 times what it is in Canada. In general, the right to own guns is sacred in the United States and is reflected in the laws.

There has also been substantial international research by the International Association of Police Officers. It shows quite clearly that the more stringent the gun control, the much lower the death rate from homicide and the much lower the rate of violent crime. I will be happy to provide the member with that research.

The Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary to the minister of Indian affairs is going to address the House next.

I wish to inform the House that the hon. parliamentary secretary is going to address the House in his language. I was apprised of this and there is no impediment to using a language other than the two official languages in the House. The hon. member has taken care in this sense and has provided the interpreters with a complete translation of what he is going to be saying to the House. The hon. member has informed me that he will be strictly adhering to the text.

• (1210)

Therefore, I see no impediment to this, providing that all the steps have been taken so that all of us will know in either of the two official languages what is being said to the House.

With that I recognize the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut, translated as follows:*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on third reading of Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons.

The proposals contained in this bill have generated a lot of discussion throughout the country. A lot of misinformation is out there. I will use my time to dispel some of that misinforma-

tion, particularly as it affects my constituency and the people I represent. I will tell this House what I have been telling the Inuit hunters in my constituency.

No hunter is going to kill one less caribou or one less seal on account of this bill. I know that. The ability and right of the Inuit to hunt will still be there under the provisions of this bill. It will always be there.

No piece of legislation can take away the Inuit way of life. This bill does not take away the Inuit way of life, nor can anything else unless the Inuit themselves choose to let it go. That way of life is protected in the Nunavut land claims agreement and in the Constitution of Canada.

The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of the land and all the other laws of Canada have to be consistent with the Constitution. Section 35 of the Constitution states:

> 35. (1) The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.
>
> (2) In this act, "aboriginal peoples of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples of Canada.
>
> (3) For greater certainty, in subsection (1), "treaty rights" includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.
>
> (4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the aboriginal and treaty rights referred to in subsection (1) are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

Article 2 of the Nunavut land claims agreement is clear on the constitutional status of the agreement. It states: "The agreement shall be a land claims agreement within the meaning of section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982".

Mr. Speaker, the most basic aboriginal and treaty rights are the rights to hunt, trap and fish for sustenance. While there are many disagreements between aboriginal peoples and government on the exact scope and content of all aboriginal and treaty rights, there is at least agreement on harvesting rights. There is no question that aboriginal and treaty rights include hunting, fishing and trapping rights. Even the courts have said so.

Harvesting is central to the aboriginal way of life. It is at the heart of our being, who we are, who we have been, and who we want to be. We do not want to lose our connection with the land. It has sustained us for thousands of years. It has kept us alive. It sustains us still.

Most Inuit and most other aboriginal people who live in remote communities still make a living from the land. It is a proud thing and an honourable thing for us to go out on the land and come home with food for our families and neighbours. That is why there is such worry in aboriginal communities about this bill. There is a deep fear that the bill is affecting our core identity and will take away our ability to buy, possess and use firearms. Some people have been exploiting that fear. I want to address this issue now.

The government is well aware that aboriginal and treaty hunting and trapping rights exist. Some very specific provisions exist in these agreements concerning these rights.

• (1215)

For example, the Nunavut land claim agreement has a whole chapter on wildlife. That chapter recognizes that Inuit are traditional and current users of wildlife and that the legal rights of Inuit to harvest wildlife flow from their traditional and current use.

Under the Nunavut land claim agreement a wildlife management system has been created that reflects the traditional and current levels, patterns and character of Inuit harvesting and avoids unnecessary interference in the exercise of the rights, priorities and privileges to harvest. Subject to the terms of the chapter, an Inuk with proper identification may harvest up to his or her adjusted basic needs level without any form of licence or permit and without imposition of any form of tax or fee.

In addition, the agreement states that where there is any inconsistency or conflict between any federal, territorial and local government laws and the agreement, the agreement shall prevail.

Those provisions in the Nunavut land claim agreement offer protection. Other land claim agreements offer similar protection.

It will be necessary for the government to work out with aboriginal peoples an accommodation between existing aboriginal and treaty harvesting rights and the provisions of Bill C–68. There must be discussions, there must be consultations. There must be a dialogue so the various provisions can be reconciled and integrated. The government knows this and intends to carry out these essential discussions.

For this reason, the government put section 110(t) into Bill C–68. Section 110(t) says the governor in council, or cabinet, can make regulations, and I quote:

> Respecting the manner in which any provision of this Act or the regulations applies to any of the aboriginal peoples of Canada, and adapting any such provision for the purposes of that application.

This section recognizes that the government and aboriginal peoples have to work together to implement this bill in ways that are respectful of and sensitive to aboriginal and treaty rights. These discussions will occur. There will be opportunities for aboriginal peoples to have a say in implementation.

By the way, aboriginal peoples should know that both the Reform Party and the Bloc Quebecois tried to remove this clause from the bill during the committee hearings.

During the committee hearings on this bill, aboriginal representatives asked for something more than section 110(t). Some groups, like the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Grand Council

of the Crees of Quebec, specifically requested the inclusion of a non–derogation clause.

I am very pleased to say that the minister and the government responded positively to this request. The minister has brought in an amendment to Bill C–68 that adds a non–derogation clause to the bill. It reads like this:

> For greater certainty, nothing in this act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

While the government's position is that the bill does not abrogate aboriginal and treaty rights, this non–derogation clause has been included in the bill to provide greater reassurance. I pushed for this amendment and I thank the Minister of Justice for responding.

The minister and the government have also made another very important change to Bill C–68. It is a change that I also pushed for and it affects the lending provisions of the bill.

When the bill was drafted initially, it stated that when someone loaned a firearm to another person the registration certificate for the firearm had to be loaned along with the firearm. I expressed my concerns to the minister about this provision. Both aboriginal and non–aboriginal groups who appeared before the justice committee also raised the lending provision as an issue. They talked about the impracticality of lending a registration certificate along with a firearm when someone is out on the land hunting for food.

Again, the minister and the government responded to the concern. The amendment made to the bill by the minister removes the requirement to transfer the registration certificate along with the firearm when the firearm is being loaned to someone who will be hunting for sustenance purposes.

This is a practical change. The government is acknowledging a way of life in rural and remote communities. Lending firearms is a common occurrence in the north, where I come from. Lending your firearm in the north is as common as lending a lawnmower to your neighbour or borrowing a cup of sugar from your neighbour in the southern parts of Canada. In northern communities, when your neighbour needs something you have in order to put food on the table, you help out in whatever way you can. Sometimes you lend your skidoo, sometimes gas, and sometimes your gun.

The change the minister has made to the lending provisions of the bill responds to the very real circumstances of all sustenance hunters, aboriginal and non–aboriginal. It is a positive change and I welcome it and I thank the minister for his consideration.

• (1220)

There are some other issues related to the bill that will need to be addressed and worked out between the federal government, the government of the Northwest Territories and aboriginal peoples.

The firearms safety training course has to recognize northern circumstances. In the north it must reflect and be adapted to the northern reality. Accommodation should be made for the aboriginal languages. I encourage both the federal and territorial governments to continue working on this matter.

The issue of traditional gun giving is also one I am sure will be addressed in discussions between government and aboriginal representatives.

I am confident these issues can be worked out satisfactorily. Reasonable people working together in a spirit of good will can sort these things out.

I support this bill. It is better now following the committee hearings and report stage. Many changes have been made to the bill to improve it.

I had some concerns, which the minister has gone a long way to address. Protections for the Inuit way of life are contained in the Nunavut land claims agreement and the Constitution of Canada. The bill contains a clause that says the government will discuss with Inuit how the bill is to be implemented in Inuit communities. Our communities will be able to have their own firearms officers. Sustenance hunting is recognized in the bill and we are doubly protected now with the addition of the clause that says that nothing in the bill can take away or limit aboriginal and treaty hunting rights.

I have never had any problem with the principles of this bill. I have no problem with gun registration. I am a hunter. I am an aboriginal hunter. I am not afraid of registering my firearms. I may experience some inconvenience with registration, but I support the principles underlying it.

The overriding objective of gun registration is public safety. I am prepared to do my part.

[*English*]

The Speaker: During the question and comment period I would ask if the hon. member would consider that in whatever official language the question is asked, he would consider answering in one of the official languages.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Nunatsiaq for his comments.

I notice that he spent his time reassuring his constituents that the bill would not be too harsh on them. I know that even the use of his language was an effort to better communicate that to his constituents.

I also have made an effort to consult and to try to get the feelings from my constituents as well. I had a town hall meeting to discuss this bill in an open forum. I could not get a representative from the justice department to present the government side. No one would come. I could not get anyone from the police chiefs to come to put their spin on it. I just could not get them. I could not get a representative from Wendy Cukier and her gun control group. They would not come. Frankly, I could not get anyone to come to defend the bill in a public forum.

A dentist got up at this public meeting and said that he wanted to shoot recreationally. He said that he wanted to shoot a handgun. He was pretty nervous. He said: "This is my first ever public presentation, but this is what I have to go through already. I decide that I want to take the course and it takes me a year to get a handgun. I have to get an FAC. I have to go through the course. I have to spend money. I have to have a background check. I have to allow them to question my neighbours. They do a criminal check on me. When I finally get a firearm, I can only transport it in the trunk of my car. Any other guns I might have are locked up; they have a trigger lock and the ammunition is separate."

• (1225)

This is already the case in Canada. In Canada we do not allow sawed off shotguns; we do not allow automatic weapons; we do not allow machine guns. This just is not allowed. People watching should know these things are already not allowed. The gun owners by and large say they are willing to go through the hoops, that it is a pain and they question its effectiveness, but they are willing to do it because they are law–abiding citizens. But they also say that there comes a time when they do not know what they are going to do any more: "I can't do more than I'm doing. I am not the problem".

The constituents of the member for Nunatsiaq are not the problem. The problem is the criminal element. This bill does very little to clamp down on the criminal misuse of firearms. This dentist who gave a speech and the other gun owners I have talked to say that when we find a criminal misusing a firearm, using it in the commission of a crime, we should throw them away for the rest of their lives: "I don't care, because they're not part of us. They're not law–abiding citizens, so throw the book at them". The problem is this bill is primarily concerned with the law–abiding citizens.

My question to the member is how will the universal registration portion of this bill make my constituent, this dentist, feel any safer? He has already jumped through a full year's worth of regulations trying to be a totally law–abiding citizen. Now he finds out that is not enough. He is exasperated, and I share his exasperation.

Mr. Anawak:

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the problem is? The problem is we are too much of a me, me, me society, rather than we, we, we. We should be looking after the interests of Canadian people as a whole. Instead, what is happening with the gun control lobby is "You're going to take away my right to have a firearm". This is not a right; it is a privilege to have a firearm.

A little bit of inconvenience in registering a rifle should be no big deal. I really do not have a problem with the registration.

By the way, I should also thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to speak Inuktitut earlier.

It is too much of a me, me, me society, rather than one that considers what is good for the country. I would like the members from Reform to support us on the issue of a non–derogation clause. Yesterday they did not support us after the hon. member for Crowfoot said: "I find it unacceptable that the government will make agreements with our aboriginal people and then violate those agreements. This is unacceptable. What's the purpose of the agreement and where is the honour in the agreement if it's simply going to be violated? No wonder the aboriginal people come forward. I admire your patience. I can't get over your patience in the face of this kind of treatment". This was from the member for Crowfoot. Then last night he voted against a non–derogation clause, which recognizes our rights under section 35 of the Constitution.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, everyone has an opinion on Bill C–68. From Lutselk'e in the Northwest Territories to Blanc–Sablon, the bill has been discussed in our homes, in our communities and especially in this House. The debate continues down into the last stretch. Yesterday again we talked about it for hours in this House.

• (1230)

The main source of controversy in Bill C–68 is undoubtedly the proposal for a national registration system.

This universal registration system will consist of a computerized registry listing the names and addresses of firearms owners and a description of the firearms in their possession. The system will be operated by the RCMP.

Firearm owners have to apply for the new ownership licence starting in January 1996 and will have until 2001 to register. Firearms will have to be registered starting in January 1998, and owners will have until 2003 to do so.

Reform Party members, the pro–gun lobby and several Liberal colleagues of the Minister of Justice are pleased about the fact that the minimum sentence for using a firearm in the commission of an offence has been increased and that existing owners of

firearms have a grace period of nearly eight years to comply with the national registration system proposed by the minister in Bill C–68.

I am convinced that registration of firearms plus ownership licences will have a positive impact on homicide and suicide rates and on controlling the number of firearms in circulation.

We cannot ignore the statistics on deaths caused by the use of firearms. Guns are used in more than one third of homicides in Canada. In the past ten years, the majority of homicides were committed using shotguns or hunting rifles.

In their presentation to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the Conférence des régies régionales de la santé et des services sociaux du Québec gave a telling summary of the situation in Quebec, and I quote: "In Quebec, firearms claim at least one victim per day or 420 deaths annually, of which 7 out of 10 are suicides. During the same twelve–month period, 400 people in Quebec died of AIDS, 400 died due to accidental falls, 900 in car accidents, 100 by drowning and 80 of accidental poisoning. The number of deaths caused by firearms is comparable to many other health problems that have raised the concerns of the public, the media and government. The annual economic cost of the wrongful use of firearms has been estimated, in 1993 Canadian dollars, at $6.595 billion in Canada and $1.659 billion in Quebec alone. The vast majority of deaths caused by gunshots occur in the home, with legally acquired rifles".

These are the depressing facts, and we cannot ignore them. Gun control is necessary in a society that wants to curb violence and enhance public safety.

The Bloc Quebecois is in favour of gun control that does not however, discriminate against those who use guns responsibly. The Bloc Quebecois and 90 per cent of the people of Quebec support firearms registration. That is the kind of society we want.

The bill is well received by Quebecers who are looking for ways to keep our society peaceful and secure and to combat smuggling more effectively. Like women across the country, women in Quebec support stricter gun controls. This is not surprising since they also have the highest rate of deaths due to gunshot wounds.

In all opinion polls, women and the more highly educated were 88 per cent in favour of a registration system for all firearms. On the other hand, men in general were only 78 per cent in favour of gun registration.

I have upset some people by saying that gender had a lot to do with this debate on the future of our society. The statistics show I was right, for the following reasons: The first is obvious; the statistics speak for themselves as regards women's support for gun registration. The second is that men are generally the aggressors, while women are more often than not at the other end of the barrel.

• (1235)

Even the Minister of Justice agreed with me, when he cited disturbing statistics. On the average, a woman dies through the discharge of a firearm every six days in Canada. Three times out of four, the murdered wife was shot with a rifle or a shotgun. Firearms control, whether we want to admit it or not, is a matter of gender: that of the victims and that of the women who support Bill C–68 by an overwhelming majority.

For reasons I set out earlier, I believe the establishment of a national registration system is a positive step. I must repeat, however, my considerable regret that the Minister of Justice yielded to the gun lobby.

By spreading the registration of owners and their weapons over eight years, the minister is making it clear that he does not want the system implemented while he is around. He should have shortened the registration period for firearms by two years. The system would have been in place next year.

There is no justification, either logistic or political, for firearms registration not to begin at the same time as licensing for ownership. Registration could have begun on January 1 next year and ended December 31, 2000.

We must remember that firearms are registered only once in the owner's lifetime. The certificate need not be renewed. The operation is a very simple one, requiring little of owners.

Lives could be saved if all firearms were registered quickly. What are we waiting for? I have chosen to live in a responsible society, and I hope my colleagues will make the same choice.

Allow my to express my delight at the end of fruitless debates and of the ineptitudes of the Reform Party. Bill C–68 will soon become a law that all Quebecers and Canadians will have to observe.

The Minister of Justice received a passing grade, barely, in this examination. His marketing operation proved a complete failure.

I have been interested in the matter of firearms since 1989 and I have never looked back. From the first, I fought for tightened gun control. As early as 1989, I asked that firearms sold in Canada be equipped with a safety locking device. I participated in the debate on Bill C–17 until it was passed in 1991.

Thank God, Reform members did not take part, and the pro–gun lobby had to find other allies in this House.

I am happy that the firearms bill will be adopted today. Although flawed, it represents a kind of social reform toward the safe and peaceful society I want.

Whatever Reform members may say, legislation on gun registration is not limited to New Zealand and Australia. If the Reform Party likes to use these examples, it is because the experience was a difficult one for these two countries. New Zealand had an obsolete, manual system that had been introduced after the first world war.

Like Canada, Australia is a federal state, but gun regulations come under the jurisdiction of the states and territories. It seems difficult to standardize a national registration system, when it comes under the jurisdiction of states with different sets of laws.

In any event, for the information of my Reform colleagues, I would like to talk briefly about other countries in the world that have introduced gun control measures. I welcome the idea that we will soon be part of this responsible community.

• (1240)

In China, a non–professional hunter can obtain a licence allowing him to own a weapon, but he cannot own more than two.

In the Czech Republic, an applicant must specify the reasons why he wants a licence and attach recommendation letters as well as a medical certificate vouching for his physical and mental health. The licence is valid for a three month period only. After obtaining his licence, the potential gun buyer must receive authorization from the district police. He must then, in the following days, take the gun he bought to the district police for registration.

In France, the registration data includes the buyer's name, place of residence and birthplace. Firearms must be registered with the gendarmerie. In France also, certain individuals are not allowed to purchase firearms, for instance those convicted of a crime or sentenced to prison for more than three months; those who are mentally disabled; those on probation; and finally, violent alcoholics.

In Germany, manufacturers and gunsmiths are required by law to apply various procedures, such as record keeping, labelling and notifying. These procedures are designed to help the authorities keep accurate records on firearms and ammunition belonging to private or business interests.

In Great Britain, anyone who has a firearm, whether they own it or not, must register it and get a licence.

In Greece, to be eligible to hold a licence, applicants must be 21 years of age and substantiate their need to have a firearm for personal safety, guarding a public building or target shooting. Firearms registration is mandatory and the licence to possess firearms must be renewed every three months.

These are a few countries around the world where firearms control was a societal choice. India, Israel, Sweden, South Africa, Poland, the Netherlands, Mexico, Malaysia, Japan and others also have similar legislation.

As you can see, contrary to what the third party would have us believe, responsible governments are not only found in Western Canada.

In addition, Bill C–68 as amended by the Standing Committee on Justice recognizes, in clause 7, long gun safety courses approved by the provinces. In Quebec, safety courses were approved by the Minister of Public Security in 1969 and have been offered ever since.

Quebecers who have undergone training in firearms handling in recent years should not have to take the course again to comply with the new legislation. Therefore, the Bloc Quebecois supports clause 7, as poorly worded as it is, since people who have already taken the safety course will not be compelled to take it again.

In closing, I would like to thank the Standing Committee on Justice and the 70 organizations and individuals who have travelled to Ottawa to express their views on Bill C–68 at the committee hearings.

Let us bear in mind that every major social project has raised controversy. Bill C–68 is one of those. Our efforts will not have been in vain.

[*English*]

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to ask a couple of questions and make a couple of comments on the member's statement.

I am not sure what suppositions she starts from but I would like to comment on two or three. She mentioned that if we register weapons we must register guns because often rifles are used in suicides, murders, domestic disputes or whatever. I do not see how registering them makes any difference. If a person is crazy and is going to shoot somebody, does it matter if it is a registered weapon or an unregistered weapon hanging on the wall? I do not see how it really makes any difference. If someone is crazy enough to shoot somebody, he or she will do it anyway.

• (1245)

I want to show it is not the registry that controls crime but other factors that can help to control crime. For example, Florida relaxed its gun laws in 1987. The murder rate has fallen

20 per cent and is now lower than the American national average.

Great Britain introduced tougher, more restrictive laws in 1988 which lowered the number of guns by 22 per cent and its violent crime rate has doubled.

The hon. member mentioned, for example, Israel, Switzerland and Sweden, that have firearm registration. I am not that familiar with them except to say that in Israel every able–bodied male of military age has an assault rifle in his house, not just a shotgun. He has a weapon with which to go to war.

For my relatives in Sweden every single man must go through military training and keeps the gat right in the House. Registering them is not a factor. It is other things and what we do to prosecute and persecute those who are involved in the criminal use of firearms.

Concerning the suicide argument, in Japan for example virtually no guns are allowed. They are banned in Japan. The suicide rate is much higher than Canada's. Just banning guns will not necessarily do away with suicides or domestic violence.

It is a horrible thing but men, not that we take any comfort in it, are assaulted at probably 10 times the rate of women by other men. Men glory in shooting other men too. Some people are crazy and we cannot legislate against that. Registering weapons will not do away with those people. We need an absolute clampdown on the criminal misuse of firearms.

I had a case in my riding. A guy sneaked across the American border in Columbia valley. He had with him a totally unregistered firearm, a .357 magnum, shoved in his jacket. He was stopped by a police officer. He knocked the police officer down. He stuck the muzzle of the gun in the female officer's mouth and said: "I'm going to kill you". He had plastic bullets which are only used for destroying people.

Thankfully someone intervened and was able to talk him out of this incident, although he threatened to kill two people. He had two firearms because he stole the police officer's firearm as well. He stole the police vehicle, took it up into the mountains nearby and torched, to the tune of about $40,000.

He had committed illegal entry. He had an unregistered illegal firearm. He had assaulted a police officer. He had threatened to murder two people. He had some drugs on him. On and on it went. Finally they tracked the guy down and caught him. What did he get? They dropped the firearms offences and for all of the incidents he got 15 months in jail.

That guy should have been thrown in jail for 25 years. That is how we should handle misuse of firearms. That guy will be on the streets by June, I suppose with a totally unregistered illegal firearm waiting to threaten to kill the next person.

My question for the member is this. Is it not true that what we need in Canada is not more control of law–abiding citizens but stricter control and stricter sentences against those who misuse firearms?

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an answer to the member who asked why firearms should be registered, since it will not serve any purpose, etc. We heard his speech. I want to tell him that the purpose of registration is, first and foremost, to make people realize that a firearm is something designed to kill. It is not a toy.

Some may claim that westerners are born with a gun in each hand, the fact remains that these guns were made to kill. This is the message being sent to the public right now. People must be aware that a firearm is dangerous. Once they realize that, they will give more thought to registering their guns, since the registration process requires that some steps be taken, through the mail or otherwise. People will ask themselves: Should I keep that firearm in the house? Is it necessary? Do I really need it, or am I just keeping it in some corner without taking real care of it, without being concerned about it and about the fact that anybody could use it to commit an offence?

So, people will ask themselves if they need a firearm. I personally have firearms in my house. I am a hunter, but I have not gone hunting since 1992. As you know, the hunting season is in the fall. In 1992, we had the referendum on the Charlottetown Accord. In 1993, the federal election took place. In 1994, a provincial election was held in Quebec. And in 1995, we will have a referendum in our province. I had to give up hunting over the past few years, and I now wonder if I should keep my guns.

I discussed the issue with my spouse and he agreed that, indeed, if we do not go hunting any more, then we should consider getting rid of these guns. I should add that, this year, my name was randomly selected to go goose hunting in Cap–Tourmente. This is an exceptional opportunity but, of course, I will not be able to make it because something more important will take place in Quebec, that is the referendum, and I will have to be there of course.

So, we have to consider whether we want to keep our firearms at home, since we no longer use them. Do we really want to keep hunting? Can we still go hunting? Do we still have time for that activity? The fact that we need a license to own a gun, and that we have to register guns, makes us think about the whole issue and, as far I am concerned, promoting this kind of awareness is the purpose of that legislation. The other goal is of course to make our society safer, but the primary purpose is to make people aware of the fact that a gun is something that kills.

[*English*]

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, although there is so much to add to what has been said already, I will keep my remarks very specific and short.

The hon. member talks about awareness. I would like to bring to the attention of the House some other information and ask for her support at the same time.

The hon. member was here earlier in the day when the member for Ottawa West commented that later today she was going to drive to the airport to pick up her daughter and grandson and return to the House to vote.

If we can believe the statistics that have been collected, if the hon. member for Ottawa West or any other member were to drive to the airport in Saskatchewan, the chances of being injured or killed on the way to or from the airport or on the way to or from any community in the province would be much higher than being injured or killed by a firearm.

According to statistics collected regarding the Trans–Canada and Yellowhead highway in Saskatchewan, let me briefly put three statistics on record. The number of accidents, injuries and fatalities over five years in the province of Saskatchewan, average per year accidents are 1,026 injured; 389 fatalities; 24 on the highway.

Firearm statistics: the five–year average in the province of Saskatchewan gives number of accidents with firearms, 18; number of injuries, 16; number killed, 2.6.

• (1255)

The third statistic, five–year average, the total number of homicides in the province of Saskatchewan are 28.2. The five–year average, number of homicides involving guns, 5.4. The average number of people killed on the highways in Saskatchewan average 24 a year. The average number of people killed in gun related homicides, 5 per year.

This year the federal government has withdrawn all support for the national highways program. There is no commitment of federal funds to support the upgrading of highways in the province of Saskatchewan yet it is imposing increase costs on the people of Saskatchewan for safety reasons, to register firearms.

I wonder if the representative of Canada's official opposition can tell us in the interests of safety whether she is as committed to national highways funding as she is committed to the national gun registry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The member wonders what difference there is between a car and a firearm. It is very simple: A car is used for transportation purposes, while a firearm is used to kill.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share my time with another government member.

Bill C–68, as drafted, has certainly raised a great deal of interest throughout Canada, particularly in the western provinces. One thing we can say is that this bill does in fact have the approval and support of a large number of Canadians.

First of all, let us be clear that almost 80 per cent of Canadians are in favour of this bill, including 90 per cent of Quebecers, and I have also learned that 68 per cent to close to 80 per cent of Albertans back the government's gun control bill.

Throughout this debate, we have listened to the opposition describe for us their vision of Canadian society. It is not a vision I share, particularly the vision of the members of the third party, who accuse us of daring to compare Canada and the United States. They would have us believe that the Canadian government wants to limit the rights of its citizens. Their allegation that the Canadian government, and especially the justice department, is violating the most fundamental rights of Canadians, is simply not true.

I would also like to tell you that I come from a small community where rifles and hunting are part of everyday life. My grandfather was and my own father to this day is an avid hunter. With him, I explored the forests of this country, especially those in the Gaspé area. My father also taught me how to handle a firearm and I can only say I am most grateful. He did, however, instill in me a certain respect for firearms and the danger they can represent for society and for the individual.

[*English*]

It is important to make the statement that never did the government ever intend to withdraw the right to hunt. That is a fundamental right we all share. However, it is the view of the government to make sure that people understand that owning a gun is a privilege. It is an item, a tool which we use that requires a lot of respect, requires some amount of control.

I will not on any further about my personal experiences. A number of people testified in committee over the course of the past few months and without any doubt there is a definite need for gun control.

• (1300)

There are all kinds of reasons; social reasons such as health and safety which require some kind of control in order to maintain the Canada we know, the kind of society that regrettably some of us might take for granted.

We were also told through allegations made by the opposition that the registration of guns would cost approximately $300 million. That is absolutely false. We have to make it very clear to all Canadians that the registration of guns will basically cost $10 up to a maximum of 10 firearms.

We are not confiscating weapons. We are asking Canadians to register their guns. We register dogs and automobiles and all kinds of things. It is very important to underline the cost and not to pursue the exaggerations put forward by the third party.

The Minister of Justice said the cost of this program will be approximately an $85 million disbursement over the next five years. However, having listened to the testimonials from various health groups we were also told we would probably save $100 million a year in various incarceration costs because there would be fewer Canadians either murdered or facing justice, fewer Canadians in the courts. The cost savings are quite incredible.

Health officials from Quebec and other provinces estimated that in terms of lost productivity, economics, trauma care, the general cost to society once one has been either a victim of crime or a family member of a victim, close to $6 billion a year is lost in total Canadian productivity. Six billion dollars is an incredible amount of money. These stats which were brought to our attention we must use in order to demonstrate to the opposition and to the Canadian population that in the end with the registration of guns we are actually saving Canadians money and we are also obviously saving lives.

Other aspects of the bill I find most interesting. Violence seems to be more and more of a preoccupation of the general public, and with reason especially in terms of guns. It was well explained to us by the opposition this morning, by the hon. member from Saint Hubert, but I think it is worth repeating. A statistic provided to us by a number of our witnesses states one stands twice the chance of being injured or killed by a firearm in rural Canada compared with any other urban area. One stands twice the chance because of the prevalence, the existence of firearms in these communities.

We are also told according to the New England *Journal of Medicine* that with the presence of a gun in a home there is five times the chance of someone committing suicide. With the presence of a gun in a home there is three times the chance of a homicide.

We also know guns are often the weapon of choice in domestic violence. Let us discuss domestic violence. I think it is a preoccupation shared by all parliamentarians regardless of their political stripe. We are told 87 per cent of victims of violence know their aggressors. We also learned 84 per cent of victims are women. Sixty–one per cent of the weapons used were long guns legally acquired. There is obviously a certain correlation with a weapon in a home and violence in the family. We must address that.

• (1305)

I could go on and speak more about the police who would like to know when they go to a home following a call on conjugal violence what they will face. Does a police officer not have the right to know what is in the home, 12 gauge, a .22, whether there is a history of conjugal violence? Is the person in possession of a gun at a certain address posing a problem to his family and does he have a history of causing problems to society? Those are legitimate questions which police officers must ask every day. We are not only doing it for them, we are doing it for the families. We are doing it for the victims, for society as a whole. These are the questions we must ask.

I would like to conclude on a positive note but regrettably I cannot. I am thinking of my brother who was at l'École polytechnique in December of 1989 and tells me the story of a young women he knew very well. She was in her late twenties. She had the courage to return to school and was on her way to write her final examination. My brother had bade her farewell, wishing her the best of luck in her work, in her new career. On that dreadful day in December of 1989 he was to learn a few hours later that she was the victim of one of the most cruel crimes ever committed in Canada.

The passage of this bill will keep in mind the victims and will keep in mind those who regrettably could have been protected had such a law existed. I am hoping to pass this law for the victims of l'École polytechnique and above all to make sure fewer crimes and fewer deaths will result in the years to come.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, all of Canada heard it from this hon. member and the hon. member for Nunatsiaq who preceded him. Let it be known the Liberal government has made a statement today on two occasions that it is not a right to own a firearm but rather a privilege. Liberal members have made the judgment that a citizen is privileged to own property. Will they extend that philosophy to the right or privilege of Canadians to own cars, houses, boats, to go on a vacation, to vote freely? Is it a right or a privilege?

I would like the hon. member to stand in the House, look right into the television camera and tell every aboriginal person it is not a right for them to own a gun but a privilege.

The member said that in rural Canada a person has twice the chance of being injured by a firearm, that where firearms are present there is five times the chance of suicide and that where firearms are present there is three times the chance of homicide. We have asked the government time and time again during this debate and I ask this member now to give us one substantive, specific piece of evidence that if a firearm were registered these statistics would be different.

• (1310)

We have asked the government on many occasions and it has not supplied to the House one substantive piece of evidence to support its claim that registration of firearms will cut down on accidents, crime or suicides. Registration will not affect this.

I have talked to many law enforcement officers across the country specifically about officers attending the scene of a domestic disturbance. They have told me to the number that any police officer who attempts to enter a residence where there is a reported domestic disturbance and who does not first and foremost assume automatically there could be a firearm in there will not be on that beat tomorrow.

The member told about this grand plan that the police officers would know in advance whether there is a firearm there. Now they automatically assume there is a firearm and have been doing that for many years. Many of police officers have told me the reason they are staying alive today is they assume and take precautions which is part of their training.

I ask the member to stand up, face the cameras and tell all of Canada including aboriginal peoples that owning a firearm is a privilege extended to them by the Liberal Government of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I caution the hon. parliamentary secretary that he has only one minute remaining to respond. I ask members to be aware that when members are speaking for only 10 minutes there are only five minutes of questions and comments. Accordingly, if a member uses the entire five minutes there will be virtually no time to respond.

Mr. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, in the United States one has the right to bear arms. In Canada it is peace, order and good government. This is what we are attempting to do.

We will defend the right to hunt but like anything else sometimes there are privileges and owning a gun is one of them. This is not the United States. This is Canada. We are Canadians. We have lived and abided by this philosophy. One thing the bill will certainly prove is that the rule of law will prevail.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not a right to own a firearm in the United States either. The Supreme Court of the United States stated the second amendment to the U.S. constitution giving the right to bear arms applies to state militias in their wish to defend against an arbitrary national government. That was the point of view of the amendment, not to give individuals the right to bear arms. This is a misunderstanding many Americans and certainly a great many Canadians have. However, the subject is not the United States.

Bill C–68 is at third reading now. We wanted to create a bill which will be fairer to lawful gun owners and which will offer additional protection to Canadian citizens and reduce crime.

Members opposite ask how we will reduce crime and how many lives will we save. I have to agree there is no common denominator that is going to give us that figure. Certainly with the information available from witnesses who appeared before the committee we have every reason to believe a good many lives will be saved.

• (1315)

I want to talk about what we are going to require from a firearms owner who has 10 or fewer long guns. We are going to ask that person to register his or her firearms. The registration will take place between January 1, 1998 and December 31, 2003. The cost for registering the firearms will probably be nothing to begin with or for the most part will be $10. One will also be able to register 10 firearms for the amount of $10. Toward the end of the five year period that figure may go from $10 to as high as $18 for the registration of 10 firearms.

For someone who has 10 long guns there will not be an inspection of that person's home. If there are 10 or fewer firearms there is no inspection whatsoever for safe storage. If in any case an inspector requires verification of a serial number or other information, that verification would take place outside the home or perhaps the owner could be requested to bring his or her firearm to the inspector's office.

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Or they might come to the home.

Mr. MacLellan: They do not go inside the home. If it is more beneficial for the individual to have the inspector come to the home, the inspector could wait outside the door while the individual brings the firearm for verification. There is no right of that inspector to go into the home.

We are saying it will cost a maximum of $18 but more likely $10 for the registration of 10 firearms for life. Those firearms do not need to be registered again unless they are sold to someone else. That is the situation.

If an individual wants to gain a possession licence then that registration will take place beginning January 1, 1996 and will continue for five years until December 31, 2001. The cost of the possession licence will not be anything to begin with. There will be a fee after the system has been in operation for a while during the five year period. For those who want to renew their firearms acquisition certificate and gain a possession licence toward the end of the five year period, it could be as much as $60. That would give the person a possession licence for five years.

There is going to be a training course for those who want to purchase a new firearm. This requirement is in place at the present time. However, if someone wants a possession licence,

already has firearms and has no intention of buying new firearms, then the training course will not be required.

There is nothing here that is going to dreadfully harm the lawful gun owner. Sure there is going to be an inconvenience and there are going to be other things in the regulations which may be an inconvenience.

The member for Saint–Hubert talked about trigger locks. The regulations are going to require that new firearms purchased at retail dealers have a trigger lock on purchase.

• (1320)

That is not going to be a major inconvenience. It is going to be a safety factor. What we want to do is to create safety in the homes, to ask for and require safe storage, not to unduly interfere with the rights of the individual. By registration and requiring safe storage, we hope people will realize what a firearm can mean in the hands of someone who would use it improperly, whether that is someone who steals the firearm from the home or someone who is intending to commit suicide.

We have heard time and again in this House and in committee that in Canada on average there are 1,400 people killed by firearms every year. Approximately 1,100 of those are suicides. If the gun is not readily available, the chance of that suicide taking place has diminished. If there is a locked door, even if it is a glass door, and the key is somewhere else, it is going to be somewhat of an effort to find that key. If the ammunition is somewhere else, it is going to be a deterrent.

Many people have told us that some people fail to plan a suicide well in advance. Sometimes it is an instant decision. Some people decide they want to use firearms. If they do not use a firearm, they will not use anything else. Psychiatrists have told us that in committee.

We made very important amendments to this bill in committee. I think personally it is a much better bill now than it was before it went to committee.

We have taken the first offence for the non–registration of long guns out of the Criminal Code and put it in the firearms act. We have changed the inspection provisions, an example of which I gave earlier.

For those who are veterans, those who have heirlooms and relics, handguns which would otherwise be prohibited and only sold to those who have similar firearms, they can pass them along to members of their family. These handguns are mementoes of a very important time in some people's lives, perhaps when they served overseas. This is extremely important and is the sort of thing we want to do. We did it because we heard witnesses and because the members of the committee worked together.

This bill is going to be a good act. It is not going to be a perfect one but it is going to be a good one. Along with the other things this government hopes to do, it will reduce crime in Canada.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very interested to hear the hon. parliamentary secretary is already changing the bill. It has not even been passed yet. I wonder if this comes under section 110.

Bring the guns to the door indeed. We know better than that. It is not in the bill and the hon. member should not say things like that.

He talks about the right and privilege question again. I wonder, when did the common law die in North America if what the hon. member says is true. I believe the hon. member is a lawyer. I hope he has read his Blackstone. If he has not, I might refresh his memory.

Blackstone's chronicles state that any Englishman has the right to possess personal weapons. Without those personal weapons, no other rights of Englishmen are effective. They are void. That is very clearly spelled out. It is a long and ancient tradition in the English speaking world.

Now that it has been declared by the Liberal government that firearms, a piece of property, are something we are privileged to own, what other types of property does this government intend to declare a privilege, seditious literature perhaps? Where do we go from here?

The hon. member mentioned the question of veterans and their heirlooms. I do not know how many letters I and other members have received that begin with words: "I carried a gun for my country for three years and now my country does not trust me with a gun. What is happening to my country?" I would like to hear the hon. parliamentary secretary's comments on that. That is a very common observation I have run into. In fact the most vociferous opponents to this legislation or gun control legislation in general actually are the veterans.

• (1325)

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the last point first with respect to the veterans who have a lot of firearms. In Atlantic Canada a great many of the veterans have Enfields. That is a long gun which is neither prohibited nor restricted now, nor will it be after this bill is passed. It will not be restricted in any way. It will have to be registered but it can be utilized as it was before. It can be passed on by the owner to anyone he or she wishes. Other than registration there is no further change in the ownership for that individual. The firearm will have to be licensed.

Mr. Morrison: That is the point.

Mr. Gouk: What about the 600,000 you are taking away?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. Clearly this is a serious matter the House is deliberating. All interventions must be made through the Chair. We are certainly feeding on each other's time. With the little time left for the hon. parliamentary secretary I would ask him to be succinct.

Mr. MacLellan: The only difference will be that there will be registration, the possession licence for the owner and a registration certificate for the firearm. Nothing else will change.

With respect to the owner of the firearm coming to the door to show and give pertinent information to an inspector, that is exactly what can happen with an agreement between the two parties. That is not a difficult situation.

With respect to the right to bear firearms, the hon. member is talking about the bill of rights in the U.K. which was passed in the 17th century and gave the right to bear arms. He will also note there has been very meaningful gun control in the United Kingdom. If it applied to the right of every individual to have any kind of firearm he or she wanted, then certainly that gun control would not have taken place.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the rest of the Reform speakers will be dividing their time.

[*Translation*]

I am pleased to have the opportunity to present my arguments regarding Bill C–68. I would like to begin by reading excerpts from a letter which was read in the House in 1976 during the debate on Bill C–83.

I quote: "The proposal to give bureaucrats the authority to determine who may or may not possess a firearm is an alarming example of the philosophy that "all that is not compulsory must be prohibited". If this measure is to become law, it is not difficult to predict that within a few years firearms in Canada will be restricted to a privileged few and that these arms will all be registered with their serial number. Subsequently it would be easy for a megalomaniac government to seize all rifles under the pretence of emergency measures and therefore secure the submissiveness of the people. If you think that the present government's policy is indeed very moderate and my fears exaggerated and unjustified, or even paranoiac, let me remind you that fascism is like cancer: if they are not restrained from the very beginning, they can completely destroy our system.

"There is no proof that firearm control can effectively reduce the rate of crime except in a totalitarian state. Of course, with a total lack of freedom and with the support of relentless police forces there is not much violent crime".

• (1330)

"But having lived and worked in some of those peaceful paradises I do not hesitate to take the moderate risks and responsibilities involved in living in a free society even if it is armed."

"If my government is not afraid of me, in return I will have no reason to fear that same government. If this moderately repressive measure becomes law, I will start to become alarmed".

I wrote this letter and Réal Caouette, the hon. member for Abitibi, read it. Things have not changed: the Liberals are still proposing repressive laws and I am still defending the rights of individual citizens.

I am, I always have been and I always will be opposed to the registration of firearms used for hunting, searches without warrants, the confiscation of private property without compensation and a minister being invested with the power to issue regulations without the approval of Parliament. A reform government would put an end to all of this; we promise.

Currently, Quebecers in rural areas and in the north—farmers, lumberjacks, trappers, etc.—are not being represented by their MPs.

Liberal, Conservative and Bloc members all refused to support the hundreds of thousands of members of a seven–group coalition from Quebec who are opposed to Bill C–68. Ultimately, the Reform Party decided to represent their interests in Parliament.

[*English*]

Réal Caouette knew that I was not one of his supporters, but he presented my letter here for the same reason that we Reformers are representing the people of rural Quebec. He was a genuine populist and he despised the unnecessary heavy hand of government.

We here are all aware of the threats to civil liberty in clauses 99 to 112 of Bill C–68, even with the feeble conciliatory amendments made in committee. These clauses have been discussed in detail, both in the House and at scores of information meetings and mass rallies throughout the country. And they were at least partly reflected in the recent landslide won by Ontario politicians who came out and strongly opposed Bill C–68.

Instead of further addressing those clauses, I would like to draw the attention of the House to some little–known historical information. I have been studying the weapons laws of pre–war Germany, and they are very closely parallel to existing and proposed laws in Canada. I will read a couple of examples. "Firearms acquisition permits must only be issued to persons of undoubted reliability, and only upon proof of need". Here is another: "Firearms can only be professionally sold or otherwise transferred domestically if they bear the manufacturer's or

dealer's company name or registered trademark and a consecutive manufacturer's serial number".

The legislation also provided for confiscations without legal action and without compensation, for the prohibition of certain types of weapons, and for arbitrary changes in regulations and fees.

In fact, the justice minister could have saved a lot of money by dismissing his high–priced legal help, getting a copy of the Reichtag legislation and running it through a photocopier, except that this document contains no search and seizure provision. Of course, outside of the English–speaking world search warrants are of as little consequence as they are to our Minister of Justice. And the penalties for non–compliance were much lighter than those proposed in Bill C–68. O Canada.

• (1335)

Some friends have suggested to me that I should not talk about these matters because by drawing attention to the recent past I am going to somehow destroy my credibility as an opponent of gun control by being too strident, too extreme. I disagree. After all, I am only the messenger drawing attention to irrefutable historical fact. Anti–gun people, above all others, should not shoot the messenger.

The laws are essentially the same. What I want people here to understand is that governments often chip away at civil liberty little by little by little. A common destination can be reached by many different roads. I am certainly not suggesting that the self–righteous authoritarianism of this government places it on the same level as the Third Reich. In fact I am satisfied that everything the Liberals and Conservatives have done and propose to do regarding guns reflects a sincere belief that gun control will somehow reduce violent crime.

The fact that this is not logical and has not worked anywhere else where it has been tried does not deter them, because they are driven not by logic but by their elitist prejudices. And prejudice is a very weak foundation on which to build the laws of a nation.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate now for the last couple of hours and I find it very, very interesting to listen to the doublespeak and the doubletalk and all the rhetoric that has been going on.

I listened to the first speech given by the justice minister, and he made a statement that I think all of Canada ought to know. It is one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard. He said that criminals will identify themselves because they will not register their guns. Criminals will identify themselves. I am not taking that statement out of context. If that is not doublespeak, if that is not one of the most ridiculous things I have ever heard! By targeting law–abiding citizens, he said we will somehow flush out the criminal element.

The people of Canada ought to know what debate is taking place here today. He says the cost will be minimal. He says that we have too many guns in society and this will simply be a minor inconvenience. The contradictions are there. We have too many guns in society. We have to get rid of them, but this will only be a minor inconvenience. It will not really restrict law–abiding gun owners. Right there are the contradictions. They are talking out of both sides of their mouths. I have a difficult time sitting here calmly listening to this debate.

One of the things they say is that it will make society safer, and then they go on to explain how they are going to tie up the police and all of our resources. How does that make society safer when you are dealing with 99.99 per cent of the people who are not a problem and you are going to tie up your police behind their desks dealing with these law–abiding citizens rather than being out on the street dealing with the criminal element? That defies logic. That is speaking out of both sides of your mouth. That will never work.

They are going to increase our taxes. They are saying it will not cost very much, $10 for 10 guns, et cetera. Who is going to pay for it? The finance minister has admitted that the increase in taxes is destroying jobs. If they destroy jobs in this country, the first people who are going to suffer are the young men of this country. Do not tell me that is not a risk or will not increase crime in this country. They cannot have it both ways. They are actually doing the opposite of what they are leading us to believe in their speeches. This is really a problem.

• (1340)

We have repeatedly stated that the registration system will provide information to the wrong people. It will fall into the wrong hands. A senior RCMP officer admitted that. He said there is no way we can prevent criminals from obtaining the information. We have a problem.

They talk about Great Britain and how much safer it is there. In Great Britain 59 per cent of the attempted burglaries are committed while someone is at home and the lights are on. In the U.S.A., less than 9 per cent of burglaries are committed when people are at home and the lights are on. Why? Because a criminal will not put himself at risk. I do not have time to go through the whole argument, but research shows that victims of attempted robbery and assault are less likely to be injured if they can defend themselves.

There are so many statements that contradict themselves. For example, the government proposes to ban .25 and .32 calibre handguns and handguns with barrel lengths of less than 4.14 inches, implying that will make society safer. What does that do? Does that restrict the criminal element? No. They will simply go to the guns that are larger and more effective.

Mr. Stinson: More killing power.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Yes, they will have more killing power, as my colleague has suggested.

This is convoluted logic. He says that over 500,000 handguns are dangerous and they need to be banned, but they are not dangerous if they leave them in the hands of their owners right now. There is a contradiction in what they are doing.

I wonder if my colleague would like to comment on some of the doublespeak, some of the contradictory statements we have been hearing today that somehow this will improve public safety. I rather doubt it will.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I do not doubt that the hon. colleague would like to respond, but the member has used up the entire five minutes for questions or comments.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, what is the alleged purpose of Bill C–68? To listen to the Liberals, Bill C–68 is somehow magically supposed to keep our homes and streets safer. However, simply put, Bill C–68 will not prevent the criminal misuse of firearms.

There are two principal parts to the bill to which many people object. The first is the registration of rifles and shotguns. Criminals will not register their guns. Even the Liberals admit that. Therefore, the legislation will do nothing to prevent premeditated crime. Criminals do not rob banks with hunting rifles. If shotguns are used they invariably use a barrel that has been sawed off, which makes it illegal and not registrable. Consequently, Bill C–68 will not effect any positive change.

The second part involves the banning of hundreds of thousands of currently legal sports firearms. I speak of .25 calibre, .32 calibre, and handguns with barrel lengths of 105 millimetres or less. According to the minister, the reason for the ban is the fact that these firearms are inaccurate and ineffective and therefore there is no justification for owning them. What is really inaccurate and ineffective is the minister's research that came up with this whole rationale.

The .32 calibre is the World Cup and Olympic calibre. Canada has won many cups and medals with this so–called inaccurate and ineffective firearm. Linda Thom, who used a firearm proposed to be banned under Bill C–68 to win a gold medal for Canada in an Olympic competition, said that she represents the minister and stated that the firearm she used was so inaccurate and ineffective that her winning that medal for Canada must have been a fluke.

Many people who have never used a gun assume that recreational shooting involves only buying a gun and a box of ammunition, going to the range, pointing at the target and pulling the trigger. If that were true it certainly would suggest that there is little sport involved in the activity. The truth is that real recreational and competitive shooting involves much more. The firearm itself requires much consideration and work, both in the selection and refinement of its use. Purchasers must consider barrel length, sighting radius, the type of sight, type of action, type and fit of grips, trigger pull, as well as many other considerations. Many of these items require changes and modifications to suit the type of shooting gun as well as the style and ability of the individual.

• (1345)

Ammunition is rarely bought at the store but instead is custom loaded by the individual. Custom loaded ammunition is much more accurate than store bought. The actual loading is a specialized activity in itself. Each firearm shoots differently and the development of the best ammunition is an activity that requires time and dedication to the sport.

When one gets down to shooting, it involves much more than pointing at the target and pulling the trigger. Each club competition is rigidly controlled for both safety and enjoyment. The objectives of each shoot are designed to be both challenging and enjoyable. Participants compete against both their own abilities and those of other competitors.

Shooting involves the development of a series of skills, a great deal of practice and friendly competition, just like any other sport. Stereotyping of the sport of competitive shooters is not justifiable. Enthusiasts range from labourers to office workers, mechanics to doctors, men and women.

The minister claims, in rather vague terms, that registering rifles and shotguns will prevent crime and thus save lives. A total of 1,354 people died from firearm related incidents in 1992. This includes suicide, homicide, accidental death and legal intervention. The minister has not given any figures on his projections of lives to be saved as a result of the legislation or even demonstrated that any lives will in fact be saved. At the same time, he implies this is the principal reason for his action.

Many of the current supporters of the legislation do so with the rationalization that if it saves any lives at all then it is worth whatever it costs. Let us have a look at these costs. In doing this, I am going to use the minister's own figures despite the fact that I believe them to be inaccurate and misleading.

According to figures tabled by the minister at the justice committee it will now cost $118.9 million to set up the registration system. This is up from the original estimate of $85 million. What the minister avoids talking about is the actual cost of registration.

All handguns are registered now so we know the cost to the system to register a firearm. That cost is $82 per firearm. The minister and his advisor, Wendy Cukier, have estimated the number of rifles and shotguns in the country to be about six million, which is curious given the auditor general puts the figure around 18 million. Using the six million figure and the known cost of registration, puts the actual cost of registration at $492 million. If the true amount is halfway between the two

estimates on the number of firearms then there goes another billion dollars in bureaucratic spending.

Somehow I think that if we really worked at it we could find something better to spend that money on.

One in nine women will develop breast cancer during their lives. This year alone 17,000 women will be newly diagnosed with the disease and over 5,400 of those will die of breast cancer. If cancer of the testicles had statistics like this the men on the other side of the House would cross their legs and pass $500 million worth of funding for research and prevention before the end of a single day. They would tell the women on their side of the House how to vote as is the Liberal procedure.

However, as it stands now, they would rather spend $118.9 million setting up a registration program for rifles and shotguns without any evidence that it will save a single life.

I have done some research into the use of $118.9 million for the detection and treatment of breast cancer. The results were very interesting. This $118.9 million could double detection screening of women in the appropriate age group. Experts tell me that this would prevent about one–third of the current deaths from this dreaded disease. That amounts to 1,710 women a year. That is more people than the total number of firearm's related deaths and we have not heard one single word of evidence that even a single life would be saved through following the minister's ill–conceived legislation.

There would be those who would point out that this expenditure for breast cancer treatment would be an annual cost whereas the setting up of the registration system is a one time cost. Ignoring the fact that setting up the registration system does not include the cost of registration itself, which is many times the initial cost, I looked at what a one time funding of $118.9 million would do for the problem of breast cancer in the long term.

• (1350)

As we all know, each disease has an associated health care cost. The cost of a terminal breast cancer patient for hospital time, chemotherapy and other expenses averages about $100,000. This does not include the human cost of the victim or her family. If we could prevent the death of 1,710 women a year with an associated health care savings of $100,000 each we would reduce health care expenses by $171 million.

Although the initial $118.9 million spent on the real saving of lives versus the minister's wild fantasy of forcing his values on others would be a one–time expenditure, 70 per cent of the health care system's savings would provide this amount each year while continuing to save the health care system an additional $52 million a year. In light of this, the minister's fantasy does not seem very supportable.

We are at a very troubled time in our country's finances. The government is talking about many cuts in federal spending. The cuts are necessary but it means the government has to learn how to set priorities in order to preserve the quality of life while addressing the financial problems we face.

It seems the government, particularly the Minister of Justice, has some very mixed priorities. It is time to tell the minister that restricting the activities of law–abiding citizens is not a priority. Its legislation is a waste of the taxpayers' money at a time when we have none to waste.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter the debate on this matter.

I was here this morning when the Minister of Justice gave his presentation. He talked about the members of the third party trafficking in fiction. If the member who just spoke had been here he would have been the beneficiary of some of the information, in particular the cost of registration.

The minister was very clear in pointing out we cannot compare the registration cost of handguns to long guns because with handgun registration there are police investigations, et cetera involved which makes it much more expensive.

We also had the member for Wild Rose telling the House there is no difference in crime rates between the United States of America and Canada. Let me tell the Reform Party that is trafficking in fiction and Canadians will not buy that line.

Members of the Reform Party say we have had registration of handguns which has not lowered the crime rate. Let me suggest to them that when a police officer arrests an individual who is carrying an unregistered handgun and he does not have a permit to carry that gun, the police officer can now arrest that individual for the possession of a restricted firearm. He can take him to the police station and no doubt the investigation will reveal that many crimes have been committed.

Let me also use another example that was cited by the Minister of Justice this morning. It relates to an incident where police officers can raid a motorcycle club where they will find 20, 30 or 40 long guns. Under the present legislation there is no way for the police to determine whether those are illegal guns.

It is important to get all the facts. This legislation is trying to move toward maintaining the kind of society Canadians have come to accept. We do not believe in mirroring the Americans and their crime rate.

• (1355)

On Tuesday, June 6, an article Second Opinion appeared in the Kitchener–Waterloo *Record*. The author of this article was John Dadds of Kitchener who was an OPP police officer for 20 years

and previously was with the metro Toronto and London, England forces.

This former police officer took aim at the Ontario Handgun Association which produced an 84 page booklet called "Politics of Panic". In his article he says that what he wanted to do was to make sure that the police have the ability to control the spread of guns, the police have the ability to control the use of guns and to make sure that the United States does not become a model for this country.

In closing, I have a question for the member. We have heard often enough from members of the Reform Party about commissioned 1-900 calls to hear what their constituents have to say. With the exception of three members who are a bit more enlightened than the rest, when are they going to come clean and actually start listening to their constituents and not say to us, as was said earlier on by the member for Crowfoot, that they do not believe in polls. You guys promised to represent—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. Thus far we have had a good vigorous debate, meeting all the criteria of good parliamentary debate. I hope that will continue after question period. I would caution also all members that all interventions must be made through the Chair, otherwise we know what can happen.

With one minute remaining, the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke because the Speaker will want to get on with members' statements.

Mr. Gouk: Mr. Speaker, in response to the direct question that the hon. member finally asked, I sent out a questionnaire in my riding. The question was: "Do you support the mandatory registration of rifles and shotguns, as expressed in the government's Bill C-68?" It is a fair and honest question. The result was 84 per cent no; 16 per cent yes.

As far as the hon. member suggesting that the Reform Party, the national opposition party, is trafficking in myths, I would suggest to him that he might look to his own party when he talks about cardboard registration. The government is going to keep the cost of registering rifles and shotguns down by giving everybody a simple card to fill out and mail in and the firearms will be registered.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the government is actually stupid enough to do that, we are going to have neighbours registering other neighbours, enemies registering enemies, pro-gun people registering people opposed to firearms. Everybody in the world will have an Uzi because that is the way those cards will be filled out.

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m., we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

BATTLE OF STONEY CREEK

Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently I attended the annual Stoney Creek battle re-enactment in my riding of Lincoln. For all of us the war of 1812 was a war we learned about in history books. There are no pictures, videos or films of the battle.

Therefore the annual re-enactment of the battle of Stoney Creek takes on an even greater significance, not only as an educational experience but more important it portrays the realities of war and the struggles suffered by our countrymen.

Many who attended the re-enactment voiced their concern over provisions of Bill C-68 which might jeopardize future re-enactments. The British North America Living History Association presented a brief to the Standing Committee on Justice. I am sure committee members have taken into consideration the points made to ensure re-enactments can continue unobstructed.

The Stoney Creek battle re-enactment is a community event and a source of pride for the city. The quality and performance of the re-enactment has earned Stoney Creek praise throughout North America. Let us not lose the opportunity to continue to provide—

* * *

[*Translation*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the name of the city chosen to host the Winter Olympics in 2002 will be announced officially this Friday in Budapest.

Many factors point to Quebec City as the ideal location, including the city's outstanding record for organizing major events, the many sports facilities that are already in place, the region's cultural and tourist attractions, the solid and enthusiastic support of the entire community and the civic pride of all Quebecers.

If we add to the flame burning inside every Quebecer, the torch carrying the Olympic flame for the 2002 Winter Olympics, the whole world will witness a joyous outburst of enthusiasm and pride.

The caucus of the Bloc Quebecois joins me in wishing Quebec City the best of luck in its bid for these games, which will be truly exceptional.

Good luck, Quebec.

S. O. 31

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, increased competition in broadcasting by telephone companies will increase consumer choice and result in lower prices.

The people of British Columbia are in danger of losing these benefits because B.C. Telecom is partly foreign owned and therefore prohibited from holding a broadcast licence.

I urge the government to remove the relevant foreign ownership restrictions altogether to maximize benefits for consumers.

As a second best policy, I urge the government to permit B. C. Telecom to own a broadcasting licence by a special waiver of the foreign ownership restriction just like it has for the company's other activities.

The people of British Columbia would be sure to benefit greatly.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the Sierra Club announced that a coalition of 12 Canadian environmental organizations will be in Halifax during the G–7 summit later this week to urge G–7 leaders to keep their promise to review international financial institutions.

The coalition's five point plan includes a review of the policies and practices of the Bretton Woods institutions, a Tobin tax on speculators, ending world bank lending to environmentally and socially destructive megaprojects, measures to reduce multinational debt and the end to structural adjustment programs.

The draft G–7 final communique leaked last week shows the G–7 countries are interested only in protecting the interests of international speculators and investors.

It is the people's summit that will be discussing fundamental reform of the Bretton Woods institutions to move us toward a more stable, equitable and sustainable international financial system.

I congratulate the Sierra Club for taking the lead in this important initiative.

* * *

WORK SAFETY

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw to the attention of the House that this week is Canadian occupational safety and health week, a week designated to focus public attention on the importance of preventing injury and illness in the workplace.

This year's slogan, "Communicating: Open the Channels", stresses the need for co–operation. The importance of prevention is clear when we look at the figures. In 1993 alone 733 Canadian workers were killed and nearly 830,000 were injured while at work. This translates into more than 15 million work days lost with direct and indirect costs of more than $10 million.

I commend the people trying to reduce these numbers by increasing awareness of the problem. I urge all members of the House to work with business and labour to stop this tragic waste of human and economic resources.

* * *

MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the world's wealthiest countries are meeting in Halifax this week for the G–7 summit to discuss greater economic and political integration.

In this climate of global change we are witnessing the dismantling of barriers to commerce regionally, continentally and globally. This coupled with the changing nature of federalism in this country offers the maritime provinces the opportunity if not the necessity to redefine their role within Confederation.

For too long the common concerns of maritimers have been diluted on the national stage by far too much local parochialism. If the maritime provinces are to re–establish their economies in the context of the national or international marketplace strong leadership must be shown now to arrive at a true economic and by extension political union of the maritime provinces.

I call on the maritime political, business and economic leaders to take up the challenge to place the maritime provinces in the position to succeed as Canada continues to undergo profound periods of restructuring.

* * *

• (1405)

BOSNIA

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I call on all members of the House to join me in welcoming Mr. Kresimir Zubak, president of the federation of Bosnia–Hercegovina, and Mr. Vladislav Pogarcic, deputy minister of foreign affairs for the Bosnian federation.

The federation of Bosnia–Hercegovina was created last year in Washington, D.C. Its creation signalled a small step toward peace in what has been a tragic and lengthy war. The federation is currently comprised of Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims who have agreed to work together toward a lasting peace.

The tragic events in Bosnia have touched us all. Television images have haunted us, as have our concerns for the safety of the hundreds of Canadian peacekeepers currently in Bosnia.

We pray for an end to the fighting in Bosnia–Hercegovina and we wish Mr. Zubak much luck in his endeavours to find a lasting peace in his homeland.

The Speaker: Colleagues, Mr. Zubak is here now with us in the gallery.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

Mr. Bernard St–Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, soon this House will be asked to debate the anti–scab bill presented by the Bloc Quebecois. The purpose of this bill is to end the inherent injustice in the Canada Labour Code that allows federally–regulated employers to hire scabs, which tends to delay dispute settlement and penalizes workers.

I ask members to recall the case of Ogilvie Mills, where a strike has been going on for more than a year, because the new employer wants to impose a collective agreement. Although the Minister of Labour has done nothing about this case, the Bloc urges the government to support our bill. Several Liberal members,including the present Minister of Human Resources Development, voted in favour of a similar bill in 1990.

To our Liberal colleagues I say: you now have a chance to show whether you are prepared to defend the interests of the workers.

* * *

[*English*]

BACKBENCHERS

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks it has become obvious that ministerial arrogance is sky high. I will suggest a few pranks backbenchers can play on cabinet to bring it back to reality, the rookies.

The first trick is to pose as maintenance staff and remove the name plates off the doors of the ministers of health, national revenue and Canadian heritage. When asked what you are doing, simply reply you are getting a head start on your summer job.

Another idea is to call on the Deputy Prime Minister on behalf of Shady Acres retirement homes. Tell her an amount is still owing on her room deposit as she forgot to include the GST. Remember that promise?

How about phoning up the minister of defence and asking him if DND cleans windows too.

Finally, backbenchers, send the Prime Minister a clear message that the strong arm, disciplinarian tactics of the past no longer wash in today's world. Vote the will of your constituents even if it bucks the party line.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PARTY FUNDRAISING

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since launching its fundraising campaign, on January 23, the Bloc Quebecois has been boasting about the fact that it was complying with the Quebec legislation on political party financing, by only accepting donations of less than $5,000, and only from individuals.

Yet, the preliminary data just released by the director general of elections concerning the 1993 election campaign show that dozens of corporate donations were accepted by Bloc Quebecois candidates and MPs, and that these donations amount to several thousands of dollars.

Now we understand why the Bloc Quebecois relied for such a long time on the Canada Elections Act clause which allows parties not to release the list of their contributors.

* * *

[*English*]

G–7 SUMMIT

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Halifax is ready. World leaders will begin to arrive tomorrow in beautiful Nova Scotia for the Halifax Summit.

They will discuss issues that will affect all of us. Reform of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund can help to build peace and economic stability throughout the world. Better co–operation to fight organized crime is key to all of our security whether we live in Tokyo or Timberlea.

• (1410)

I thank everyone who has worked so hard to make this Halifax summit a great success.

The summit action is not just around the table. Mount Saint Vincent University will bestow an honorary degree on Hillary Clinton. Halifax West will welcome hundreds of international media to see a few of our fabulous sites and we will show off our cultural industries and have a Ceilidh on the Cove in Hubbards. We welcome the world for a fabulous summit.

[*Translation*]

REFERENDUM ON QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Château Frontenac was all lit up. Those in charge of the protocol had been at work since the early morning; everything was ready for the big ceremony. Mr. Parizeau himself, also known as "Vibrant Weasel", was presiding and the excitement filled the air.

This is how we learned that the leaders of the PQ, the Bloc and the ADQ had signed a document in which they ask that a referendum on the separation of Quebec be held this fall. But, for many observers, there was no need to wait for this so–called signature ceremony to learn that the PQ leader and his two associates want Quebec to separate.

Four months ago today, people in Orford, Sutton, Cowansville, Lac–Brome, Bedford and the Brome—Missisquoi riding as a whole, said no the separatist adventure. They chose Canada. Quebecers do not want separation, and they will make it clear at the referendum.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his UI reform proposal tabled last week, the Minister of Human Resources Development strikes a direct blow at young people entering the job market by now requiring first time claimants to have worked a minimum of six months before they become eligible for any government assistance.

This reform proposal is ridiculous, considering the appalling situation young people in Quebec and Canada, a generation with 16.5 per cent unemployment, are being plunged into.

Thousands of young people are being penalized, even those who are qualified. In Canada, 30 per cent of poor families included at least one graduate, a proportion that has doubled in the past ten years.

To continue to add to the burden of a generation that has already undergone great hardship is just plain cruel. The minister must withdraw his proposal and stop attacking the young.

* * *

[*English*]

LIBERAL PARTY

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, tonight's vote on Bill C–68 will be a decisive moment in Ontario politics. Ninety–seven Liberal members will have an opportunity to represent the views of their constituents. We will have a chance to see if last week's lesson in populism renews the desire of all members to do what is right for their ridings and their province.

Time allocation may speed some bills through the House but Ontario members know the final vote on this issue will take place in 1997 on the gun bill, on pensions, on sexual orientation and employment equity. Liberals must choose between supporting their party or supporting their constituents. Will it be Liberal, Tory, same old story? Do not allow your decisions to be Mcleoded. Vote with your constituents.

* * *

REFORM PARTY

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the final vote in the House on Bill C–68.

Just as we faced some tough questions on the bill, it is time for the other side to answer one or two. We know who they are, the new politicians, the great populists, the members who came here to represent the folks back home; the wundekinders who will ignore special interests and stay true to their constituents.

I think their whip said it best when he said a few minutes ago to vote the will of your constituents even if it bucks the party line. The member from Simcoe—Centre was telling us the same thing. In the face of a clear consensus, in the face of the clear wishes of the constituents in Calgary, their leader is kowtowing to the gun lobby, turning his back on his constituents and bowing to the will of his caucus—some populist.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CRIME

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Senator Joyce Fairbairn, along with the Solicitor General and members of criminal justice associations, launched "Between the Lines", an information kit on literacy and crime prevention which points out ways in which we can make a difference in reducing crime in our modern society.

[*English*]

The answer to crime does not lie only in building more prisons or adding more police. The answer lies also in a combined effort by everyone in reducing and eliminating the social inequalities and injustices that contribute to crime in the first place.

• (1415)

We already see the tragic consequences of crime in our federal penitentiaries. The majority of offenders who enter our federal correctional institutions have poor academic skills. Many are unable to read a newspaper or a comic book or follow a simple set of instructions.

The literacy program Between the Lines will make a fundamental and lasting contribution to the prevention of crime and the reduction of illiteracy in Canada.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: Before we begin question period today, I would like to draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of fellow parliamentarians, members of the planning, budgetary and public accounts committee of the Mexican congress.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with its UI reform, the federal government is preparing once again to substantially cut eligibility and UI benefits. According to today's *Globe and Mail*, Quebec will be the principal victim of the additional cuts to the unemployment insurance plan, which will amount to $1.6 billion.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Would he confirm that, as usual, Quebec will bear the cost of the additional cuts of $1.6 billion in unemployment insurance, since it will assume 40 per cent of the cuts for a total of $605 million as compared with only $255 million for Ontario?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I said it yesterday and I will repeat it today: the government has reached no decision yet. The Minister of Human Resources Development is currently conferring on the matter. There will be a reform of all social programs in the fall to enable us to put funds at the disposal of those who want to work and take training courses.

This is our focus—we want to enable workers to find jobs and recover their dignity. The specific program will be announced once consultations have been completed. At the moment, no one can claim that one party or another in Canada is forced to contribute more than the others.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in other words, if we unscramble the Prime Minister's answer, we may conclude that no decision has been made, the project is in the works and the *Globe and Mail* was right to refer to it today.

I would ask the Prime Minister if we are to understand that he and his government want to put off a decision until the fall, that

is after the referendum on Quebec sovereignty, so that the announcement of the cuts, affecting the unemployed in Quebec primarily, will follow afterwards?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I am pleased to hear that there will be a referendum. We are looking forward to having one.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): I hope that the question will be clear, that they will say "we want to separate from Canada" and that they will not try to trick people into thinking that the intent of the referendum, is anything other than separation.

As for us and our UI program, reforming all the social programs requires consultation with the provincial governments. The minister is consulting them now. The papers can only speculate at the moment. This is not the first time articles have appeared in the papers, with the results of the federal government programs differing entirely from what the *Globe and Mail* saying. This is usually exactly what happens.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Prime Minister seems willing to talk about the referendum. He told us that he is looking forward to the referendum and to a straightforward question. Quebecers know full well that the only thing the Prime Minister can offer Quebec is the status quo, the same old unfair cuts, and that his only objective is to finish the job started in 1982.

Mr. Loubier: Hear, Hear.

• (1420)

Mr. Bouchard: Since he wants to talk about the referendum and wants a straightforward answer—because the answer will be as straightforward as the question—, does the Prime Minister admit that, faced with the decision made by a sovereignist, clearly sovereignist Quebec people, he, as the Prime Minister of Canada, will then have to sit at the table and negotiate on a one–to–one basis with the Quebec government?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we would really like to know what the question is. They came up in December with a scheme that the people very quickly got wise to. This whole scheme was nothing but smoke and mirrors. They then tried to change directions, so that the December program was already over by March. Quebecers will probably get wise to the new June scheme by October. Everyone will understand that the opposition leader's question is purely hypothetical, because I know that if Quebecers are asked, "Do you want to separate from Canada?", they will always vote to stay in Canada. I am convinced of that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister uses the word "scheme" to refer to what is the clear and straightforward expression of an economic responsibility initiative in the mutual interest of the people of both Canada and Quebec. He himself will have to take note of that after Quebecers vote Yes to sovereignty.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bouchard: I ask the Prime Minister, who is one of the champions of federalism without any ideas, any thoughts or anything else to offer, how he can claim to be addressing Quebecers' desire for change, when he and other federalists have nothing to offer Quebec but the status quo, the federal system that has always been denounced by Quebec federalists, as well as resignation and increasing encroachment on Quebec's areas of jurisdiction?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition rose in the House today to explain to Quebecers: You will vote for sovereignty, but you will keep Canadian citizenship, the Canadian currency, the Canadian passport, the economic and political union with Canada. The only thing missing in his bag of tricks is what I said in Trois–Rivières: "We in the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc Quebecois will keep the name "Canada". You can find another one for the rest of Canada, because Canada is so great that we want to keep the name 'Canada' for ourselves".

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will take the next two questions.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: Interesting.

Mr. Bouchard: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Prime Minister is not interested in what happens to the economic interests of Quebec after sovereignty. I want to ask him whether, if only for the sake of the economic interests of Ontario and the rest of Canada and the need to maintain trade relations between the parties, he would not feel obliged as Prime Minister to sit down and negotiate with Mr. Parizeau who would have a mandate from the people of Quebec?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am willing to meet Mr. Parizeau at any time to discuss the concerns of Quebecers: job creation, economic growth, and improving the situation with regard to public finances. That is what people want to discuss. I only hope that the Leader of the Opposition will tell Quebecers that their proposal is about separation. That is what they want.

• (1425)

They would have Quebecers believe that once they have separated, they will still be part of Canada. This is a mirage, a lot of smoke and mirrors and shows a lack of intellectual honesty.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let the Leader of the Opposition rise in the House and tell Quebecers and Canadians what he told the Americans: "Please realize I am not a sovereignist, I am a separatist". Let him repeat that to all Quebecers, and he will lose his referendum.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I deplore the fact that the Prime Minister should dismiss as intellectual dishonesty the wishes of a people that for 300 years has been working towards the culmination of its destiny as a nation and will do so democratically and lawfully.

I want to ask the Prime Minister, when this fall the votes are counted on the evening of the referendum and Quebecers, as I hope they will, vote yes, on the basis of our present mandate, I want to ask him how he sees his responsibilities as custodian of the economic interests of the part of Canada he will still represent?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my position has been known to all Canadians for a long time. I am a federalist, and I believe in a united Canada where Quebec will feel at home.

[*English*]

I am not the one who has to do some virage to try to find words to hide the truth from the people who will be voting. I know the people of Quebec want to stay in Canada. All the polls say that. Mr. Parizeau came with his astuce in December. That was a flop by the month of March. Then came the Leader of the Opposition who tried to hide the truth. He made a virage. Today the virage is back to square one. He is a separatist and he does not have the guts to say that to the nation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to change the subject to the separation of one of the government ministers from the cabinet.

When we first raised the issue of the heritage minister's dollars for contracts dinner, we were told that it was merely a routine fundraiser to pay off the minister's campaign debts. This was the story of the organizer, Richard Gervais, and was confirmed by many of the guests who attended the dinner.

• (1430)

Now we learn from Elections Canada that the Minister of Canadian Heritage had no election debts to pay. In fact his receipts and reimbursements minus his expenses left him $25,000 ahead. The dinner was held, therefore, for other purposes, which will go undisclosed until the government releases all the information surrounding the minister's dinner.

My question for the Prime Minister: Will the government table the complete list of who was invited to the heritage minister's dinner and who contributed the money for what purposes? The Prime Minister knows full well that Elections Canada documents will not provide the information.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister of Canadian Heritage had debts or no debts is irrelevant.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): We used to have debt, but we do not have debt any more. For the last eight years I raised money to pay the debt. When we raise money it is to pay the debt and to have enough money for the next election. The minister raised money for the Liberal Party that will be used in the next election. That money will compete with the money the leader of the Reform Party is raising when he has his own private dinners around the country.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's obsession with protecting a party loyalist is clouding his judgment.

The heritage minister violated the federal code of ethics, not once, not twice, but three times. He targeted departmental clients for donations. He rewarded some with heritage contracts and appointments, placing himself in direct conflict of interest. Now there is the question of raising money under cloudy pretences to pay off debts that did not exist. Canadians are right to wonder what kind of example this sets for other ministers.

My supplementary is to the ultimate arbiter of government ethics. Since the Prime Minister is unwilling to discipline the Minister of Canadian Heritage, does this mean that other ministers are free to hold similar fundraising dinners that target departmental clients?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ministers are advised as I am that they have an obligation, like any other member of Parliament to help to raise money for the next election of the Liberal Party. They have to do it according to the rules, and the rules are very clear by Elections Canada. Every contribution has to be made public if it is more than $100. That is exactly what ministers are instructed to do and they are doing it. It is known by the public.

I had great success in the city of Calgary. Many of the friends of the leader of the Reform Party came, paid, and were happy with the speech.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, according to Mitchell Sharp, the government's original ethics adviser, the heritage minister's dinner may be just the tip of an iceberg.

Mr. Sharp said yesterday the government's code of ethics was clear and tough but that some cabinet ministers are not following it. He went on to say that business should be separate from fundraising to eliminate the appearance of conflict of interest and that cabinet should receive a refresher course on the code of ethics.

Since the Prime Minister has personally assumed the role of ethics counsellor, which other ministers are not following the government's guidelines? And will they be invited to an ethics summer course, which Mr. Sharp advises?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sharp advises me and ministers when we need advice. He is correct when he tells every one of us to be prudent. Being prudent is to make sure that every contribution is paid, a receipt is made, and it is published under the Canada Elections Act. That is exactly what happened in this case.

Every contribution has been above the table and according to the laws of Canada. Unless we pass a law in the House that all political party expenditures are paid by the nation, we will have to raise money according to this law. This law permits ministers and members of Parliament of all parties to raise money as long as they give receipts in accordance with the Canada Elections Act.

* * *

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

JOB CREATION

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint–Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to Statistics Canada, net job creation over the past six months has been zero, although the Minister of Finance's budget predicted job growth of three per cent in 1995. In addition, economic growth has literally gone flat in the first three months of 1995, with an annualized growth rate of 0.7 per cent, yet the Minister of Finance forecast in his budget that the rate of growth would hit 3.8 per cent this year.

Since everything points to the fact that the minister's predictions will not come true this year, will he acknowledge that zero economic growth will not generate any new jobs and that he is going to have to review his budgetary forecast regarding the deficit?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, firstly, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for getting his leader to allow him to ask a question.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): I know why this is; those hon. members contradict themselves so much.

I would like to point out to the hon. member that over 200,000 private sector jobs were created in the past eight months. This trend even applies in Quebec, where over 50,000 jobs were created in the past year.

There is no doubt that the economy is slow, due to a slowdown in the American economy and to the fact that the economic recovery was based mostly on our capacity to export. This having been said, most economists predict that the slowdown that everybody was expecting next year will hit us this year and that next year, we can expect a recovery.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint–Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, instead of spinning yarns, the Minister of Finance would be well advised to take a real look at his balance sheet since coming to office.

Mortgage rates, for example, have increased by 30 per cent, the growth rate for exports dropped 90 per cent over three months and there has been no net job creation over the past six months. That is the real balance sheet of this government, of the Minister of Finance. Therefore, he should have given me real answers and real figures instead of making it all up.

I would like to ask him the following question: Will he acknowledge that a growth rate of close to zero confirms the failure of his economic strategy, which has not enabled us to create any new jobs or to offer Quebecers and Canadians the hope of dignity through employment, which the Prime Minister keeps on repeating?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have no idea where the hon. member gets his figures. Maybe from the "Just for Laughs" festival. Please allow me, Mr. Speaker, to give you the real figures.

The unemployment rate in May of this year was 9.5 per cent, compared to 10.4 per cent in May 1994; shipments in the manufacturing sector were 17 per cent higher this month than in May 1994; the trade balance surplus hit an all–time high of $23.2 billion in the first quarter of 1995; the deficit in Canada's current account, which is normally around 4 per cent, is currently at 2 per cent. We are very proud of our accomplishments.

* * *

[*English*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, since it appears the Canadian hostages in Bosnia are being released, the government now has an opportunity to safely scale down the Canadian commitment to Bosnia, which is scheduled to end in just three months. An orderly withdrawal started now would take about that time to be completed.

Will the Prime Minister end his chronic waffling and hand–wringing and announce the Canadian contribution will not be extended beyond September?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Canadian soldiers there are playing an extremely useful role. We have decided to extend our mandate for another six months. We will make a decision at that time. We have to finish the job we started. We will not quit in mid–term. We said we were to be there for six months, and Canadian soldiers and the Canadian people are the kind of people who do the job they say they will do. If we decide to go it will be decided in accordance with our commitments and with our partners in this situation.

• (1440)

I have to say to the House of Commons that when we look objectively, before the UN troops arrived there were approximately 200,000 people killed in one year, and it was reduced to 3,000 last year. This means the presence of the UN troops there has saved thousands and thousands of lives. The Canadian soldiers and the others in the UN force have done a very good job.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, talking about Bosnia, the Prime Minister stated in this House: "We are very far away from this part of the world and in many ways it is somewhat more of a European problem than a Canadian problem".

If the Prime Minister actually believes what he said, will this be the position the government will take at the G–7 summit?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course I said it is more of a European problem than a Canadian problem. But peacekeeping around the world has been a very proud policy of the Canadian government.

We have had peacekeepers around the world. We initiated peacekeeping during the Suez crisis when Mike Pearson created that solution to solve that very difficult war with Great Britain and France versus Egypt.

Since that time Canadians have always been present at peacekeeping operations. We have been in Cyprus; we have been in the Golan; we have been everywhere there has been a need for Canadian soldiers. There is nothing more satisfying for me when I am travelling to meet with the leaders of other countries than to have them tell me that Canadian troops are always the best.

* * *

[*Translation*]

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

The first victims of an economic slowdown are always young people in low–paying jobs. The situation has continued to deteriorate, since youth unemployment has gone up from 11.2

per cent in 1989 to 16.5 per cent in 1994, an increase of nearly 50 per cent in five years. In Quebec, more than one out of every three unemployed workers are young people.

When we realize that young people are usually in low-paying jobs, how can the Minister of Finance expect to give them any hope, when he has no job creation policy to offer and on top of that, limits their access to unemployment insurance by making them work for at least six months to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits for the first time?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about the unemployment situation among young Canadians. We have always been very concerned about this, even before the economic downturn we are experiencing today. That is why at the beginning of our mandate, the Minister of Human Resources Development put in place a number of programs for the purpose of creating jobs for young people, to provide incentives for them to go back to work or start a career.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the minister seriously claim that his government has given young unemployed workers hope and the dignity of work, when the unemployment statistics fail to reflect a situation that many are experiencing, and I am referring to the fact that more and more young unemployed workers are on welfare?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member looked at the figures he would see that the unemployment rate for young people is now at its lowest point since 1990 when the recession began.

The job creation measures have helped to bring down the youth unemployment rate by three or four points to its lowest level. In the meantime, to recognize the special importance of young people, in this last year we have increased the direct investment for youth training and youth employment programs from $193 million to $236 million, a net increase in this one year alone. At a time when budgets are very limited and we are facing real fiscal restraint we have increased the investment for young people by $43 million. That means this year we will have 15,000 to 20,000 young people enlisted in various forms of internship programs, the youth service corps and other youth-related programs.

Our commitment to young people admits of no question from the Bloc Quebecois. We are committed to helping our young people get back to work.

ECONOMY

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' February budget based its revenue projections on a GDP growth of 3.8 per cent. The actual growth in the first quarter of 1995 was less than 1 per cent. There is little prospect of improvement in the second quarter. The budget did not plan for a recession.

• (1445)

Is the Minister of Finance willing to admit that his budget forecasts are wrong and that his deficit targets are being threatened?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our deficit targets are not being threatened. At the time we made them we made it very clear that we have brought in both prudent assumptions for growth and for interest rates. We also put in place substantial contingency reserves. I can assure the hon. member that we are on target in terms of the deficit.

The hon. member knows as well that a majority of economists projected strong growth for this year with a decline in growth next year in the United States and consequently in Canada. The view today on the decline that was projected, I believe, is that it is going to occur earlier than expected and that it should lead to an increase in growth next year.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is speculation certainly in that answer. I do not think the minister can downplay the current poor economic conditions. A lot of Canadians are very concerned. They are concerned about their jobs. They are not buying houses as they did a few months ago. They are not buying cars. Consumer purchasing is down.

Reform has told the minister that the one thing government could do to restore consumer confidence is to lay out a plan to eliminate the deficit. The minister and the government have not taken our advice.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. What is the plan of the government to restore consumer confidence and avert a recession in the country?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that consumer confidence is not dependent on whether the government provides, as we have decided to do, rolling two year targets in deficit reduction or a longer target.

The member also knows that the credibility of long term targets by Canadian governments has not been all that great. We are the first government in a long time to not only hit its target but to do substantially better. This is the realization of a

government doing what it said it was going to do which is to re–establish confidence in the country. I am very confident.

Yesterday, Gallup polls found that the Canadian people had more confidence in the government's handling of the economy than any government in the last 22 years. That is confidence.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Last weekend, the Bosnian President tried to meet the American President, Bill Clinton, to have the embargo on arms to Bosnia lifted. In the American Senate, a majority of Republicans and Democrats voted in favour of lifting the embargo, but the President is maintaining it for the time being.

Given the importance of maintaining the embargo, did the Prime Minister reiterate the need to maintain it to the President of Bosnia when they met?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did exactly that on my trip to Sarajevo last June. Speaking on behalf of the French and the English, who knew I was going there, I told the Bosnian Prime Minister himself, in Parliament in Sarajevo, that, for us to maintain our troops there, it was vital the embargo not be lifted.

Our position of last year remains unchanged, and I am pleased to see that the President of the United States respects it.

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister's position is clear on the embargo, how does he explain the fact that, 48 hours before the start of the C–7 Summit, Canada has yet to decide on its participation in the rapid reaction force, which is to be debated at the G–7 Summit in Halifax?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have expressed the government's position, which is that we are not keen to take part in this new initiative. We have said so to our partners. We are still looking at the proposal.

• (1450)

We want to know exactly what form the force will take, what the chain of command will be and what the relationship will be with the UN. We still lack satisfactory answers on many points, and so are not prepared to make a commitment.

[*English*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The government has been restoring hope and prosperity by fulfilling commitments made in the red book. One of those commitments on page 22 involves replacing and eliminating the GST.

Will the Minister of Finance outline the progress that has been made with respect to the GST? Is he any closer to seeing this commitment implemented?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development –Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Don Valley North has shown a great interest in this subject, as has the Prime Minister.

As the member knows, there is tremendous support for harmonization among consumers and among small business. Already there are tremendous savings from greater efficiency.

The problem has been that a number of the provincial governments have not seen the same degree of urgency. I am glad to say that we have had a number of very fruitful meetings with a number of the provincial governments. There is no doubt that we are progressing.

In the last budget in Quebec, there was virtual harmonization realized. We have all seen the public statements of premier elect Harris to the effect of his interest.

When the hon. member for Don Valley North goes back to Toronto, if he sees premier–elect Harris, he can tell him that as soon as he names his finance minister, whoever he or she may be, I will meet them here in Ottawa, Toronto, Nipissing or I will meet the new finance minister in the member's office in Don Valley North.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

It looks like the Clinton administration may prohibit Canadian companies that do business with Cuba from exporting to the United States. Such a move would infringe on our sovereignty and would violate key provisions of the North American free trade agreement as well as the WTO.

What is the minister doing to ensure that Canadian companies continue to have access to the U.S. market?

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this matter first came up when the so–called Helms bill came before the U.S. Congress.

At that time, we made our objections clearly known to the United States government. Since then the administration has questioned the terms of the bill in such a way as to suggest it will not go forward in the way that was first anticipated.

On the more specific question the member raises, I have asked our embassy in Washington to inform us of the details of the U.S. treasury's proposed action. We do not have all the details yet. However, I can assure the member opposite we will do everything to make certain Canadian companies have the full opportunity to participate, as they are now doing, in the Cuban economy.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know we do not have Jesse Helms setting Canadian trade policy. However Canadian companies like Lantic, Redpath and B.C. Sugar may be targeted as early as tomorrow because they buy raw sugar from Cuba.

What is the minister doing to protect these interests today? These are interests that have to be looked after at this very moment.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we do not have the details and certainly not details on the supposed action that might be taken against Canadian sugar companies in the context that the member mentions.

Our present concern is to ascertain the possible action the U.S. treasury might take against four Cuban Canadian joint ventures led by the Sherritt company. In that instance, we are seeking further information. I hope that I shall have more information I can provide the member in due course.

* * *

• (1455)

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

According to an Angus Reid survey, three out of four consumers are concerned about the use of BST. Even the dairy industry is against it. The Dairy Council, which represents processors, rejects this product, deeming it unnecessary and undesirable, while dairy producers have demanded that the minister extend the moratorium.

Does the minister admit that neither the dairy industry nor consumers want BST on the market and that they all want the moratorium to be extended?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when concerns were first raised about the potential use of rBST, a synthetic product, in the spring of last year, the House of Commons agriculture committee undertook a very useful examination of a number of issues surrounding that question.

It produced a report. That report recommended a number of things, including a delay period during which a task force could be structured to bring forward further information which would be of assistance to producers, processors, consumers and others that are interested in the question.

Over the course of the last year this process has gone forward. The delay period has been in place and remains in place until the first of July. The task force has completed its work. A great deal of useful information has been brought forward which will be helpful to all of those interested in this question so they can understand and appreciate all of the issues and all of the arguments, pro and con, with a little more detail.

The key question is one of health and the efficacy of this product, which is being studied as is required by law by the regulatory and scientific officials within the Department of Health. Unless and until the Department of Health issues a notice of compliance, the use of this product is governed under the controls of the Food and Drugs Act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, less than 19 days before the moratorium expires, the Minister of Agriculture must admit that both the public and the dairy industry expect him to act quickly. Does the minister undertake today in this House to extend the moratorium on the use of BST?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that many in the dairy industry have expressed the concerns to which the hon. gentleman has referred. There are others in the dairy industry who have advanced the other point of view.

The existence of the moratorium or the delay is not the critical issue, quite frankly. The critical issue is whether this product has a notice of compliance issued to it by the legal regulatory authorities in Health Canada. No such notice of compliance has been issued. Therefore the sale and distribution of this product in Canada remains illegal.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on May 31 I faxed the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development regarding the Adams Lake road blockade to tell him that both the native spokesman and the lessees behind the blockade urgently requested his personal involvement. As of 9.30 this morning I have had no reply.

In law and in good conscience how can the minister continue to hide behind the bureaucracy and ignore the Adams Lake road blockade which has been in place since March 21?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been two blockades in B.C. in the last month: Upper Nicola and the one at Adams First Nations.

The blockade at Upper Nicola, as the hon. member knows, is down. The other is up. It is more sensitive than Upper Nicola because it was fish and this is an archaeological site. Artefacts have been found which the province has designated. The developer gave an undertaking that he would do an archaeological study, which he has not done. The province has sent him a letter under the B.C. heritage conservation act demanding that he do the study and cease the work. That has not been done.

Reformers said we were going to have three Okas there, which meant military force, if we did not follow their instructions. I would like to point out to the House that two men came forward at Upper Nicola. Their names were Stanley and Belleau. They went to the chiefs, talked to them with dignity, and the blockade at Upper Nicola came down. They were RCMP officers and a proud tradition did the job. Also, they were aboriginal RCMP officers and I want to commend them in the House.

• (1500)

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the blockade on Douglas Lake was taken down and I appreciate what the RCMP did there.

Adams Lake Chief Ron Jules has confirmed that the band will remove two cattle guards eliminating all vehicle access as of June 15. The RCMP have advised residents to form an evacuation plan. We are talking about private property here.

What recommendation would the minister of Indian affairs make to the Adams Lake residents regarding the evacuation plan which his continued inaction has created?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, this is clearly provincial. I have worked well with Mr. Cashore out there.

Mr. Stinson: It is not clearly provincial.

Mr. Irwin: It is off reserve and it is clearly on provincial property. As hon. members were told last week the RCMP are under contract to the B.C. government and it is their call. If requested we will go in and facilitate.

In the Upper Nicola there was a difference. The member of the Reform Party offered to go in and help. I am hoping this member will take some lessons from his seatmate over there and will do the same thing.

* * *

BOSNIA

Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

In Bosnia–Hercegovina innocent lives are being lost every day. Conditions continue to worsen for the people in Bosnia. Our soldiers are doing a magnificent job in their attempt to protect citizens. What action has the minister taken on behalf of the Canadian government to assist those who are fleeing the bloodshed in Bosnia?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in addition to the valiant efforts the member of Parliament noted on behalf of our peacekeepers, the government has seen fit to extend two special immigration programs to try to assist some of the citizens of the former Yugoslavia.

The first has been a family class program that has had its criteria relaxed so that people can be reunited with families living in Canada. As a result of that program, over 7,200 individuals have been reunited with their loved ones in Canada. The second program has been to try to focus on some of the refugee relief work in that troubled area. To date the results indicate that over 8,200 private and government sponsored refugees now call Canada their home.

These programs are working well but it is a modest response to a horrific situation. The only answer, as we all know, is for civility and peace to return to the region. We all hope and pray that it will be sooner rather than later.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to draw your attention today to the presence in the gallery of two outstanding Canadians.

One is an internationally acclaimed author. She won the 1993 Governor General's Award and the 1995 Pulitzer Prize for her novel *The Stone Diaries*. Colleagues, I present to you Carol Shields.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Colleagues, the other prominent Canadian made history in 1984 when he became Canada's first man in space. He continues to be a source of inspiration to many young Canadians and will be returning to space in 1996. I present to you Dr. Marc Garneau.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1505)

PRIVILEGE

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF PHOTOGRAPH—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Saint John on May 30, 1995. For providing me with the relevant facts and documents related to this matter and for their contributions to the discussion, I would like to thank the hon. member and the hon. Minister of Health.

In her presentation, the member brought the House's attention to a photograph of her used in an expert panel report entitled "When Packages Can't Speak". The report concerning plain and generic packaging of tobacco products had been prepared at the request of the Department of Health.

The member claimed that the unauthorized use of her picture in a visual impact study included in the report had violated her privacy, was an assault on her dignity as an individual and as a member of the House, had opened her up to ridicule and had stereotyped her in a manner that misrepresented who she was and thus could impede her ability to perform her duties as a member of Parliament. She therefore requested a public apology from the Prime Minister and an explanation from the Minister of Health as to how her picture could have found its way into this expert panel report.

[*Translation*]

On June 1, 1995, the hon. Minister of Health responded to the matter. In her intervention, the minister explained that she, members of the expert panel and representatives of the private company charged with selecting the photographs, when informed that the picture used was one of the hon. member, had immediately issued a letter of apology to the member. The minister then tabled a copy of a letter to the hon. member explaining how her picture had been selected.

This matter has troubled me and I have looked into it carefully. I believe that it is important that I give the House a chronology of certain events which preceded the raising of this question of privilege, for the panel report in question is part of a larger study in which the House, through one of its committees, has been directly involved.

[*English*]

On June 21, 1994 the Standing Committee on Health presented its first report entitled "Towards Zero Consumption: Generic Packaging of Tobacco Products". Pursuant to Standing Order 109 the government was requested by the committee to table a comprehensive response. On November 18, 1994 the

Minister of Health tabled the government response to the committee report. In responding to the standing committee's recommendations the government noted that:

> —an expert panel, comprised of specialists in marketing, package design and consumer behaviour, and chosen in collaboration with provincial and territorial partners in the National Strategy to Reduce Tobacco Use, has established a study framework designed to determine what relationship may exist between generic packaging and the taking up of smoking by youth.

[*Translation*]

The Government response also noted that Health Canada would thoroughly review and analyse the evidence assembled by the expert panel and would take into account the study and conclusions of the Standing Committee on Health. Thus, the standing committee could be said to have been anticipating the opportunity to give detailed study to the panel report.

[*English*]

The report dated March 1995 was released to the media and the public on May 19, 1995. To ensure that the committee was familiar with its contents, that morning Health Canada held an informal briefing for the committee attended by members, staff and researchers. Copies of the report were also distributed to all members of the House in the usual manner.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

Photographs of members of Parliament and images of the House of Commons and the Parliament buildings are seen everyday on television and in newspapers and magazines. These images form part of the media coverage of Parliament that we have come to expect. They may be used in a straightforward manner or satirically, but their focus is ultimately on the work of Parliament and parliamentarians.

[*English*]

It is possible however that these same images of members and of the institution of Parliament may be misrepresented. In our history there exist examples of cases where the symbols of Parliament have been used inappropriately. In each instance objections have been raised in the House.

As examples, I would refer members to Speakers' rulings regarding the Sperry and Hutchison Company, as found in the *Journals* of February 16, 1960 at pages 156 to 158, and the Steelworkers of Hamilton Council as found in the *Journals* of March 23, 1965 at pages 1159 and 1160. In both cases, documents meant to look like *Hansard*, a publication carrying with it the image of the House of Commons, were published and distributed by non–parliamentary bodies. The Speaker ruled both matters to be prima facie cases of privilege.

[*Translation*]

As members are aware, *Erskine May's 21st Edition*, at page 69, defines privilege as follows:

> Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

Neverthless, not every matter which is seemingly offensive to the House may fall within the strict definition of privilege. As May continues:

> When any of these rights and immunities is disregarded or attacked, the offense is called a breach of privilege and is punishable under the law of Parliament. Each House also claims the right to punish as contempts actions which, while not breaches of any specific privilege, obstruct or impede it in the performance of its functions, or are offences against its authority or dignity, such as disobedience to its legitimate commands or libels upon itself, its members or its offencers.

[*English*]

Most relevant to our current situation, May further points out on page 121 of the 21st edition that:

> Indignities offered to the House by words spoken or writings published reflecting on its character or proceedings have been constantly punished by both the Lords and the Commons upon the principle that such acts tend to obstruct the Houses in the performance of their functions by diminishing the respect due to them.
>
> Reflections upon members, the particular individuals not being named or otherwise indicated, are equivalent to reflections on the House.

My role is to determine therefore whether or not at first glance the circumstances of the question of privilege before me fit the criteria as described by Erskine May. The question is: Has the use and publication of the photograph of the hon. member for Saint John constituted a contempt of the House?

• (1515)

The hon. Minister of Health has explained to the House and to the hon. member for Saint John how this incident arose. She has also apologized on more than one occasion, as have others involved in the production of the report.

Based on my research and my understanding of the citations found in Erskine May I cannot conclude the member, although perhaps embarrassed by this event, has been impeded in performing her duties as a member of the House of Commons.

In the absence of malicious intent or any other obvious motive it is difficult to find that a contempt of the House has occurred.

Members of Parliament are public figures and frequently appear in the media. Those who interact with government and with Parliament must remember the use of a member's photograph in a situation totally unrelated to his or her parliamentary duties may well lead to unforeseen difficulties and could cause considerable embarrassment.

In this case I can only go so far as to remind everyone that the House of Commons and its members must be treated with respect and dignity first by its membership and also by all intervening parties. I hope all members appreciate the seriousness and potential dangers of a repetition of a situation such as this.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, be read the third time and passed; and of the amendment.

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to offer my support for this vital piece of legislation currently before the House of Commons.

I am particularly honoured to offer my congratulations to the House on its passage of the non–derogation clause as requested by numerous presentations to the justice committee.

Unfortunately I am faced with the irony of the Reform Party which in its presentation in debate and through question period attested to the valid and warranted requests by aboriginal people for their treaty of aboriginal rights to be respected in this matter. Yet it voted against this clause last night in an effort to continue to try to discredit what we as responsible parliamentarians are privileged to support.

Why have we created this clause? Since the government's action plan on firearms control was tabled in November of last year aboriginal people throughout the country expressed their concerns about the impact of the legislation on constitutionally protected aboriginal and treaty rights to hunt and trap. Submissions were made to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs by several organizations including the Council of Yukon Indians, the Assembly of First Nations, the Grand Council of the Cree, the James Bay and Northern Quebec agreement hunting, fishing and trapping co–ordinating committee, the Métis National Council and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. Submissions were also received from the governments of the Northwest Territories and Yukon.

The federal government recognizes the need to take into consideration these concerns. The government has moved this motion to address such concerns and has thereby ensured aboriginal treaty rights are respected when this new law is implemented throughout Canada.

The legislation will help protect the aboriginal treaty rights and the aboriginal people of Canada. We will see these rights are

reconciled with the highest standards for public safety which is in this firearms act and part III of the Criminal Code.

We must challenge ourselves as people who are wiling to do the best for our country and our fellow Canadians. We have acted responsibly in showing Canadians that in a number of instances we have heard their concerns with respect to this legislation and have acted on them. I am proud we are accomplishing that in the House.

I am a bit disappointed with the Reform Party. It says it is the party that will listen to the people, but it will not. When three of its members will eventually support this legislation I will not mock out of respect because I respect parties and people who keep their word. Reformers said they would listen to the people but they will not. They said they would allow free votes in their party but they are not adhering to that. They ran on the issue of safe streets but they have forgotten that promise. They said they want to come to Parliament and address fiscal responsibilities but they obviously do not know the difference between a bond and a bullet.

• (1520)

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has been an experience in the House today listening to Liberal members trying to defend this indefensible gun control legislation, Bill C–68.

We in the Reform Party, the hon. member would be surprised to know, understand the recognition of aboriginal rights contained within the Constitution. We certainly can read although he may doubt that sometimes.

Recognizing that in the Constitution hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights are protected for aboriginal people, the Constitution does not specifically refer to methods of hunting, trapping or fishing. We are not talking about entrenched treaty rights in the application of Bill C–68 to aboriginal people. We are talking about the use of an implement to carry out their hunting, fishing and trapping rights.

This same instrument is used by many non–natives in northern hinterland areas. I assume these non–natives who hunt for sustenance enjoy the same or similar hunting rights as aboriginals. I find it questionable that the government in its amendments to this bill has not recognized hunting for sustenance activities of non–natives who live in remote northern areas.

I ask the hon. minister of Indian affairs whether his government specifically sees a difference between a remote residential aboriginal hunting for sustenance and a non–aboriginal who lives in a remote district of Canada and hunts for sustenance. Why would one under the proposed legislation be required to comply with all the regulations of Bill C–68 and yet a special provision might be given to another?

Mr. Irwin Mr. Speaker, in broad terms we have populations of aboriginals in Winnipeg, Toronto, Kenora and other areas as high as 60,000 to 65,000. Within these areas aboriginal people are more at risk to violence by all facts right now. It is in their best interest to look at our policies of safe streets, knowing that we are not attacking gatherers or hunters or tourism or farmers, all things the Reform, I thought, stood for.

The hon. member says I would be surprised by some things Reform does or says. Nothing surprises me when it comes from the Reform.

There are provisions in the act having nothing to do with being Indian or not. If you are under 18 and a gatherer there is an exemption. You can use your gun if you are a gatherer of food.

• (1525)

The member talks about methodology, and I have said over and over again this does not free any person on methodology. Surely using the test of reasonableness under the treaties no aboriginal person can go hunting with a Sherman tank. By any test of reasonableness we can control and legislate on methodology.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate I understand the hon. Secretary of State for Financial Institutions wishes to table a motion.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1), I wish to table a notice of ways and means motion to amend the Customs Act and the customs tariff and to make related and consequential amendments to other acts.

I ask that an order of the day be designated for the consideration of this motion.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons be read the third time and passed; and of the amendment.

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on third reading of Bill C–68 on the final day of debate on this fine bill.

I am very proud to rise as a member of this caucus because I am proud not just of our position on this bill but also of the strength of our caucus in standing up to criticism which, although many times unfair and certainly very emotional, has been strong and relentless. I am also proud of the Prime Minister and particularly of the justice minister who has seen this legislation through from beginning to end.

I am proud also because I know I am representing the views of my constituents in Windsor—St. Clair. We have heard a lot of the importance of representing the views of our constituents today. We heard a lot from the third party about that. There are some very specific reasons the people of Windsor—St. Clair want me to vote for the bill.

In Windsor we enjoy a great deal of American tourism. We are less than a mile from the United States. When thinking where to go for lunch one can actually factor in restaurants in Detroit. One can go there and get back on one's lunch hour. That is how close it is. We have clean, safe streets. We have tremendous cross–border shopping in reverse and we have a casino which attracts 17,000 visitors a day, 90 per cent of whom are American.

People who are active in the tourist industry in Windsor, hoteliers, people at the casino and others, tell us one of the great reasons for the attraction of our community is that it is in Canada and people feel safe there. They tell us clearly and unequivocally that when they canvas their customers, when they talk to the patrons at the Windsor casino, gun control is a factor.

This bill in a very specific economic sense is good for my riding. The people of my riding appreciate it, understand it and want it. That is not my only reason for supporting it and certainly is not the only reason my constituents have for supporting it.

It is my view and the view of the majority of my constituents that the bill is not just about crime control. The people of Windsor—St. Clair and I as their representative suggest the bill is about the kind of Canada we want for the future, in our retirement for our children, for our grandchildren. It is about the values we share as a country.

There is no constitutional right to bear arms in Canada. There is no right to pack a pistol on one's hip or to hide one in one's car; nor should there ever be. On the other hand as a society we value hunting, sport shooting and aboriginal rights and we struggle to find the balance between those seemingly competing interests. In Windsor we know this very well. We also know what happens when firearms as a commodity go out of control.

• (1530)

As I said, we live less than a mile from a country with a very different view of this commodity, a country where firearms are indeed out of control. We watch the Detroit news in Windsor, and every night purposeful criminal shootings and accidental shootings are displayed on the air as though they were car accidents or as though they were just another fact of life. In those American cities they are.

I worked in Windsor in the criminal courts as both a defence lawyer and a prosecuting lawyer. Every Monday morning in bail court—court room number three, for those of you who are listening in Windsor—there would be a parade of American visitors to Canada who came into the country, passed that great big sign that says that firearms are prohibited in Canada, came across the border and had their firearms seized. Why? They would tell us they had forgotten they were in the car. They would be under the front seat, loaded, or in the glove box loaded or in the trunk loose and loaded, sometimes carelessly stored, sometimes kept loaded and right on hand.

Very often these same people would be offended by our laws and highly indignant, all of them feeling that they have a God–given right to carry a gun, and in spite of the warning at the border they were going to continue to carry it. Why do they feel that way? They feel that way because their culture is different from ours, but also because many of them feel a need to carry that gun. They feel they need protection. This is not the society or the culture the vast majority of Canadians want to live in.

I enjoy Americans very much. I like going to the United States. There is much to admire about their culture, their industry, their enthusiasm, their protection of individual rights. There is much to recommend in their democratic system. Yet last February the President of the United States came to this House and spoke to a joint sitting of the House and the Senate, and what did he talk about? He talked about our efforts to control firearms in our society. What did he talk about when he was introduced to our justice minister that evening? Both he and Mrs. Clinton wished him well in his struggle to control this commodity.

My friends opposite like to talk about democracy and about the need for us to represent our constituents. They like to talk about the importance of representing the folks back home in this House. I believe that is what I am doing. I believe that the constituents of Windsor—St. Clair support me, support this government, support the Prime Minister and the justice minister in this effort to control this commodity. I believe as well that the vast majority of the constituents of the members of the third party feel the same way.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the speech the member made. I know she has spent some time on this.

I feel very frustrated in trying to communicate to the Canadian people all of the things that are contained in this 128–page bill, so I took it upon myself for the last year and a half to regularly inform them through news releases. I think I have sent 31 or 32 news releases out informing them as to the contents of this legislation.

We have also promised that if it proves to be ineffective we would repeal it. We are quite confident that it will not meet the high expectations this government has put forth in this legislation.

My question for the member is simply this. Why did she oppose my amendment to have an independent auditor review this legislation after fives years to see whether it is cost–effective and whether it is meeting the goals this government claims it will meet? If they are so confident that it is going to make our society safer, why did they oppose that common sense amendment?

• (1535)

I also have another comment with regard to the comments made by the previous speaker.

I have many native people in my community and I regularly visit with them. They are strongly opposed to Bill C–68. And even with the amendments that were introduced yesterday, they are still going to be opposed to it, because they say they do not want more provisions in Canadian law that give them special status. They would like to see us move toward equality. They are not appreciative of what the government is doing by trying to tinker with C–68 to make it more palatable for native people. They are very concerned about that.

In light of the events of last night, I should review them for the people who are watching on television. Last night we sat here for hours and hours simply going over all the amendments that were made at the last minute, many of them by the government, to fix up this flawed legislation to make it a little more workable in their eyes.

Would it not make sense to postpone this, in light of the fact that it will not take full effect until the year 2003 anyway? Would it not make sense to postpone it a few more months to make sure it is workable? Because we have pointed out many flaws in it.

Would the member object to those two amendments? We feel it is really important to look at these things. I would like some good answers from the government. Maybe the member can address those two questions.

Ms. Cohen: Mr. Speaker, I think there were basically two questions asked. The first was the question of whether I would agree with my hon. friend that there should be an audit of the situation in a few years.

I think the hon. member is confused about the nature of the bill. This bill is about cultural values, crime, and a variety of issues, none of which are capable of being dealt with in a financial audit. It is not an economic bill.

With respect to the second question, about postponing the legislation, the people of my riding do not want the legislation postponed. They want us to get on with it and get on with our agenda.

I would suggest to my hon. friend this his constituents probably have concerns other than guns as well.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I did not mention specifically the costs of the bill. It is a significant factor, but the member is trying to portray it as simply a cost item.

I am asking whether she would agree to an independent audit to see if it would be cost–effective, but also whether it was meeting the targeted government claims that it will reduce crime. That is the question I asked.

I also asked if she would agree to postpone it for a few more months. It does not even begin to take effect until 1996, so why rush it through now? If there are this many amendments coming at the last minute, we have a serious problem in the justice department. If they have to propose this many amendments and all the things that need to be addressed, would it not make more sense to wait and get it right the first time? I think this is something she should address.

I would like to make another comment. We have listened to all the rhetoric coming forth from the government. I would like to remind the Canadian people that we heard exactly the same rhetoric before the Young Offenders Act was introduced. So the same people who brought us the Young Offenders Act are now bringing us this gun control legislation, the same people who ran up the debt.

This bill is going to be a horrendous cost. I wonder if the hon. member would rather spend the money on crisis centres or counselling for families at risk, rather than on this legislation? Would it not make more sense? We are running further and further into debt. I do not think we need more legislation like this.

The same government that is giving criminals more rights than victims is also bringing us legislation that will put a heavy burden on law–abiding gun owners rather than criminals. I cannot see how we can accept that.

• (1540)

I would appreciate the member looking at and fairly dealing with the questions that I have. Let us wait a bit. This time line does not mean that we have to pass it today. Would it not make more sense to wait? That is the amendment we are debating before the House. Maybe she has forgotten that.

Ms. Cohen: Mr. Speaker, in response I would say that I did answer the hon. member's two questions before, but apparently he did not like the answers.

We have never sold this as a bill to reduce crime by reason of its existence in Canada, although it is being used as such on a faulty basis for argument by the opposition. This bill will provide the tools to law enforcement agencies and the cultural

basis that will enable us to have less crime in the future. There is a substantial difference.

Also, with respect to the issue of delay, the hon. member should give his head a shake and realize that the people of Canada want us to get on with the business of governing. The people of Canada are not obsessed by guns. The people of Canada are worried about jobs and unemployment. Equating money for gun control with money for crisis centres is unfair, particularly coming from a party whose members tried to turn down summer grants for those very services in their ridings.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate, at third reading, of Bill C-68, the gun control legislation. My short experience as a parliamentarian has made me more familiar with the whole enactment process, and also more aware of the importance of lobbies.

There is a lobby in favour of gun control and one opposed to it but, in my opinion, the only lobby that really matters is my constituents. Consequently, my position on this issue, which is also that of the Bloc Quebecois, reflects the discussions which I had with my constituents. I am thinking in particular of the residents of Saint-Médard, in the Rivière-du-Loup area, the community health department official who came to my office to discuss the impact of that legislation, and also those representing shooting clubs and firearms merchants. This is not a black and white issue.

In this case, I believe that the approach is very different from the one used with the social program reform, when the government tried to impose a UI reform on the backs of the unemployed and seasonal workers. In that case we had no choice but to oppose such measure.

This is the first time in 18 months that I have had to really weigh the government's intentions and the real impact of its legislation, including in rural areas, which have the highest rate of accidents related to the use of firearms, even though the use of such firearms, including by hunters, is generally much more in compliance with the legislation.

In terms of its purpose, this bill seeks to reduce the number of deaths and injuries related to firearms, as well as to ensure legitimate, controlled and prudent ownership of such weapons, even though it will not prevent certain uncontrollable, impulsive reactions leading to tragedies. The objective is no doubt very laudable. However, is universal registration the solution? Given the increasing number of acts of violence in today's society, it seems that we have to use a curative approach and see if we get good results.

My philosophy regarding this bill is the same as the one which prevails in the occupational safety and health sector.

• (1545)

The basic principle we must consider is that in order to prevent crimes or accidents involving firearms, an effort must be made to eliminate the problem at the source, as with any accident at work.

Take noise, for example. In certain cases, we can completely eliminate the noise made by a firearm with a silencer or another similar device, and, when that is not possible, people can wear earplugs to protect their hearing. Using this model, the question in the case of firearms is how to cut down on the number of deaths.

The first approach that I think is important and that is not the focus of this bill, but should be taken into consideration, is to eliminate problems at the source. We must have information about the kinds of accidents that are associated with the use of firearms, how criminals go about smuggling firearms, how, in cases of domestic violence, one of the spouses uses a gun with results that are irreparable and final, how many hunting and other accidents take place. This is how we can reduce the number of mortalities from the outset, by eliminating the problem at the source.

This is an area in which Western society has not been too successful. We have an increase in violence, a very high rate of unemployment, a growing need for the services of psychologists and too much violence on television. These are all significant factors that require a systemic approach.

With particular respect to firearms, we have a situation where we cannot solve the problem at the source, but we must try to reduce the negative effects of firearm use. We can say that the purpose of the bill should be to ensure that firearms are not available to someone wishing to take an irreparable step.

In order to achieve this goal, and that is the purpose of registration, we must know who possesses firearms. Are they legally entitled to do so? We must ensure that people with firearms are honest people, in so far as possible, and that they are capable of using those firearms correctly. Will the method proposed, registration, be effective? We shall see.

Plenty of time has been allowed for implementation. There will be no change for three years. After that, there will be a five year period, taking us to the year 2003, during which registration can be carried out. That is when we will see whether values have changed in our society, because that is really what this bill is proposing, a change in values. Because our society views violence differently, a long established practice needs to be changed to ensure adequate control over firearms.

We will see whether or not this goal is achieved in concrete terms. I will remind you that success will have to be determined by taking into account all the actions taken. Last week, I learned that additional resources will be allocated to the RCMP to fight smuggling. Will these resources be enough? I do not know. This measure must be part of an action plan and I think this is an interesting idea.

On the other hand, as you solve one problem, you want to make sure you are not creating new problems in the process; in the case in point, this means not making life impossible for honest citizens who use firearms correctly. In that sense, it is a shame that the government did not see fit to incorporate some of the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, particularly with regard to having the legislation apply equally to everyone.

It says that the First Nations, aboriginal peoples can be exempted by cabinet decision from the application of any or all provisions of the act. It seems to me that creating two classes of citizens like that is unfair.

• (1550)

With respect to cost control, we were assured that it would not cost more than $10 to register up to 10 weapons per owner and that this registration would be good for life.

We, however, put forward a proposal to ensure that, for example, the next government would not suddenly be tempted to do what was done in many other registration systems like those in the auto industry and other sectors, to turn this into a cash cow for the government through very substantial cost increases. I think that this would be inappropriate and that the government would have to be accountable for its actions should it do so in the future. We would have liked this to be included in the bill, but it was not.

Another amendment called for a minimum four year sentence, provided for in the bill, for crimes committed with weapons. We think that this will create a double standard and that judges will have a hard time implementing this provision because crimes committed with firearms will have to be treated differently from those committed with other tools or instruments. I think that the government should have spent more time considering this.

In the debate on the firearms bill, the Bloc Quebecois's policy has always been to ensure that we have a balanced bill at the end of the day. Will it be sufficiently balanced for us to vote in favour? In this regard, the amendments deliver a number of gains.

For example, with regard to decriminalization, converting a Criminal Code offence to a statutory offence, which does not involve fingerprinting, mug shots, and entry into the police electronic network for first time offenders, is an interesting gain, because those who forget to register during the five year period would not be considered to be criminals but simply citizens who forgot to do something and who must rectify the situation.

Another element on which gains were made is the decision to issue licences. We do not rely only on reports from other people, we take into account the place of residence of the person. A person will not be kept from owning a firearm on the ground that he or she is in contact with a specific individual. Rather, the decision will be related to that person's place of residence, and whether interdictions apply to other individuals in that residence. That is, in our opinion, a valuable gain.

Another important issue raised by several hunters is the fact that the firearm handling courses which they took under the Quebec legislation were not recognized. Again, an important gain was made regarding this issue and the situation will now be more acceptable to Quebec hunters. That change is a good one. It does not go against the principle which underlies gun control, but it eliminates the frustrations experienced by hunters who use firearms for an honest purpose, their hobby.

I also want to point out that, after a few years, only those who have a valid license will be allowed to buy non–prohibited ammunition. This will surely help avoid accidents which occur, for example, when young people go out and buy ammunition. Indeed, this type of situation often results in accidents, and that is unacceptable.

We are dealing with a bill which, in my opinion, is not perfect, a bill which has been the object of numerous debates. This legislation led us to examine the pros and the cons of an interesting principle, a principle which is aimed at reducing violence as well as the number of accidents and tragedies which we hear about on the news, including violence against one's spouse. This is not to say that all accidents and tragedies will be eliminated. People will still be able to use other means of violence.

• (1555)

We have witnessed this recently, but the use of a firearm has such a devastating and often definitive effect that we hope that implementing this bill will have positive effects.

I would like to conclude by saying that I drew my reflections on this bill today from personal experience, and I tried to see the bill's everyday implications. I still remember a story I was told, like the one about one of my uncles who died in a hunting accident years ago. At the time, no training courses were given to hunters to inform them regarding the proper use of firearms. Courses were introduced to try to remedy this situation. I could also talk to you about one of my friends who was in a corner store when suddenly, in came a gang of robbers. I hope that this law will correct situations of this kind.

The most obvious goal for me is preventing people from using a firearm to commit suicide. Often, access to a firearm is the definitive, deciding factor on the outcome of the situation. Although the Firearms Act will not directly help people who are contemplating suicide to deal with their crises, it will at least save some lives by barring access to firearms in cases where people are refused licences for justifiable reasons.

In conclusion, I believe that this law is not the best firearms bill we could have introduced, but that it is better than none at all. I want to ask those people who have been long–time regular users of firearms to calm down and consider what the actual impact will be on their daily lives.

As I said earlier, for three years there will be no impact as such. After that, a person has five years to register his firearm. We will have plenty of time to find out whether there will be any negative impact.

If firearms registration is done properly and if in eight, ten, fifteen or twenty years we as a society are able to show that our statistics on the number of accidents, the type of accidents and the number of suicides have gone down, then it will have been worthwhile. From this point of view, aside from the constraints on lawful users of firearms, I wish they would think about that other aspect and realize that, in the best interests of our society, it would be advisable to support this bill and provide for adequate supervision.

For instance, the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, which were defeated, made provisions for Cabinet to use its regulatory authority with respect to aboriginal people. We need practical applications to ensure that the department is sympathetic to certain needs and to ensure that the bill passed in this House makes our society different from other societies where there is a lot more violence and, in the process, ensures that we have a quality of life and a social model that is far superior.

[*English*]

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is one statement my hon. colleague from Quebec has made that I strongly disagree with. He said that the bill was flawed but it was better than no bill. That is one of the problems in the country. Bad laws are worse than no laws.

Why can he not agree with the amendment we are debating this afternoon to wait for at least six months and work on it to make it not such a bad law?

My first question is not the most important of my two questions. I have been working with the Senate; I have been a watchdog for a year and a half. Would he agree that we should allow the Senate to examine the matter very closely, to be a chamber of sober second thought? Does he feel that the Senate has a legitimate role to play in the legislation? Would he like to see a Senate that would be truly representative of Canada, all provinces, create equality and play a legitimate role in checking out the legislation?

• (1600)

My second question is the key question. I cannot figure out why the Bloc is not opposed to legislation that so clearly infringes on areas of provincial jurisdiction, such as education, requiring federal education courses to be taken in the provinces; regulation of private property, clearly in the Constitution as an area of provincial jurisdiction; and licensing, increasing provincial taxes.

I understand the Quebec government is looking for $300 million in compensation to implement the bill and the minister says it will only cost $85 million. How can the member go along with a bill that so clearly infringes on areas of provincial jurisdiction?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, I will answer generally first on the matter of the Senate. I believe the Senate is outdated. The other House is an outmoded institution, which reflects the view of the 19th and earlier centuries that elected representatives lacked sufficient education and therefore needed the opinion of wiser individuals, advisers.

Today, with the quality found in the House of Commons, the Senate has become more of a political reward for those who have contributed in some way or other to the party in power. I hope elected officials will have control over this sort of legislation. If voters, in the end, had to decide on the basis of legislation we passed, they would decide on the situation as a whole.

However, as regards the six–month delay, I myself believe and I think the Bloc caucus agrees, I cannot speak for the other caucuses, that we have been very well informed on the entire question of firearms. Lobbying has been very strong from all sides, I daresay even exaggerated at times. We had to examine all of it. I met many groups of voters in order to form an opinion about what should be in the bill and I think I have all the information I need.

As for the matter of training, the bill provides that training courses given by the Government of Quebec will be accepted by the federal government and that hunters who have taken the courses will not have to take them again. In this regard, the Bloc has won a major point by protecting the lives of ordinary people from disruption, and this is one of the amendments that leads me to believe the bill is balanced enough for me to vote for it and promote it. With the support of the vast majority of Quebecers for gun control, this amendment, among others, serves the needs of the rural population, which I represent here, and which I believe will enjoy long–term benefit from this new bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, perhaps I may draw your attention to Standing Order 18 which says we do not have

the right to criticize the other House. I realize very few people are aware of this rule, but I do want to point this out.

[*English*]

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the comments on the bill by the hon. member across the way. The important discussion that is going on today has been going on for nearly a year now. I heard him mention the various things he has done in his area to garner input from all factions.

I would like to ask the hon. member a question from his perspective in the area he represents in Quebec. Knowing full well that Quebec has many hunters and many people who enjoy outdoor sports, especially in the wooded and northern regions of Quebec, has he received input from various groups that makes him believe the bill will impact on responsible firearms owners, owners of rifles and shotguns who are legitimate hunters in Quebec? Does he believe the legislation will impact on them, impede them or cause them any particular hardship in carrying out their sports and their competitions as target shooters as they have in the past?

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, when I met the people in my riding, I also spoke to members of the hunting community and people from the department of public health who argued in favour of the legislation. In the case of hunters and all people involved in outdoor activities who use firearms, there will be some changes that will be frustrating. That is quite true.

First of all, they will have expenses they did not have before, and they will have to understand the new rules and how these affect them. In this area, we have to deal with people's perceptions of the bill as well as with the bill itself. In fact, I hope that thanks to the timeframe provided under the bill, the first three years and then another five years to register, the government avoids what happened to the previous legislation, which was never operational mainly because the government at the time did not take the trouble to inform the public and make the legislation acceptable to all voters, to all citizens. I think this is a legitimate change that will require sensitive enforcement of the legislation.

I recall the amendment we proposed regarding criminalization and a number of other aspects, where we wanted to ensure that the minister would be flexible—I am thinking of the minimum sentence of four years. I think the minister will have to give this some serious consideration and perhaps, in the years to come, a number of technical amendments might be considered, because people may end up in the penitentiary system and become criminals as a result of a single misstep.

This morning the Leader of the Opposition gave the example of the young person who breaks into a cornerstore with a gun and as a result will get at least four years. Under the Young Offenders Act as applied in Quebec, under the previous legislation, he would have had a good chance of being rehabilitated. If he is sent to the penitentiary for four years, chances are he will acquire some bad habits before he comes out and by that time it will be too late. So there should be some flexibility on the part of the government to ensure the legislation is enforced correctly.

As for hunters who will have to change their habits, I think we have to look at the benefits to society as a whole.

We also have to be very clear about what the government intends to do about smuggling. If the money people spend on additional registration is used to cover the cost of the system, that is all right, but these people will need tangible evidence that they are not the only ones who are paying and that further action is being taken in society, so it is not just a matter of plugging one hole but making sure all the holes are plugged, like smuggling firearms into Canada across what is perhaps the longest border between two countries. The government has already announced significant initiatives, but I think that we will have to ensure that they are enforced because hunters will be most frustrated if they are forced to pay fees when, ultimately, all of the other measures end up not achieving their intended results.

We come up against the same things in this sector as we do in the environmental sector. The way I see it, to all intents and purposes, the real effects of a law are more evident 8, 10, 15, 20 years after the fact than they are immediately after its introduction. It is important to realize this. We are bringing in legislation today for the sake of future generations. We cannot talk about a piece of legislation like we talk about next year's budget, which can be corrected the year after.

• (1610)

This was one of the considerations which got me thinking and strongly defending the arguments put forth by the inhabitants of rural regions on the issue. All of this notwithstanding, I think that this legislation will allow us to distinguish ourselves, as a society, from the American model, for example, where violence is so widespread that certain states have decided to permit almost anybody to carry a firearm. I am not interested in this model. If I have a choice between the two, I would much rather choose the model proposed here.

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as chair of the justice committee which intensely and thoroughly examined the bill for over seven weeks, I should like to report more fully to the House of Commons.

After the bill was sent to the committee on April 24, we held 52 meetings lasting until June 5. In that time we heard 70 witness groups.

While I am and always have been a strong supporter of gun control and a supporter of Bill C–68, I took the position as chair of the committee that I would bend over backward to accommodate those groups which opposed the bill, to accommodate those members of Parliament and parties who had concerns about or opposition to the bill. I did this because I think the credibility and integrity of the parliamentary system take precedence over partisan views and behaviour. As a result, approximately two–thirds of the witnesses who appeared before the committee were in opposition to the bill and 61 amendments were made.

Further amendments were made last night at report stage. Of course not all amendments were accepted, which is normal in a democratic society where there are opposing views. Some of the amendments would have cut out the essential elements of the bill, and therefore they were opposed. Other amendments which were directed to major and minor improvements in the bill were not convincing to the majority on the committee.

Now I should like to take off my committee chairman's hat and put on my House of Commons hat and show my support for the bill. Ever since I was elected in 1965 I have been a strong supporter of gun control. Nearly all the elements in this bill and in Bill C–17 from 1992 were contained in one or other of my private member's bills from the late 1960s and early 1970s. With this bill nearly all the proposals I made 30 years ago will have been legislated.

Over and over again, before the committee, witnesses opposing the bill said there was no evidence that the licensing of gun owners and the registration of guns would reduce crime. That is not correct. There is overwhelming evidence that where guns and gun owners are more strictly controlled there is less crime with guns.

If we examine the situation in western Europe where in nearly all countries guns are registered, they have a much lower rate of crime with guns. In Canada, where we have had the registration of handguns for many years, we have had a lower rate of crime with handguns than in the United States where handguns or no guns are registered at all.

Some people might refer to some of the states of the United States that have very strict gun laws, but we cannot really consider them because in the United States there is no border control between the states. For example, if one is in New York State one can very easily travel to a neighbouring state where guns are easily available. Therefore the strict gun laws in one American state do not have very much impact on the control of crime with guns.

However, in Canada, as I say, we have had very strict control on handguns which have been restricted weapons since 1934. In Canada 53 per cent of our crimes with guns are with long guns, whereas only 17 per cent of crimes with guns are with handguns. It is interesting to note that in the United States the statistics are exactly the opposite where two–thirds of its crimes with guns are with handguns. This demonstrates that where we control handguns we have a much lower rate of crime with handguns. Because we have no control on long guns most of our crimes with guns are with long guns.

• (1615)

The purpose of licensing is to screen out irresponsible, imbalanced reckless persons who might acquire guns, to screen out people who have problems with alcohol or narcotics. The licensing system in the bill is merely an extension of what we have already had for several years with firearms acquisition certificates.

The registration system will require more responsibility from gun owners and provide police with more tools for crime prevention and crime detection. The purpose of both of these measures is public safety. The bill requires no more of gun owners than we already have in varying degrees for automobiles, boats, aircraft, ski–doos, dogs and bicycles. In other words, the measures in the bill with respect to licensing and registration are for preventive policing, the approach of the police these days, to prevent crimes than after the crime applying a harsh penalty. It is much better to prevent the crime by keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous, irresponsible people than to punish them after they have committed the crime.

Furthermore, I want to make absolutely clear there is no intention at all by me or anybody else in government to ban all guns or ban hunting or competitive shooting.

This is my fourth gun bill debate since I came here in 1965. On those four occasions this fear was raised by opponents of those bills. It never happened. We have as many or more hunters today than we had in 1965 when we first started introducing bills to control guns.

On the other hand, while there has been no real reduction in the number of hunters or competitive shooters there has been a gradual reduction of crime with guns. In 1974, 47.2 per cent of homicides were with a firearm. In 1976, we passed a law that brought in a certain restriction on firearms. That was the year we brought in the firearms acquisition certificate. By 1980 only 32.9 per cent of homicides were committed with a firearm. In 1992 we had Bill C–17 with further restrictions and further controls on firearms. In 1993, the last year for which we have statistics, only 30.6 per cent of homicides were with firearms.

In that period homicides have declined as well. The highest rate for homicides in recent years was in 1975 when we had 3.02 homicides per 100,000 population. In 1993 there were 2.19 per

100,000, a considerable drop after stricter controls on guns and as well the abolition of capital punishment in 1976.

I will deal with some of the myths raised during the hearings of the committee, one being if we control guns more strictly only criminals will have guns. Sixty–six per cent of homicides are committed by people with no prior criminal record. In other words, 66 per cent were law–abiding until they committed homicide. Marc Lépine, who killed 14 women at l'École polytechnique, had no prior criminal record. Valery Fabrikant, who killed four professors at Concordia University, had no prior criminal record.

• (1620)

We will never control professional gangsters or professional criminals; they will always get their guns. The great majority of our murders are not committed by those people but by people who were previously law–abiding.

The other myth is that guns do not kill, people kill. That is true but people kill more easily and more effectively with guns than with other weapons. Guns are the most lethal of weapons. When a gun is readily available what might have been an assault becomes a murder.

There is considerable evidence from Canada, the United States and all over the world that where guns are more available there are more crimes with guns. The bill will restrict the availability of guns to many who might use them criminally. It will also put barriers in the way of those who want to acquire them quickly and irresponsibly. The bill will reduce crime with guns. It will control not only guns but crime.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the hon. member.

I find it very interesting how they can look at some of the statistics from around the world and twist them to suit their own purposes. The member cited statistics from Europe. England embarked on a campaign against guns and he is perfectly aware that violent crime increased in England as these laws were put into effect. I am making him aware that it depends on how one twists these statistics.

I agree with him when he says we need to get at the root of the problem. This is not getting at the root of the problem. We are simply seeing someone bleeding on the rug and we are saying please bleed over here. Instead of trying to stop the crime, instead of trying to stop the problem we are simply shifting it somewhere else. We are not targeting the problem of crime.

Prevention is the principle. If we are to spend hundreds of millions of dollars and save lives, which the government stated is the intent of the bill, would it not be better to spend it in some other way? Would it not be more cost effective?

Why does the member oppose my amendment to have a review of this legislation by an independent auditor to see whether it is meeting the goals and objectives the government has set? I cannot understand why he would object to that.

The statistics he quotes beg the question of how many more lives could be saved if we would spend the money in other ways. Another key question the government has never addressed is how many lives will this cost. I presented evidence to the government that showed guns have saved many lives.

This legislation will tie up our police. How many lives will it cost because the police are no longer on the street but are tied up with law–abiding citizens registering guns? How many jobs will be destroyed because of the increase in taxes this will make necessary? What will those people without jobs do? Some of them may possibly turn to a life of crime.

We as parliamentarians sometimes forget to look at the secondary aspects, the secondary effects our legislation has. Could the hon. member address those two questions I have raised?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what statistics the hon. member is looking at. I do not have them here before me today but I looked at some this morning because I have to give another speech tonight on homicide at another place.

The rate of murder in the United Kingdom is less than 2 per 100,000; less than in Canada where it is 2.19 per 100,000. In the United States the rate of murder is 9.6 per 100,000. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. Let us hear his figures.

The rate of murder in the United Kingdom is lower than in Canada and the rate of murder with guns is much lower than in Canada and much lower than in the United States.

• (1625)

The member has not presented us with any facts. I challenge him. I will come back to the House tomorrow under a standing order and put the facts on record. In all of Europe the rate of crime committed with guns is substantially lower than in the United States and in Canada. He cannot state otherwise. There may have been a slight increase, but the slight increase is nowhere near that of the United States which has open access to guns.

He asked why we do not spend the money on other programs which might deal with the causes of crime. I am rather surprised by that. Every time the government has put proposals to the House in that direction members of his party vote against them. Not only do they not approve of the cuts the government has made in social programs, they want to cut them even further—what hypocrisy.

The people who will pay for the registration system and the licensing system will be the gun owners, just like those of us who own automobiles have to pay for the registration system and the licensing system. The general taxpayer should not have to pay for the gun control system. It should be paid for by the people who own and use guns, and rightly so. The moneys we would use for general social programs to attack the causes of crime will come out of general tax revenue. They should not be played one against the other.

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons.

I congratulate the Minister of Justice on his efforts and perseverance in bringing this important and timely matter to the House of Commons. More important, I commend the minister for his willingness to listen and to respond to the comments of all Canadians regarding the bill without sacrificing the major goals and initiatives of it.

I do not believe any other bill in this session has generated as much discussion and debate among Canadians as has this one. However, as I have listened to the discussion and the debate some of the major aspects of the legislation are being overlooked. I will comment on some of the issues I feel have not been adequately highlighted.

The legislation sends a clear message to criminals, judges and the public. If a person uses a gun while committing a crime they will be punished. The Criminal Code will be amended to provide that when a person has committed one of the ten listed serious crimes with a firearm they will be subject to a minimum sentence of four years in prison. In many cases the actual punishment will be more severe. If a person uses a gun in the commission of a crime they will be punished. No matter what other mitigating factors are involved, a judge will have no choice but to sentence people guilty of these offences to four years in a federal penitentiary.

The message is clear. The protection of the public must be the main goal of our penal system. In addition, people convicted of these offences will be banned from owning a firearm for life. I believe it is important to reflect on these provisions because they highlight the central goal and purpose of the legislation, to ensure Canada remains a safe place and that Canadians continue to enjoy protection from gun related crime.

The provision aimed at tighter border controls was referred to earlier by my hon. colleague with respect to the importation of firearms. One need only look to the south to see the dangers guns pose. It is with great pride that many Canadians compare the relative safety of our cities and towns to those of the United States. Given the easy availability of firearms in the United States it is clear any legislation aimed at controlling the use of guns must address the importation of guns.

Import–export controls for firearms are presently based on the premise that guns are a commodity and therefore are subject to the same trade controls as any other commodity. Under Bill C–68 changes will be made to provide for a fundamental reorientation of the policy toward firearm imports. In particular, the legislation will recognize that importing firearms may have important consequences in terms of public safety and crime control.

Under Bill C–68 for every firearm coming into Canada the person responsible will be required to have either an import permit for commercial use or a customs declaration for personal use. Every gun coming into Canada will now be tracked. These import declarations and permits will only be issued to those individuals and companies who have the necessary permission to possess firearms while in Canada. These controls form part of the bill's effort to reduce the underground market for guns and provide for the accurate tracking of all guns in Canada.

• (1630)

Of course, in conjunction with these new measures, the act provides also for penalties for those individuals who do not obey the import guidelines. Under Bill C–68, the Criminal Code will be amended to provide for a new offence of importing a firearm without the proper customs declaration or permit. This offence will be punishable by a minimum of one year imprisonment if prosecuted on indictment. In addition, the court has the power to prohibit the offender from possessing a firearm for up to 10 years.

Again, the theme underlying Bill C–68 is clear in these provisions. The theme is the protection of the public and the reduction of crime.

The bill also recognizes the legitimate use of guns, but at the same time it is aimed at limiting the use of guns by those people who have no legitimate purpose to do so. This will be done by reducing the underground market for guns, the place where criminals get their guns, and by increasing the penalties for those who use guns for illegitimate purposes.

There are other measures which I would like to briefly highlight. Any future sale or importation of handguns that have a barrel length of 105 millimetres or less will be banned. In addition, the definition of firearm in section 85 of the Criminal Code will be expanded to include imitation firearms so that those who simply use or threaten with a fake gun will not escape the penalties under the Criminal Code.

I would now like to take a few moments to comment on the section of the bill that has by far generated the most public debate, the system of universal gun registration. In my conversations, letters and meetings with constituents, it is this section of the bill that has been the focus of much discussion. Before understanding the purpose of universal gun registration, one must be cognizant of the other initiatives contained in Bill C–68 which I have previously touched upon. I repeat, Bill C–68

is about increasing public safety and controlling the criminal misuse of guns.

The universal registration system supports and supplements the other provisions of the bill. The registration of all firearms enables Canada to control and track the flow of firearms across its borders. Without registration, the increased penalties for illegal importation would be unenforceable. It enables Canada and its police forces to address the issue of criminal misuse of guns by helping enforce prohibition orders issued by the courts, by helping police to trace stolen guns and guns used in crimes and by helping increase compliance with safe storage requirements. Registration is the backbone of this bill and it is the section upon which the rest of the bill can be effectively implemented.

Many critics of gun registration have argued that registration will not work because criminals will not register their guns. Frankly, this misses the whole point. Criminals obtain their guns from the underground market which is fed by smuggled and stolen guns. Registration will help eliminate two sources of supply for this market. It will enable police to accurately track the point at which the guns enter the underground market.

Police have been calling for a form of gun legislation for years. If anyone is in a position to say whether gun control will effectively assist in the prevention of crime, I believe it is the police.

I would like to quote from a letter from Chief Vincent MacDonald, president of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. Speaking on behalf of the association, Chief MacDonald stated: "We view the registration of all firearms as pivotal to the entire package, critical to controlling the illegal gun trade, to supporting preventative action and to enforcing the law".

It is for these reasons that the registration system contained in Bill C–68 is both necessary and desirable.

Many of the concerns with the registration system rest on what I believe has been a lack of accurate information. For instance, the cost of implementing the registration system will be funded 100 per cent through fees charged for licences and registration certificates. There will be no drain on existing police resources as a result of the implementation of the registration system.

• (1635)

The cost of registration for individual gun owners will not be excessive. For owners who wish to register currently owned firearms, a registration certificate will cost between zero and $10 in the first year of availability. Additionally, a non–acquisition firearm licence will cost between zero and $10 in the first year of availability. The actual process to acquire certificates and licences will be straightforward and quick.

In addition to my own views on gun registration, like other members of the House I have consulted and listened to my constituents. I have received many telephone calls and letters. I have attended town hall meetings and have spoken personally with constituents.

I believe in this bill. I support it fully and I am very pleased at this time to have the opportunity to say so in the House of Commons.

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the hon. member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce for getting this bill successfully through committee and back into the House. As a member of the committee I know we worked very hard to make the bill suitable for everybody in Canada and easily adaptable to the desires of most people.

I would like to refer to a letter I received by fax today. This letter was sent to the Minister of Justice from the Federation of Medical Women of Canada and states: "The Federation of Medical Women of Canada support the gun control legislation Bill C–68 now being debated and voted on by Parliament".

The letter goes on to state that in 1990 Statistics Canada reported 1,400 deaths per year involving firearms. Research has shown that the risk of homicide and suicide is greater for people who live in houses with firearms. The federation also states: "We view domestic violence as a social and health issue which requires an effective preventative approach with a combination of education and legislation. As an organization, we recognize that we have a role to play".

It is about the role to play that I would like to make a further comment. I am pleased that most Canadians are not the source of the problem for which the law is geared. This makes Canada unique. We have an abundance of law–abiding citizens but an additional attribute of Canadians is that even Canadians who are not directly affected do share a common sense of responsibility for the welfare of others.

To those who oppose the bill on the basis that they are good citizens and need no laws, I appeal to their higher sense of responsibility for they could make true models for all others. They could accept the bill as it is, respect it and set a model for those who are not law–abiding citizens. I am asking all who oppose the bill to act as good citizens and accept their responsibility and do what the bill asks.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not think there is a question in the member's comments. If the member for St. John's West wishes to reply briefly she may.

Mrs. Payne: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in what will really be the closing debate on the government's controversial gun control Bill C–68.

My colleagues, under the able direction of the hon. member for Crowfoot, have put forward a host of arguments concerning the defects of the bill and over 200 amendments to endeavour to correct the worst of those defects. I wish to commend each and every one of our Reform members for the quality of their contributions and the conscientiousness with which they have made them.

Although these seeds of gun control reform may have fallen on barren ground in this Chamber, I can assure the government that those seeds are falling on fertile ground in the country at large. Within a year they will bring a crop of public discontent which will cause the minister and the government to rue the day they rammed this ill conceived legislation through their own caucus and through Parliament.

As the debate winds up, I do not want to dwell any longer on the details of the bill but instead on the bigger picture. What are the characteristics of a good law and does this bill possess them?

• (1640)

The short answer is that a good law must have at least three characteristics. It must be within the constitutional competence of the government. It must be effective in achieving the objective for which it is introduced. Above all it must be capable of carrying the judgment of the people who will pay the bills and for whose benefit it has been introduced. In other words, a good law must pass the test of constitutionality, effectiveness and democratic consent.

Let us look at the big picture. Will Bill C–68 if enacted be a good law or a bad law?

First is the test of constitutionality. This bill will be challenged constitutionally. It will be subject to constitutional challenges to which it would not be subject if the minister had carried out more genuine consultations, listened to the advice he had received and given greater care to the issue of civil liberties when he first conceived and drafted the bill.

With respect to potentially damaging constitutional challenges, I refer to the following. There is the contention of the James Bay Cree and Yukon First Nations that the minister did not comply with the provisions of constitutional agreements with themselves in framing the legislation. I refer further to the fact that several of the provinces consider the onerous regulatory aspects of the act an imposition and an intrusion into their provincial jurisdictions. They may very well challenge the constitutionality of the act once the regulations are proclaimed.

Finally, I refer to the concerns of the civil libertarians that certain clauses, such as those pertaining to inspection, may very well contravene the charter of rights and freedoms, in particular, the rights of Canadians to privacy and security of the person.

It is with some bitterness I note that when these concerns with respect to the intrusion of the bill on civil liberties were first raised by ordinary citizens with their MPs, they were completely ignored by the government. When they were pointed out again by Reform MPs in this House and in committee, they were ignored by the government and the media.

It was only when more elite groups like the Canadian Bar Association or politically correct groups like the Canadian Civil Liberties Association also made the same points months later that the civil liberties issue was even recognized as a potential flaw in the bill by the justice department. I say it is a sad day when the civil liberties of a people are taken for granted by the government and only judged to be at risk when the elites or special interest groups deign to acknowledge the risk.

I would also ask how the justice minister in introducing his first major complete legislative initiative to this House could have managed to get himself on to such shaky constitutional ground including potential violations of the charter of rights and freedoms. Bill C–68 fails the test of being on sound, and unquestionably sound, constitutional ground.

A second major test which any government legislative measure must pass regardless of whether or not it has sufficient support to pass in this Chamber is the test of effectiveness. Will it achieve the object, in this case an increase in public safety, which is its purported intent?

My colleagues have made the argument very effectively that Bill C–68 will not achieve the goal of increased public safety because it focuses less than 20 per cent on the regulation of the criminal use of firearms and over 80 per cent on the regulation of the non–criminal use of firearms. To be effective the emphasis of the bill should have been exactly the opposite.

There is another front on which this bill fails the effectiveness test. As all members know, the Criminal Code and a national gun registry is a federal responsibility but its administration is a provincial responsibility. To be effective a bill of this nature must have the full and positive co–operation of the provinces. It is becoming increasingly apparent that this is not the case. At least five provinces and two territories have indicated their profound unhappiness with the bill and the administrative obligations it imposes upon them.

The Government of Saskatchewan has gone so far as to introduce a motion in the Saskatchewan assembly urging the federal government to introduce amendments to Bill C–68, to allow provinces and territories to opt out of the provisions respecting registration and licensing. The attorney general in Saskatchewan has called on the federal minister to place higher penalties on criminals who use firearms in the commission of an offence and to withdraw all the remaining sections of the gun

control package. He has indicated his willingness to continue to oppose this federal legislation.

• (1645)

The minister has made it clear that he will proceed delicately with respect to imposing the administration of this gun control legislation on Indian reserves, many of whom are unalterably opposed to the provisions. This holds out the unseemly prospect of one approach for non–aboriginals, and another for aboriginals, in violation of the basic concept of equality of all citizens before the law.

From a political standpoint, no one in his right mind believes that the federal government, in association with the separatist government of Quebec, is going to vigorously and actively proceed to register every firearm in that province, including those on aboriginal reserves, during a period of constitutional uncertainty.

In other words, even a cursory examination of the practical aspects of administering the bill across the country by provincial governments, half of whom profoundly disagree with it, and on aboriginal reserves, the majority of which disagree with it, reveals profound weaknesses in the potential administration of the bill, profound weaknesses which will render it ineffective in achieving its purpose.

The third test of a good law is that it must be capable of carrying the judgment of the people who pay the bills and for whose benefit it has been introduced. In other words, it must pass the test of democratic consent and support.

Since the bill was first introduced, the government has maintained that it has vast public support, citing various public opinion polls in that regard. However, governments, especially elitist ones that boast of their ability to spin doctor the issues, have a habit of deceiving themselves on the subject of democratic support and their reading of the polls, as was profoundly illustrated in the country and in the House with respect to the Charlottetown accord.

Various polls have been conducted which ask the public whether they are in favour of gun control, and of course the majority answered in agreement. These polls usually fail to follow up that question with the more pertinent question: Should the focus of gun legislation be on punishing the criminal use of firearms or regulating the non–criminal use of firearms? If and when that question is put to the Canadian public, I submit that the majority favour coming down like a ton of bricks on the criminal's use of firearms which is precisely the Reform position.

Other polls ask whether the public supports the federal government's proposed gun control legislation, but fail to ask whether the respondents are in any way, shape or form, familiar with the federal government's gun control legislation. They completely miss the point that as the public gains more and more knowledge about this bill, its support for it declines rather than increases no matter what the initial level. This was precisely the same pattern of declining support which ultimately sank the Charlottetown accord.

Made in Ottawa solutions to national problems, if promoted and promulgated by governments with vast dollars to spend on public relations, initially receive a high rating—in the vicinity of 60 per cent to 65 per cent—with the public. However, as the public gets to know more and more about the legislation, as they examine it for themselves, as they discuss it, as they hear the perspective of the provincial and municipal politicians, the interest groups, the academics and their friends and neighbours, the track record is that public support declines in direct relation to increased knowledge about the legislation.

Any piece of public legislation is subject to declining public support, a trajectory which in the case of this bill will mean that less than 50 per cent of the public will support its provisions by late this fall. That is the sign of a bad law, a law which cannot be properly enforced and will not achieve the intent of Parliament because it does not carry the judgment of the people who pay the bills and whom it supposedly benefits.

I therefore submit in conclusion that Bill C–68, if passed into law, will not be a good law. It will be a bad law, a blight on the legislative record of the government, a law that fails the three great tests of constitutionality, of effectiveness and of the democratic consent of the governed.

• (1650)

What should be the fate of a bad law? It should be repealed, which is precisely what a Reform government will do when it eventually replaces this government.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If you would seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent that the vote initially scheduled to take place at 5.30 p.m. this day be rescheduled to 6.30 p.m., immediately after private members' hour.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: So ordered.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the remarks of my hon. colleague, the leader of the third party in the House.

I listened with interest because I want to tell him that I would also listen with interest if I heard those loud cries from the civil libertarians in this country. I, for one, would listen to those and I am sure members on my side of the House would also listen with me and react.

The loud voices have not been heard by civil libertarians. They have been heard by a very vocal gun lobby very much supported by the Reform Party, the members opposite.

I want to come back to a statement that concerned me in my hon. colleague's speech about constitutional law which is something that we should be very concerned about.

The charter of rights and freedoms is something of which we must be very cognizant in every piece of legislation. When a minister brings forward legislation he has to sign on that he has taken into consideration constitutional and charter arguments. The charter, I often hear, is something that gets in the way. Our protection in search and seizure provisions comes from the charter provisions. That is why Canadians should not be afraid of the gun control bill.

I also want to talk about constitutionality because my colleague opposite raised it. The Supreme Court of Canada has already ruled that gun control is a matter of criminal law. It does not matter that all the provisions of the Criminal Code offence be in the Criminal Code.

That the Criminal Code is for crime prevention has been very clearly ruled in the appellate court in Alberta and in the Supreme Court of Canada. It has been stated by Professor Hogg, who is the expert in Canada on constitutional law, that gun control law is a criminal control provision, a crime prevention provision, and is totally intra vires the Parliament of Canada.

What is the hon. member going to say to the Supreme Court justices?

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's learned legal opinion but she did not address the constitutional problems that I raised.

I did not argue that the federal Parliament does not have the constitutional right to pass gun control legislation. I did raise the point that it was aboriginal people who were the first to raise the constitutional question about the bill. Their argument was nowhere close to what the member was trying to defend.

They argued that the constitutional documents which constitute the arrangements between the James Bay Cree and the federal government and the Yukon First Nations and the federal government contained a clause that required a type of consultation which was not provided or honoured by the minister. This was raised by some citizens, a completely different lot.

The other arguments that have been raised with respect to constitutionality are with respect to specific provisions. As the member well knows, the provinces are concerned about the clauses that mention ending the right to remain silent, the requirement to co–operate with the police, the presumption of guilt until proven innocent, the assignment of guilt by association, allowing confiscation of property without compensation, the provision of search and seizure without a warrant. The suspicion is they violate sections 7 and 8 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

• (1655)

I suggest it is in these specific areas the bill gets on to shaky ground. The minister would have been well advised to accept amendments and changes in these areas if his interest was in getting a bill that would not be on shaky constitutional ground if enacted.

The Deputy Speaker: With the understanding the hon. leader was sharing his time with another member, the time for questions and comments has expired.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today concerns gun control. When the debate is finished, members on both sides of the House will be asked to say yea or nay. Should I vote in favour of the bill as some polls have suggested, or if on examining the content of the bill I find that on balance it has serious shortcomings not addressed by the pollsters' questions, do I then cast my vote against the bill? If I do vote against the bill, am I then voting against the wishes of my constituents?

I do not need to tell the House one of the most fundamental principles of my party is that Reform members of Parliament vote according to the wishes of their constituents regardless of their personal convictions.

The question of how a member should vote is worth examining in the context of the bill. It is a question that is fundamental to the public's perception of our role as members of Parliament. It is a question whose time has come because with today's technology, members of this place and the public at large could vote on any matter before the House without having to leave home.

What do Canadians expect of their elected officials? Do they simply want us to look at the polls or look at the bill? Do they want us to vote according to the polls or according to the bill? Certainly many polls would suggest Canadians support gun registration. However this bill is about more than gun registration. It raises important questions about fundamental legal rights, about fairness and even handedness in sentencing, important questions about the spending of limited government resources and basic questions about whether the bill meets its stated objectives of making our streets and homes safer.

Asking Canadians if they support gun registration and asking them if they support Bill C–68 are two distinct questions. No poll has adequately addressed the difference between the two. That is why Canadians have sent us to this place: to examine bills and make the distinctions the pollsters cannot or will not, to challenge the self–serving press releases of the government and to advance the real concerns of our constituents.

Canadians expect us to vote on the merits of the bill. I want to emphasize I do not have any reservations about gun registration as a policy. However I cannot support the bill because I believe it is fundamentally flawed. It does not advance the cause of justice or the safety of the citizens one iota.

I cannot support the bill because it diverts scarce public resources and energies to policies which will not truly enhance personal and community safety. Members cannot transfer support for gun registration to Bill C–68.

There is another side of the issue I would also like to address. Why has the government not devoted its energies and resources to measures that will truly lead to safer communities? Consider the tragic case of Christopher Stevenson. Members may recall Christopher was an 11–year old Ontario boy who was raped and murdered by a psychopathic pedophile and a nine–time child rapist, Joseph Fredericks.

Recently Dr. Jim Cairns who headed the inquest into Christopher's death warned that our children remain targets of dangerous sexual predators because governments are not moving in a meaningful way to protect them. The evidence presented at the inquest was that these offenders cannot be treated and the only way to protect society is through indefinite detention. Yet the principal recommendation of the Stevenson inquiry that repeat child sex offenders be jailed indefinitely has not been implemented.

• (1700)

Why has the government not enacted sexual predator legislation which puts the rights of the victim and the protection of society above all else? Why has the government diverted energies and resources of the Department of Justice and the House from addressing real solutions to the problem of violence in our homes and neighbourhoods?

These are the real questions. These are the questions members opposite must answer. These are the questions to which Canadians want answers.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Waterloo—National Defence.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be an expert on hunting and guns but I know the hon. member for Delta may be of some assistance. How can his party justify not supporting the bill?

I will put it in terms of what I understand from hunting. I have seen a hunting expedition. I saw the hunters arrive in their vehicles in northern Canada, in the Northwest Territories. They were in licensed vehicles. Presumably they had stopped at licensed gas stations along the way to pick up gas. They got on a licensed aircraft on a licensed airfield and flew to some remote lake where they hunted. They had to have a hunting licence in order to hunt. I presume the licence was specific as to the species of animal they were able to hunt.

They got the animal. They then applied for a licence to export the horns from the Northwest Territories because they could not not export from the Northwest Territories without a licence. They got back in their licensed vehicle, having travelled with a licensed guide on their hunting trip.

If everything else about the sport is licensed except the most dangerous part of it, that is the gun, why is there objection to proceeding with the licensing of guns? There is no objection to licensing game wardens. There is no problem with getting a licence to hunt. There is no problem with licensing the guides, the aircraft, the cars, the gas station and everything else. Yet Reform members have a mental block with respect to licensing guns. Could the hon. member enlighten me? I cannot understand this attitude.

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, the issue of licensing put quite simply is that if I have a car that is not used on the highway I do not need to register it. If I am not using the vehicle registration is not required. That applies to many elements in society.

The issue is not about licensing. The issue is about public safety. The gun handler is licensed. The legislation requires a very stringent test and personal interventions by police authorities to ensure that the person can adequately operate the weapon and so on. We have given very careful consideration to dealing with the issue of licensing.

However the issue is not licensing; the issue is public safety. We are opposed to the bill because licensing will not advance the cause of public safety one iota.

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the hon. member's speech when he talked about licensing. Yesterday I talked about the importance of representing one's constituents here. As I did so members of the Reform Party kept yelling at me and telling me that somehow I was not representing my constituents by making a decision to vote in favour of the bill.

An hon. member: We all know that you will do what you are told.

Mr. Speller: Do what I am told? Look at the hon. members who are falling in line with their leader.

Their leader lives in an urban area that is in favour of the legislation. All the polls that have been taken across the country have clearly shown that. How can the hon. member and members of his caucus stand here to say that those of us in Ontario, for instance, who are trying to best represent our constituents, who have taken polls and have spoken to many constituents, are not representing our constituents? His own leader comes from an area of the country where polls have shown that the majority of the people are in favour of the legislation. His leader is going to vote against it, against the wishes of his constituents. That party's key point during the election campaign was to represent

its constituents and have free votes. How does that align with party policy?

• (1705)

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether the question the poll has asked can be equated to Bill C–68. In my view asking the question "are you in favour of registering firearms" does not equate to Bill C–68 because Bill C–68 goes far beyond that. That is the point. The question that gets answered is the one asked.

In this instance the pollsters are not asking the right question. At best a series of questions would have to be asked regarding Bill C–68. Then we as members of the House would have to balance it off and ask what would carry the most weight, the registration of guns or the violation of the human rights or legal rights that we believe are inherent in it.

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for London West.

I express my support of Bill C–68 that has been before the House for several months now. The Minister of Justice has travelled the country in consultation and the bill has been scrutinized by the media. It has been studied by the standing committee of which I am a member. Over 70 groups and approximately 35 members appeared before the committee. The time has arrived for the House to act on the legislation.

Certain colleagues in the House frequently look to the United States to cite examples of public policy which in their view should be adopted in this country. I often question whether certain members opposite are more familiar with the American constitution as opposed to the Canadian Constitution.

Canadians have looked to the United States and at its pervasive gun culture. One need only watch the nightly news on any American station to realize the tragic consequences of the pro gun movement, a movement that shares the common beliefs of many people and parties in the House.

My own riding of Sarnia—Lambton borders on the community of Port Huron in the state of Michigan. Last September just as children were going back to school two individuals who were repairing a roof at a school got into an argument. One went out to his truck, got a gun and shot his co–worker in full view of the children.

In the same city, which is a relatively prosperous community of 100,000, there were seven shootings in schools last year. Children as young as 12 were bringing guns to school in their gym bags so they could settle a school yard dispute. This was all happening in a very middle class prosperous community 400 yards away from my riding. This is terribly anecdotal material but I suggest it draws a distinction between our two countries.

Bill C–68 is an opportunity to define and shape the type of attitudes we as Canadians have toward the flow of guns, the possession of guns and the usage of guns in the country. It is a step toward recognition of the type of society based on our history and our values, one of which is to let other people speak without being interrupted. It distinguishes us absolutely from our neighbours to the south. It recognizes that there are legitimate uses for firearms and that there are concurrent obligations in such ownership.

As someone who sat on the committee I can quite safely say that the quality of the testimony and the evidence was of great concern to me. It was readily apparent that there were doctors appearing before the committee who were quite willing to give legal opinions and there were lawyers appearing before the committee who were quite willing to give medical opinions. Many individuals who appeared as members of responsible firearms groups or gun owners groups offered advice on accounting principles even though they had no background in it. They would offer advice on certain belief systems that bordered on religions.

• (1710)

As a result I suggest to those here and those watching that it is necessary to weigh the probative value of the evidence of an expert, for example in business administration, who because he has a doctorate in business administration transfers his advice to the National Rifle Association and the Fraser Institute, all the time posing as a criminologist.

Similarly one would question the opinion of a medical doctor who appeared before the committee and formed conclusions regarding suicide that fly in the face of empirical research on the subject, as well as the evidence of a group representative who purports to speak for veterans buried in Europe, victims of the second world war.

It is safe and true to say that there was a continuum of opinion before the committee on the bill, some of which quite frankly bordered on the absurd and some of which resembled reasonable, objective and logical suggestions.

Those who belong—and I would suggest there are some in the House—to the show me school, that is those who demand mathematical equations empirically setting out reductions in murder, accident and suicide rates, are demanding a burden of proof that from a logical perspective is false and perverse. We are hearing a lot of it tonight. I am referring to those who demand no registration but implicitly know that locking up one

spouse in jail for shooting the other spouse will somehow deter others from the same behaviour.

If we take the punishment versus prevention logic and follow it through to its conclusion, surely punishment would be a sufficient deterrent to allow banks to transport money without armoured cars. Surely the threat of a sentence for holding up a bank employee transporting cash would be sufficient to prevent such a criminal act and banks could cut the cost of doing business by not spending money on such preventive safety measures as armoured cars.

We know there are still robberies of armoured cars. The fact that banks have taken reasonable measures to prevent acts that are reasonably foreseeable is accepted by society as the prudent course of action.

Similarly we have in the country workplace safety laws that require certain steps to be taken to minimize accidents in the workplace. Such laws are accepted even though there is a cost in implementing safety devices and inspection procedures because certain tragedies are preventable, although by no means can such legislation eliminate unfortunate accidents and occurrences.

If the same burden of proof were placed on the implementation of workplace safety laws or seatbelt laws such as was suggested by members across the way, and if the same quantitative mathematical proof were applied to the laws before passage, obviously none of the statutory provisions would ever exist. We would live in a country without workplace safety laws.

I commend to all opponents of the bill who would prefer to talk rather than listen the testimony of public health experts who appeared before the committee. They recognized that laws such as this one create a change not only in the flow of guns, the possession of guns and the usage of guns, but more important in the attitudes of society toward guns.

Many witnesses who appeared before the committee stated the tired old maxim that we have heard many times: people kill, guns do not. Such simple statements deny the fact that guns are inherently dangerous objects and that in possessing these weapons certain obligations should be imposed.

Is it unreasonable to know who owns the weapons or where they are moving in society? Is it in some way an imposition on someone's inherent right to have some central registry system when the same exists for dogs, cars, houses and securities?

Mr. Stinson: It stops the dogs that bite and the drunks who drive.

Mr. Gallaway: Nothwithstanding all the talk across the way, is it reasonable to conclude from the evidence of the police, public health experts, suicide prevention groups and public safety experts that the cornerstone of the bill, the registry system, will cut the rate of crime and suicides in Canada? The unequivocal response is yes, I must acknowledge that there were many witnesses who sincerely denied this to be the case. There are those who cling to the beliefs of the business administrator turned criminologist. Perhaps these people will turn to their accountant the next time they have a medical problem.

• (1715)

The Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired. Questions or comments, the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the government had not chosen to enact time allocation I am sure all of us would have enjoyed hearing the remainder of the hon. member's speech on this issue. He can thank his own party for cutting him off in that sense.

We are talking about effectiveness of this impending legislation. Every time we try to raise concerns about it in this House we are accused of trafficking in fiction. The government says that the people of Canada have to trust it. It will draft these regulations. We have not seen what they are yet. We have to trust the government that once it gets the regulations in place it will effectively address the issues.

I want to briefly read into the record the following:

> Registration pertains to things—guns in this case—not people. It records the description, serial number and ownership of each item or weapon. For extremely lethal and easily hidden weapons such as handguns—which in Canada are restricted and of which there are relatively few—it is a workable and relatively effective system that screens owners and weapons alike and inhibits casual purchase. However, for the ten million long guns in Canada I believe that a registration scheme would be unworkable and impractical in comparison with its potential benefits.

This quote was from the hon. member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, *Hansard*, Commons debates, page 12627, April 8, 1976, the hon. member who currently sits as the chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice. This is the very hypocrisy Canadians are concerned about, where members seem to change their opinion. They are concerned that this legislation will be simply one more step in the ongoing erosion of the rights of law–abiding firearms owners. I would like to hear the hon. members address that concern from Canadians.

Mr. Gallaway: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a hallmark of the member opposite that he is locked in time and that new evidence will not persuade him to change his mind. His mind is made up and that is the way it is going to be.

The member would like to ask the question and continue to talk. I know that the hon. member on occasion appeared at committee. I once again commend to him the evidence of the public health experts. I would also commend to him the change

in technology since the hon. member made that statement in 1976.

Would he only deal with a doctor who used technology that was locked in time at 1976? I think not. I would suggest to him that with the change in information systems today, in 1995, 19 years after 1976, he might want to re–examine the statement made by the hon. member in 1976.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton has been belabouring the Americans again. I do not know what that has to do with our gun debate.

Since he has raised it, I would like to mention the situation where I live in western Canada on the prairie, very close to the U.S. border. We have great cultural similarities and great economic similarities with the people on the other side. We walk back and forth. As a matter of fact, we have more in common with each other than they have with drug dealers in New York or I have with silver spoon lawyers from Toronto.

Is it not interesting that over the last 15 years the homicide rate in the four northern states adjacent to the prairie provinces has been 16 per cent lower than on the Canadian side? It is 3.1 per hundred thousand per year on the Canadian side and 2.7 on the American side. Is that not interesting? Of all the states in the union, these are the four that have the most wide–open gun laws. You can carry anything short of a bazooka down there. But it is not a great big shooting gallery where they run around shooting one another. There is a cultural factor, which this government never takes into consideration, and it should.

• (1720)

I believe the hon. member has a few seconds to respond.

Mr. Gallaway: Mr. Speaker, I understand why the hon. member opposite thought I was only talking about the Americans. I was trying to draw a distinction. However, having regard to his seatmate, I understand why he could not hear me.

It is very easy to take a very localized area and say that the statistics are different. We are not talking about a registry system that applies in the city of Ottawa or in the city of Calgary; we are talking about a national system. It is very easy to distort reality with these numbers. For example, in the city of Washington, where they have very stringent gun controls, they have an extremely high murder rate but a much lower suicide rate. How would they explain that? It is because you cannot take a localized area—

An hon. member: They don't live long enough to contemplate suicide.

Mr. Grubel: Can you explain that?

Mr. Gallaway: I really appreciate the question and I would appreciate an attempt to answer it.

They have a localized area and they are trying to extend that to a national number. The member opposite knows that is false and misleading.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–68 has one simple objective: to reduce death and injuries by firearms. Despite the views of a small and strident gun lobby, which I wish to emphasize does not speak for the majority of Canadians, this bill does not in any way support a hidden agenda on the part of this government to confiscate legally owned firearms or to sanction police state actions against the private dwelling houses of Canadians.

What this act does is limit in some measure access to firearms to people who are qualified, responsible, and knowledgeable about their proper use and storage. The numbers speak for themselves. Nearly 40 per cent of domestic homicides involve firearms. Most of the victims are women and children. Where firearms are used in homicides, 85 per cent were committed with long guns, the vast majority being legally owned.

The risk of death from a firearm discharge in Canada is almost equal to the risk of death from a motor vehicle crash: 2.37 deaths per 10,000 firearms possessed, versus 2.4 per 10,000 registered motor vehicles in 1990.

The opposition to this bill has been intense. They say that guns do not kill, people do. Simply put, people with guns kill, and they do so with frightening efficiency. Let us look at the suicide stats. Suicide attempts involving guns have a 7 per cent survival rate. Where guns are not involved the survival rate rises to 65 per cent.

The opponents of gun control say that if someone really wants to commit suicide they will find a way. However, experts on suicide prevention appearing before the committee testified to the contrary. Suicide is an impulsive act. Even a short delay will often give the person the chance to reconsider, and they often do. Therefore, limiting or delaying access to firearms can and will save lives.

It will come as no surprise that those areas of Canada where firearm ownership is highest also displayed the highest rates of firearm death and injury. Remarkably, these are the same groups that came before committee seeking an exemption from this bill, saying that their traditional way of life was threatened. But I note that the member for Nunatsiaq said that this bill will not result in one less caribou death.

It has been argued that firearm homicide is strictly a big city phenomenon. In Canada this is simply not true. For instance, a study by the Northeastern Ontario Trauma Centre found higher rates of gun homicides in rural northern Ontario than throughout Ontario as a whole.

What about the notion of arming for self–defence? The idea has been discredited. In fact, studies show that people with guns in their homes are 43 times more likely to kill themselves or someone close to them than to kill an intruder. An alarming study by Dr. Scott of George Washington University shows that for every woman who buys a handgun for self–protection, 239 women are murdered by such weapons, many with their own weapon.

• (1725)

There was a very instructive study by the Swiss professor Martin Killias in a May 1993 article in the *Canadian Medical Journal*. Dr. Killias is very clear on one point: gun ownership directly correlates with gun deaths and gun injury. Noting that 27 per cent of Swiss households have guns, about the same incidence as in Canada, he writes: "Contrary to what gun organizations claim, Switzerland pays a high price for this. In suicide, Switzerland ranks third, just behind Hungary and Finland, but far higher than other countries." The reason for this is "the unusually high percentage of suicides committed with firearms".

Dr. Killias' conclusions are confirmed in a similar 1993 study of 18 countries for the United Nations Inter–regional Crime and Justice Institute. Countries such as Great Britain and Germany, which strictly control access to firearms, have much lower death rates by firearms than Canada or the United States.

Gun registration is the rule throughout Europe: in Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, Holland, Portugal, Spain and Switzerland. Canada and the United States are the exceptions.

What about public support for this bill? I have over 7,000 pieces of mail supporting this bill forwarded to me as an Ontario member by Wendy Cukier and Heidi Rathjen of the Coalition for Gun Control. I especially wish to commend these two remarkable women for so effectively giving voice to the concerns of such a broad cross–section of groups, including police organizations, medical associations, churches, women's shelters and transition houses, teachers federations, municipal councils, including my own, universities, boards of education, labour groups, provincial bars and legal associations and, most important, the overwhelming majority of the Canadian people.

One of my constituents, Dr. Henry Barnett, the most prominent neurologist in Canada, spoke to me about his colleagues south of the border, about their hopes for effective gun control and about their discouragement and their complete inability to effect legislative change in the face of the opposition of the National Rifle Association, America's largest and most influential lobby group.

Let us make no mistake, the American ultra–right are watching this debate very closely. This debate involves more than guns. It is about our way of life, our freedom. It is about the right of Canadians to say no to guns. It is about our right to decide how we want to live.

Opposing the bill we have primarily gun clubs, gun sellers, gun collectors, hunters and outfitters, native peoples, and the Reform Party. To further their own agenda or to protect their own economic interest, some groups capitalize on the fears of their honest and law–abiding members. These self–styled advocacy groups, these so–called responsible firearms groups, have engaged in a deliberate campaign of misinformation. Every time the government proposes gun control, these same groups come out. The same accusations are made: police state, confiscation. But the confiscations do not occur. The police do not come out in the middle of the night.

"Punish the criminal", they say, "not the responsible law–abiding gun owner". "It is just another tax grab". Let us not ignore the real cost of guns. When law–abiding, responsible gun owners kill and injure themselves and others, aside from the lost lives of 1,400 Canadians there is a very real dollar figure, $70 million a year in primary health costs and related public services in this country paid for by Canadian taxpayers.

They complain at the inconvenience of having to register, of having to fill out forms. I remember one witness who came before the committee whose daughter had been shot dead by a long gun recalling her response to a provincial attorney general on the subject of inconvenience: "Let me tell you about inconvenience. The death of your child at the hands of a man wielding a gun is an inconvenience. Do you know how many forms I have had to fill out?" I will always remember that woman's voice.

The cost to the gun owner is nominal. It is $10 to register up to 10 guns, no cost whatsoever to subsistence hunters. Is this an oppressive or punitive tax? Does this in any way impede the gun owner's right to use and enjoy his weapon? Not in the least.

Every time gun controls are brought forward, the same argument is heard: "You will destroy hunting. You will cripple our outfitting industry, on which our remote communities depend." The argument is a red herring. Gun control has no effect whatsoever on a hunter's decision to obtain a hunting licence.

This is Parliament's fourth gun control bill, and our hunting and sports shooting community is in fine shape. In fact, it is stronger, safer, and more responsible than its American counterpart.

• (1730)

We do have gun clubs but we do not have civilian militias. Canadians understand gun ownership is a privilege and not a right. The government is prepared to safeguard that privilege but only if it is clearly understood privilege demands responsibility.

Let us be clear the bill falls squarely within the federal government's criminal law jurisdiction. It does not admit to any exceptions in the application. The government in the interests of all Canadians must ensure coast to coast compliance.

In fairness, many witnesses did draw attention to provisions which if misinterpreted might result in anomalies. In response the minister again appeared before the committee to suggest amendments regarding among other things bona fide inadvertent failure to register, inspection powers and relic firearms. These amendments are fully detailed in the committee report.

I add my voice to the people in my riding and across the country who support the principle embodied by the legislation. It is my pleasure to give Bill C–68 my unequivocal support and I recommend to all members of this House to do likewise.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made Thursday, June 8, in accordance with provisions in Standing Order 78(2), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to the order made earlier today, voting on all matters required to dispose of third reading of Bill C–68 will take place at 6.30 p.m.

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

PEACEKEEPING ACT

The House resumed from April 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in second reading of Bill C–295. As members are well aware, the government has already stated its opposition to this bill in no uncertain terms. Today I will restate the government's main objections and explain why the bill must not become law.

Canada's support for peacekeeping is a reflection of our strong commitment to international peace and security. Our impressive record in this field is recognized worldwide. We have long argued our experience and skills are unmatched. As proof of our expertise Canada is currently at the forefront of efforts to improve the conduct of the United Nations' peacekeeping operations. We take pride in our peacekeeping reputation and we work hard to preserve it.

Unfortunately Bill C–295 if it were to pass into law would do irreparable damage to this reputation. This is a flawed, contradictory piece of legislation that would seriously undermine Canadian efforts to contribute effectively to peacekeeping operations.

The bill goes beyond consultation and seeks explicit control by Parliament of all peacekeeping activities. This would set a very dangerous precedent, for Bill C–295 would restrict the prerogative and discretion of the governor in council to determine Canada's contribution to UN or regional operations.

Under section 4 of the National Defence Act the Minister of National Defence has responsibility for the management and direction of the Canadian forces and of all matters relating to national defence including peacekeeping. The bill would remove this responsibility not only from the minister but from the government as a whole respecting military operations.

Perhaps the most serious repercussion of giving Parliament direct control over peacekeeping operations relates to the speed with which events unfold in the post–cold war world. The bill which calls for a five–hour debate prior to any mission involving more than 100 Canadian forces members would add another layer to the decision making process. As a result it would limit Canada's ability to respond quickly to UN peacekeeping requests or to changes in the actual peacekeeping mandate.

• (1735)

The need for quick deployment in peacekeeping operations cannot be overstated. We have heard again and again how a more rapid response by the international community might have saved tens of thousands of lives in Rwanda.

Bill C–295 if anything would increase reaction time, making it even more difficult to respond to such crisis. The bill would also hamper current efforts by the ministers of national defence and foreign affairs to improve the UN's rapid reaction capability and to find ways Canada might contribute to such a capability.

In short, the bill sends the wrong message to our partners at a time when we are leading the way in promoting new methods to enhance the UN's ability to prevent and resolve conflict.

If Canada is to remain an effective peacekeeper the authority to deploy and operate peacekeeping forces must stay in the hands of the governor in council. The government has the expertise and experience to decide, sometimes on a moment's notice, whether troops should be deployed and how they should operate. Although it welcomes the advice of Parliament, the

government must have the flexibility and some measure of independence to make these decisions.

In effect while Bill C–295 would like to see Canada define its own objectives for specific peacekeeping missions and decide when those objectives are met, it is willing to place Canadian commanding officers under UN or other international command. This is unacceptable. Currently Canadian forces personnel serving on peacekeeping operations are always commanded by a Canadian. While they can be placed under operational control of multinational commanders for specific tasks they are never put under command of the UN or other international organizations. If they were, their assigned tasks would be changed. Their units could be split up and they could be deployed to new areas of operations, all without consent of the Canadian government. This would be unacceptable.

At present all Canadian contingent commanders are directly responsible to the chief of the defence staff for the Canadian contribution to the overall mission and tasks of a peacekeeping force. Bill C–295 would end this practice which would ultimately mean less, not more national control. This does not seem to fit the general intent of the bill which suggests many of these concepts have not been fairly thought out.

Such muddled thinking carries over to the sections of the bill dealing with rules of engagement and the use of force. Subsection 5(3) authorizes the use of deadly force only in self–defence and in defence of civilians threatened with deadly force or else to stop serious human rights abuses.

However, it is important to understand peacekeepers may use force to protect civilians only if it is specifically authorized by a United Nations security council resolution. At the same time, the UN mandate may also require the use of force for reasons other than those specified in subsection 5(3).

In other words, rules of engagement must take into account the specifics of the mandate. They cannot be restricted by legislation that turns a blind eye to such details.

• (1740)

The bill is murky and confusing in other areas. It would amend the National Defence Act so that all members of the Canadian forces assigned to a peacekeeping mission would be on active service for all purposes. However, this proposal is unnecessary because pursuant to Order in Council 1989–583, April 6, 1989, all regular force members anywhere in or beyond Canada and all reserve force members beyond Canada are currently on active service.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A couple of the government speakers have pointed out to me an error I made in the drafting of the bill. At line 31 of page 3, I used the words "command of the United Nations" when I meant to use "operational control". I wonder if there would be unanimous consent for the following. I move:

That, in line 31 of subclause 6(2) of Bill C–295, the Peacekeeping Act, the word "command" be struck out and replaced by "operational control".

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit that change in the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to participate in the debate on Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof.

I would remind you that the Bloc Quebecois has already expressed its support, with a few reservations, for this bill by our colleague for Fraser Valley East.

I would like to recall the exceptional participation by Canadians, and particularly francophones, in UN peacekeeping operations since they started in 1956 at the initiative of Lester B. Pearson.

I would also take the opportunity afforded me to salute the courage of the Canadian military who, over the years and in the course of various missions, have taken part in UN peacekeeping operations. I salute in particular the members of the Royal 22nd Regiment from Valcartier. Their presence in the former Yugoslavia reminds me that the horrors of this Bosnian conflict are felt right here at home. I want to offer all my moral support to the men and women who are over there and to their families here, who are feeling doubt and uncertainty but also pride.

These peacekeeping missions are not what they were 40 years ago. They are constantly changing. They are increasingly costly in human and material terms, and their objectives are ever more in doubt. The role of peacekeepers is also being questioned. Should the deployment of international troops be faster and easier or, on the contrary, should UN peacekeeping operations be limited? Should UN peacekeepers have broader mandates?

Recent conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Rwanda have made the international public more aware of peacekeeping activities, but they mainly brought to light the flawed rules of engagement for UN peacekeepers, and perhaps also the Canadian government's lack of responsibility in refusing to set clear peacekeeping objectives.

Yet, these operations were once quite simple. The peacekeepers' job was to come between the warring factions in order to keep the peace and foster the resolution of conflicts. But peacekeeping operations have changed a great deal since the

1956 Suez crisis, while humanitarian efforts have become much more important in recent years.

The rise in ethnic conflicts since the tensions between East and West have disappeared have turned peacekeeping missions into dangerous operations in which peacekeepers are caught in the middle of heavy fighting. Of course, the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the end of the cold war have given us an opportunity to contribute to the advancement of democracy and human rights. But this should not be done blindly.

Unfortunately, the new complexity of peacekeeping mandates did not go hand in hand with public acceptance. The Canadian Forces' traditional role on the international stage has always been to support peacekeeping missions by contributing troops. However, the time for unconditional participation in every UN operation may be over.

• (1745)

As some say, Canada is not the 9–1–1 of the planet. It is our view, in the Bloc Quebecois, that Canada should make any future commitment subject to more definite conditions. It is also our view that the Canadian Armed Forces should be configured around a clearly defined role. The credibility of our actions depends on it.

In addition, we think that Canada should have a comprehensive review of its involvement in international security and peacekeeping. It should therefore review its contribution to existing military alliances, such as NATO and NORAD, as well as promote within these organizations a broadening of their role and mandate according to the needs of the UN.

While reviewing its contribution to global peace and security, Canada should support the setting up of a standby contingent that could be deployed with UN peacekeeping forces abroad. These organizations need to see their skills updated both with respect to preserving security and resolving conflicts.

The problem is that the Canadian government has no peacekeeping policy. As the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition asked last March, on what basis do we agree to take part in peacekeeping missions? No one can answer.

The Bloc Quebecois refuses to give the defence minister a free hand and allow troops from Quebec and Canada to continue to be sent on missions which are frustrating because there is no clear and definite mandate, and in which they are totally powerless to do anything about the horrors suffered by civilian populations.

Today, at a time when peacekeeping missions are becoming increasingly complex and their costs astronomical, while more and more lives are lost, clear conditions of participation are essential. The Bloc Quebecois hopes that the government will undertake to set out the conditions under which our troops will participate and their mandate can be renewed.

It is essential that conditions be harmonized with the UN. UN missions are hard, particularly psychologically, because their purpose is not clear. The government and the Minister of National Defence should provide more information to this House, they should encourage a debate on the issue, so that we can work together to find a solution to the impasse in which Canadian troops find themselves.

This is why the Bloc Quebecois supports this bill. It is essential that Parliament be informed of Canadian military activities abroad. As you know, the Bloc said on a number of occasions that Canadian participation in peacekeeping missions ought to be voted on in the House of Commons, following a short debate, time permitting.

However, the Bloc Quebecois feels that Bill C–295 goes way too far in terms of parliamentary control and is much too rigid. Clause 4 does not include any provision dealing with the situation where Canadian troops might have to get involved in peacekeeping operations at a time when Parliament is not sitting, such as in the summer for example.

Consequently, the legislation proposed by the Reform Party precludes the government from taking quick action in case of a crisis. There must be a happy medium between the position of the Reform Party and that of the Liberal government, which tries to restrict the role of parliamentarians to making speeches which carry no weight.

We also have some reservations about the role of the UN in defining peacekeeping operations. Clause 4 of Bill C–295 provides that a motion must be debated in the House of Commons to authorize the participation of Canadians in a peacekeeping mission, to specify the objectives and role of the mission, to define the state or the area in which the mission is to operate, to specify the date on which the authority is to expire, and to specify a maximum planned expenditure for the mission.

I remind Reform members that the mandate, the objectives, the area and the duration of each UN mission would not be an issue if a permanent peacekeeping force were established, since the parameters would be defined by the United Nations.

The problem exists today because the government sends, more or less automatically and without giving it much consideration, Canadian troops to every UN peacekeeping mission. So, the lack of parameters regarding the mandate of Canadian troops participating in peacekeeping missions clearly illustrates this problem, since the Canadian government seems unable to define the mandate and the objectives of Canadian participation in peacekeeping missions. Obviously, Parliament should look after that issue.

• (1750)

Do not forget that Canada's policy on peacekeeping missions must include a mechanism by which the peacekeepers' mandates can be adapted to the circumstances of the conflict. Unfortunately, the Reform Party is silent on this issue.

The fact remains, nevertheless, that Parliament should be in a position to periodically review the situation and the context of peacekeeping missions, in order to make decisions on whether or not to commit Canadian troops, or whether to extend or shorten their mandates. This is why we will throw our support behind Bill C–295, despite the reservations that I have already expressed.

In this month celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, it is clear that the international community and the government have to seriously review the UN's peacekeeping operations.

[*English*]

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government in its election platform made a commitment to better involve parliamentarians in the decision making process on foreign policy and defence issues. To that effect, House and Senate members have had the opportunity to participate extensively in the review of Canada's foreign and defence policies.

A number of debates have been held in the House over the last 16 months on several aspects of our international relations. These debates have allowed members to express their views specifically on Canada's peacekeeping policy and operations. This is why I thank the hon. member from the Reform Party for bringing in Bill C–295. It gives us another opportunity to give our views on our peacekeeping forces abroad.

The concerns raised in Bill C–295 are in part similar to those expressed in previous debates. They show that a more open and accessible decision making process in the field of defence and foreign policy is necessary. The government subscribes to the intentions which have motivated the tabling of Bill C–295. It is after all the responsibility of this government to ensure that Canada's contributions to peacekeeping operations remain efficient and useful and that they respect the financial situation of the country.

Bill C–295 generally calls for rigid procedures which would run counter to the need for the case by case flexible approach that has made Canadians successful peacekeepers in the past. Moreover the adoption of Bill C–295 which in its general outline borrows heavily from the American approach to peacekeeping would send a very negative signal to our partners and to the international community at a time when Canada is promoting new ways of improving the efficiency and the relevance of the UN in the field of conflict prevention and resolution.

The end of the cold war has seen a return to violent ethnic and nationalistic conflicts in many parts of the world. This reality coupled with the new co–operation among the members of the security council have changed the peacekeeping equation. Missions have increased in number and grown in size and scope putting severe pressure on the financial capability of the UN and member states.

Ten years ago Canada's share of the total UN cost of peacekeeping was $8 million. In 1995 Canadian assessment alone will be in excess of $150 million, not including the incremental costs of the Department of National Defence. This is admittedly a burden but it is also an investment in peace at costs far lower than were we to allow conflicts to continue unabated and uncontained.

Canada remains one of the strongest advocates of reinforcing the UN's conflict prevention and conflict resolution capability. We have been working with like minded countries at the UN to bring about reforms that will provide the organization with the political, financial and military tools it needs to fulfil its growing responsibilities.

Canada is conducting a study on a UN rapid reaction capability which will provide recommendations on how to make the UN more efficient and more timely in case of conflicts. We are also organizing with our partners peacekeeping seminars in the context of the ASEAN regional forum and the OAS. We are working with the OAU to improve the capability of African countries to better contribute to peacekeeping operations and preventive diplomacy.

• (1755)

On April 24 the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre officially opened providing the international community with a world class training facility in this vital field. Canada's credibility and efficiency in the field of peacekeeping came from its commitments to the UN and its reliability in time of crisis. Canada has contributed with distinction in most operations in the history of peacekeeping because of the foresight of its leaders, the flexibility of its policies and the courage and skills of its troops.

Bill C–295, despite the well founded intentions of its author, would prevent the government from meeting these conditions. More specifically, Bill C–295 calls for a five hour debate prior to any mission that involves 100 or more members of the Canadian forces. Given the complexity of the situation on the ground and the sensitive nature of the negotiations that take place between the UN, the parties to the conflict and the troop contributors, a public debate on a given operation would take place in the shadow of diplomatic activities. It would likely lead to general reflection on peacekeeping without addressing the

specifics of the mission being debated. In other words, it would not respond to the problem for which this is allegedly a solution.

Other avenues are already available to parliamentarians to express their views on the subject. The government will continue to ensure those views are taken into account when cabinet decides on Canada's contribution to peacekeeping.

Given the nature of conflicts in the current international environment and the speed at which crisis situations degenerate into open confrontations, debating each mission might also hinder the government's ability to rapidly reply to a UN request and deploy Canadian troops in a timely fashion. This is precisely the opposite of what the government is currently promoting and urging the UN, to be more timely and more effective in responding to crises. Both the defence review and the foreign affairs review drew attention to this issue.

Bill C–295, if implemented, would ask the Minister of National Defence to specify the objectives, duties and role of the mission as well as to define its area of operation. These aspects are currently defined by the UN Security Council after careful consideration and discussions with troop contributors. This is the sole competence of the UN.

Should individual countries decide to redefine missions, objectives and operational requirements this situation would lead to constant stalemate in UN planning and deploying. When an operation does not meet Canadian approval, Canada does not contribute. This was the case for instance in the latest UN verification mission in Angola.

Canada and other like minded countries have invested personnel and financial resources in order to ensure the UN fulfils its task in an efficient manner, observing the criteria and conditions which are necessary for countries contributing troops to participate in peacekeeping missions.

We continue to play a leading role in the establishment of a better decision making process in the UN. Recently we have succeeded among other things in obtaining a better consultation mechanism between the security council and the contributing countries at the early stage in the process of mission planning. We intend to continue to press the UN and the security council on this issue.

The bill also stipulates that the Canadian forces in peacekeeping operations shall be under direct command of a Canadian officer. This has always been the case. We do not need further legislation to ensure that provision.

The bill further allows for this Canadian officer to be placed under United Nations command. The government strongly opposes this suggestion. Currently, Canadian soldiers are under UN control, but the ultimate command of the troops remains with Canadian authorities. Such a practice prevents the UN field commander from using Canadian troops for tasks that have not been agreed to by the government.

Such a far reaching commitment appears to contradict the intent of the rest of Bill C–295 and demonstrates this proposal is not clearly thought out. I respect the author of the bill just tried to correct that with unanimous consent, but I think it shows how ill thought out the bill was.

Let me underline again the commitment of this government to open debate on peacekeeping issues, especially in times of scarce resources. It is important to reach a broad consensus about where and how Canada should contribute to the needs of the international community. The foreign and defence policy reviews and the debates in the House are tangible proof of the seriousness of the government about the issue.

• (1800)

However, Bill C–295 is a step in the wrong direction. The idea of providing greater parliamentary control over the Canadian contribution to UN peacekeeping is exerted at the wrong end of the decision making process.

The adoption of this bill would not shake the overall Canadian attitude toward peacekeeping operations. It would rather have the effect of confusing the decision making processes and limiting Canada's ability to respond in a timely fashion to UN requests.

Canadians remain supportive of our contribution to peacekeeping, as was demonstrated during the foreign and defence policy reviews and in several polls taken over the years. Canada should build on this past experience rather than move in the direction of this bill.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof. Bill C–295 is the peacekeeping act.

In commencing my remarks, I would like to address some of the concerns expressed by the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke as well as those of the parliamentary secretary.

Careful examination of the bill reveals that their concern of the ability of the governor in council to react rapidly is ill founded, in fact, specious. If we read the bill, it says that less than 100 people can be deployed for an indeterminate amount of time. More than 100 people can be deployed immediately without reference to Parliament for up to 30 days.

If Parliament does not agree that Canadians should have a say in whether or not their people are committed to peacekeeping operations and 30 days is inadequate, then Parliament, in my estimation, is not doing its job.

Bill C–295 should not be necessary at this time. We should have established long since an ability for Parliament to become involved in the deployment of Canadian forces personnel to life threatening situations.

I would like to go on record as commending the government. It is far superior to its predecessors in that it has had four debates to date dealing with peacekeeping. The first one was on January 25, 1994 and at that time there was all party support for Canada's continuing peacekeeping commitments. Following that, on February 17, 1994 there was a debate by the special joint committee on Canada's defence policy which also touched on peacekeeping and again received all party support.

The third debate on peacekeeping was in September 1994. Notice was given on September 19, with the debate on September 21, hardly sufficient time to adequately prepare and debate an issue, particularly when the mandate was to be renewed on September 30. In other words, it was just over a week from the time the debate commenced until the commitment was signed.

In December 1994 Reform laid down four stipulations which should be met if Canadian troops were to be left in the former Yugoslavia. These were that the airport at Sarajevo should be kept open; convoys should be able to proceed unimpeded; peacekeepers should not be interfered with and that a ceasefire should be in place and respected. As we all know, subsequent to that time these four parameters were all violated.

Using an opposition supply day, Reform forced a discussion on severe problems in the defence department. The Minister of National Defence, having belatedly realized his failure to schedule a debate on renewal of the Balkan commitment, tried to convey that the opposition initiated debate would constitute a debate on renewing our peacekeeping commitment. When that was not satisfactory to us, the minister called for a debate on March 29, 1995 with the commitment expiring on March 31, 1995.

While I commend the government for having held debates, I question the validity of their timing. If we are really serious about Parliament and Canadians having input in whether Canadian troops should be committed to life threatening situations, surely it deserves more attention than it has been given by the government.

I would like to quote from the red book where it says: "A Liberal government will also expand the rights of Parliament to debate major Canadian foreign policy initiatives, such as the deployment of peacekeeping forces and the rights of Canadian to regular and serious consultation on foreign policy issues". From that statement it is quite obvious the government is not keeping its promise so we have another broken red book promise.

• (1805)

If one wants to look at a newly emerging democratic country, my colleague from Nanaimo—Cowichan recently returned from a North Atlantic Council meeting in Hungary at Budapest. He found that although it is relatively newly into the business, civilian control of the military in Hungary is vitally important. More important, the Hungarian Parliament has far more control than does the Canadian Parliament. No Hungarian soldier may be sent on operations beyond Hungary's borders without the approval of Parliament. This ensures that the pros and cons of any deployment are debated and that the people are aware of the factors bearing on the involvement of their country in foreign ventures.

I ask the question: Had there been a full parliamentary debate prior to committing forces to the former Yugoslavia, would we now be in Bosnia and Hercegovina? I suggest that probably there would be at least 250 members of the House who would disagree with that initial commitment having been taken, going on the mandate that was not there and the fact that the achievement of peace was not a real desire on the part of the people involved.

There was no peace to keep and no desire for peace on the part of the combatants. That would have been brought out in debate. It would have become obvious there could be no appropriate mandate for the Canadian peacekeepers to become involved.

We need real debate, not a facade or smoke and mirrors. This is even more vitally important when one considers that peacekeeping is becoming more dangerous with every day. Canada, as the House will well remember, was once involved in all peacekeeping operations. With the reduction in the size of our forces, the financial constraints and the realization that Canada can no longer contribute to all, we must selectively involve ourselves in those missions that we know we can accomplish well.

UN peacekeeping has grown astronomically. In January of 1993 the UN had 12,000 peacekeepers in the field. Eighteen months later, in July of 1994, there were 80,000 peacekeepers in the field. In early 1993, Canada had 4,700 peacekeepers deployed. The number now has shrunk to between 3,000 and 3,500, but that number seems likely to continue. Canada is now providing 3.6 per cent of the UN peacekeepers.

With regard to command and control, I would like to return to the comments made by both the Bloc and the parliamentary secretary with regard to a UN standing force. They object to the unfortunate mistake of my colleague when he put command rather than operational control, but they seem willing to consider the assignment of operational command or control to the UN. I do not think Canadians are willing to see Canadian soldiers committed to a shooting situation or to a life threatening

situation based on a decision by the United Nations without reference to Parliament. Certainly I would not agree with that.

Canadians are the best or at least among the very best in the world of peacekeeping. Our peacekeepers are well trained, well disciplined. They are innovative. They are trustworthy. They are dependable. They are compassionate and proficient in establishing and maintaining good relations with all factions in the area of conflict. This is painfully evident when one visits Bosnia or Croatia. Our peacekeepers are trusted because they are known to be unbiased. They show no favouritism to one side or the other. This means that all sides trust their judgment and rely on them to be fair and impartial.

Someone said that more interpersonal relations training is required for our peacekeepers. There are very few, if any, of us who would not benefit from more training in this aspect but personal observation in the field has shown me that our peacekeepers not only do well but excel in their relationships with all factions in their area of responsibility. Possibly, because of Canadian qualifications, we should consider a different aspect of peacekeeping for Canada. Perhaps it should be our mandate or our best purpose to deploy quickly. We have the ability to resolve a situation over a short period of time and then withdraw, turning that job over to other peacekeepers: a first in, stabilize, establish a good situation and withdraw scenario.

• (1810)

Withdrawing seems to be Canada's primary peacekeeping problem. We can involve ourselves but we cannot get out. Canada had troops in Cyprus for more than 29 years. As a matter of fact we still have two people there. We have been in Croatia and Bosnia–Hercegovina for more than three years.

Bill C–295 would not hamstring government's ability to react quickly to pop–up crises because it applies only to the commitment of 100 or more personnel and to time periods exceeding one month. Furthermore, considering the seriousness of deploying Canadian personnel on peacekeeping operations, a parliamentary debate would seem to be the minimum acceptable approval required.

Should Parliament be in recess at the time of a crisis surely such a commitment deserves and would justify the recall of Parliament for such a debate.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C–295 on behalf of the people of Guelph—Wellington today.

I thank the hon. member for Fraser Valley East for his concern for Canadian peacekeepers. I know he is very sincere in this bill. I believe the bill has been introduced because of his concern and for the well–being of Canadian forces, a concern that is shared by the residents of Guelph—Wellington.

Canadians invented the concept of peace making. Former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in the 1950s. Our peacekeepers shared that same prize in the 1980s. We have always acted in the interest of maintaining international peace and security.

Many of my constituents have participated in peacekeeping operations across the world and have distinguished themselves in service to their country. For example, recently Petty Officer Second Class Martin Mollison received a mention in dispatch from the Governor General for his act of bravery while serving in Cambodia.

I cannot support this legislation for several reasons I wish to make clear to the House. As the hon. member knows, peacekeeping is carried out pursuant to the authority of the Minister of National Defence under section 4 of the National Defence Act. The minister has the authority with respect to the management and direction of the Canadian forces and of all matters relating to national defence.

The legislation changes the decision making with respect to peacekeeping deployment and therefore restricts the prerogative, speed and discretion of the crown to determine Canada's contribution to United Nations or regional peace operations.

The legislation would also remove the responsibility and discretion of the minister respecting military operations. This would therefore affect the speed with which we can respond to requests for assistance from the United Nations.

The legislation would also ensure it would take longer for Canada to provide assistance because it would add another layer in decision making processes which is a strange suggestion from a member whose party stands for reduced government and easier decision making.

The Reform Party's blue sheet states it supports a national defence policy that would provide a fast response to national or international conflict. By providing for a process that would subject the involvement of Canadian forces in international peacekeeping missions to parliamentary control the hon. member appears to be contradicting the support of a quick response which is central to the promises he made during the last election.

Chapter VII of the United Nations charter provides for action by the security council with respect to the peace, breaches of peace and acts of aggression. Under articles 25 and 48 of the charter, member states of the United Nations are required to carry out the decisions of the security council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The procedures proposed by Bill C–295 would restrict government from carrying out its obligations under the United Nations charter. All Canadians share the pride of knowing that we have contributed to world peace. While the armed forces remain small and the population is modest compared to other

nations, we were the first in peacekeeping and we remain respected because of what we do.

• (1815)

Peacekeeping is what we do well. We are asked to participate in missions around the world because other nations look to us for the expertise and skill required to perform the job of peacekeeping. Regrettably, we are often targeted by those who do not respect freedom and peace because we are, quite simply, the very best.

One hundred thousand Canadians have served in over 30 missions during the past 45 years. We have been asked because Canada has earned the respect and has acquired the skill to function as peacekeepers wherever we are required.

I find it troublesome to read that Bill C–295 would give up Canadian sovereign command of Canadian forces. As the parliamentary secretary said earlier, Canadian personnel serving on peace operations are always commanded by a Canadian. Our commanders are directly responsible to the Chief of Defence Staff for the Canadian contribution to the overall mission and tasks of any given operation abroad. The hon. member at this point has said that he has changed that. I am pleased to see that, because it was a real flaw in the bill.

The people of Guelph—Wellington are justifiably proud of our contribution to the history of peacekeeping. We support the concept of our troops promoting good relations and preventing genocide, acts of terrorism, and civil war. The Canadian flag has for many in the world been seen first on the shoulders of a peacekeeper in Somalia, Yugoslavia, Cyprus, and Central America. Our peacekeepers have served as care–givers, have rebuilt and maintained orphanages, and their families have organized food, clothing, and toy collections in order not only to keep the peace but to provide some comfort to innocent men, women, and children who suffer from acts of violence and war.

Many of those peacekeepers were born in Guelph—Wellington and have family in my community or they have studied at the University of Guelph. My constituents remind me that every peacekeeper is a hero.

The people of Guelph—Wellington want the overall control of our troops to be in the hands of the Canadian command.

Never before has a government so often sought the consultation of members of Parliament on issues of peacekeeping. We have on this issue, as we have on so many others, demonstrated our commitment to seek the views of all parliamentarians and their constituents.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence have listened and they will continue to do so. Actions have followed their seeking our advice on peacekeeping missions. There are times, however, when the government needs to act without delay. In our rapidly changing world, when nationalism and religious fervour have risen to increasingly dangerous terms, the need for flexibility is paramount.

My constituents will continue to support the government in promoting world peace and development. We understand the complexities of this commitment. We know that peacekeeping is not without risk. We also know that as the makers of the concept of peacekeeping its success will continue as long as we play a vital role in its future. The current system works well. It allows the government maximum flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this legislation. I thank the House for the opportunity to speak to Bill C–295.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on this private member's bill. It is certainly timely. I congratulate the hon. member for Fraser Valley East for bringing it forward at this time.

The current crisis in Bosnia has brought into sharp focus the need for Canadians to have clear criteria for the future of peacekeeping missions. That is exactly what Bill C–295 does.

Certainly we have heard in the House many times that we cannot go everywhere. We have heard that we have to be more accountable, we have to be more transparent, and of course we always have to be aware of the cost of such measures.

Let me review what has occurred in Bosnia to illustrate why we need a bill such as this.

Canadian troops first went to this war–torn country over two and a half years ago in the honest hope that they could provide assistance and humanitarian relief to the people of Bosnia. They also hoped to keep combatants apart and facilitate a negotiated peace for the region.

• (1820)

Unfortunately, these laudable goals were not backed up by a United Nations mandate that could get the job done. With no leadership from Ottawa, our peacekeepers have been left twisting in the wind.

Our peacekeepers are the best in the world and their service in Bosnia has been above and beyond the call of duty. They deserve to have modern equipment, a coherent government policy, decisive leadership from Ottawa, and a UN mandate that allows them to do their job properly. Unfortunately, the government has let them down in almost all these respects.

We have received most recently mixed messages. We have a defence minister who says we should consolidate, we should fight back, and he even condones air strikes. We have a foreign affairs minister who says let us leave it the way it is and hope we can return to the mandate, as long as they do not keep taking us

hostage and humiliating us. We have a Prime Minister who in effect simply tries to ride the middle and more or less agrees one day to go one way and another day to go the other.

We do not have leadership in this area, and we certainly are letting our peacekeepers down because of it. Meeting with people as recently as today, that has been reconfirmed by people who have been there as recently as two days ago. To begin with, the government has overextended our commitments to peacekeeping while simultaneously cutting back on the defence budget. The results have been most unfortunate. For example, we have troops who go out on peacekeeping missions with equipment that would be considered antiques by many nations.

Compounding this, we have Liberal defence cuts that have very much limited the availability of trained personnel. This means that for missions such as the one in Bosnia we have to keep sending the same people over time and again. How do members think our soldiers feel as they are posted back to Bosnia for the third or fourth time? What about their families? What do members think their reaction is when they see Canadian peacekeepers being targeted by all sides in that conflict? What do they feel, knowing that Canadian troops are regularly taken hostage at gunpoint by the very people they were sent to help?

We must decide what we are going to do, and this bill helps us to do that. We must specialize. We must pick our areas. We cannot be everything to all people. And of course we must make sure we have a clear mandate and the equipment to deliver on that mandate.

There is no peace to keep in Bosnia. There is also no humanitarian mission to speak of. The only thing the UN is successful at is being used as a pawn by the warring factions. The government should have recognized this long ago. Canada should never have renewed our commitment to Bosnia in March, considering the ridiculous situation our peacekeepers are in. The Reform Party warned the government and we asked for this withdrawal since before last Christmas, but the government did not listen.

Our proud peacekeepers were not sent to Bosnia to be hostages. They were not sent there to be forced to helplessly watch murder and torture, since their mandate does not allow them to stop it. They were not sent there to be shot at by the very people they are supposed to be helping to find peace.

The Bosnian mission has disintegrated beyond repair. While the government buries its head in the sand and wrings its hands in indecision, it is up to private members such as my hon. colleague from Fraser Valley East to speak for the people of Canada and to stand up for the interests of our peacekeepers.

Bill C–295 does what the government should have done long ago. Instead of trusting the safety and lives of our peacekeepers to the twist of fate, this Parliament must set down criteria to condition our involvement for future missions. These criteria should outline what is acceptable and what is not. This is what Bill C–295 does. Most important among these criteria is that Parliament have the right to choose what peacekeeping missions Canada will participate in.

It is not up to the Prime Minister to snap his fingers and expect that everyone will do what he wants. We supposedly live in a democracy, not a dictatorship, although the recent tactics of the Liberal Party on Bill C–68, Bill C–85, and Bill C–41 really have me wondering if that is true.

It is amazing that we are told, "If you do not agree with us, backbenchers, stay home. Forget about the people at home. The party knows best. We will take the message from Ottawa to the constituency."

• (1825)

We waste time talking about $2 coins and three most important bills like this are left for us to talk about in six hours' time on third reading. We keep all of these people in line by giving them travel perks, by constituency spending, and by committee activity.

Beyond the basic idea of parliamentary approval, members of Parliament will need specific information upon which to base their decision. Without knowing the specific objectives and duties of the peacekeepers, how can members know how to vote? Without knowing the duration and the maximum cost of the mission, how would Parliament decide on the best course of action? These questions will be answered if Bill C–295 is passed.

Another key aspect of this bill is that it clearly spells out that Canadian peacekeepers shall be neutral and not engage in combat. This may seem obvious, but from watching the crisis in Bosnia it seems like the UN has taken sides. This is unacceptable. You cannot join the war you are intending to stop. This is why we have concerns about the strike force, about the whole concept of that strike force and what it is going to do. I guess we would have to applaud the government on the go slow action of recommending our involvement in this whole strike force idea. To escalate the war is certainly moving further and further away from the mandate, which we do not believe exists there any longer.

Another vitally important criterion for the good of our peacekeepers involves the reasonable use of force. Again referring to the ridiculous situation in Bosnia, we see how this has been a major failing in the past. We have had troops that have not been able to defend themselves properly. We also have troops who have been forced to watch helplessly as civilians were massacred because their mandate did not allow them to do anything

to stop it. Bill C–295 deals with this problem and spells out some very—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fraser Valley East has brought forward legislation in the area of what under our constitutional system is left to good judgment and good sense. It takes us a step toward the American constitution, constitutionalizing these areas of discretionary judgment. Yet of course the experience with the American constitution is that when it comes to issues like the Vietnam War it does not prevent the United States sliding into that, in spite of the constitutional provisions.

Reference has been made to eastern European experience. I was interested myself in the Russian constitution and the careful separation of powers now provided and the control by parliament over the military. Of course in Russia the newly written constitution has not stopped it from being embroiled in the conflict in the Caucasus.

It is a mistake to imagine that legislation can cover these issues of prerogative power. In those constitutions that have done it, alternative glosses are simply developed.

I thought we had a valuable debate here in the last few months. I do remember the undertaking given on the government side to consult with Parliament. When I went to the committee on defence this afternoon I had the privilege of sitting in and speaking there. I was reminded of our extraordinary good sense and that we have profited by experience. The failure in Somalia was a failure of judgment by the previous government. It did not study the geography; it did not study the military logistical base for support, and it paid the error of that misjudgment.

These are matters about which I think we can say that we in Canada are better informed today. I think several successive debates in this House have brought an understanding on both sides that it is something to go into seriously, that we understand the limits of peacekeeping, that we will not creep into peacemaking type political actions under the guise that it is classical peacekeeping as Canada has conceived and that where we send our people in we will make sure their mission is adjusted to the realities of the military logistical support we can provide.

What I am saying is I basically believe the system as it now exists will involve a proper and full consultation with Parliament from now on. We are anxious for advice. We are all committed to no more Somalias but to continuing in the Pearson tradition where we can be useful. Somebody cited Cyprus. We can be proud of Cyprus. We have kept the peace there and that is the model we will all be following in the future.

• (1830)

I commend the member opposite for his initiative. However, I do believe it is covered under the powers of the constitutional customs which we have developed and which have been very much evident in the past few months by the experience of the debate and the lessons we have learned in Bosnia.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

FIREARMS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, be read the third time and passed; and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order adopted earlier today, it is my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of third reading of Bill C–68, an Act respecting firearms and other weapons.

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 276*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Cummins
de Jong	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger

Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—57

Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Schmidt
Silye
Solomon
Stinson
Taylor
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Beauce)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Comuzzi
Crête
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Cohen
Collins
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lalonde
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)

Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Ringuette–Maltais
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
Skoke
St–Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—198

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Calder
Cauchon
Crawford
Dupuy
Gagnon (Québec)
Laurin
Mercier
Ouellet

Bachand
Canuel
Copps
Deshaies
Easter
Guimond
Marchand
O'Reilly
Proud

• (1900)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(*Division No. 277*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Beauce)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Irwin
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lalonde
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sheridan
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
White (North Vancouver)
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—192

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Iftody
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Schmidt
Serré
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Taylor
Ur
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood—63
Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Collins
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McLaughlin
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Solomon
Steckle
Strahl
Thompson
Wayne
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Calder
Cauchon
Crawford
Dupuy
Gagnon (Québec)
Laurin
Mercier
Ouellet
Bachand
Canuel
Copps
Deshaies
Easter
Guimond
Marchand
O'Reilly
Proud

• (1910)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–41, an act to to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: We are now at report stage of Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof.

[*Translation*]

There are 25 motions in amendment in the *Order Paper* at the report stage of Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are substantially similar to an amendment previously moved and defeated in committee. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(5) they have not been selected. The other motions will be grouped for debate as follows.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 1, Motions Nos. 3 and 4.

[*English*]

Group No. 2, Motions Nos. 5 to 17 inclusive.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 3, Motions Nos. 18 and 20.

Group No. 4, Motion No. 19.

Group No. 5, Motion No. 21.

[*English*]

Group No. 6, Motions Nos. 22, 23 and 25.

Group No. 7, Motion No. 24.

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the table in case members want to check them. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

I shall now propose the motions in Group No. 1.

• (1915)

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 42, on page 4, lines 1 to 45, on page 5, lines 1 to 45, on page 6 and lines 1 to 40, on page 7.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): moved

Motion No. 4

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended in the French version, by replacing line 42, on page 5, with the following:

"de la personne peut être conservé par le corps de".

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the first amendment of my caucus to Bill C–41. However, before I do so, I wish to point out that my colleagues and I listened very intently to all the witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice. We made every attempt to reflect the opinions of these people in the amendments we introduced during clause by clause consideration of the bill. The amendments put forward today are based on the sentiments expressed to us from both the committee testimony and the thousands of letters we have received from all across Canada.

Reform members of the Standing Committee on Justice paid particular attention to the view of the Canadian Police Association on Bill C–41, an authority the justice minister often cites as one of the major supporters of his gun control legislation. In its brief to the committee the Canadian Police Association stated:

> Bill C–41 with few exceptions is unwieldy, complicated, internally self–contradictory, duplicitous and, what is worse in almost all of it, completely unnecessary for anyone with any knowledge of or use for the common law heritage of Canada.

It went on to say:

> While it would attempt to codify basic sentencing principles eliminating this most basic judicial discretion, at the same time it would bestow huge new discretionary powers to a whole range of persons within the justice system. The common thread in those new powers is that all are to the benefit of the offender in the sense of non–custodial consequences for criminal actions.
>
> Where sentencing reform calls for protection this bill offers platitudes. Where it calls for clarity it offers confusion and outright hypocrisy. It will almost certainly cause the already skyrocketing criminal justice budget to expand further still.

That is what the Canadian Police Association had to say about the bill. I could not have better summarized Bill C–41. We have to wonder why the Minister of Justice so readily embraced the support of the Canadian Police Association for Bill C–68 and totally ignored its opposition to Bill C–41.

Our first amendment is to delete section 717 of Bill C–41. Through this section the government has introduced a program of alternative measures to incarceration. This is the Liberal government's response to overcrowding in Canada's prisons. Rather than deal with the cause of crime, something Reform has been urging the government to do for some time, the Liberals choose to provide alternatives to putting criminals in prison.

We would not have objected so vehemently to this section of Bill C–41 if the government had specified which offences may be subject to alternative measures. We could support the use of alternative measures for specific non–violent offences to reduce expensive court procedures and incarceration. However no such specifications appear in Bill C–41.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and Victims of Violence recommended section 717 be amended to "restrict the availability of the program to persons who have committed less serious offences and first time offenders". Specifically reflecting the opinions expressed by these witnesses, Reform introduced an amendment during clause by clause consideration to limit the use of alternative measures. Our amendment was defeated.

• (1920)

The government failed to describe in the bill what may or may not constitute an alternate measure but rather has left this discretion up to the provinces. This has effectively granted broad discretionary powers to an unnamed source that is to be variable from province to province. This will create an inconsistency in the justice system of the country, something we can ill afford.

Reform introduced an amendment proposing that a set of federal standards be established for the implementation of alternative measures programs by provinces to ensure justice is consistent in Canada. Our amendment was defeated.

The discretion given in the bill to the provinces responsible for the administration of justice is not reflected in Bill C–68. When Reform introduced amendments during clause by clause consideration of the bill to return to the provinces the authority to regulate gun clubs and gun shows our amendment was defeated.

The parliamentary secretary said there should be federal standards for the regulation of these businesses. The inconsistency in the government's justice legislation clearly demonstrates that the objective of justice to reduce crime is not the motivating factor behind Bill C–37, Bill C–68 or Bill C–41.

Under Bill C–41 alternative measures can only be used if the offender fully and freely consents to participate, with no consideration being given to the victim. Reform proposed the use of alternative measures only after due consideration has been given to any views expressed by the victim against whom the offence has been committed. The rights of victims should always come before those of the offender.

We also introduced an amendment stipulating that these measures could only be used for a person who has not been dealt with by alternative measures before or has been previously convicted of an offence. Both amendments were defeated.

As stipulated in Bill C–41 it is not mandatory for records concerning alternative measures to be retained. Nor do the records have to be transferred to a central repository. This means when someone commits another offence that a previous offence which was dealt with by an alternative measure will not be available for sentencing in the second case.

One has to wonder how serious the government is about doing background checks on applicants for a firearms licence as outlined in Bill C–68. Because of this provision in Bill C–41 pertinent information regarding an admission of guilt may not be discovered by chief firearms officers unless they conduct lengthy and expensive checks into the records of all local police forces. Again Reform introduced an amendment making it mandatory for the police to retain records and for those records to be placed in a central registry. Again that amendment was defeated.

We therefore today move to delete the section dealing with alternative measures from Bill C–41. We have also introduced an amendment to delete section 718.2 from the bill which gives the courts the authority to increase or reduce a sentence for relevant, aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offence or the offender.

Reform believes this section of the bill is totally unnecessary. The courts already take aggravating and mitigating circumstances into consideration when determining the length of a sentence to impose on an offender.

We do not believe this section serves any purpose except to advance the justice minister's position that sexual orientation should be a protected category in the charter. We object to the minister's back door attempt through the bill to keep his word to provide added protection for certain groups of people and thereby create a semblance of special status for those groups. Rather than amend the charter and thus draw widespread public opposition, he is appeasing this group of Canadians by including the term in the Criminal Code.

Reform believes all Canadians are equal before the law. We do not accept that anyone should be granted special protection or status before or under the law and therefore move to strike this section from the bill.

I am appalled the government has chosen to limit debate on this contentious bill. It had ample opportunity to bring the bill back to Parliament months ago when the committee reported it back to the House. The government obviously delayed report and third reading stages of the bill in anticipation of it being lost in the bottleneck of legislation the government is scrambling to pass before the summer recess.

It is quite obvious the government is afraid to allow Bill C–41 and Bill C–68 to sit over the summer, providing Liberal MPs an opportunity to discover how their constituents really feel about these bills. I have to question the confidence of the government with regard to these pieces of legislation. I therefore implore

members of the House to listen to Canadians and remove these sections from the bill.

• (1925)

Canada is faced with rising crime rates, escalating costs to administer justice and growing debt. The task of the federal justice minister is to deal with these problems in unison. That would be difficult but not insurmountable.

I place these considerations before the House.

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am looking to your guidance on a question with respect to the voting patterns you have just issued on the various motions.

Is it appropriate for me to mention this point of order now or would you prefer that I see you privately? I am somewhat confused as to item (k) in Group No. 2. I am in your hands as to how you would like to handle it.

The Speaker: If the hon. member would come to the Chair perhaps I could at least give him an opinion on how I believe it will be worked out.

In the meantime I would propose to continue debate.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 4 is on the French language. You may think that this is a little different, but I did not think either that I would one day make a speech on the French language in this House. However, that was my only reason for putting forward this motion, as you will see.

The motion deals with the French version of Section 717.2(1), which, in my opinion, is not drafted in everyday, understandable French. Understandable it may be, but certainly not for the average person.

Since it is a very short paragraph, I will read it for you:

> 717.2(1) Le dossier relatif à une infraction imputée à une personne et comportant, notamment, l'original ou une reproduction des empreintes digitales ou de toute photographie de la personne peut être tenu par le corps de police qui a mené l'enquête à ce sujet ou qui a participé à cette enquête.

The French "qui a tenu" is obviously a literal translation of "hold". In French, "obtenu une photographie" means holding it in one's hands, although in this context it means keeping or holding it. That is why I moved my amendment aimed at substituting the word "conservé" for the word "tenu". A photograph or document may be kept but, as I understand it, it is held in one's hands. It is in that sense that, as I said, I was very surprised to realize that I now had to put forward a motion on the French language.

I should tell you that a number of my other motions are also related to the French language, as you will see a little later. I will not list them all at this time, but the French used here is often peculiar, as the Bar Association noted. In several appearances before the justice committee, the Barreau du Québec observed that the French used in the Criminal Code did not match reality.

I will now quote an excerpt from the Barreau's brief on another bill, but it could also apply to this one. The Barreau du Québec says that no one is deemed ignorant of the law. That, as we know, is true. They go on to say, "The law must, however, be intelligible. The genius of the language, although it has its own rules, does not rule out the Cartesian, concise approach that is essential to the proper understanding of statutory law".

• (1930)

As for Michel Sparer and Wallace Schwab, they recognize the fact that the implementation of these principles requires strong intellectual skills, for the writer must be able to move away from specifics and sometimes partisan views to take a broader, more global approach while at the same time being extremely succinct.

They add that the simpler subject–verb–complement structure which is preferred in French shows that this language emphasizes what English usually relegates to a position of secondary importance, hence the need to be careful not to translate literally and to rearrange in a logical sequence, as required, sentences that sound English.

Understandably, in view of how complex regulatory activity is, legal instruments cannot always be drafted in accordance with these guidelines nowadays. According to the Barreau du Québec, clarity must nevertheless remain one of the primary goals of the legislator, hence the value of drafting the French and English texts separately, a rule that the Barreau suspects was broken in this case.

That is a common complaint from the association. That is why I moved several amendments to Bill C–41 designed to make the French version truly consistent with what we call the genius of the French language. I hope that our linguists are listening in this evening, so that someday we can have French instruments that are understandable and intelligible.

[*English*]

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the motions brought forward in this first grouping.

Motion No. 4 was brought forward by the member for Saint–Hubert. I realize what the member is intending and has the suggested wording that would reduce the scope of the terms of the bill. The Department of Justice looked at this and felt the recommendation would be inconsistent with the use of the verb tenir elsewhere in the text. Therefore if we changed it here we would run the risk of putting other parts of the legislation in a tenuous position.

With respect to Motion No. 3, I am very surprised when the member for Crowfoot talks about cost cutting in conjunction with the Canadian Police Association and wanting to save money by doing away with alternate measures. The inmate population is exploding. The years between 1989–90 and 1993–94, four years, the federal inmate population increased by 17 per cent, with total expenditures in 1993–94 at $880 million for federal corrections and $990 million for provincial corrections.

The annual cost of holding an inmate on average in medium and maximum security was $39,000 per inmate per year for federal institutions and $35,000 per inmate per year for provincial institutions.

• (1935)

That indicates the dramatic increase in the actual cost of incarceration. The member for Crowfoot says we should not have alternative measures. If we do not start working toward alternative measures what we will have is people in incarceration costing an extremely large sum of money.

Many are in incarceration. One–third of the people in incarceration are there for non–payment of debt. We want to get away from that. Who is being punished in a case like that when we have people in incarceration for non–payment of debt?

In many cases they cannot afford to pay. It is of no purpose to put them in incarceration. The alternate measures have been in federal legislation for many years in the Young Offenders Act. The experience of the provinces in administering alternative measures programs has been sufficiently positive that they have asked us in the Department of Justice, the Minister of Justice in particular, to include similar measures within the Criminal Code for adults.

Deleting those provisions would go against a perfectly reasonable request being made by the provinces. The availability of alternative measures exercised under the programs authorized by the provincial attorney general within enabling federal legislation respects the division of powers between the Government of Canada and the provincial government and recognizes provinces are in the best position to develop and administer programs related to the offenders targeted by those measures.

The availability of alternative measures will better enable provinces to manage their costs in respect to court time and the use of correctional facilities and resources. It seems inconsistent that the Reform Party, which has focused much of its attention on bringing costs under control, would deny provinces the tool to better manage cases appearing before their courts.

Deterring and deleting alternative measures would reduce the scope of action available to the courts and to the provinces as they administer criminal justice and would not strengthen either this bill or the criminal justice system in general.

The member for Crowfoot, on behalf of the Reform Party, said he put forward federal standards. We want to have some kind of standards but alternative measures are looked at in different ways in different provinces.

The problem with the program is some areas do not have the facilities to provide the alternative measures. That is a severe problem and it means in some areas of the country alternative measures provisions or possibilities are either non–existent or severely curtailed.

We could say because of that we will scrap alternative measures altogether so they are not put in place anywhere in the country but that really does not achieve anything. It denies the people in the areas that have the alternative measures possibilities from utilizing these possibilities.

Also, we could say if one has created a certain seriousness of offence that person is not eligible. When we are dealing with cases, with human concerns and with human considerations, who is to say that where somebody who has been flaunted and taunted in incarceration would be better put back in incarceration than into a program where he would have to spend some time working in the community or for the benefit of the victims?

• (1940)

Also we want to be able to offer the program in a positive nature and to improve on it. We heard in committee that one problem with the alternative measures was that when young people were involved in this they were not being supervised. That is the case in some instances. We have to strengthen these programs. I think there are various ways of doing that.

It has also been stated by the Reform Party that we should have a central registry because there is no record of those who are put on alternate measures and we do not know if they have been before the courts before or if they have been on alternative measures. If there is no record the next time they appear it would be considered a first offence and they would be on alternative measures again.

That is not the case. It is not CPIC, it is not on a national computer but it is in local court files. There is a general record on alternate measures programs.

Alternate measures programs work in different ways in various provinces. It is used as a diversion program in Nova Scotia. Offenders are put on the diversion program before they come to court and a record of this is kept in the police files. In other provinces they appear before the court and instead of being sentenced after the case is heard they are put on the alternative measures program. The programs are working. Young people have been rehabilitated to prove it.

We are not saying we will have the same success rate with adults because the older a person becomes the less the possibility of rehabilitation, but we do feel there will be success. Quite often incarcerating these people costs the Canadian public up to

$100,000 per person in some instances, which is the case in some young offenders facilities.

The average cost of keeping someone incarcerated in a federal institution for one year is $39,000. If we can get better results or even if we can get the same results in alternative measures we should examine them.

We should leave the possibility with the provinces that want these programs for adults. We should give the learned judges and justices the ability to place people on these programs if it is deemed the best course to take.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard St–Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the official opposition critic on correctional issues, I take a particular interest in this bill. In spite of all the controversy surrounding this issue, the time has come to update and adapt our criminal justice system to the modern reality.

The efforts made to reform the sentencing process in Canada span a number of years and have required enormous human and financial resources. For the first time, we have an opportunity to give concrete expression to these efforts and to implement recommendations made by numerous commissions in their reports. Such a reform requires an objective review of the current situation, as well as the development of an original model for the future.

Several recent studies come to conclusions which confirm the need to reform Canada's criminal justice system. Let me mention a few. First, it is fairly safe to say that Canada puts too many people in jail for periods which are too long. Second, contrary to popular belief and to what some may claim, the crime rate, particularly for violent crimes, has not increased in Canada. Studies covering the period between 1988 and 1993 show that these rates remained essentially the same throughout that period. In fact, the rate for violent crimes has dropped slightly since 1991.

• (1945)

Bill C–41 is a true reform of the sentencing process, and only such a reform will solve some of the crucial problems which have been surfacing in recent years. Instinctively, and also because of fear, society has always been in favour of imposing long terms of imprisonment on criminals. Yet, it is established that such long periods of incarceration increase the risk of recidivism.

Consequently, public safety is not at all increased, quite the contrary. If we put offenders in jail for long periods of time, the problem will not be solved once they get back on the street.

Almost sixty years later, we finally have a chance to make amends and act responsibly, fifty years after the famous Archambault report, published in 1938, stated that we had a collective responsibility, and we have that chance in the form of Bill C–41 and, more specifically, the new section 717 of the Criminal Code.

Of course we could save a lot of public money by using probation instead of incarceration as part of the rehabilitation process. In Great Britain, where alternative measures have been used for years and are used frequently, this did not lead to an increase in the crime rate, on the contrary, since Great Britain has one of the lowest repeater rates in the world.

The government has spent millions of dollars in recent years on the construction and maintenance of prisons that in the end do not do what they are supposed to do. Incarceration has failed to meet its two main objectives: to punish the offender and to protect society on a permanent basis.

Overcrowding and double occupancy of cells have reached a critical level in federal penitentiaries, as the hon. member from Kingston pointed out a few minutes ago. If Canada were to build new prisons, they would fill up immediately. However, if we could find alternatives to incarceration, in the case of offenders who are not dangerous—the majority of the prison population—we would solve the problem of overcrowding in prison institutions. We are talking about more than 80 per cent of the prison population, in this case.

So before getting into construction programs that will cost many more millions, we should develop alternatives that are less costly, more cost effective and therefore more effective overall.

The average annual cost of community supervision for all provinces is about $1,500 per person on probation or parole, while it costs $80,000 annually to keep an inmate in prison.

Quite frankly, using prison sentences as the principal punishment for all kinds of offences is no longer a defensible option nowadays. Most offenders are neither violent nor dangerous. It is unlikely their behaviour will improve as a result of going to prison. Consequently, alternatives to incarceration and alternate forms of punishment are increasingly considered a necessary option.

Alternatives to incarceration are not a recent development. The principle has been discussed for half a century. And for half a century we have been marking time. I think it time we tuned into today's reality and for once took a step forward by adopting provisions that would enable us to develop alternatives to incarceration, as clause 6 of Bill C–41 proposes.

We are forever hearing that imprisonment is expensive and that the courts are too slow. Well, by adopting alternative measures we also resolve the problem of congestion in the courts. With these measures, minor offences may be handled by means other than formal and costly legal proceedings. There are two main objectives: to prevent subsequent criminal behaviour

and to attenuate any prejudice minor offenders may suffer in legal proceedings.

These measures also get the community involved and put greater focus on reconciliation between victim and offender. Alternative measures are already used successfully in certain provinces for young offenders. They may now be used for adults. There are many alternative solutions.

• (1950)

They do not involve just victim compensation, for example, the number of day–fines, compensatory work for non–payment of fines, and so on. There is a whole list of them, if you want to be more specific.

There are many examples of sentences aimed at the social reintegration of offenders. Therefore, first offenders or minor offenders will be taken out of the legal system. These measures will ensure public protection by reducing the negative effects of incarceration. The courts will have more time for more important matters.

It should be pointed out that this diversion process is only for those who admit liability for their acts of commission or omission when it is considered that alternative measures do not interfere with public safety and the interests of the victim, while at the same time meeting the needs of the offender.

Such alternative measures must be part of a program approved by the attorney general, his deputy or a person designated by the lieutenant governor in council. The Crown must be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to prosecute and the person charged must be informed of his or her right to counsel, on top of having fully agreed to participate in this program.

Imprisonment and detention should only be a last resort, when everything else has failed. Alternative penalties are a good example of a different approach to conflict resolution in that they attempt to minimize the negative impact on individuals, judicial red tape and the economic and human cost to society of many needless incarcerations.

To conclude, I will therefore support this bill, which makes it possible to take a step forward, and I am pleased that by passing these provisions on alternative measures we can show that we are able to be innovative in devising sentences which are more sensible and therefore more in line with what is needed at present in the correctional service.

[*English*]

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak to Bill C–41.

Once again we have a piece of legislation that simply does not do anything in terms of justice, punishment or dealing with the problems facing the country. When I look at the last two years, there have not been any bills passed in the House as far as I am concerned that do anything in terms of making the country safer, better for those individuals called victims who need the protection of our system. It just is not happening.

I am thinking of certain bills such as the one the member across the way put forth to eliminate section 745 which died and we do not bring it back. I could mention a dozen others. I am really upset that we are not getting good legislation that will give the effect the famous red ink book says it would do.

There is no measure in this legislation that causes me more grief than the government's attempt to deal with violent young offenders. We passed Bill C–37 which says that 16 and 17–year olds will go to adult court. Then we come out with a bill that is going to make the sentencing the same as if they were in youth court. It does not make sense.

• (1955)

Picture the family of a young mother standing by her graveside hearing words from the minister telling all who gathered how much this woman will be missed. Picture the tears sliding down the many cheeks of Canadians present and listen to their voices repeat over and over again: "Why did this happen?"

This picture is happening far too often to too many Canadians to be passed over by the government's attempt at social engineering which does little to prevent violent youth from believing that to kill someone they will be punished by this government. This government is using crybaby tactics to soothe the intellectuals who continually state that 16 and 17–year old murderers are too young, too poor and too abused to know the difference between right and wrong.

What does this government say the penalty should be for such sadness, hurt and brutality to victims, families and friends? According to the justice minister, if the murderer is a 16 or 17–year old, a slap on the wrist and a promise not to do it again is penalty enough. Remember, this is the same government that publicly stated it was going to get tough with ultraviolent young offenders. Remember, this is the justice minister who told Canadians that his government would not tolerate those youth who carry knives and hold no regard for human life or the feelings of those who care.

What did this minister and the government do to punish and deter 16 and 17–year old hooligans with no regard for others? In Bill C–41 the government proposed to punish 16 and 17–year old murderers by transferring them to adult court with a five year jail sentence. Maybe if the youthful killer was particularly violent and gruesome, he possibly could be removed from society for 10 years.

This sentence is ironically considered just as serious to the justice minister as his original punishment for law–abiding citizens whose only crime is hiding a firearm from the minister's scrutiny. The fact that this minister and this government

equated taking a human life with the heinous crime of refusing to file the proper paperwork with the bureaucracy is ridiculous.

This minister made fine grandstanding speeches on how violent, killing youth would be held accountable for their actions. This same minister and his government told heart wrenching stories of poverty, dysfunctional families and their effect on juvenile crime. Whatever the reason, there is no excuse for coldly and cruelly taking another life.

Let me remind those opposite that not all youth raised in poverty turn to crime, deciding a human life is a worthless commodity that can be snuffed out at a whim. Let me remind those opposite that many youth are not raised in ideal conditions but go on to work hard day after day, save their money, meet someone, marry, have children and do all the normal things. Yet this bill makes folly of those hard working youth who do understand they have a role in society and that they can achieve a better life by following the minimum expectations of society.

What does this tell the people of Canada who have day in and day out raised their voices in loud cries that they have had enough of 16 and 17–year old butchers being treated like victims of some social order—

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like some clarification from the Chair. It is my understanding that at this stage we are debating report stage Motions Nos. 3 and 4. I have been listening with care to the remarks of the member for Wild Rose and have yet to understand what relationship they bear to Motions Nos. 3 and 4. It may be that there is some confusion as to the stage of the debate. I wonder if the Speaker might provide some guidance.

The Speaker: Yes, the hon. member is correct. We are debating Motions Nos. 3 and 4. Many times members use a few minutes to set up their argument. I would presume that is what the hon. member for Wild Rose is doing.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I sum this all up at the end.

There are several things I know this government would like to do in regard to alternative measures, even with the violent people it is talking about and it certainly applies to the youth just as much as anyone else. I am talking about those alternative measures that may be applied to youth where we were going to get tough in Bill C–37. We were going to take 16 and 17–year olds to adult court, yet the sentencing and alternative measures the government is trying to propose in this bill do not seem to fall into line with what was proposed in Bill C–37.

• (2000)

Why should 16 and 17 year olds be excused for the most serious of crimes? If they are only one or two years older, what difference does it make when it gets that serious? Canadians are saying this is enough of this namby–pamby justice spouted by a bleeding heart government. Canadians say that the quality of mercy must be chosen when the right circumstances prevail, and murder is not one of those circumstances.

How dare we suggest alternative measures for a killer? How dare we even think that might be a good solution? Canadians are saying that if a 16 or 17 year old chooses to kill, he or she must also know that society will choose not to show mercy, that society will demand a grievous penalty to match the heinous crime.

Canadians are growing weary of a government that says one thing to a majority but follows the directions dictated by a small minority of ivory tower individuals who barricade themselves behind security systems and isolate themselves from the real world and reality and then say that young murderers cannot be blamed for their crimes and should be put on alternative measures.

I have had enough of this say everything but do nothing government. This has been going on for far too long. We see other clauses that come up in this particular bill and we have been trying to figure out exactly what we are trying to prove in our society. Consider 718.2. We would like to get rid of this section. We have made a list of people who are going to be treated differently than others because of their race, colour, creed, and now we want to add sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, while we are at it let us add fat people. I will tell you what happened in this House just a month ago. Someone sitting right over there said "Come on, fatso, let's go outside and fight". Rather than speaking to you, Mr. Speaker, about that kind of language, I decided I would meet him face to face and see if I could tell him not to do that. I am sure he will not do it again. It is a shame that I as a fat person would be left off this list. If we check, there are lawsuits throughout the country of people who did not get jobs because they were not built right or maybe because their IQ was a little too low. Why would that affect anything? Maybe some do not look right.

So let us take the section and get rid of it. For heaven's sake, do not add sexual orientation. That is the last thing we need in this country.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: We are still debating Motions Nos. 3 and 4, and I give the floor to the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief and will probably succeed in this endeavour.

In response to the motion introduced earlier by my colleague, the hon. member for Saint–Hubert, the hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys did not appear convinced of the need to amend section 717. Therefore, I took the liberty of consulting a dictionary while I was waiting for my turn to speak.

In fact, subsection 717.2(1) of the French version says the following:

> 717.2(1) Le dossier relatif à une infraction imputée à une personne et comportant, notamment, l'original ou une reproduction des empreintes digitales ou de toute photographie de la personne peut être tenu par le corps de police qui a mené l'enquête à ce sujet ou qui a participé à cette enquête.

The controversy centres on the meaning of the word "tenu". On page 849 of the general Larousse English–French dictionary, the verb "to hold" is translated by "contrôler et avoir la responsabilité de". The hon. member for Saint–Hubert in fact proposes translating the English word "hold" by the most correct French equivalent. I can very well hold the bill in my hands; but that does not necessarily mean that I will keep it for 10 years.

The aim of clause 717.2 is to enable police officials to keep records on offences. If they are to be kept, there must be some control. So, if I take the bill and put it in my desk, I am controlling it. It is archived, and I control it. I do not have it in my hands.

I understand that the English verb "hold" can include a number of things, but there is a specific term, which does not have a negative effect on other legislation. In using the French verb "tenir" in its strictest sense, we talk about holding something in our hands and having immediate and brief control, but we will hold on to it.

• (2005)

The hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys may very well hold his wife in his arms, but that does not mean he controls her. There is a difference between the two.

An hon. member: He wants to keep her.

Mr. Langlois: He would do well to hold her from time to time, if I may be permitted a little humour. I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary will agree that the magic of the French language and one of its beauties as well would enable us to bring the English and the French closer together. This is why I invite the hon. parliamentary secretary to see if this error cannot simply be corrected.

Excuse me for having taken my seat before I had finished speaking.

[*English*]

Mr. Nunziata: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, is there still an opportunity to speak to Motions 3 and 4, which I understand are grouped together?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Yes, there is. The hon. member for York South—Weston.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was not in the House because I was trying to seek some clarification with respect to this concept of alternative measures. I would like to address my comments for the moment to this particular provision in Bill C–41.

As I understand it, a person can commit a murder, a person can commit a rape, a person can commit an aggravated assault, and under this provision that person may never in fact be prosecuted in a court of law.

The section reads: "Alternative measures may be used to deal with a person alleged to have committed an offence only if it is not inconsistent with the protection of society and the following conditions are met: (a) the measures are part of a program of alternative measures authorized by the Attorney General or the Attorney General's delegate".

That means that we in this Parliament dealing with federal law are saying that there are crimes, any crime in the Criminal Code, if the attorney general for any of the provinces in Canada decides that for example we are not going to prosecute rapists any longer—you may say this is far–fetched and it will never happen, but the fact is that this amendment would allow that to happen. A provincial government somewhere in this country might decide for whatever reason they are not going to prosecute rapes any more and instead rapists will heretofore be subject to alternative measures.

What are those alternative measures? We do not in this legislation describe what those alternative measures are, what crimes will be subject to those alternative measures. In fact it says any crime. We do not know. Does that mean that a rapist, someone who is alleged to have committed a rape, can for example be diverted out of the criminal justice system and into some alternative measures? What can those alternative measures be? We do not know. This bill does not define what alternative measures are. This bill leaves it up to the attorneys general of the provinces.

I am sorry, but I do not have faith in attorneys general in this province to prosecute or to deal with serious offenders. They could very well say, using my scenario, that alleged rapists will have to do some community work, will have to cut grass instead of serving time in prison, or they might have to work at a day care centre. That might sound outrageous, but this section is outrageous. It is inconsistent with the desire of Canadians from one coast to the other to have strict laws to deal with violent offenders.

• (2010)

I can understand if we used alternative measures for non–violent offences such as fraud, robbery, someone who steals food, milk or bread, someone who is not a threat to my children or to

my neighbour's children. However this is totally openended. Any offence is eligible for alternative measures.

In effect what this bill would do is have a checkerboard system of criminal law in this country. If the attorney general for the province of Alberta decides no to alternative measures, there are no alternative measures in the province of Alberta. Everyone will be prosecuted under the Criminal Code. If the province of Quebec decides yes, we love alternative measures, we are going to divert everyone to the alternative measures scenario, then all of a sudden someone who commits a serious crime in Alberta will serve time in a penitentiary but if someone commits a serious crime in the province of Quebec he will be cutting grass somewhere and sleeping at the local Howard Johnson.

Members might laugh, but let me tell them that under section 745 of the Criminal Code there there is some discretion to the various provinces. In the province of Quebec, almost all those applicants, all those convicted killers who were convicted of first degree murder and applied for their parole ineligibility to be reduced, almost all of them have been successful. The going rate for murder in the province of Quebec is closer to 15 years. In the province of Alberta, where the attorney general takes a different view of these matters, the going rate for first degree murder is 25 years.

Criminal law should be applicable and evenly applied across the country. Section 745 is a clear example of what happens when one allows provincial attorneys general discretion in prosecuting in a particular fashion. There is no doubt in my mind that if this section is passed without amendment there will be a checkerboard system of criminal law.

If the government is serious about alternative measures they will restrict it to non–indictable offences. The hon. parliamentary secretary laughs and shrugs it off. I can understand—

Mr. Milliken: That is utter nonsense.

Mr. Nunziata: I can understand that there are a lot of prisons in the member's riding and he might be somewhat sympathetic to that element in society.

There is a danger in this section passing an inconsistent system of criminal law. At the very least, the government should agree that any violent offence cannot be diverted out of the criminal justice system. That is discretion that this Parliament should not give to anybody. If one is alleged to have committed a violent offence, whether it is murder, rape, aggravated assault, that person should be prosecuted in a criminal court.

I do not want someone who assaults my children or rapes my neighbour's wife to be given the opportunity not to be prosecuted. That is unconstitutional. Every Canadian under the Constitution is entitled to the equal benefit and equal protection of the law.

I would submit that this section is unconstitutional. It is not in keeping with what I have been hearing for 11 years as a member of Parliament. We need effective laws in this country. What this does is further tip the balance in favour of those who choose a criminal lifestyle. That is wrong.

• (2015)

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I should like to put one observation on the record about Group No. 1 that has to do with sentencing circles for aboriginal Canadians.

I do not really have a problem with the whole notion of sentencing circles, but there seems to be a grave anomaly between how we handle and treat young offenders in the system in an aboriginal sentencing circle and young Canadians who are not aboriginal in a similar circumstance.

As the House well knows, in a sentencing circle one of the primary motivators to change behaviour is identification of the perpetrator by his or her peers, aunts, uncles and other people who live in the community. In a sentencing circle the perpetrator is expected to make good to the community at large because he or she may have broken trust with the community. It is his or her obligation to make good to the community.

Why is it an important part of rehabilitation in the aboriginal community to identify young offenders to the community when in the non–aboriginal community anonymity is the very foundation of the Young Offenders Act? It just does not make sense to me that in the aboriginal community identification is a large part of the rehabilitation process and on the other side of the same coin in non–aboriginal communities which do not have the benefit of sentencing circles anonymity is a large part of it. In my estimation it makes no sense whatsoever to have anonymity as a part of the Young Offenders Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. MacLellan: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There were two motions in that grouping.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Motions Nos. 3 and 4 are in Group No. 1. We have deferred the division and Motions Nos. 3 and 4 will be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you might find unanimous consent of the House to consider that Motions Nos. 5 to 17 have been put to the House without you having to read them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 39, on page 8 and lines 1 to 15, on page 9.

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 39, on page 8, with the following:

"limiting the generality of the foregoing, evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused a position of trust or authority in relation to the victim shall be deemed to be an aggravating circumstance;".

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 8, with the following:

"vated by prejudice, or".

Motion No. 8

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 8, with the following:

"vated by bias, prejudice or hate, or".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended in the English version, by replacing line 30, on page 8, with the following:

"vated by prejudice or hate based on".

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 8, with the following:

"the actual or perceived race, national or ethnic origin, lan–".

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 33 and 34, on page 8, with the following:

"or physical disability, heterosexuality, homosexuality or bisexuality of the victim, or".

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended:

(*a*) by replacing lines 33 and 34, on page 8, with the following:

"or physical disability, sexuality of the victim, or"; and

(*b*) by adding after line 15, at page 9, the following:

"(2) For the purposes of this section, "sexuality" means, only, heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality and, for greater certainty, does not include a preference towards any sexual act or activity that would constitute an offence under this Act."

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 33, on page 8, with the following:

"or physical disability".

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.) moved

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended in the English version, by replacing line 33, on page 8, with the following:

"or physical disability, sexual orientation,".

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended in the French version, by replacing line 40, on page 33, with the following:

"garde d'enfant auxquels s'expose une".

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by adding after line 3 on page 8, the following:

"(i.1) evidence that the offender committed an indictable offence that consisted of a physical or sexual assault on or harm to the person of the offender's spouse or common law spouse or an attempt or threat to carry out such an offence; or".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20, on page 55, with the following:

"of a legislature."

• (2020)

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege this evening to speak to Motions Nos. 7 and 8. We are dealing with a very controversial bill. It is controversial because many Canadians have expressed concern about the intent of the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Pardon me, Madam Speaker, but let me explain before the hon. member goes any further with his remarks. I do not know if I should discuss this with you right now, but I have a problem. As I understand it, based on the Speaker's decision, my Motion No. 4 will be voted on at the same time as Motion No. 3, which deals with a completely different subject. Mine is about the French language, and the hon. member's about alternative measures. There really is no connection.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The Speaker has decided in this case that, if Motion No. 3 is adopted, it will not be necessary to vote on Motion No. 4. In fact, both votes have been deferred. As a result of the vote on Motion No. 3 being deferred, the vote on Motion No. 4 was automatically deferred.

Does this answer your question? The vote on Motion No. 4 has been deferred along with that on Motion No. 3.

Mrs. Venne: Very well.

Mr. Langlois: Madam Speaker, on a further point of clarification, just to be perfectly clear, before the hon. member for Ontario resumes his speech, which I will listen to with great interest.

My understanding was that the vote on the motion put forward by the hon. member for Saint–Hubert was deferred till the end. I can understand that. But if the motion put forward by our colleague, the hon. member for Crowfoot, is defeated, we will have to vote on Motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. member for Saint–Hubert in any case, will we not?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): You could approach the table. The Speaker's decision is clear. If Motion No. 3 is defeated, Motion No. 4 will be voted on. It was included in Group No. 1 only for the purpose of debate.

Mr. McTeague: Madam Speaker, I know that I have only 10 minutes to address two issues. I hope that I will be able to do so in so little time, and if I am, that will be quite an accomplishment.

[*English*]

I believe generally in the principle of equality. I believe that Bill C–41 is a good bill in general. It deals with substantive matters of sentencing and matters that we treated openly in the campaign.

However, the most troubling part of the bill deals with section 718.2(a)(i). I find it troubling because this section of the bill, which is a very small paragraph in an omnibus bill, attempts to treat the whole matter of hatred in a very superficial way.

This section has been presented as a means toward combating hate crimes by toughening sentences where it was not the case in the past. It gives members the impression that hate crimes are somehow going unaddressed in terms of our legal ability to respond effectively to the rise in crime and the incidence of hate crime.

The Canadian Bar Association before the justice committee made it extremely clear that without exception there were no examples where one could prove that people who committed hate crimes, whether against an individual or a person belonging to a group of individuals, did not have the book not thrown at them. It is with regret that I suggest the piece of legislation in section 718.2 is nothing less than redundant.

The level of support for the concern about the bill falls into two areas. My fellow colleagues from the government side will be able to speak about their concerns with reference to sexual orientation. My concern is of a much grander nature. It deals with the fact that we are saying in the country and in the bill that hatred is only significant when the characteristic of the individual is taken into account. I would submit that misses the very point on which hate crimes ought to be based.

• (2025)

Hatred is hatred. It is no more or less significant given who it is directed against. It should be a principle not only of Parliament but a fundamental principle of Canadians in general that hatred is something we should repudiate at every turn.

I thought I would at some point be able to bring forward Motions Nos. 6 and 7 to the justice committee. One of the motions would delete the clause after the words hate, biased and prejudiced. Those words make it so that hatred is more significant if it is only based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor. I do not know what any other similar factor is. Perhaps I could have an appropriate explanation of exactly what that means, but I say with some certainty that a judge reading any other similar factor would have difficulty trying to understand just what is meant.

I have looked to various applications of the legislation and where it will have its greatest impact. If we are serious about changing hate crimes, particularly as our red book suggested in terms of hate propaganda, ought we not to be correcting sections 318 to 320 of the Criminal Code rather than treating hatred in a rather cavalier fashion, in a rather superfluous or superficial fashion under an omnibus bill on sentencing?

If I had been given the opportunity to speak or provide some amendments based on good advice to the government during the committee period, I would have put forward the concern some hon. colleagues have expressed that other forms of hatred manifested against certain individuals would not be covered under the legislation.

I presented to the hon. member for Portneuf the prospect of hate based on language. I am pleased to see that it is here. Unfortunately I had to do that indirectly.

[*Translation*]

One of the things I noticed is that my position and reservations on this bill were expressed and reinforced by the Barreau du Québec. According to the Barreau, Canadians do not want a restrictive two–tier justice system that protects only some segments of our society.

On the other hand, some people have argued that there is no indication that the courts have been lenient with offenders motivated by hatred for these segments, groups or individuals in our society. In their opinion, as judges already have considerable latitude in the sentencing process, they often use this latitude to impose tough sentences for crimes they deem detrimental to society.

According to the amendment proposed by the Barreau, if the evidence submitted to the court shows that the offence was motivated by prejudice, the judge may feel that the aggravating circumstances surrounding the crime call for a tougher sentence.

Although I respect the Barreau's position, I am quoting these comments for the hon. members opposite, especially those from the Bloc Quebecois, because the Barreau du Québec, which represents all lawyers in the province, said that what was needed was a general rather than specific principle.

[*English*]

I am extremely concerned that the legislation, in its attempt to address hate crimes, will leave people out. I am not sure what motivates one to write legislation such as this, particularly section 718. However, if it has anything to do with political correctness, might I suggest that in exchange for political correctness we respond to actual legal need? Hatred is a very serious problem that ought to be treated more seriously in more appropriate legislation.

How serious can we be about nibbling around the edges? I am concerned about ensuring that we have a fair system of justice for all. The legislation almost ensures that in Canada we no longer can claim to have a justice system for all.

• (2030)

We are saying that it is more important for some hatreds to be treated more significantly if the person who happens to be the unfortunate victim of hatred is part of the listed group. I have cited language. I could also cite the physical appearance of people. The hon. member for Wild Rose referred to fat people.

This is a very political environment. Perhaps we could talk about hatred based on political considerations, people who hold political views that are different from others and who have been the subject of hate. How in this bill, how in this amendment, are those people going to find equal protection before and under the law?

The charter says that we are supposed to provide equality for all individuals. My reading of this section suggests that only some people, those who happen to constitute a part of this list, will be protected.

Many other concerns have been raised in the past about whether the legislation will be able to in some way thwart or deter someone from committing a hate crime. Those who are filled with hatred do not read omnibus bills on sentencing to find out what their punishment will be.

What they will know is that in every single instance without exception the justices and the good people of this nation who prosecute these issues have been able to find without exception that when someone commits a crime based on hate it is always treated as an aggravating circumstance. If this list forms the basis under which the law would find an aggravating circumstance, those left out could be considered crimes committed for which the judge would find at the point of sentencing to be of a mitigating factor.

We need equality of treatment when it comes to hatred. We need to make sure that we use the proper instruments to protect it and to protect those who have been its victims in the past and its victims in the future.

Not much more can be made more true than the fact that individuals from coast to coast expect from Parliament fairness and equality before the law. Bill C–41 is a long bill. It is an exhaustive bill. We must treat hatred in its proper perspective.

I urge all members to support my motions, justice for all.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, the motions on clause 718.2 of Bill C–41 represent the majority of the motions to amend tabled at report stage. Most deal with the question of whether or not the expression "sexual orientation" should be included in the provisions which relate to the aggravating circumstances to be considered when a sentence is imposed.

Motion No. 5, tabled by the hon. member for Crowfoot, is the most drastic one, since it proposes to completely eliminate

clause 718.2 in the bill. In so doing, the Reform Party would render the legislation meaningless, since it would abolish the basic principles and objectives of sentencing.

The principles stated in clause 718, which underlie the bill, are a step in the right direction. Indeed, we can only support a measure which seeks to contribute, along with crime prevention initiatives, to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing appropriate sanctions.

Moreover, the alternative measures provided in clause 717 regarding some offenders, that is the penalties other than incarceration and probation, are innovative measures which will result in fewer offenders being sent to jail, while also putting the emphasis on rehabilitation rather than incarceration.

• (2035)

Some motions, including those of the hon. member for Scarborough West, seek to introduce a comprehensive definition of the expression "sexual orientation" in clause 718.2 of the bill. The member actually managed to table several motions to amend which are essentially variations on the same theme, in the hope that one of them will somehow get through.

The debate on the real issues of Bill C–41 was sidetracked from the very beginning. Indeed, since the legislation was tabled, the debate has focused on the sensitive issue of homosexual rights. Under aggravating circumstances, the bill provides a list of prejudices motivating hate crimes, including the sexual orientation of the victim.

The judge must consider a hate motivated crime as an aggravating circumstance at the time of sentencing. The debate has been sidetracked both by the defenders of homosexuals' right to protection and by the extreme right that wants the bill's provision regarding aggravating circumstances to be dropped. I have received thousands of letters asking me to vote against Bill C–41 because it contains the phrase "sexual orientation". Our offices were flooded with these form letters. They merely reflected the opinion of a ill–informed minority.

Those who signed these letters actually wanted us to scrap a 75 page bill, containing a hundred clauses and representing a complete reform of that part of the Criminal Code that deals with sentencing, because it contained two words too many. Let us keep in mind that Bill C–41 does not create new rights. It is a sentencing bill, and therefore sets out parameters by which judges must be guided in arriving at sentences. Clause 718.2 in particular concerns only an accused found guilty and the criteria that apply to his sentence.

It is not the purpose of this clause to create rights for the groups listed therein. The rights of individuals are protected under the Constitution and other legislation on the protection of human rights. Bill C–41 is not a new charter of rights and freedoms, as several interested groups would have us believe. When a bill contains the term "sexual orientation", the meaning of the term raises many questions. What does it really mean? How should its meaning be interpreted?

In the Egan case, the federal court seems to indicate that a sexual tendency or orientation can be heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual. This case made a challenge under section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The court concluded that, although the Supreme Court has never issued an opinion on the issue, the fact that sexual tendencies can be invoked as motives constituting discrimination such as those prohibited under subsection 15(1) had become a matter of settled law.

On June 30, 1993, a little while after the Egan decision, the Supreme Court stated in the Ward decision that sexual orientation is an innate or unchangeable characteristic. This case involved discrimination against refugees and the protection of refugees. The Supreme Court accepted as a category persons who fear persecution because of gender, linguistic backgrounds and sexual orientation.

I would like to mention in passing that the Bloc Quebecois proposed an amendment regarding the linguistic traits of victims in committee, which was accepted. This amendment is in line with the position taken by the Supreme Court in the Ward case. But, you might ask, should we not clearly define the term "sexual orientation"? Since political correctness has come into style, the names of several minority groups have changed considerably.

• (2040)

The blind have become the visually impaired; the deaf, the hearing impaired; the mentally ill are now mentally handicapped.

Since language changes constantly, the designation of homosexuals has changed as well. In the 19th century, this phenomenon was referred to as sexual inversion. In the 20th century, this term was replaced by the word homosexuality. Subsequently, we had the terms gay and lesbian. Not so long ago, people talked about sexual preference. Of course, the gay community soon dropped this term because it indicated a choice or characteristic acquired by the individual and not an innate characteristic.

Scientists are now trying to determine whether homosexuality is not only innate but genetically determined. In a scenario that may not be that far down the road, we may have individuals with male or female genetic characteristics, plus homosexual genetic characteristics that would influence the individual's behaviour and thus determine his or her future sexual orientation.

Some people maintain this is a nightmare scenario, especially those who flooded the fax machines on Parliament Hill with strong protests against Bill C–41. The mere term sexual orientation caused a wave of panic. Opponents of this legislation

simply want to throw out an entire bill on sentencing because it supposedly gives more rights to homosexuals, which is patently untrue. Crimes motivated by hate or prejudice have a profound impact on the victim. They differ from any other kind of crime. The victim, attacked because of the colour of his or her skin, because of his or her religion or because she is a woman, suffers far more than someone whose wallet is stolen. That is what clause 718.2 of the bill is all about.

I will not support Motions Nos. 5 to 17, inclusive, except, of course, for Motions Nos. 9 and 15.

[*English*]

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House to speak at report stage on Motions Nos. 6 and 13 proposing amendments to Bill C–41.

Bill C–41, and in particular section 718.2, has been vigorously promoted by the government and the media as the hate crime legislation.

Let me remind this honourable House that section 718.2 is not the operative hate crime provisions of the Criminal Code. Rather it is the purposes and principles of sentencing which must at all times reflect the fundamental values, principles and morals on which this great nation, Canada, has been founded.

Section 718.2, as drafted, is unacceptable. It does not reflect the principles and values of the majority of Canadians. The specific inclusion of the words sexual orientation gives legal recognition and legal status to a faction in society which is undermining and destroying Canadian values and Judeo–Christian morality.

Such a special recognition of sexual orientation in the Criminal Code is an overt condonation of the practices of homosexuality which is being imposed on all Canadians. Bill C–41 has the effect of legislating a morality that is not supported by Canadian and Judeo–Christian morals, values and principles.

To endorse or to include the words sexual orientation in any federal legislation would confer on homosexuals the ability to obtain special legal status, allow them to redefine the family, to enter into the realm of the sanctity of marriage, to adopt children, to infiltrate the curriculum of schools and to impose an alternative lifestyle on youth. All these demands are encroaching on and undermining the inherent and inviolable rights of family and the rights of the church.

The family unit is the basic institution of life and the solid foundation on which our forefathers have built this great nation. The protection of families, family life and family values must be a priority with this government. Families have inherent and inviolable rights. Families have existed before the church and families have existed before the state. The rights of the family must be preserved, safeguarded and protected by Parliament.

• (2045)

Why do I as a legislator continue to make reference to principles, values and morals when debating Bill C–41? It is because section 718.2 refers specifically to principles. In the words of the hon. justice minister before the justice committee on Bill C–41 on November 17, 1994—

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order pursuant to Standing Order 18, which reads in part as follows:

> No Member shall speak disrespectfully of the Sovereign, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of the Governor General or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof.

As a gay man, the words spoken by the hon. member for Central Nova are deeply offensive, not just to me as an individual but to all gay men and lesbians in this country. To be accused of immorality—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I did not hear the hon. member refer to you as an individual. I stand corrected if she did.

Ms. Skoke: In the justice committee on November 17, 1994 the justice minister stated:

> But the second and I believe the more important reason for legislating is that one of the legitimate purposes of Parliament and of legislation is to allow the legislators to identify themselves with a principle, to take the lead and to show what the values are that guide us as a nation.
>
> We may have different views on what those values are, but this bill reflects the values and views of this government in relation to this matter.

I beg to differ with our justice minister on this issue. With confidence I say that section 718.2 does not reflect the principles and values of the Canadian majority. As of June 6, 1995 this honourable House had received over 83,000 signatures on petitions directly related to the wording of sexual orientation. Since September 20, 1994 I have received in my office alone over 10,000 letters, faxes and telephone calls confirming the views, values, principles and morality of Canadian people.

The media can attest to the interest shown in Bill C–41 on the issues of principles, values and morals. Talk show hosts, radio, television, newspapers, magazines and all Canadians are talking about Bill C–41 and its serious implications. No more. Canadians are not prepared to silently acquiesce in legislative change which will affect their right to speech, right to expression, opinion and belief, the right to freedom of religion and most important, the right to practise all those freedoms openly without fear of intimidation, coercion or criminal sanction.

Section 718.2 is incorporated in the Criminal Code of Canada. Whether the question of the purpose of the criminal law is approached from a retributive or a utilitarian direction, it is important to understand that the fundamental nature of criminal

law sanctions is punitive. The criminal law and the criminal justice system constitute the end point on a continuum of informal and formal customs, beliefs and institutions of social control, the end point in terms of the ultimately coercive intervention of the state in the lives of its citizens.

Simply put, the criminal sanction of section 718.2 will ultimately operate to elevate the existing Canadian legal test of tolerance to a higher legal standard whereby Canadians are required not only to be tolerant of homosexuals and their chosen lifestyles, but they must condone, accept and endorse homosexuality as being natural and moral.

Canadians do not have to accept homosexuality as being natural and moral. Homosexuality is not natural; it is immoral. Homosexuality must not and should not be condoned.

• (2050)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ménard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Up to now, I have kept from interrupting my colleague for Central Nova. However—and I would like some guidance from the Chair—I contend that associating homosexuality with immorality strikes a blow at a large sector of society and is therefore unparliamentary. I would ask the member for Central Nova—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, but that is a matter of debate.

Mr. Ménard: Is the word immoral acceptable, Madam Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): These words are not directed at anyone in particular.

[*English*]

Ms. Skoke: Madam Speaker, justice, law and morality are inseparable. In our country Canada, we cannot have laws unless our laws are just and moral.

The preamble to the Canadian Constitution set forth in the Constitution Act recognizes the supremacy of God and the rule of law. The recognition of the supremacy of God entrenches into the Constitution natural law. Therefore the laws of our country must not contravene natural law for to do so the laws would be ultra vires or unconstitutional.

A strict legal approach to section 718.2 will disclose that this section is seriously flawed and unconstitutional. There are many unanswered legal questions regarding section 718.2. The words hate, prejudice and bias are undefined. Hate is an emotion; bias and prejudice are beliefs. The charter guarantees freedom of conscience, expression, opinion, belief and religion.

In practicality, when the court employs section 718.2 in determining whether motivation is on the basis of hate, prejudice or bias as an aggravating factor, I ask this honourable House what legal test shall be applied? Is it an objective test or a subjective test? If it is subjective, whose subjectivity is applied, the subjectivity of the victim or the subjectivity of the accused?

If sexual orientation is included in the list of section 718.2, what is the operative legal definition of sexual orientation and how can one identify the sexual orientation of another? What legal test will be applied by the judge and will such a test be based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation of the victim? Where in Canadian law can an accused person be sentenced for a crime without having first been charged, tried and convicted of the said crime?

Section 718.2 is a double jeopardy provision of Bill C–41 which is unconstitutional. Its effect clearly sentences an individual for hate motivation without the individual having been charged under the hate crime provisions of the Criminal Code. This is unacceptable in Canada. It contravenes the charter guarantees of the right to be charged with an offence known in Canadian law and the right to be tried in accordance with the fundamental principles of justice.

Section 718.2 violates the equity sections of the charter, in particular section 15, which states that every Canadian is equal before and under the law. The list of factors provided for in section 718.2 creates an inequity in law which must not be tolerated. Since every Canadian is equal before and under the law, then a list of categories is unnecessary and restrictive.

The hon. member for Ontario has proposed an amendment to delete the list. I support Motions Nos. 7 and 8. I do not support the inclusion of the words sexual orientation in Bill C–41 or in any federal legislation. I ask this honourable House to support my position by voting in support of my specific amendment, Motion No. 13, which will specifically exclude the words sexual orientation from section 718.2.

I further challenge this honourable House to carefully consider section 718.2 and to examine its constitutional validity and its effect upon the charter guarantees afforded to all Canadians. Before this House is Motion No. 6, a general amendment to Bill C–41 which will delete section 718.2 in part and I ask for support from this honourable House.

In conclusion I cannot support any federal legislation that includes the words sexual orientation particularly in the Criminal Code of Canada. To do so would be to utilize a criminal sanction to afford special legal status to homosexuals and to give legal recognition to a faction in our society which is undermining and destroying our Canadian values, principles and morals.

• (2055)

Over the past 25 years Parliament has been encroaching upon and undermining the inherent and inviolable rights of the family, the right to life and the rights of the church. Section 718.2 is just another example of this.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is difficult to know where to begin in response to the comments of the last speaker. As one who is among those she has accused of seeking to undermine and destroy the Canadian society, as one she has described as immoral and unnatural, and as a member of a community of gay men and lesbians whom she has similarly slandered with her hatred—

Mr. Wappel: Madam Speaker, on a point of order I refer you to Standing Order 18 where it states that no member may use offensive words against any member. The hon. member has accused the hon. member for Central Nova of slander. That is a direct accusation against a member of this House. I ask you to call the member to order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I will ask the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway to withdraw his comments.

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, the previous speaker was clearly making reference to a community. In responding—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I believe the standing order as read is quite specific. Would you please withdraw your words. They were directed at a member.

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I will withdraw any personal references to the hon. member but certainly with respect to the point—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Fine. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ménard: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. When you take part in a debate you are responsible for the words you utter. I know that, like all the members of this House, you are particularly sensitive to the words reported.

I would just like to understand your decision and draw to your attention that the remarks our colleague made in her opening words to her debate are what she actually said. If I may, I—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Order. I have already made a decision on the point of order. The member referred directly to a member of this House, which is not done, while the other member referred to a group in society.

[*English*]

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, obviously what we are seeing here is that if one hon. member in the course of debate were to refer to black people hypothetically as a group as being immoral, unnatural and attacking the family and an assault on Canadian values, that black people were in that category, of course in those circumstances a member of this House who happened to be a black person could not respond. That is what the Speaker is saying. The Speaker is saying that if a member of this House got up—

Mr. Nunziata: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway purports to be opposed to hate yet he seems to want to propagate it. I would simply indicate that he is challenging the authority of the Chair. You have made your ruling and he persists in challenging your authority. I would ask that if he is not prepared to play by the rules—

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear on the motion I am proposing to the House. Before doing so, I want to say that I strongly support the principles underlying section 718.2 of this legislation. I find it particularly disturbing that a member of this House in arguing against this provision could so distort the reality that underlies the section.

For example, it was suggested that this section would take effect even if there were no convictions. That is what the hon. member for Central Nova said. Section 718.2 takes effect only at sentencing. The hon. member is a lawyer. I assume she is aware that sentencing takes place only after conviction. Let us be very clear.

• (2100)

Ms. Skoke: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I think it is important that if the hon. member is to quote what I say he quotes directly and does not paraphrase. He has obviously misunderstood the context of my speech and I think that is important.

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, the hon. member's words speak for themselves and the distortions in those words speak for themselves as well.

No one in supporting this legislation is seeking any kind of special rights or privileges any more than those who support legislation to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation are seeking any kind of special rights or privileges.

There are certain communities in which people are attacked on the basis of certain identifiable characteristics. The gay community is one of those communities.

The justice committee on Bill C–41 heard very moving testimony from two gay men who were walking peacefully down

the street in Toronto near the corner of Church and Welsley when they were attacked by thugs with broken beer bottles and beaten up. They were not attacked because they were fat. They were attacked because they were gay. That is what this legislation is attempting to respond to.

The hon. member for Scarborough West asks how they knew that. That is a very good question. That is precisely the purpose of the amendment in Motion No. 10. They assumed these were two gay men. They perceived them as being gay men because they were walking in an area which has a significant number of gays and lesbians.

That is why it is essential this legislation respond to the question of sexual orientation. If an individual attacks another individual because they believe that person to be Jewish or gay or lesbian the impact of that is just as serious. As a number of witnesses who appeared before the committee made very clear, it is essential that the perception of the victim be included in this legislation. That is the purpose of my amendment.

As one of the briefs from the Ottawa–Carleton regional police bias crime unit pointed out, Alain Brosseau, a waiter working one night at the Chateau Laurier, walked toward his home through Majors Hill park and was attacked by a group of people who thought he was a gay man. They threw him off the bridge and killed him. That was just as serious and this legislation should reflect that seriousness as well. That was the point made by B'nai Brith, the point made by the Centre de recerche–action sur les relations raciales and by many others.

It is important we understand this legislation is not conferring privileges. I wish it were not the case that Jews are singled out for anti–semitic attacks. I wish it were not the case that gay men and lesbians were victims of gay bashing, as the Minister of Justice said.

On Saturday night in Vancouver at the Edge restaurant some friends of mine were sitting peacefully having coffee when suddenly through the door came a number of thugs who started to attack them, calling them faggots, beating them up and breaking their arms. This crime does not just affect the individuals involved but by its very nature it has a chilling effect on a community. That is why it is so important that we amend the criminal law as has been proposed here.

• (2105)

This legislation is very important. It is also important that we understand the kind of attitudes we have heard from the member for Central Nova. The member for New Westminster—Burnaby said that gay bashing was not much of a problem because it was only one marginalized group, skinheads as he said, attacking another marginalized group, or it was gay people beating up other gay people. Those are the attitudes we have to confront.

We need this legislation. I commend those moving it forward. I commend the Ottawa police department for its leadership in this area. I hope the House will reject the voices of those not prepared to accept equality and move toward legislation that ensures hate crimes are punished to the fullest in society.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join in debate on Bill C–41.

I want to comment as objectively as I can on section 718.2. This section has attracted more attention than any other aspect of the bill. There is a backlash of sorts that has conjured up a great deal of concern among a number of Canadians. The bill is referred to often as a hate crimes bill. It is a sentencing bill with some 60 or 70 pages and has a wide range of important amendments to guide our sentencing.

Section 718.2 as has been indicated by a number of prior speakers has attracted attention. Section 718.2 states:

> A court that imposes a sentence shall also take into consideration the following principles:
>
> (a) a sentence should be increased or reduced to account for any relevant aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offence or the offender, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing,
>
> (i) evidence that the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor, or
>
> (ii) evidence that the offender, in the committing offence, abused a position of trust or authority in relation to the victim shall be deemed to be a aggravating circumstances;

To put that in English, section 718.2 basically says that when someone has been charged and convicted of a crime, prior to sentencing that person the courts must make an assessment and that assessment must be whether there is an aggravating circumstance.

Presently in the bill there are two different categories of aggravating circumstances. The first refers to bias, prejudice and hate. That goes on to be elaborated on by adding to it the so–called list for greater certainty. In other words that a bias, prejudice or hate was based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation would require a stiffer sentence.

The second aggravating circumstance has to do with abuse of positions of trust or authority. A position of trust would be in the character of a doctor over a patient, a teacher over a student, a babysitter over a child. Positions of authority might include such things as an elderly person in the care of a child or a child in the care of the parents.

One of the reasons the bill and this section have attracted so much attention is this list on which bias, prejudice and hate might be motivated is identical to the list in our charter of rights and freedoms. The only addition to the list are the words sexual orientation which have brought tremendous focus to this section. It has been the one reason the bill has been used as a proxy for the discussion of all sides of the story and the arguments with regard to sexual orientation.

• (2110)

I do not want to use much of my time to deal with this. The extent of concern within my community, and I have received many letters, indicates that basically we are all equal under our laws and that if there is any list it tends to indicate that someone has been left off the list. If our charter is to hold true the words bias, prejudice and hate should be sufficient. On that basis I will be supporting the report stage motion to eliminate the list.

I will now move on very briefly to my motion which is to add an aggravating circumstance to bias, prejudice and hate and the abuse of trust in authority positions.

According to the 1993 violence against women survey and Statistics Canada 29 per cent of women or 2.7 million who have ever been married or lived in a common law relationship have been physically or sexually assaulted by their partner at some point during the relationship. We are all painfully aware of the serious problems and the negative consequences not only to those involved but to society as a whole. We have been so overwhelmed by the tragic statistics and the pleas for help over so many years, I fear we have become desensitized to the severity of the problem.

As a result of those facts I have presented a report stage Motion No. 16 which asks the House to consider making spousal abuse a situation which would require stiffer sentences. It did take some time. The motion was submitted in April. It took a great deal of time to work through justice, to work with colleagues from all sides of the House.

I am pleased to inform the House that as a result of the motion and as a result of the support I received from all sides of the House the Minister of Justice has agreed to accept the situation of spousal abuse as an aggravating circumstance requiring a stiffer penalty. This is a very momentous situation for the House to stop giving merely moral support to the plight of abused women and children and to start giving tangible, legislative backbone to deal with the issue of spousal abuse.

Motion No. 17 presented by the minister will be addressed in the House in advance of my Motion No. 16. I will be supporting Motion No. 17. I believe it incorporates the intent of the motion I put forward.

I thank the minister and the justice officials and members of the House. I am sure all women in Canada thank all members for their support for abused women.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have only 10 minutes to offer my comments on 13 very interesting amendments which obviously, as we have seen from the debate so far, evoke very strong feelings. Unfortunately with only 10 minutes I am forced to concentrate on my amendments.

I do support Motion No. 6 standing in the name of the hon. member for Central Nova for the legal, moral and ethical reasons she stated in her speech. If the House is not supportive of Motion No. 6 then I am certainly in support of Motions Nos. 7 and 8 standing in the name of the hon. member for Ontario for the reasons he gave in his excellent address.

• (2115)

If it should transpire that none of those motions have passed with the approval of this House, then we have section 718.2 with the phrase sexual orientation as part of that section. In those circumstances, only one of two things will happen. Either the phrase sexual orientation will remain undefined, or it can be defined by this House pursuant to one of the amendments that I have put forward.

So one might wonder why we need a definition, which is what I want to talk about in the remaining time. Let us examine some actual facts, not rhetoric and various other things, but let us talk about some facts.

Fact one: This is the first time the phrase sexual orientation is going to be used in any federal Canadian statute.

Fact two: This phrase is undefined in any legal or standard dictionary.

Fact three: This phrase is undefined by any court in Canada. There have been passing references to the phrase, a footnote here or there by one or two or three judges, but it has not been judiciously interpreted in this country.

We asked the minister what sexual orientation means. When he appeared before the justice committee on November 17, 1994, he said: "Sexual orientation encompasses homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality". If that is in fact the case, then that is exactly what my Motion No. 11 proposes. It proposes to state that sexual orientation means exactly what the Minister of Justice said it meant in the committee; namely, homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality. The important point is that it would mean nothing else but those three things the minister said.

It is interesting to note that virtually every jurisdiction in the world that I have found that uses the phrase sexual orientation or similar words actually defines the phrase. We are meeting so much resistance here in Canada to defining a legal phrase that has never been used in this country in a statute. Yet in other countries there does not seem to be this problem.

Let us take a look, for example, at California, which has a population greater than our entire country. They say sexual orientation means heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality, period. This is exactly what the Minister of Justice said and exactly what my Motion No. 11 states.

What about our own regulations, not statutes, under the Canadian Radio–television and Telecommunications Commission? Even they go some way to defining sexual orientation by saying: "Sexual orientation does not include the orientation

toward any sexual act or activity that would constitute an offence under the Criminal Code". Who could disagree with that? That is in fact a definition because it is a definition of exclusion. Motion No. 11 is a definition of inclusion.

Let us take, for example, the District of Columbia. Sexual orientation means male or female homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality—and I note for the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway—by preference or practice. But it is defined. That is the point: it is defined in statute.

Finally, let us talk about Australia. We talked about the United States, so we will now talk about South Australia and its equal opportunity act. The act states: "It is unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of sexuality. Sexuality is defined as meaning heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality or trans–sexuality". Well my other motion deals with that, with the exception of trans–sexuality.

All of these jurisdictions define the phrase. So what I am saying is we should define the phrase. What if we do not? Does the undefined phrase sexual orientation mean something other than what the minister has said it means?

• (2120)

Let us look at the evidence that was called at the committee. Dr. Greenberg, who is a member of the policy review committee from the Canadian Criminal Justice Association and who is also a psychiatrist at one of the Ottawa hospitals, in response to a question by me, said: "Sexual orientation is a descriptive term. It basically defines what attracts a person to a stimulus. In other words, just like a compass, what is it that orients a person toward a particular stimulus? It is what stimulus arouses a person sexually." I asked, "Yes, so necrophilia would be a sexual orientation to you?" Dr. Greenberg answers, "A deviant sexual orientation, yes."

It goes on. The Canadian Psychological Association said: "It is not for us to say whether in the courts it would be,"—that is to say, interpreted—"but certainly sexual orientation is a key and fundamental component of pedophilia". That is not the member for Scarborough West talking, that is Dr. Stephen J. Wormith, chairperson of the criminal justice psychology section of the Canadian Psychological Association. That is what he says. This is if it is undefined.

We have many other quotations, which I have sent around to all hon. members in this House.

If those witnesses do not agree that sexual orientation does not mean what the minister said, what are the courts going to do? The courts are not responsible to the people of Canada. I do not want to take that chance. It is for this House to define phrases, not for the courts.

Interestingly enough, every other characteristic listed in 718.2 is defined. Race has been defined. National or ethnic origin has been defined. Language has been defined. Colour has been defined. Religion has been defined. Sex has been defined. Age has been defined. Mental or physical disability has been defined. Here are the definitions, judicial and otherwise.

The only identifiable characteristic that has not been given a definition in this country is sexual orientation. Why is that? According to the minister, he says that it would be offensive to provide a definition. I quote: "It would be offensive for us to define that term". That is the reason he gives for not defining a term that the witnesses said includes necrophilia, pedophilia, scopophilia, or whatever other kind of philias you want to talk about. That is not just some hon. member talking; those are actual expert witnesses before the justice committee who made these points.

Who would it offend? It is not offensive to the people of Scarborough West. I conducted a poll. Seventy–two per cent of my constituents want sexual orientation defined before it is put in any federal statute. It is not offensive to anybody I know.

If we draft statutes on the basis of offence, we have given a lot of offence to a lot of gun owners and we just passed Bill C–68. That gives offence. We cannot draft statutes on the basis of who they might or might not offend. We draft statutes on the basis of what is right and what is wrong. Wedraft according to the proper rules of drafting and give definitions.

I ask the House, if sexual orientation is going to remain, please define it.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is a very interesting debate. I have been listening to it very carefully.

I am really very mystified about how this whole question of sexual orientation has managed to take off as such a pre–eminent feature of Bill C–41. As was said earlier, we are talking about a bill that has 70 pages dealing largely and most importantly with the question of sentencing, which we have wanted for some time. There are some very good provisions in this bill that are much needed in our society, particularly with respect to our criminal justice system.

• (2125)

What we seem to gravitate to is one little section. It is not even a whole section; it is just a little itsy–bitsy part of a section. It is in section 718.2 that we refer to the words "sexual orientation".

The hon. member for Scarborough West has done a lot of research on this, and I commend him. He says that sexual orientation should be defined. He mentions that the other aspects—race, colour, sex, and gender—are defined. However

they are not defined in the bill. They may be defined, but they are not defined in the bill because these are incidental terms.

What we are dealing with is the fact of sentencing. That is why it is called a sentencing bill. There are no rights given under this bill to anyone, regardless of race, religion, language, or sexual orientation. We are not saying that anybody in those categories has any rights.

What we are saying is that if somebody is attacked and it can be proven that they were attacked because of their sex, religion, language, or sexual orientation, such as the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway has said about some people going into a restaurant and saying "Let's go and get those faggots", then there is objective evidence that they are being attacked for that reason. Because they are being attacked for that reason, it is a question of bias, prejudice, or hate based on those principles. If the people then go to court and are found guilty, they will be sentenced. In the sentencing it will be determined that the reason they committed the crime was because of bias, prejudice, and hate on their part in relation to language, religion, or sexual orientation. If that is the case, then their sentence is greater than if that was not the case.

A member says that is already being done in the courts across the country. Why then, one may ask, do we have it in the legislation? Because it is not being applied equally across the country. It is being applied differently in each province and we want to have it applied equally. Members have said, hate, bias and prejudice are onerous terms, principles, and sicknesses, which creep into adverse and unpleasant actions in our society. We want to apply it equally across the country.

Why, if we want to put it in the act, do we have to use these terms? The reason we have to use terms like religion, language, sex and sexual orientation is because the Supreme Court of Canada stated in the Zundel and Keegstra cases that they have to know what we mean by hate. What is it we are talking about when we talk about hate? Are we talking about hate based on sexual orientation, religion, or language, or are we talking about hate based on someone beating somebody else up because they do not like the Vancouver Canucks or the Toronto Maple Leafs? Is that the sort of hate? Hate can be used in so many ways.

We want to define what kind of hate we mean and what we are talking about when we go to court on this principle. So we put in examples, but we also say that is not the last of it. We also say "national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor". We are not saying that anything can be hate; we refer to a similar factor that relates to the terms we have previously set forth in that list.

• (2130)

We are not giving any rights at all under this. The bill does not define sexual orientation because it is not a principle of the bill. The worst that can happen by not defining sexual orientation is that someone may make a mistake about what sexual orientation is in the sentencing process.

If some people want a definition of sexual orientation it should be put in the Canadian Human Rights Act. That is where such a definition would apply, not in a sentencing bill.

In Motion No. 10, brought forward by the member for Burnaby—Kingsway, he mentions changing the bill. Instead of saying race, national or ethnic origin, religion, language or sexual orientation, he wants it to say "the actual or perceived race" and so on.

We do not need that because perceived is not a factor either. If someone is attacked because of language or sexual orientation or race it does not matter in the sentencing process if that person actually spoke that language, was of that sexual orientation, was of that race or not. The fact they were actually attacked based on bias, prejudice or hate and whether the victim was correctly identified in that hate, bias or prejudice does not matter. It is the reason for the assault that the sentence is given.

If the person is convicted on the basis of that attack, based on that bias, prejudice or hate on questions of language, sexual orientation or religion, whether the victim was or was not, if the attacker thought the victim was, there is still the hate and there is still going to be the enhanced sentence. It does not matter if it was perceived or not perceived but what the objectively stated intention of the person committing the offence was.

This is a good bill. We are getting carried away, led astray by various factors. Everything in the bill is important but what is most important is what the bill wants to do and can do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wish to state from the outset that it will be impossible for me to support the amendments proposed by the hon. members for Scarborough West and for Central Nova, which, of course, should not surprise us. I want to start by repeating what we were told by a psychology professor, who had a great influence on me. He started from the basic premise that sexuality has many facets. This sexology professor reminded us that those who feel comfortable with their own sexuality do not feel the need to denigrate others with a different sexual orientation.

Tonight, I am sorry that some of my colleagues, whose views I as a parliamentarian must respect, may have made comments which, in my opinion, showed, to say the least, very little respect for a kind of sexual pluralism that must be acknowledged. What I find most regrettable, and the reason why I do not understand the purpose of the amendments tabled by some of my colleagues, can be summed up as follows: Is it too much to ask some parliamentarians to recognize, to understand that, in 1995, some members of society are still being molested, beaten or ill–treated for the sole reason that they are or appear to be homosexual?

• (2135)

That is what the bill before the House wants to deal with. I fail to understand why parliamentarians who have a voice in government, who have a public voice, will not admit that this is so, although all the hard scientific evidence is there.

In fact, two years ago, the Government of Quebec, the first government in Canada to speak out against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, instructed the Quebec Human Rights Commission, a public body with credibility, to investigate violence against gays. That was the specific mandate of this commission. We can assume that, if a government takes the trouble to instruct a commission to investigate, acts of violence are being committed in our society.

The commission, which made several recommendations, examined fifty statements by gays, young and not so young, who were attacked—I think it is important to emphasize this—who were attacked simply because they were gay. I think you would have to be extremely obtuse, bigoted and empty headed not to realize, as a parliamentarian, that this is a situation that must be dealt with.

What do the opponents to this bill find so disturbing? Of course we could wonder about their fantasies, but we will refrain. We will remain strictly on topic. What disturbs them in the legal sense?

With all due respect for the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Central Nova—I must admit that when she talks about homosexuality, she does not mince her words, which is putting it mildly—I have not heard either member give examples that would hold water in the legal sense.

I would have had more respect, although I still have some, through you Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member for Central Nova or the hon. member for Scarborough West, if they had risen in their seats and argued on a legal basis to make a connection between agreeing that gays should not be attacked and pedophilia.

That is what disturbs them. That is what frightens them. I had a chance to discuss this with the hon. member during an exchange in committee. However, none of them were able to make a connection between what is proposed in clause 718.2 and what they themselves as parliamentarians anticipated would happen.

Quite frankly, when people are disturbed by a difference that is as legitimate as it is ancient, by the expression of a difference in sexual experience, one wonders, and whether they are parliamentarians is irrelevant, whether they have a healthy and balanced life.

What is disturbing, and I think the Minister of Justice is to be commended for his courage in this respect, is that, as parliamentarians, we have no obligation to support a certain set of moral values. You know, when the only argument is a moral argument, when as a member, all they can do is get up and talk about prayers, religion and family, it is because they do not have much in the way of legal arguments.

I have great respect for people who are deeply religious. I have great respect for parliamentarians in this House who, in some way or another, want to perpetuate the family, be it in its traditional form.

But please, do not tell us that because we want to protect a specific group of people who are confronted with violence every day, because the legislator wants to make attacking gays because of their sexual orientation a factor in determining sentencing, please do not tell us we are challenging family values.

• (2140)

I come from a traditional family. My father, Claude, is 55 years old, my mother, Thérèse, is 60 years old. I have a twin brother who has the exact same genetic base as me, another brother who is a police officer—nobody is perfect—and an older brother. I come from a traditional family. It is quite traditional, with my father supporting the family and my mother raising five children at home, who all shared similar influence.

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine, Lib.): And one son who is a comedian.

Mr. Ménard: The hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine is paying me a compliment that I cannot ignore. My point is that it is certainly not as a challenge to the traditional or alternative family that we, as legislators, want to put a stop to violence. I cannot accept this kind of argument.

I suspect that the hon. member for Scarborough West made an honest mistake when he told us that there is no mention of sexual orientation in any Canadian legislation. As a good, honest lawyer, he knows full well that for a number of years now, the Canadian Human Rights Act is to be construed as explicitly including sexual orientation. Finally, it took all the determination, the energy and the drive of a group like EGALE to remind everyone, including MPs, this in a manner that deserves to be praised, that in 18 years of existing case law, no comparison can be made between what the legislator is about to do and any form

of perversion mentioned by some members of this House who, in so doing, showed an unacceptable lack of consideration.

After all, why, as parliamentarians, do we want the courts to take sexual orientation into account, among other factors, when sentencing an offender? The hon. member for Scarborough West knows full well that none of the other aggravating factors is defined in clause 718.2. Why be so obsessed about stating facts which do not withstand close scrutiny?

I will conclude with this: When parliamentarians from every party, as well as the courts, understand that we play an educating role every time we make a decision, then we will live in a society which I long for, a society where it will possible for a person, whether a public figure or not, to be gay, to live his or her difference and feel good about it, and to not be exposed to physical abuse, as is unfortunately often the case for members of the gay community.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I want to compliment my colleagues from Scarborough West and Hochelaga who have been speaking in this debate for the tenor, the tone and the wisdom of their speeches and the way they have conducted themselves. It is interesting that two people coming from such polar opposites in this debate can both put their points well, succinctly and make their arguments.

Madam Speaker, I am absolutely fed up with being discriminated against. It is really starting to get to me. After studying the legislation, I see no mention of white, middle aged, sort of Catholic males.

If I am lying in a ditch somewhere with my head kicked in, why is it any less of an offence, albeit I am a member of the Reform Party? Why is it any less of an offence for me to be lying in a ditch with my head kicked in than someone else who may be black, may be gay or some other human characteristic? That is the reason I have a problem with the legislation. The whole notion of sexual orientation in the bill is a red herring.

• (2145)

If the government had the guts and courage of its convictions on sexual orientation it would come in the front door and amend the human rights act upfront instead of trying to slide this amendment in through the back door. As the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice so aptly put it, why does this one teeny–weeny, itsy–bitsy two–word phrase in a 30–page bill have people up in arms?

It has people up in arms because it does not come to this question honestly. We have to be very careful to address the whole notion of sexual orientation honestly. Most Canadians, myself included, are absolutely 100 per cent against the notion of discrimination against anybody for any reason, including people who are gay. We are equally opposed to affirmative action based on any human characteristic.

The whole notion of rights came up in the 16th century and has come up through western Liberal democracies. It is a big part of the American Declaration of Independence. Now that we have sort of been messing around with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms the whole notion of rights has become confused.

As human beings we have two rights that are inalienable: the right to life and the right to liberty. Beyond those every other so–called right is a privilege given to us by other members of society for one reason or another.

When people came together under an apple tree and decided on some sort of governance, they were willing to give up some of our individual freedoms and liberties for the greater good, so that those that remained would be enhanced. We gave the responsibility to government to provide for these freedoms, security of the person and policing. We did so voluntarily but we did so as human beings.

We did not come together under a tree as white males, gay males, lesbian females, black females, males and females. We came together under a tree and said that for the common good we would have rules and order in society. We did not vest any one of us with rights or privileges superior to anyone else. When we came together and decided to have governance we said we wanted it for the common good.

Down the road things do not always work out the way they should. We know there are certain people in society who have been discriminated against. We know intuitively it is right to prevent discrimination. We have enacted laws over the years to prevent it. If we have to enact laws in the future to prevent discrimination against people because they are gay, homosexual, bisexual or lesbian, we should do so. However let us not be afraid of addressing it head on.

As my hon. colleague from Scarborough West said, statute laws that are ambiguous in nature in not defining the term sexual orientation do not bring credit to the law making process.

I wish to conclude my comments with a plea to all hon. members and to Canadians in general. We must make a clear distinction between the prevention of discrimination, which is laudable and which we all want, and affirmative action or giving benefit by reason of specific characteristics including sexual orientation. These are two very different ideas which have been combined and mixed up in the bill to the discredit of the bill.

• (2150)

If it is the government's intention to have sexual orientation as a defined part of the human rights act, the government should bring forth legislation as it promised to do in the election campaign and in its red book. It should show the courage of its convictions and do it through the front door honestly and honourably, not try to slide it in the back door through this legislation.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make further submissions on the legislation. Earlier I spoke about the alternative measures section in the code. I indicated then that I disagreed with the provision that would allow attorneys general across the country to use their discretion and not prosecute serious crimes. It is somewhat inconsistent now that the bill purports to deal more harshly with those who commit crimes motivated by hate, knowing that a court could very well divert an offender who commits an offence out of the criminal justice system and invoke the alternative measures.

The bill is not about sexual orientation. The bill is not about homosexuality. Frankly what the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway and the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve do in the confines of their bedrooms is their business. That is not what the bill purports to deal with.

The question of whether or not homosexuality is immoral is not the issue with the legislation. As the hon. member indicated, that debate is the real debate and that debate will only take place when a bill is put before the House dealing with amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act. Bill C–41 is an omnibus bill. It is referred to as an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof.

If we look at the index we see it deals with alternative measures, purpose and principles of sentencing, punishment generally, procedure and evidence, restitution, conditional sentence of imprisonment, fines and forfeitures. The bill is not about sexual orientation or homosexuality. It is often referred to in the media as the hate crime bill. One section deals with hate crime and that is section 718.2. The section purports to deal with hate motivated crimes. The bill is not about homosexuality; it is about political correctness.

The first question I ask as a lawyer and as a Canadian is whether we need this section in the Criminal Code. The answer is very simply no. This section is here not because there is a void that has to be filled in criminal law. It is not here because there is a groundswell of support for this change in the country. It is because specific groups in society have effectively lobbied the Government of Canada to inject into the criminal law an unnecessary section.

I quote from a reputable newspaper that has never been accused of being homophobic, anti–homosexual or anything of the sort. The *Globe and Mail*, wrote an editorial entitled "Unnecessary Laws" which takes the position that the section is unnecessary. My views happen to coincide completely with the arguments made in the editorial. I quote:

> The new sentencing guidelines are redundant and ill considered, injecting politics once again into the making of criminal law.

• (2155)

It goes on to say:

> If Parliament wants to protect threatened groups from hate crimes, it cannot exclude certain groups that some of its members happen not to like. The real problem with section 718.2 is not that it refers to homosexuals but that it is proposed at all.

And this is the key:

> Judges already have wide discretion in sentencing. They often use this discretion to hand out particularly harsh sentences for crimes they consider particularly harmful to society. As far as we can determine the government has presented no evidence that judges are being unduly lenient with criminals motivated by hate. So why pass a law that in effect asks them to be tougher?

What evidence does the Minister of Justice have or what evidence did he present to the justice committee to warrant this new section in the Criminal Code of Canada? As far as I know, and I have asked several members of the committee, there was no study presented to the committee and there was no evidence other than anecdotal evidence.

The member for Burnaby—Kingsway and others can talk about a particular hate motivated crime that happened in Vancouver, Toronto or Halifax. We know these crimes take place. But how often do they take place? Does the government have that evidence? Does the minister have a study that indicates that 1,000, 1,500, 2,000 or 10,000 so–called hate motivated crimes are taking place? We keep statistics on all kinds of matters related to the criminal law. If so, is there evidence to suggest that judges have been unduly lenient in dealing with offenders who commit a crime motivated by hate? I would submit there is no evidence to suggest that judges are too lenient. Then why present the law?

The criminal law is not a piece of legislation to be amended and changed in order to be "politically correct" because certain groups in society have pressured effectively for an inclusion of something in the law. The criminal law deals with many matters. It is a serious law, not to be used by politicians to curry votes and support from groups within society.

The *Globe and Mail* goes on to say:

> The Criminal Code is not a toy. Nor is it a showcase for the government's good intentions. It is the law of the land. Before the government makes any changes to the code it should show that there is a problem in the first place, and what is more, a problem that can be addressed by the law. Governments should make law only out of demonstrated need. First demonstrate, then legislate.

The *Globe and Mail* makes a very persuasive argument on why we do not need this section in the Criminal Code of Canada.

The *Financial Post* is not a homophobic newspaper. I do not believe it can be accused of being anti-homosexual or anti-gay. It carried an editorial dated May 27 entitled "Cluttering up the Code" from which I would like to quote:

> So much for the punishment fitting the crime. According to C-41 it is not enough that a person is assaulted or robbed or killed. Now any relevant aggravating circumstances are to be considered when meting out the punishment. If you happen to be beaten up or murdered because you were in the wrong place at the wrong time, or because someone wanted to rob you, the court is told to give the offender a lighter sentence than it would to someone who assaulted or murdered because they hated the victim's religion.

• (2200)

In other words in an attempt to attack discrimination the law itself would discriminate. Furthermore, since the government has not produced evidence that the courts have been especially lenient on those who commit crimes motivated by hate, where is the need for such a provision? The bill says the fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute to the respect for the law. The section on sentencing does the opposite. It is motivated by politics, not by the principle of impartial justice.

For these reasons alone, I urge members of Parliament to reject this section of the bill. It is unnecessary. It is politically motivated. We are not debating here the issue of whether homosexuality is moral or immoral. That debate is yet to come.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the parliamentary secretary to the justice minister's comment about how good Bill C-41 is and how much more it included other than section 718.2.

If the parliamentary secretary was listening carefully to the member for York South—Weston, he clearly pointed out two areas of this bill that are very questionable. One of them deals with alternative measures. Several clauses and subclauses are very questionable. Another one is section 718.2.

A third one I have found which is absolutely reflective of a government that really does not pay attention to the wishes of the people but writes legislation contrary to it is section 745.1. This section deals with early release for first and second degree murderers if they are under 18 years of age.

Very little has been debated on this bill. It was incumbent upon members in this House to do a thorough debate of this bill because of its implications.

Returning to 745.1 it reads:

> The sentence to be pronounced against a person who was under the age of 18 at the time of the commission of the offence for which the person was convicted of first degree murder or second degree murder and who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life shall be that the person be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until a person has served such period between five and 10 years of the sentence as is specified by the judge presiding at the trial.

In other words, what is the difference between this piece of legislation when dealing with first and second degree murderers who are under 18 years old and those provisions under the Young Offenders Act? There is no difference whatsoever. Just like section 745, the attempt to repeal that section of the Criminal Code by the member for York South—Weston was brought about by him through a private member's bill.

Here is another section that almost replaces it which would be extremely irritating if the people in this country knew about its existence yet they know little about what is happening here. Bill C-41 is a very questionable document.

If I have learned anything since coming to Ottawa it is the wishes of the Canadian people are seldom reflected in legislation. More often than not legislation is passed either in spite of the desires of Canadians or by pulling the wool over their eyes, which is what Bill C-41 does.

I have also learned that political philosophy can influence legislation in one of two ways. The ideology of the political party that sponsors the piece of legislation can influence the means by which a commonly desired Canadian goal can be achieved, or it can set the goals. Bill C-41 is little more than ideology dressed up.

• (2205)

Canadians are realizing more and more that our current justice minister, the architect of this piece of legislation, is a man of the left, if not the far left. The justice minister knows exactly what he is doing. Just as he has hidden the true intent and true result of Bill C-68, the firearms registration bill, in a soft, fuzzy cloud of crime control, so he has disguised the real intent of Bill C-41 behind a veil of real justice reform. It is pure trickery, but it is also very transparent.

Bill C-41 is a bad bill and it will do bad things for Canada. Bill C-41 is an entirely predictable expression of what the current minister wants for Canada and what sort of impact he wants to leave on the political landscape. With Bill C-41 Canada sits atop the crest of a hill. If we in the House pass the bill we will propel ourselves down the slippery slope of governmental redefinition of the family, of governmental sanction of unhealthy relationships.

Mark my words, this in turn will lead to a further alienation of the Canadian people from their legislators. People are already disillusioned with politicians. They do not trust politicians. Why should they? Politicians craft bills like Bill C-41 and disguise it behind the veil of justice reform. It is only later when the legislative rubber hits the road and the courts take action that

Canadians find out what really is the true impact of the bill. That is what will happen with Bill C–41.

The world will not end if this bill passes. In fact, it will not change overnight. However, it will change and it will change for the worst. If this bill passes, the courts will be given full licence to redefine what marriage is, what discrimination means, what the limits of freedom of association are and just how free free speech is. We have seen examples of that in the House with the attempts to shut down debate. That will happen.

Bill C–41 with the inclusion of sexual orientation, whatever that means, as a protected category will inevitably lead to a change of discourse in the courts and eventually on the streets. It will lead to expanded special rights for one very small group of people. It will set new limits for the majority of people who do nothing more in life than go to work, go to church, pay their taxes, raise their kids and ask nothing more than to be left untouched as much as possible by the long arm of the Liberal state apparatus.

My years on the police force were invaluable in understanding what the real long term impact of legislation such as this will do. It has provided me with an education like no other with respect to the importance of the fine points of legislation and the massive ripple effect it will have on the street. The devil is in the details, as they say.

The Bail Reform Act for example is an act which was filled with good intentions but led Canada down a slippery slope which ended in the weakening of the criminal justice system in protecting society. That was a Liberal act. It was intended to allow the early release of non–violent offenders but was interpreted by jurists to include violent offenders. Broad intentions were transformed into bizarre reality as the legislative rubber hit the judicial road.

We have all seen the direction the Supreme Court has taken on the charter. The charter has to be so exploited by narrow political causes that constituents regularly call my office saying to scrap the thing altogether. Our esteemed court of highest appeal has ruled that drunks cannot commit crimes.

For those on the other side of the House who accuse me of fear mongering for suggesting that Bill C–41 with its addition of sexual orientation to the list of protected groups will not create waves which will wash dangerously over Canadian families, I say let us look at the record and let us get rid of the long list of those protected areas. For those who say that this bill is only about protecting people I say, just wait. A few years away, a few court decisions hence, this protection will turn into promotion. While all of us in this House support protection of any person from discrimination or violence, let us think very carefully about what we want to end up promoting.

• (2210)

Let us be honest with ourselves on this bill. We all know what it is going to lead to. I along with my constituents do not like that one bit.

The Reform Party does not like opposing legislation just for the sake of opposing it. No party should oppose legislation for that reason but we oppose this bill in its present form for good reasons. Those reasons are very much related to the problems I spoke of above.

What will happen when the open endedness of section 717 of the bill dealing with alternative measures for non–violent offences hits the streets and is subject to administration and interpretation? Nobody knows. The justice minister does not know.

I for one did not seek election in this House in order to leave the fate of legislation up to the law of unexpected consequence. This section, one of the more important sections of the bill, opens the door to the sort of judicial expansion that I witnessed while I was on the police force, the sort of expansion I know Canadians do not want.

Since we could not have this section tightened up in committee, we have no choice but to vote to scrap it. In my experience it is far better to return to the drawing board than to paint a dangerously obscure picture, especially when we are talking about criminal justice legislation.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I came into this House tonight, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister said to me: "It is a sad day". I said that it was not a sad day, but that it was a great day for a number of reasons. If I may refer to another piece of legislation, a battle was won tonight in the House, the battle to see the gun control bill passed. That made it not a sad day.

I know that my colleague and my other colleague, the member from Mississauga who also thought it was a sad day were referring to attitudes that are expressed not just in this House, not just in this city or this province but right across the country. I want to talk a little about that in my very brief time. I am paraphrasing but I believe and my colleague from Toronto agrees with me that it was St. Thomas More, the great chancellor of England who said that all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.

I have listened to some of the nonsensical reactions. I am not talking about members in this House but the letters I have received and responses from people who clearly have not read the bill, who do not understand what the bill is about, or who perhaps do understand what the bill is about and still evince an attitude of frightening intolerance. I know what my two colleagues mean when they say it is a sad day.

The reason I know it is not a sad day is that this bill will become law. It will pass because it is the right thing to do. What I am struggling with is the fact that colleagues in this House, some colleagues within our own party, members of the church to which I belong and to which I pay great homage and great love hurt me very much by their illogical and irrational response to this legislation. This legislation says in effect that if *x* goes out and hits *y* because he just does not like *y*'s face and injures him and he is convicted of let us call it assault causing bodily harm, so we do not have to worry about private prosecutions here, the provisions in this legislation would not kick in. It does not call for it. It is not one of the things that falls under these provisions against hate.

• (2215)

What if someone does not like you, Mr. Speaker, because you may be a Presbyterian and decides to assault you because he does not like Presbyterians and you are a member of that group? Should this exacerbate the situation? I think so. The Minister of Justice thinks so, the Prime Minister thinks so, the parliamentary secretary thinks so. The vast number of Canadians think so. The vast number of Canadians are tolerant and believe that to attack someone because of a belief, ethnocultural background, skin colour or sexual orientation exacerbates the assault.

The questions as to whether that is right or wrong are distinct questions of policy and divisions between the Reform Party and the Liberal Party to take one example. What we are talking about is something that goes much deeper. It goes back to what I said when I started my speech that the member for Mississauga and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister were disheartened when I came in here tonight because of the feelings of intolerance that have flown around this bill from its inception.

I went home today to do two things. I was opening a special centre for technology in my riding, a wonderful thing for the G–7, and also because my mother is very ill. She is dying in the hospital after a very long life. I thought about bringing up this allusion tonight in my speech.

In a sense I want to pay tribute to her because I am here and I hold the opinions I hold because of the way she, a single mother, brought me up. She was a school teacher who desperately wanted to be a lawyer but coming to her maturity in the depression in Cape Breton, the oldest of nine children, it was not possible. She taught school. She was involved in politics. She was involved in the teachers' union. She was a feminist. She was a single mother because my father died when I was very young. She believed passionately in tolerance.

I remember when I was four years old a man came to our house selling baskets. He was a Micmac. As was the Cape Breton tradition, my mother gave him a meal before he left. She bought some baskets from him as well. As he walked away from our house my mother said: "That poor man. It is a very difficult thing to be an Indian in this society".

I remember the discussion that resulted from that. It went on between us for the next 40 years as she talked to me about questions of tolerance. She talked to me about taking people at face value. She talked to me about tolerance based on fear and ignorance and how we must always fight to root it out.

Whether that intolerance is against aboriginal people, people of colour, people who hold a different sexual orientation from someone else's it is shocking that we allow the vilification that has gone on around this debate to go on, that we allow the ignorance and fear to go on, and that we do not collectively as parliamentarians stand up and say enough.

• (2220)

We are changing the sentencing law because it is the right thing to do. We are changing the sentencing law because people deserve to be protected from people who hate them. If someone assaults someone else because they hate what he or she stands for, thinks, believes in or because of something endemic to that person which includes sexual orientation, they are wrong and it deserves to be brought out after their conviction in a court of law and added to their sentence.

I stand here tonight to say this from my mother, Reenie Clancy, who will not be with us for very much longer. I am very proud that she taught me to believe this way. I am also very proud that I am here to vote for this bill.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–41, the sentencing bill, starts out with good intentions but fails to carry them out. I like the part that mentions reparation to victims and the promotion of a sense of responsibility to offenders. It is about time victims were mentioned in legislation. I would even like to see that portion of this bill strengthened.

However, the bill goes down hill from there. The alternative measures section allows authorities to choose individual offenders for special sentencing deals. Already sentences for similar crimes vary from place to place within Canada and they even vary from the city to the country. If one is to kill someone in this country, as the hon. member for York South—Weston pointed out earlier, statistically one should probably do it in Quebec because one gets far less time in jail than in other parts of the country. I find that incredible.

The alternative measures section will make it easier on some criminals, which is the trend in our justice system, to blame all wrongdoing on society and remove the need for punishment. People do not want more leniency. They want the opposite. Imagine the return of the lash that was suggested 10 years ago as a legitimate element in our justice system. Now we hear calls for it in some parts of the country nearly every day. I am not convinced that is the answer but it shows me people are crying

out for action from the government. They demand action and justice but they are not seeing it in this bill.

Tomorrow I hope to meet with the justice minister to talk about a case in my constituency in which a woman was stalked for five years and finally when she was caught by her estranged husband and stabbed repeatedly her husband received two years less a day in jail. That is a shame. I am sick and tired of sentencing bills that allow this kind of discrepancy. That person should have been put away for a long time and this woman protected. Instead they are allowed to come back into society in a few short months. It is disgusting.

When we get to the hate crime section of the bill we see some more inequalities. It allows a stiffer sentence if a crime is motivated by hatred against certain groups. If aggravated assault is perpetrated on me because somebody wants my money, it hurts just as much to get punched in the eye no matter what group I am from. The whole concept of identifying Canadians by groups instead of as individuals is a disturbing trend in Canadian society.

Too often the government wants to label people by ethnicity, colour, race, gender and now by sexual orientation. People should be labelled in one way, Canadians. They should be entitled to all the privileges, responsibilities and protection every single Canadian deserves.

This section also marks a basic shift in our legal system by starting to criminalize thought. We have always punished people for the wrong things they do, not for the wrong things they think. I have zero tolerance for hatred and I think we should continuously speak out against hatred whenever we see it. We cannot stamp it out by pretending to read people's minds and then sending them to jail for it. It sets a bad precedent for the future because hatred is so hard to define and to know what goes on in someone's head is almost impossible.

• (2225)

In a previous debate some months ago when the member for Central Nova stated in her opinion that homosexuality is immoral, her words were characterized by the member for Burnaby—Kingsway as hateful, bigoted comments that have absolutely no place in the Chamber and certainly not in the Liberal Party of Canada.

One member's moral opinion, granted, is seen by a leading homosexual in the country as an expression of hatred and bigotry. It is a dangerous trend to label people like that. Where could this take us?

Maybe members are not familiar with this but British Columbia right now is contemplating a law called the bubble law that will make it illegal to even voice protest against abortion within a certain distance of an abortion clinic. Every day an elderly priest stands in front of the House and wears or puts up a sign that says abortion is wrong. That is his opinion. If the law in British Columbia passes it would be illegal to do that. Someone could sit on a park bench within 100 feet of an abortion clinic with a sign around their neck saying they are against abortion and they would be totally in contravention of the law.

That is the trouble because it starts to infiltrate and impugn motives on people. They could not even stand on the corner with a simple sign hung around their neck saying they are against abortion. One day if this trend continues legitimate opinions that express the morality of homosexuality on either side may be viewed as illegal or hateful. I think that is a very dangerous trend.

The hate crimes section does not yet entrench this but it takes a step in that direction. By establishing a principle in Bill C–41 we are paving the way that it is all right to punish thoughts with jail terms.

I would like to remove the entire hate crimes section. The second best option would be to remove all the enumerated groups. My third preference would be to remove the phrase sexual orientation from the bill. If this amendment also failed in this group I would at least think the terms should be defined.

Why would I remove the phrase sexual orientation? Other speakers have elaborated that it is simply not necessary. Homosexuals or people of whatever sexual orientation are already protected against violence, as they should be, like all other Canadians because they are protected by the Criminal Code.

The Canadian Bar Association said to the committee that when someone can show they have been assaulted or somehow abused in all cases prosecutions followed, and so they should. That is why it is unnecessary to include phrases like this.

Why should sexual orientation be defined? When the Prime Minister was the Minister of Justice he said in committee in 1981:

> I am not here to determine what sexual orientation means. It is because of the problem of the definition of those words that we do not think they should even be in the Constitution.

On July 14, 1993 the Canadian Human Rights Commission said:

> We should be wary of coming to a complete definition. I propose to analyze this case from the point of view of what I believe to be a minimal definition of sexual orientation, namely, the capacity, or perceived capacity, to be sexually attracted to persons of one's own gender.

Homosexuality is a minimal definition. The commission left it open ended. Let me read some very recent quotes from the standing committee on justice. John Conroy of the Canadian Bar Association said on November 24 last year:

> That has certainly been the definition I've always understood: homosexual, heterosexual or some other sexual orientation. It could be any kind of sexual orientation, and it could be something that, as you say, is illegal.

Listen to Dr. Stephen Wormith, chair of the criminal justice psychology section of the Canadian Psychological Association last November:

> Sexual orientation is a crucial factor of paedophilia; a fundamental component of a true paedophile is his or her sexual orientation. Certainly sexual orientation is a key and fundamental component of paedophilia.

• (2230)

On February 9 of this year, Robert Wakefield, the director of the Ottawa region of the Criminal Lawyers Association, said this about sexual orientation:

> Psychiatrists use it. They will say somebody is heterosexual, or gay, or lesbian, or a paedophile. There are other sorts of deviant sexual behaviours that they regard as an individual's sexual orientation.

Finally, Dr. Greenberg, assistant professor of psychiatry at the University of Ottawa and staff forensic psychiatrist at the Royal Ottawa Hospital, said in February of this year:

> Sexual orientation is a descriptive term. It basically defines what attracts a person to a stimulus. In other words, just like a compass—

A member asked him: "So necrophilia would be a sexual orientation to you?" "A deviant sexual orientation, yes," he answered.

I cannot believe that the Minister of Justice wants to open this can of worms. He is not listening to the experts. I am ashamed to have to stand here in Parliament and tell the Canadian people what the government is doing. If people are concerned about what this bill could mean, then they should get on the phone or the fax and get in touch of their member of Parliament or the Liberal government and tell them that of your concern about what this could open up if this bill goes ahead as it is written.

I regret that with time allocation there are only a few hours left before this bill will become law if the government pushes ahead. I ask the government to reconsider, to listen carefully to the amendments that will be proposed later and do the right thing to eliminate this section altogether.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C–41.

Let me first pay homage to the hon. member for Halifax. Her comment about the influence her mother had on her definitely indicates a life well spent and she can be very proud of it. I am proud of it as a Canadian.

A lot of misinformation is floating around about Bill C–41. It is quite a comprehensive bill. It is a major bill. One hon. member mentioned some misgivings about the issue of alternative measures. Alternative measures refer to cases where jail is not appropriate and community service can be utilized. Rehabilitation is first and foremost and saves society money, as well as being more humane.

My seatmate from Mississauga South had a part to play in the bill, including special considerations for family members. I applaud him for that initiative.

The controversial section of the bill is section 718.2. It deals with hate motivation. One of the things I heard most often is that we are conferring special status on homosexuals. We are giving them special treatment. Let me just say that the law applies equally to heterosexuals and homosexuals.

If a group of gay people or homosexuals were to attack a heterosexual, the law would have the same application. Everybody is equal before the law. That is an important point to make because a lot of people would propagate misinformation on this bill.

When I listen to arguments in the House about hate crime I really am amazed. This is the year we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the end of the second world war. We are all proud of the contributions that Canadian soldiers made.

Let us think back to what happened during the second world war. Everybody seems to forget. Let us talk about some of the hate crimes that occurred during that war. The horrors that the Jews suffered are well known. First they lost their property, their jobs, their civil rights. Then they were taken to the gas chambers. When the war came to an end six million Jews had died in the holocaust.

• (2235)

I cannot for the life of me understand how this year when we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of victory in the second world war we could have such flippant attitudes in the House about hate crimes. It is just amazing.

We have all heard about the *Spirit of St. Louis* that went from port to port looking for refuge for Jews. They were turned away at port after port and were sent back to their deaths. Nobody wanted to know or to believe this was happening.

A few short months ago we remembered the 80th anniversary of the massacre of the Armenians when 2.5 million people died. They died because of hate. Finally we seem to have some good news coming our way. Members of the IRA are putting down their arms. What is the basis of that conflict? It is a religious conflict—hatred.

Take a look at the present situation in Yugoslavia. What do we have there? It is not some minor disagreement. A holocaust is

occurring right now and it is based on hate. There are also the Hutus and the Tutsi in Rwanda. It goes on and on.

Recently I attended a NATO conference in Budapest in eastern Europe. The major problem discussed in the civilian affairs committee related to the treatment of minorities and avoiding the examples of history. How do you do that? It is done by recognizing that hatred for others because they are different from us can have a very drastic impact.

Let me express a bit of a disappointment. When this new Parliament started a new party came into the House that promised to treat politics differently and not heckle other people while they were trying to speak. I am referring to members of the Reform Party. They have been a major disappointment on this issue to me personally.

I come from the community of Kitchener–Waterloo where neo–Nazis have made their presence felt. They have marched in front of European Sound. They have spewed forward their hate propaganda. One of the Jewish activists in my community, Mona Zetner, had her house burned down. She had to go into hiding.

As a person who came to this country as a refugee having grown up in war torn Europe, I can appreciate what hatred has done. I would suggest to members of the House that perhaps they might think about that, look around at the problems in this world. Many of them come from hatred.

I heard many people talking about how this bill has had no support. The United Church of Canada supports this bill. The Centre for Research–Action on Race Relations has urged members of Parliament to support it. The Urban Alliance on Race Relations support the bill.

• (2240)

I say this to my colleagues in the Reform Party because they often ask for the police officers' stance. The chief of police for Ottawa says: "As chief of police, I strongly support this legislative change that will allow my officers to effectively work to counter hate crimes in our community. I urge the quick passage of Bill C–41".

The Canadian Jewish Congress, a community so much more than many others knows the effect of hate and hate crimes, supports the bill. The list goes on and on.

Let me end with the support that comes from the Canadian Federation of Municipalities. At its March meeting held in Ottawa, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' national board of directors endorsed a resolution concerning violence arising from hatred over race, religion, gender and sexual orientation. FCM supports the position taken in Bill C–41 which would provide sentencing guidelines to enable judges to impose tougher sentences on those who commit crimes of hate based on race, religion, gender and sexual orientation.

These people represent the grassroots of the country and are at the level of enforcement of the law. I stand with them and I stand with my colleagues in the Liberal Party who are going to pass this bill. I am going to do it proudly.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad tonight that the Liberals have resolved all the problems of Canadians so now they can create some more with Bill C–41.

I was talking to a fellow today about Bill C–41. He said that the solicitor general will probably have a little bit of a new job as a result of this. He will have to get new signs outside of the prisons now. We will not call them prisons. We will call them institutes for the morally challenged. That is where this kind of legislation is heading.

One of the Liberal members talked about incidental terms, minor terms. Why are we talking about section 718.2? There are so many other good things in this bill. Why are we concentrating on it?

It is truly sad that the Liberal government does not get it. We need a sentencing bill. What we have is a sentencing bill mixed into an omnibus bill that has every other agenda that Canadians do not want. How do we deal with a debate when we want improvements to sentencing but all these other side issues of the Liberal government are involved in it? We vote against it even though there are some provisions that might be good. We have to vote against it because it has some things that are ridiculous.

I note in the bill on page 3 there is an attempt to define things. For instance, there are definitions of accused, alternatives, what a court means. There are all kinds of definitions in the bill. It escapes me as to why the definition of sexual orientation is not in the bill.

If it is undefined, who gets to define it? All of the lawyers in the country who are going to spend an inordinate amount of our money at the cost of victims, once again will define sexual orientation. They are also going to be defining other issues in the bill, issues based on bias, prejudice and hate.

This will come about at the cost of the victim once again running through court case after court case trying to get definitions. I might try to help the Liberal government because I am going to define it tonight. I am going to define sexual orientation.

I get my definition from a number of authors produced in a book by Victims of Violence with which I have had some association in the past. They say that the term sexual preference and sexual orientation are essentially the same thing. In fact, in the index of the recent *Sex in America* study under "sexual orientation" the reader is directed to see "Attitudes About Sex", which includes sexual preference. Both refer to the type

of individual a person is sexually attracted to. If pedophiles are ever to hope to be protected by the law, they must first show that pedophilia is a sexual orientation.

• (2245)

I would like to read a couple of quotes in an attempt to define it, because they do not have the courage to do it.

Dr. David Greenberg, a psychiatrist at the sexual behaviour clinic at the Royal Ottawa Hospital, said: "Heterosexuality, homosexuality, pedophilia—they are all just different orientations and an individual may have a number of them".

The first lawyer who comes up on the first case of pedophilia will attempt to define it. Perhaps the lawyer for Alan Winter, a pedophile from my area, will attempt to define it, because the government has not the courage to define it.

Kim Tate, author of *Child Pornography*, 1990, defined a pedophile as "an individual above the age of consent who prefers to have sex with children and who fantasizes about them". That is found at page 104.

Dr. Fred Berlin of the John Hopkins Medical School, in the Focus on the Family newsletter, number 11, November 1992, said that pedophilia is a value judgment and it may be a different kind of sexual orientation.

Do they understand where these folks are coming from? If this government does not define sexual orientation then other people will in the courts. If the government has not the courage of its convictions, why is it leaving it to the courts?

The comment I hear from a Liberal member is that statutes are normally interpreted by the courts. That tells us everything about the reason the Liberal government will not define sexual orientation. It will leave it to the lawyers to do it at the cost of young kids in this country.

Dr. Paul Cameron of the Family Research Institute in Washington said: "Sexual orientation is as ambiguous as political orientation".

Why will the government not define it?

Let us go to a quote from the Right Hon. Prime Minister when he was the justice minister. He was asked in the House of Commons on January 21, 1981, what sexual orientation meant. He stated:

> It is because of the problem of the definition of those words that we do not think they should be in the Constitution. Do not ask me today to tell you what it is, because those concepts are difficult to interpret, to define and that is why we do not want them in the Constitution. I am not going to venture to tell you what is sexual orientation. I am not interested; and I will not fall into that trap, because we do not want them for the very reason that it is socially and in terms of law it is a very difficult area.

In 1981, before he was Prime Minister, he did not want it. And here we are in 1995 and he does not have the courage to define it. He is going to leave it to the courts.

One only has to have some experience with a pedophile to understand what is going on. In my community, Alan Winter had a foster home. He had over 80 children sent to him by one of the governments in the country. Thirty-one of those people, of whom I have met a number, were all molested by Alan Winter. He got sentenced to 16 years in prison as a dangerous offender but of course the parole board let him out in a little over five years. That is a different story, which will hit the House one day soon.

An hon. member said that has nothing to do with this bill but it has everything to do with this bill. This government does not have the courage to define sexual orientation in section 718.2 of Bill C-41. It is going to get defined, and the very people who are committing unlawful acts of pedophilia are going to use sexual orientation as an excuse. That is what is wrong with it.

• (2250)

Some say this is fear mongering; some say this is homophobic. This is reality. This is what the lawyers out there are sitting on. In fact I have a video of a lawyer in this country saying exactly that: that will be his defence.

Since we have over 80,000 signatures from petitioners from every province and territory in this country saying do not proceed with this area of the act, why is it that the government chooses to ignore those people? Why is it that this government chooses to ignore people by restricting debate and calling closure on this particular bill, on MPs' pensions, on Bill C-68? Why is it?

There is one word this government should remember. It is "retroactive". When we get on that side of the fence, the tables will be turned.

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was not really prepared to speak this evening. Actually I do not even have House duty, and I have been sitting here since early this afternoon listening.

When we listen to things like this we really firm up our own beliefs and become very aware of how nasty human beings can get, how obtuse human beings can get, how they can purposely change things to suit themselves, and how they have obviously lived a life not subject to prejudice.

When I was a little girl my mom took me to kindergarten and registered me. I am a Polish kid. We went up to the desk and people said to her: "What is the name of the child you are registering?" She said "Carolyn". She looked at me for a minute. My maiden name was Janozeski. Because she had been beaten up and told she was a smelly polack from the time she was a small child, she changed instantly my last name to Janis. For many years I was functioning under a pseudonym.

The profound effect of being told she was a smelly polack and there was nothing she could do to defend herself against that accusation except scrub herself, change her clothing, make sure

she was always clean, was that when she took me to school when I was five years old she changed my name.

The thing that really bothers me is people who fit into this category that everyone is objecting to so strongly. They cannot scrub themselves, they cannot change their clothing, they cannot change the colour of their skin. But we can protect them against people who do not understand what goes on inside that skin.

It is very important that we keep very clear that this is a sentencing bill. It is not condoning any acts that seem so offensive to the people on the other side of the floor. It is saying to them that if you do not like the colour of someone's skin or if they happen to have the outward appearance of a different sexual orientation from yours, you cannot walk up to them on the street and punch their head in. There is nothing they can do to protect themselves against those types of accusations. Therein lies the frustration.

In a country like Canada we protect those people. We protect each other. In fact, if anybody you are protecting hits anybody for any reason, why are you protecting them? You do not need the categories.

• (2255)

Anybody who attacks somebody else in this country should feel the full force of the law. Anybody who gets into a bar room brawl and chooses to get into an argument with a neighbour is walking into it with their eyes wide open. The cases we have heard described are of people walking along the street and simply because of the way they walk, the way they wear their hair or the fact that they may be different from us, you are condoning people leaping out of a car and beating them to a pulp.

Some hon. members: Oh, no.

Mrs. Parrish: I am sorry, I have been sitting here all evening listening to you stretch a bill—

The Speaker: Order. Forgive me for interrupting, but I want the hon. member to please address the Chair.

Mrs. Parrish: I have been listening to a stretching of the truth all evening. I have been listening to them talk about a simple two–word expression, about opening a Pandora's box to the world, that in Canada we will be condoning all kinds of perversions.

I am a Roman Catholic. I come from a Polish Catholic Church, and one cannot get much stricter than that. The priest in my church said to me one day, "What about this C–41?" I said "I'm going to send you a copy of the bill, and you call me if you have any problems with it". I have never received a phone call. There are over 10,000 families in that church who listen to that priest and who form opinions based on his learned judgment.

I have had church groups in my area send me profoundly disgusting pieces of literature because members of Parliament have sent them letters stirring them all up with false information.

I am standing here in the House and am very proud to be supporting C–41. I am remembering the prejudice my mother went through and the prejudice I have experienced on very minor occasions. I am hoping that everything we do in this House will protect all children and adults from that same sort of prejudice.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with great patience to the debate unfold this evening. I have my speaking points here. As a matter of fact I even have the Liberal speaking points for Bill C–41, their strategy to try to win the debate and to out–talk the opposition. I have heard the arguments of all the lawyers on both sides of the House and on both sides of the issue. If anything, it has given me more of a prejudice or a bias against lawyers, perhaps because I am a bit troubled with this bill.

I see in the Liberal speaking points that it states: "Bill C–41 will not be the subject of a free vote". It concerns me that the Liberal powers had to send a note to all of their members suggesting that they dare not suggest a free vote on this issue. That is very disconcerting.

I probably have had just about as much mail on this issue as I have had on gun control. They have been running neck and neck. I think actually the gun control issue won the day, but hundreds of letters have poured into my office expressing concern. Most of the letters were handwritten or typed. Very few letters were duplicated, photocopied or photostatted. A lot of the letters expressed serious concerns about C–41. Unfortunately, it all bore down on this particular portion that deals with the hate section. This bill is rather large and I am sure there are a lot more weaknesses in this bill than just the area we are discussing in this section of report stage.

I want to talk a little bit about the whole process of hate, bias, and prejudice. Raised out in the prairies, I was taught that we were to love our enemies. I was taught that hate was wrong. I believe with all my heart that hate is wrong. It is very difficult to know when you are loved or hated. You cannot always tell. Mr. Speaker, when you look at me I do not sense that you hate me. I expect you do not, and I assure you I do not hate you. Perhaps I would and I was hiding it. This bill attempts to play god by looking into people's heads and deciding whether or not they hate and whether or not the crime they committed was based on their hate, prejudice or bias. The words prejudice and bias concern me even more than the word hate in this legislation.

• (2300)

A crime is a crime. If someone commits an assault against me it is a criminal action and the Criminal Code allows the justice system to deal with that action. Whether that person hates me or not, it is a crime and needs to be dealt with.

What is morality and what is immorality? That is very difficult to determine. What if somebody knocks me on the head because they want to see if I have some money in my wallet? That is a crime, an assault. It is immoral because that person wants the money in my wallet. That is just as immoral as if the person hated me because I am white or because I am a heterosexual.

It is wrong. There are laws in place to deal with that offence, whether the person is committing an immoral act of knocking me over the head to commit a theft of my money or whether he is knocking me over the head because he hates me for some reason. Put forward in the bill is my gender, my sexual preference, my physical disability if I should have any. It is a crime and our Criminal Code has to deal with crimes because they are crimes, not because of who committed them or why they were committed. If it is wrong, it is wrong.

The bill is causing great division and great concern that our justice system will begin to look into people's heads and convict them based on playing the role of god in determining whether or not they hate, are prejudiced or biased. That is wrong. That is why the legislation is wrong and it should be defeated.

The Holocaust was a hateful, terrible blight on human history. It was wrong and all the perpetrators should have been brought to justice for that terrible atrocity against humanity. It was wrong. It was criminal. It was hateful.

If someone kicks, beats or attacks a person because they are not white, that is wrong. There are provisions in the Criminal Code already to deal with that hateful, wrong crime and I applaud that. If a person is attacked for some other reason other than those on the short list in Bill C–41, it is just as wrong and needs to be punished just as severely.

This follows along the lines of the Charlottetown accord where winners and losers were picked. One group is especially set aside and included in the legislation. Somehow it is given more pre–eminence by the judicial system. Those who are not on the list are nobodys. They are not nearly as important. The justice system needs to deal fairly with criminal acts. So what if it was theft? Let us just give a light sentence; it was not a hate crime. That thinking is wrong. This legislation is wrong and should be defeated. It does not need to be passed in this form.

I have biases and prejudices and I do not make apologies for those. Some are positive biases and some may be considered to be negative biases. I have a negative bias toward the Liberal Party because of the legislation it put forward. I do not hate Liberals but I have a bias against them and that is why I did not run as a Liberal. That is fair and just. There is nothing wrong with that. I have a bias in favour of my wife. That is why I married her. I thought she was wonderful. I see other people I would never want to be married to. I may have a bias against them but I do not hate them. That is not a criminal action.

If this bill were passed, who knows how the courts might interpret the legislation? It is rather frightening because the bill is not just talking about assaults. It is talking about all criminal actions.

I could talk about a lot of issues but before my time runs out, I want to talk about whether laws like this create solutions or whether they exacerbate the problem.

• (2305)

There is another category of people who are not looked upon very highly. I happen to be one of them. That is the category we all fit into on these benches, the category of politicians. Politicians are not included in this legislation. I know all of us have heard people say that they should take all politicians, put them in a boat, take them to the middle of the Atlantic Ocean and sink the thing.

That is terrible. I would be one of them. I would be sunk. That could be considered hateful and wrong. So what should we do? Should we include politicians in this legislation as well? Is that going to solve the problem? Will people suddenly think we are wonderful because we put a law in place that says you must not say that politicians should be put in a boat, sailed out to the middle of the ocean and sunk? That would exacerbate the problem. People would say: "Aha, we were right. They should be put in a boat, taken to the middle of the ocean and sunk". This is creating a worse problem because it is bringing these groups into prominence.

In summation, let me give an example. This House wants to pass a bill that will give MPs a special pension. Is that not wonderful, a special law just for MPs. That is going to endear us to the public, is it not? It is far richer than any pension in the private sector. Is that going to make people love us more? No, it will do the opposite. People are going to say: "Those politicians, they have to have a special pension plan just for them. They have to have special laws just for them. They want to be above the common people. They need special consideration". People then begin to have negative feelings. They have biases and prejudices, perhaps even hatred against politicians. That is wrong.

The philosophy behind this bill is wrong. It needs to be defeated and I will be voting against it.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was not going to participate tonight. However, having listened to the very provocative comments, I thought it was time to once again attempt to set the record straight for the members

of the Reform Party who seem to have trouble reading very plain English.

Reform Party members in the course of their remarks tonight have totally misrepresented the effect of the proposed amendments to section 718.2 on page 8 of this bill.

Mr. Hanger: Is the member the only one who can interpret it?

Mr. Milliken: I am going to interpret it. I am going to tell the hon. member what it means with the hope I can get it through his head. This seems to have been a real problem tonight.

The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster said people would be convicted because of their hatred which is totally false. There is nothing in this bill dealing with hatred that changes the rules in respect of hatred. It does in respect of sentence, not in respect of the commission of an offence. There is a significant difference in law between those two.

A person will be convicted on the basis of the law as it stands. There is no change in the provisions in this act respecting hatred and conviction. A person is convicted of an offence against the law as it stands. This bill makes the sentence different from what it would otherwise be.

There is quite a difference between conviction and sentence. Sentence follows conviction; it does not precede it. A person does not get sentenced until he or she is convicted. A person must be convicted and will not be convicted under this law in any way which is different from that under the existing law. The new law will provide for a different sentence after conviction based on hate, if that is judged to be the basis of the crime.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley West went further in his remarks. He suggested this was going to change things and give all kinds of protection to pedophiles and other serious offenders. Mr. Speaker, I invite you to find that in this section of the act or indeed in this whole bill. Where is there any protection for anyone? This increases the severity of the sentence. That is not protection but increased offence and increased penalty. There is no change here that lets people off. It increases penalties for offences.

It says if you discriminate against someone based on sexual orientation you will get a harsher penalty. It does not say that persons who commit sexual offences get lighter penalties. That is what the hon. member for Fraser Valley West said in his speech. I have never heard such rubbish in my life. It is totally false, misleading and wrong. He should be ashamed to have made such a stupid comment.

• (2310)

We have heard dozens of them tonight, gross misrepresentations of this bill. I hear them in here and I get them in letters from constituents, particularly from British Columbia. They come floating into my office obviously stirred up by members of the Reform Party going out there and spouting this nonsense to their electors. Nothing could be further from the truth. This just is not right.

This bill does not do anything like what is being suggested in this House. All it deals with is sentencing. A person is convicted under the current law and then is sentenced. This provides a slightly heavier penalty for those who commit hate offences. That is all this does. This is not a case of revamping the law in relation to any minority groups. It provides for a stiffer penalty. What is wrong with that?

Mr. Hanger: It is already in place.

Mr. Milliken: If it is already in place, why are these minority groups crying out for this protection? They are saying people are beating them up with impunity. That is why. They are getting away with it or they get light sentences. This is exactly what they say.

Minority groups came to the committee. The hon. member was on the committee as far as I know. I was not, but I heard about it in the media. They cried out for help saying that judges do not believe they are being beaten up just because they are members of these minority groups. Judges give a light sentence as though it were a normal case of assault that just happened on the street. In fact minority groups are of the view, and this view is widely shared by members of this party, that gangs are going around looking for members of minority groups to beat them up.

Mr. Hanger: Deal with the gangs.

Mr. Milliken: That is what this bill is for. It will put them in prison. They will get a longer sentence if they have committed this kind of offence.

Why would members opposite take such exception to this? Who are they trying to protect by fighting this bill? The thugs who go about beating up these people. That is who they are trying to protect. Why do they have any interest in protecting those people? Surely they should be ashamed of protecting those kinds of people.

A little while ago I had reference to the fact that I represented a lot of people in prison in Kingston. I do and I am proud to represent them, but I do not expect that they would get lighter sentences because they go beating people up. I expect that they get punished for it.

This bill only asks that in taking into account what sentence is appropriate a judge consider certain aggravating circumstances. One of those aggravating circumstances is stated to be evidence that the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on a number of factors. What could possibly be wrong with that?

I can understand an argument that says we should have equality of treatment. An assault is an assault is an assault. If somebody gets bumped on the head whether it is because the person is out to beat him up because he is black, gay, Catholic,

Jewish, or whatever, okay, maybe that should not be treated differently. I understand that argument and that appears to be the argument Reform Party members are advancing although they are doing it in the most cumbersome fashion imaginable. They are putting all kinds of other things in the bill.

If that is the only argument, surely it is not unreasonable to have passed a bill that does not specify a minimum offence, that does not specify that the penalty must be heavier but does provide that in considering the sentence to be given, the judge must take that factor into account.

This has nothing to do with juries. This is a matter of sentencing which is in the exclusive purview of a judge under our system. Juries will not be deciding sentences for criminals based on this section. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West in his remarks implicated juries in the whole thing, which again is a gross distortion of the facts.

I am really having trouble understanding how it is that members of this House could possibly misconstrue this bill. This is an extremely minor change in the law. It has nothing to do with the commission of offences. It only has to do with penalties.

One of my colleagues got a call from a constituent about this one night asking why he was supporting this bill. He made it very clear by saying: "Why would I not? Unless you are raising a bunch of gay bashers in your house you will not have any worry about this bill either. It will not have anything to do with you". He was absolutely right. The only people who will be affected by the bill are the thugs who are running around communities beating up people. If those are the people Reform Party members are defending, I say to them that they should be ashamed of themselves.

• (2315)

I am not surprised and I think it appropriate to read something more from the little book of reform. One can derive some basis for the thoughts of members of the Reform Party on this issue when one hears their views on certain social issues. I would like to read some now.

The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville had better be careful; he is in this book too. I want to read a quote from the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, that enlightened patriarch of Canada's social system who said: "Old age security is welfare for the aged". Those are words of wisdom. That is what he said. Imagine.

We have the hon. member for Beaver River who is frequently quoted as an authority on this kind of subject. She said: "We feel that medicare is for the sick and not for the poor".

Then of course we have the hon. member for Capilano—Howe Sound, also well known as the father and architect of Canada's social programs, who said: "Having programs in support of single mothers causes mothers to be single and need support". My goodness. De profundis, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Milliken: I have more. I can see, Mr. Speaker, that they are a little overwrought.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, despite the very late hour I will try to return a little sanity to the debate.

Bill C–41, the sentencing bill before us, has some fundamental flaws. It seems the drafters could not decide what is the real purpose of sentencing. Should we base the prison term on the seriousness of the crime or the identity of the victim? Are alternative measures desirable because our jails are full or because it is more likely that criminals in community service programs are less likely to reoffend?

Certainly a structured program in open custody may be a preferable alternative to incarceration for a first time offender, especially if it is more for a minor property offence and genuine remorse is shown.

Is it appropriate for repeat offenders whether against property or people? Section 717 leaves alternative measures wide open. There are no limitations on which types of crime should be excluded. If it is primarily intended to empty our jails of the people who fail to pay their fines then say so. If it is supposed to provide an alternative for first time offenders who do not belong with hardened criminals then say so, but do not leave it wide open.

Who gets to decide which self–admitted criminal will benefit from alternative measures? In section 717(b) the bill only says a person. This means someone other than a judge may decide which criminals avoid court and a criminal conviction.

Why is the government reluctant to exclude habitual or violent offenders from alternative measures? Is it afraid of a charter challenge by murderers who would claim that their rights are being violated? If they are denied alternative measures, will lawyers try to tie up the courts with appeals and challenges to any decision to proceed in the courts?

If the government does not have the courage to restrict eligibility for alternative measures perhaps we must reconsider whether alternative measures should be available at all. As legislators we have a responsibility to society to make the tough decisions about which types of crime or offenders should be eligible.

A condition of people's eligibility under section 717 is admitting to their crime. However, after admitting to an offence, they are henceforth referred to as persons alleged to have committed an offence. There is no trial. They are never convicted of a crime. They are not called an offender and therefore have no criminal record. Furthermore their admission of guilt cannot be used against them in any future court proceedings. Alternative measures represent the ultimate plea bargaining dream for lawyers. Now they can admit to a crime, there is no conviction, and the records are buried after two years.

• (2320)

I quote from section 717.1:

> —regardless of the degree of their compliance with the terms and conditions of the alternative measures.

Something is very wrong with the sentencing bill. Section 717 needs to be fixed or struck.

Another seriously flawed section is 718 which outlines the purposes and principles of sentencing. Noticeably absent from the list is the concept of punishment. For example, under section 718(a) one objective is: "to denounce unlawful conduct". What is that supposed to mean? Breaking the law is not nice? Why do we not say that one objective is to punish unlawful conduct?

Under section 718(b) the objective is: "to deter the offender and other persons from committing offences". I find it encouraging that the government considers alternative measures such as raking leaves at the local park deterrents. At the same time it totally denies the deterrent value of capital punishment in the case of first degree murder. Which would give a person greater pause: the prospect of three square meals a day, leisure time and the opportunity to pursue a university degree behind bars, or the death penalty?

The objective of section 718(d) is: "to assist in rehabilitating offenders", which represents a clear indictment of our rehabilitation record. Why not simply say to rehabilitate offenders? Why qualify it? If we admit that they are not rehabilitated, that incarceration alone is not working and that we know they are going to reoffend, why are we letting them out? Is that consistent with public safety?

The drafters of the bill failed to realize that incarceration by itself does not punish or rehabilitate people. Likewise acknowledgement of one's actions is not the same thing as guilt or remorse. Let us face it, the real reason we are trying alternative measures is that the government is finally willing to admit the current prison system is not working. If the government can prove recidivism rates are lower with community service and open custody, why are the same principles of work and restitution to society not being applied during incarceration? What is wrong with making able bodied prisoners work?

The new Ontario government is contemplating workfare for welfare recipients. The bill advocates labour in the community, but the government is afraid it will be denying the rights of hardened criminals if they have to work to help compensate for their room and board in prison. Perfecting their golf swing or learning new safe cracking techniques from fellow inmates is hardly constructive or liable to contribute to rehabilitation or reintegration.

Why can we advocate labour for people in open custody but not for those in closed custody? Society should not fear the concept of punishment. Instead we seem to extend more rights to criminals than to victims. At last count Clifford Olsen had launched 32 frivolous lawsuits at taxpayers' expense. Instead of helping to support the cost of their upkeep and learning the habit of working every day, other felons like him go on strike over the quality of their food.

In section 718.2 the government completely departs from the previous implicit admission that our jails are crowded and incarceration as now practised is not working. Suddenly the government advocates putting people behind bars for longer periods, not based on the seriousness of the crime but on the physical attributes or the sexual preferences of the victim.

I find it ironic that in section 717 the government refuses to list which crimes are eligible for alternative measures, leaving it open to anything from car theft to murder. However when we turn to section 718.2 suddenly the government feels the need to create a list. If the aggravating and mitigating circumstances apply to everyone equally why is there a list of special considerations?

After letters opposing the new gun control legislation, the second highest number of letters I have received from my constituents concern the inclusion of the undefined phrase sexual orientation in the list of aggravating circumstances found in the bill. They do not want special rights extended to Canadians based on their sexual preferences, and that is what section 718.2 appears to do.

If the government caves in to special interest groups and political correctness then it should call a spade a spade.

• (2325)

By including the phrase sexual orientation the government is trying to deter gay bashing by heterosexuals. By leaving it undefined it can also include other sexual orientations such as pedophilia and necrophilia.

Liberal colleagues across the way will say that pedophilia is a crime in Canada. Yes, it is. A recent court decision said that sodomy with a 14–year–old was legal, but under section 718.2 if someone punches a pedophile he could receive a harsher sentence even though pedophilia is illegal under Canada's laws.

Canadians want equality. Sexual orientation has been the lightning rod for Bill C–41. Even if it were defined or removed, the fundamental premise of section 718.2 is flawed. Canadians

should be equal before the law and section 718.2 must be deleted in its entirety.

If we change a basic sentence in principle and emphasize the identity of the victim more than the severity of the crime, we will truly be on that slippery slope. The rule of law requires proof, not conjecture. Regrettably prejudice exists in Canada, but creating false inequalities through arbitrary criminal sentencing will hardly address the problem. If anything, it will increase intolerance by creating the justifiable perception that some groups are getting preferential treatment under the law.

In conclusion, justice is supposed to be blind. We all grew up with the image of the blindfolded woman holding the scales. Why do criminals not receive the same sentence for the same crime based on the seriousness of the offence, no matter what group the victim belongs to? Are some Canadian lives worth more or less than others? Prejudice, bias and hatred must be addressed through other mechanisms. It is not the role of the courts to implement the government's social engineering agenda.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax West will have the floor next. I would point out that it is 11:26 p.m. and the hon. member will probably not be concluding today. He will have the floor tomorrow.

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party made statements about lawyers and how terrible it is that so many lawyers in the country will get involved in the issue in various ways. Sometimes in this job it helps to have some understanding of the law and some training in law because we are dealing with interpretations. Reform members are telling us how laws will or will not be interpreted while at the same time they are claiming they have no understanding of legal matters.

The law is all about making distinctions. The penalties differ according to different elements of a crime. If there are additional elements in an offence then the penalties are different. For example, common assault is not considered in the same way. The penalty is not the same as an assault causing bodily harm because there are additional elements that require a stiffer or more serious response.

The reason the Criminal Code has so many sections is that we are making distinctions and there are many different elements and different kinds of crimes. When we are talking about an attack on a group there is a distinction. An attack of any kind is an important crime. It is important that there be strong sentences against attacks of whatever kind. When people are attacked because they belong to a group, whether it is a religious group or whatever, it is a kind of terrorism against the group. It is an additional element that requires an additional response. It is a little more serious. Both are serious but this is a little more so. It is an additional element and that distinction must be made.

I recently read the Supreme Court of Canada decision in the Egan and Nesbitt case which deals with the issue of sexual orientation. There are quite a number of different opinions but they all used the phrase sexual orientation. I do not know what members here or what lawyers in the country claim to be better lawyers and to know more about the law than the Supreme Court of Canada. However they are comfortable using that phrase and express no concern or no hesitation in doing so. That is the first point I wanted to make.

• (2330)

The second point is this section does not condone any kind of activity. However, the government has introduced an amendment which provides that nothing in the bill will change or make something not a crime or condone any activity that is a crime at present. Therefore if pedophilia is a crime now it will still be a crime. If necrophilia is a crime it will still be a crime. Those things will not change. I cannot see why they are so concerned about this provision.

Too often these kind of offences have received lighter sentences than they should and there are no bases in these cases for appeal. There must be a basis for an appeal and this provision provides for that. They must be treated seriously and the bill provides that. I recommend support.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first chapter of the May 1995 report of the Auditor General of Canada deals with issue of ethics and fraud awareness in government.

The auditor general goes on to state: "Leadership by members of Parliament, ministers and deputy ministers is critical to maintain ethical standards and performance in government".

The topic of my concern is move management conducted by the interdepartmental committee on household moves which involves hundreds of government personnel in administration and costs the government well in excess of $100 million annually.

My concern is the waste of the tens of millions of taxpayer dollars in the area of move management, conflict of interest, gift giving and possible fraud.

The waste of taxpayers dollars is well documented in a number of governmental reports dating back to the May 1991 audit on military move claims by the director general of audit at DND. The report stated:

> We conclude that the cost management framework governing the program of activities associated with the relocation of CF members is ineffective. The processes and activities we reviewed are not designed to ensure that each move is economical.

Consulting and Audit Canada in a reported dated November 1992 called for the elimination of military control of government moves and recommended privatization.

A policy directive signed by the ministers of government services, solicitor general and national defence of the previous government on October 15, 1993 terminated the military control of household moves and transferred it to the Department of government services with privatization of move management to follow.

Following the election a letter prepared by a Col. G.K. MacLean, signed by an aide to the Minister of National Defence, stated the decision by the three previous ministers dissolving the IDC was not appropriate and it was not within their competence to do so.

The waste and rip off continue to this day. In a report by Audit Services Canada, criminal matters branch, completed on August 30, 1994, further competition was recommended.

In a letter to the chairman of the IDC, Col. MacLean, George Addy, director of investigation and research bureau of competition policy, states:

> As we have indicated to you, in addition to promoting the benefits of encouraging competition, we have particular concern that the terms of the tender could induce a breach of the 1993 prohibition order against the major van lines.

This is unbelievable. Here we have DND inducing private sector suppliers to breach the law.

The IDC allowed two new bidders into the club as of this fiscal year and they received $14 million in household moving business. Major Harrison, a member of the IDC, cancelled half of this contract one day prior to the start of the contract. On June 8 last week Major Harrison cancelled the remaining part of the contract.

The information I have is that the new bidder was harassed, the businesses of his suppliers threatened and that his business was terminated without cause to maintain the cosy, profitable arrangement established with the four van lines to maintain a closed club.

The information I have indicates that Major Harrison acted on his own without the authority of the IDC. When I phoned him yesterday to question him on whose authority he suspended the contract, jeopardizing a number of private businesses that could go bankrupt, businesses that pay his salary and our salary, he told me to call his lawyer. His arrogance to a member of Parliament elected to be held accountable for governance does a disservice to his country.

This issue has been on my desk since I was first elected in 1993. I have been stonewalled, lied to and had information withheld from me. I have heard allegations that the weight of goods moved on behalf of the government has been inflated, fraudulent insurance claims have been made and gifts have been given to government officials.

I have examples of people leaving government employ and going to work for the van lines and related businesses. If this is not a conflict of interest I do not know what is.

I have received zero satisfaction from DND on this issue. This issue cries out for a forensic investigation. I am supplying the auditor general's criminal branch with all of my information and sources it can check.

As we clean up this mess and hold the responsible accountable, this will in the future become a classic case study of waste and corruption that used to be.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for giving me the opportunity to address his question and to set the record straight.

The interdepartmental committee on household goods removal manages the movement of household goods of federal government employees. While the committee is chaired by and receives administrative support from the Department of National Defence, it also contains members from the RCMP and Public Works and Government Services of Canada.

The bureau of competitions did conduct an exhaustive review of the interdepartmental committee's contracting procedure and concluded these procedures complied with all aspects of competitive law.

In addition, there were a number of recommendations for increasing competition and encouraging new companies to bid for contracts. Many of these recommendations were implemented this past year and others are scheduled to take effect in the future.

As a result of these changes four new companies submitted bids for a share of the contracts to be awarded over the coming year and two of them were successful. It now turns out that both of these successful companies are run by the same person and for reasons unknown to the department or anybody they have now withdrawn their bids and have decided not to accept the government contracts. Accordingly the interdepartmental committee suspended Corporate Moving Services, CMS, on June 8 last week.

The government has not forced any contractor to withdraw its bid. I emphasize that. The government tariff is the lowest corporate tariff provided by the moving industry. The net result so far of the changes has been an overall lowering of prices by over 9 per cent in 1995 alone and an anticipated saving to the government over the next year of $10 million.

The process has been going on for about five years with the effect of a 35 per cent reduction in price. We intend to continue to streamline our procedures and implement changes that will encourage competition and lower prices.

I thank my hon. colleague for the opportunity to set the record straight and to stress the government is committed to fairness in awarding government contracts while at the same time ensuring the best possible value for the Canadian taxpayer.

The Speaker: It being 11.36 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11.38 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 14, 1995

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

MUSICFEST CANADA

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the city of Calgary for hosting MusicFest Canada 95.

MusicFest Canada is the largest educational music festival in North America. With school choirs, jazz ensembles and concert bands from coast to coast, over 7,000 students were welcomed by the people of Calgary. Their warm hospitality was appreciated by all schools attending this event including Huron Heights Secondary School which is in my riding.

The Huron Jazz Ensembles conducted by Kevin Anderson represented Huron Heights with class in their role as ambassadors of the York—Simcoe region in this prestigious festival. Both c'est jazz, Huron's vocal jazz ensemble, and After Hours, the senior jazz band, were honoured with silver awards for their splendid performances.

In individual categories, Huron Heights again placed among the nation's best. Andrew Jones was named lead trombonist in the festival's Canadian All–Star Jazz Band. Andrew was also honoured with a prestigious General Motors award of excellence scholarship.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TELEFILM CANADA

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the cuts announced at Telefilm threaten successful festivals like the international film festival in Abitibi–Témiscamingue and the Carrousel festival in Rimouski, which will lose their subsidies entirely.

These festivals, however, have proven their success, often on shoestring budgets, with the quality of their events and their popularity with the public. They are local initiatives that are the pride of their region and of all of Quebec.

Telefilm's director, François Macerola, revealed his true colours with the dispassionate comment that the cuts had to be made somewhere. Clearly, the aim is to cut in the regions and concentrate everything in the major centres to benefit the money–making cultural events and industries. That is what it is all about. Quebecers cannot imagine their future as a people without the support and vitality of all the regions in Quebec.

This is another example of Quebec solidarity that the federal government fails to grasp. We wonder whether the directors should not attend one of the Minister of Canadian Heritage's $2,000 a plate dinners to ensure the survival of the regional festivals. When is the minister's next dinner?

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS SECURITY SERVICES

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a select group of men and women we as parliamentarians have come to know on a professional basis. The people of whom I speak are the men and women of the House of Commons security services which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year.

The history of the security services may be traced from the original two parliamentary door guards appointed to keep watch on the newly constructed departmental buildings in 1865 through the creation in 1868 of the Dominion Police Force which was absorbed into the Royal North West Mounted Police in 1920, to the creation of the House of Commons protective staff. In recent years, in recognition of the broader scope of its activities, the House changed the title to security services. It has and continues to provide an excellent service, not only to the members of this House, but to all who enter these buildings.

I invite all members of this House to join me in congratulating members of the House of Commons security services on a job well done as well as wishing them continued success in the years to come.

S. O. 31

INTEREST RATES

Mr. Jag Bhaduria (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville, Ind. Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the battle lines continue to grow each day concerning who is right and who is wrong in analysing the Canadian economy. On one side people such as Lloyd Atkinson, former head economist at the Bank of Montreal, are saying that unless the Bank of Canada eases up on interest rates, our economy will be heading toward a recession within a year. On the other side is Bank of Canada Governor Gordon Thiessen who feared a move to decrease the interest rate because it would undermine his bank's inflation fighting credentials.

Still other noted economists strongly believe that the Bank of Canada will have no choice but to either lower interest rates or let the dollar weaken to keep the economy afloat. Yesterday's unexpected announcement by the Bank of Canada of a reduction rate by 19 basis points to 7.19 per cent was a welcome relief for Canadians. Our standard of living has steadily declined over the past four years. We need a made in Canada interest rate policy.

* * *

SPINA BIFIDA

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, bringing to the attention of the House the plight of lesser known diseases is neither exciting nor titillating, but the tragedies they leave in their wake are real.

This is Spina Bifida Week in Canada. This illness occurs within the first four weeks of pregnancy and causes various levels of permanent nerve damage and lower limb paralysis. One in every 750 children born in Canada has spina bifida.

We now know that giving folic acid to a woman during early pregnancy can reduce the risk of spina bifida in the fetus. The Spina Bifida Association would like to raise awareness of the benefits of folic acid among women of child bearing age and among the population in general.

In 1994–95 Health Canada contributed $55,000 to assist the national level of the Spina Bifida Association of Canada in its many developmental, promotional and service activities across the country.

I congratulate the Spina Bifida Association and its many volunteers for their quiet but excellent work, and ask members to join me—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Perth—Wellington—Waterloo.

* * *

STRATFORD CHEFS SCHOOL

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, culinary writer Marcella Hazan refers to it as the best of its kind in the world. A Cornell University study called it the best all round training school.

The success story they are referring to is the Stratford Chefs School. The school is operated by Stratford restaurant owners James Morris and Eleanor Kane. From November to March, their restaurant kitchens are transformed into classrooms and their cooks into teachers.

By learning from professionals in a working atmosphere, graduates are able to make the transition to the workforce without missing a step. Today, graduates are being snapped up by the world's hottest restaurants in Germany, England, New York and Japan.

Considering the 100 per cent employment record of the school, there is little mystery surrounding the yearly flood of applications to fill the 65 available positions.

I congratulate the Stratford Chefs School and wish it continuing success in the international sphere.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TAINTED BLOOD

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, more damning revelations were made yesterday by Dr. Perrault in connection with the work of the Krever Commission. Dr. Perrault, formerly of the Red Cross, stated that only one national political authority could have resolved the impasse at the time and prevented the infection of hundreds of hemophiliacs.

For the first time, Dr. Perrault indicated that this political authority was the federal Minister of Health, since the products used by hemophiliacs were clearly under federal jurisdiction.

• (1405)

Despite these allegations, Justice Krever still does not intend to ask the federal politicians involved in the matter to testify before the commission. Why this stubbornness? Whose interests are being served by not having this whole disturbing business come to light? The Bloc Quebecois is wondering about the real reasons keeping the whole truth on this terrible tragedy from coming out.

* * *

[*English*]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Waterloo asked me when I was going to poll my constituents on Bill C–68 and follow the results. I did. The results of an impartial question were 84 per cent opposed to government legislation.

Last night after the Liberals rammed through the passage of Bill C–68, a CTV program held a phone in poll asking whether or not the public supported the government legislation. The program Canada Tonight which is broadcast from Vancouver to Toronto made use of two 1–900 numbers for the listening audience to phone in and cast their vote. Twenty–three thousand six hundred people made their wishes known. Eighty–four per cent opposed the government legislation.

For Liberal backbenchers who wanted to represent their constituents, the Prime Minister had a warning in caucus this morning. Vote against me once, that is once too often. Vote against me twice, you are out. That is Liberal democracy.

The Minister of Justice thought his problems were over last night. They are only just beginning.

* * *

ONTARIO ELECTION

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is usually not my style to rub salt in a wound, but after sitting in the House last week listening to all the Ontario Liberal MPs state how they were going to sweep the provincial election and wipe out the Conservatives, I feel it is time for me to have my say. Therefore, first and foremost, I am serving a special lunch tomorrow in my office. I invite all of them to come. They will eat crow as the entrée.

Also, it is truly sad to hear the Reform members taking credit for the Conservative party win when they did not get a single solitary Reform member candidate elected.

Let us give credit where credit is due. Let us congratulate Premier–elect Mike Harris and the PC party on such a decisive victory.

All I have to say to the Liberals and the Reformers is that in 1997 I will see them once again. I will be serving the entrée of crow.

* * *

BRIAN DUCHARME

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Health presented Canada volunteer awards to several outstanding Canadians. Among them was Brian Ducharme of Tecumseh, Ontario in the riding of Windsor—St. Clair.

Brian Ducharme has served as a volunteer board member with Hiatus House in Windsor since 1981. Hiatus House is a shelter for battered women and their children. Because of the contributions of Brian Ducharme and others like him, it is a shelter with a difference. Indeed, it is the premier facility of its kind in Canada.

I am proud to be able to acknowledge Mr. Ducharme and his contributions in this House.

S. O. 31

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we paid tribute to the tremendous contribution of the federal Public Service of Canada. With all the pain associated with downsizing where many employees are deemed surplus and unnecessary, it is critical during this difficult period that we dispel the many stereotypes that exist about our public service.

It is also critical particularly at this time that we offer support to those public servants and their families who have been affected. We are at a crossroads in our history where the role and direction of government is being scrutinized.

Canada is a great nation that is making great strides to remain competitive in an ever changing global marketplace. Canada's public service is known as one of the best in the world. All Canadians benefit from the many services they deliver which makes Canada the number one country in which to live.

Today I salute the many public servants in my riding of Cumberland—Colchester. I thank them for their dedicated quality service and their commitment to finding better ways to improve Canada.

* * *

CLAIRE CULHANE

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mrs. Claire Culhane of Vancouver East has been selected as one of the 23 recipients of the 1995 Canada Volunteer Medal and Certificate of Honour.

Mrs. Culhane is a respected and admired Canadian who is a competent fighter for justice. Some of her campaigns against injustice include: anti–Franco activities in Spain in the 1930s; anti–poverty activities in Montreal in the 1940s; assisting her husband with the Shipyard Labour Organization in 1944; leading the Workers Education Association in 1945; and opposing Canada's involvement in the Vietnam war.

• (1410)

She is currently forming the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted. She became involved in the support group for the wrongful imprisonment of Christine Lamont in Brazil. She has written books which are required reading for criminology courses in many of Canada's universities.

Mrs. Culhane received the commemorative medal for the 125th anniversary of Canada's Confederation and is an honorary member of the British Columbia Humanist Association.

I would like to thank Mrs. Culhane for her outstanding work and congratulate her for her many achievements.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, twelve Canadian peacekeepers are among the hostages still being held by Bosnian Serbs, while several other UN peacekeepers and observers were released yesterday.

We hope that they will not be used as the ultimate bargaining chip and demand that they be released immediately and unconditionally.

We deeply regret the rather low key involvement of the Canadian government in this crisis. Not only is Canada not a member of the contact group, which considerably limits its influence, but it has no policy regarding a Canadian contribution to the new rapid reaction force.

Such a lack of leadership could harm not only Canada's reputation but also the efforts of peacekeepers on the site, as the Bosnian army prepares to launch an offensive north of Sarajevo, which could lead to another crisis.

* * *

[*English*]

SENTENCING LEGISLATION

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–41 destroys the principle that as Canadians we all stand equal before the law. Section 718.2 of this bill would have the courts administer greater penalties for violent crimes committed against certain groups identified by the justice minister in this bill.

The courts already take aggravating and mitigating circumstances into consideration when determining the penalty to impose on an offender. This section tells the court that some acts of violence are to be taken more seriously than others because of who the victims are. This creates special status and is unacceptable.

Section 718.2 serves absolutely no purpose other than to grant an opportunity for the justice minister to make a politically correct statement. The Criminal Code, the law of this land, is not the place for the government to be making politically correct statements. The Criminal Code must uphold the most fundamental principle of law: that all Canadians, all citizens must stand equal before the law.

NUCLEAR NON–PROLIFERATION TREATY

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Government of France has just announced that it plans to resume nuclear testing in the South Pacific, ending a moratorium on testing that has held since 1992.

The statement of principles from the nuclear non–proliferation treaty signed in May of this year commits all nuclear weapons states to exercise utmost restraint on nuclear testing pending the signing of a comprehensive test ban treaty. The French announcement is clearly a step in the opposite direction.

The Canadian government was one of the many nations that pushed to make this treaty binding and permanent. Now, just one month after that signing, the spirit of the agreement is threatened.

I call on the Canadian government to show that it means what it says by protesting France's decision and to restate this country's commitment to a ban on all nuclear testing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEPUTY PREMIER OF QUEBEC

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Deputy Premier of Quebec took the opportunity, while visiting the Parliament in Strasbourg, to make waves and try to discredit Canada over the issue that has become known as the turbot war.

"We were extremely disappointed", he said,"to see our country reduced to opening fire on fishing vessels from friendly countries".

Must we remind the Deputy Premier of Quebec of the extraordinary support received by Canada both at home and abroad in this conflict? Perhaps he should be reminded that the Bloc Quebecois and a very large majority of Quebecers also supported our position.

These remarks on the part of the PQ Deputy Premier are unjustified and reek of separatist expediency. A certain premier's personal totem is vibrant weasel; did we witness the birth of the thoughtful catfish, yesterday?

* * *

[*English*]

CAROL COLANGELO

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 19 the city of St. Catharines will honour one of its own with a special certificate of merit for the heroic events of Carol Colangelo.

Last September a little girl fell into the water off the west pier in Port Dalhousie. The little girl's aunt who could not swim saw Carol Colangelo and her husband and ran to them for help.

• (1415)

Carol kicked off her shoes and jumped in. Four–year old Kaitlyn Theobald was unconscious and sinking when Carol

reached her. The heavy clothing Carol was wearing made it difficult to rescue Kaitlyn. With the help of her husband Ron, both Carol and Kaitlyn were pulled to safety.

I join with the city of St. Catharines in congratulating Carol Colangelo for her heroic actions.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nepean.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

MEMBER FOR NEPEAN

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish you would have waited until I had finished my statement before you did that. It makes it more difficult for me.

I would like to publicly thank the members of the House and the constituency of Nepean for the many kindnesses shown to me these past few months during my surgery and illness. I have been overwhelmed with letters, phone calls, flowers and gifts, personal testimonies, prayers, love and good wishes. I have quickly come to realize how important it is to have friends like I have. For this I thank you.

I must also thank the surgical team headed by Dr. Rolando Del Maestro of Victoria Hospital in London, Ontario. I am so grateful that the professionalism of his team has allowed me to quickly return to this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Welcome home, Beryl. I like your hat.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bouchard: Mr. Speaker, we all like the hat and the person under it. I am very happy and very proud that she is back in the House. Welcome.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CANADA SOCIAL TRANSFER

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a report published today, the National Council of Welfare launched a stinging condemnation of the Canada social transfer. According to the report, this brainchild of the Minister of Finance was the worst initiative in 30 years because it threatened to destroy the very foundation of social services and programs in Canada. According to the Council, the reform of transfer payments would inevitably lead to a reduction in spending on social assistance.

My question is of course directed to the father of this brainchild, the Minister of Finance.

Does the minister agree, as the Council stated, that by reducing federal contributions to social programs funding, the Canada social transfer will cause the provinces to reduce their budgets for social assistance and make the most vulnerable in our society even poorer?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I liked the preamble much better than the question.

[*Translation*]

The fact is that the Canada social transfer as such will not involve any cuts in transfers to the provinces. What it does provide, whether there are cuts or not, is far more flexibility for the provinces in deciding how to meet the needs of their residents. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should complain that we are giving the provinces the flexibility they want.

• (1420)

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance and its minister seem to live on another planet, because if they were right about this explanation, it would mean that the demand for health care has dropped and that to adjust to a changing world, in other words, to a reduction in the need for health care and social services, the Department of Finance would, very sensibly, have reduced its contribution.

That, however, is not the case and I wonder how the minister, who is unable to justify the reduction in the Canada social transfer, would be able to justify the new cuts totalling $1.6 billion in the Unemployment Insurance Plan, cuts that will have a more severe impact on the regional economies of Quebec, which has more seasonal workers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, there will be no cuts in the Canada social transfer concept. The transfer is a concept that will give the federal government a chance to maintain its transfers and at the same time give the provinces more flexibility.

I think the Prime Minister was very clear about this last week when he said, in referring to medicare, that it would put the federal government in a position where it could protect and also maintain cash transfers which, according to a timeframe established some years ago, will disappear if no action is taken immediately.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know that political speeches and responses in the House may be somewhat complex and sometimes unnecessarily so, but this is a real masterpiece.

How can the federal government tell us that Canada transfers will help the federal government protect medicare, for instance,

while in the same breath it says that it intends to make substantial cuts in the government's contribution to medicare? I would appreciate an answer.

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was very clear last week, as was the minister of HRD, as I was, that the cash contributions of the federal government are steadily declining, according to a schedule that was established a long time ago.

With this particular measure we have put the federal government in a position where it will be able to flat line those cash contributions over a period of time while maintaining the federal government's contribution to the very important social programs of the country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a year ago, rumours were flying that the Canada assistance plan was headed for the chopping block. In the last budget, it was announced that the cash payments to the provinces for social programs would be cut by $7 billion within two years, which was the amount previously allocated to social assistance.

Does the Minister of Finance confirm that the Canada social transfer's sole objective is to progressively reduce to zero the federal government's contribution to social assistance funding, while preserving its ability to continue setting national standards?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's premise is totally wrong. First of all, the provinces, including Quebec, started to cut well before the federal government tabled its budget.

Second, for this year and next year, not only does the budget not prescribe any cuts but it actually increases federal transfers.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin: I must tell you that the hon. member's figures are wrong. I cannot answer a question based on an invalid premise.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am speechless. In case he forgot, the Minister of Finance announced $7 billion in cuts in his last budget. Today, he tells us that there are no cuts.

An hon. member: No, he says there are increases.

Mr. Gauthier: Well, I am dumbfounded. Mr. Speaker, I will give the minister a second chance.

• (1425)

Since the funds allocated to the provinces for social assistance will dry up in two years because of the federal cuts announced in his budget, will the Minister of Finance frankly admit that it would have been impossible for him to impose federal standards on the provinces had he not invented the Canada social transfer ruse?

[*English*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member says he has a little difficulty understanding French, a little difficulty understanding Latin. My Latin is not too good either.

Let me say it again in English. The Leader of the Opposition says his colleague has no difficulty understanding math. He now says I have got the wrong person.

Since the government took office, transfers to the provinces have increased. Transfers to the provinces have not been cut for this year and in fact are going up.

Ultimately there will be a cut but that is no excuse for provincial action. The fact is any province, including the province of Quebec, has as much money to work with today as it did when we took office. Let us be very clear about that.

As far as social programs are concerned, a mechanism has been put in place that stops their continuous erosion all the way down to zero. There have been reductions but we have set in place a mechanism and any province that wants to sit down with us or the minister of HRD and is prepared to look at national values, that mechanism is in place.

There is a pre–condition to all of that. That is the goodwill and the understanding that this is one country and that this country wants to build, not destroy.

* * *

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, another day and yet another troubling revelation about the heritage minister and his dollars for contracts dinner in Montreal.

André Bureau, the former head of the CRTC and the current president of The Astral Broadcasting Group, has now revealed that he received an invitation to the minister's private money gathering event, as did his business partner, Harold Greenberg. Astral has direct business dealings with both the CRTC and with the heritage department. Mr. Bureau and Mr. Greenberg, however, could see a potential conflict of interest in the dinner and to their credit declined the invitation.

If André Bureau, a former and respected public servant, aware of the federal code of ethics, could clearly see the potential for a conflict of interest in the minister's dinner, why is it that the minister, the Prime Minister and the government cannot see that conflict?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I could ask the leader of the Reform Party in return why the hon. member cannot see that this is an open and transparent event because of the way the donations are reported according to the election law of Canada. Therefore what the hon. member is looking for is simply not there.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are wondering why the government pretends it cannot see the ethical issue which is involved here. Legitimate political fundraisers involving a minister do not target clients having business or regulatory dealings with the minister's department.

The heritage minister was clearly in the wrong and the government is making matters worse by pretending that it does not see the wrong.

By the ethical standards of the red book, is it right or is it wrong for ministers to participate in political fundraisers targeted to clients having business or regulatory dealings with their departments? Is it right or is it wrong?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question.

Ministers take part in fundraising activities just as the leader of that party takes part in fundraising activities. It is a normal part of the political process in this country to take part in fundraising activities.

• (1430)

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, no Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister or House leader can present themselves to this House as the guardians of ethics in government unless they can tell right from wrong and unless they are willing to act on discernments of that kind. That is what ethics are all about.

I ask the government House leader one more time, and I will say it slowly so it is clear. Is it right or wrong for ministers to participate in political fundraisers targeted to people having business or regulatory dealings with their departments? If it is wrong, will the heritage minister resign?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question. It is clear when it comes to this topic that it is not the hon. member's strong suit.

[*Translation*]

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. In its recently tabled report on Bill C–76, the Liberal majority on the finance committee states, and I quote: "The Committee recognizes the obligation of the Minister of Human Resources Development to develop, through mutual consent with the provinces, principles and objectives for the social assistance and post–secondary education components of the CHST".

What does the minister intend to do with the finance committee's recommendation, which insists on his obligation to develop national standards for education and social assistance?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we set out very clearly in the budget what the process would be.

We will be inviting the provinces to meet with us to discuss how we can arrive through mutual consent at a useful and effective set of principles that will help guide the country in a united, co–operative, integrated way to reach our social goals. It is really based upon good faith that there is a real willingness by all provinces and the federal government to come together and arrive at a way in which we can effectively combine our resources to target them to the groups of people who are in most serious need and at the same time make sure we can protect and maintain the fundamental principles underlying our system of health care and social assistance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister has yet to get together with his provincial counterparts, will he now pledge not to impose new principles or national standards if a province objects to them?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody should prejudge the process. As I read the recollections, I was very interested in the comments of the minister in Quebec who is responsible for employment matters, who talked about the need to come together to look at more active programming for employment and to try to find ways in which we can facilitate investment in individuals.

This is the same thing we have been saying for a year and a half. It is nice to see that there is now a coming together of minds on this matter from the Government of Quebec and that it now shares the point of view that we need reform and reorganization.

I am sure that if we can organize the goodwill we will find effective ways to give Canadians a common, co–operative, united framework to approach some of our most important social concerns.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was revealed that Private David Brocklebank, who was acquitted of all charges in the death of Shidane Arone, was charged because of his conduct in the First Airborne video.

Despite the minister's promises of openness, these new charges were kept secret from the public and even from the Somalia commission itself.

How can the public have any confidence in the government's commitment to the Somalia inquiry when it insists on acting behind its back?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Private Brocklebank was informed, as was his counsel, on April 7 that two charges were to be laid under the National Defence Act for conduct unbecoming a member of the Canadian military.

• (1435)

Those charges were held in abeyance pending a legal review of the case to see whether or not proceeding with that disciplinary action would prejudice the commission.

The legal opinion was that proceeding with this would not prejudice the commission. As a result, the charge was allowed to go on in conformity with the normal practices of the National Defence Act and the nature of this particular offence, which in no way related directly to the criminal charges and others related to the death of Mr. Arone.

Therefore, this particular matter was allowed to proceed and a summary hearing was heard. This was all in accordance with normal practices. It is not anyone's intention to go behind anyone's back. We did this in the normal way.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this was a weapons handling charge. If such charges are not included in the Somalia commission inquiry, they should be.

The minister has frequently told this House, and yesterday said it to the face of a tearful wife and mother, that he cannot prejudice the inquiry. In my view, keeping the Brocklebank charges secret for two months prejudices the inquiry. Mark Boland's imprisonment prejudices the inquiry. Barry Armstrong's sudden deployment to Bosnia prejudices the inquiry.

How can the minister defend the contradiction between his professed wish for openness and his department's policy to lock up, shut down, or ship off eyewitnesses to the events in Somalia?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically all of the accusations contained in the hon. member's question.

It seems that the hon. member, for whom I have great respect as an individual, and the members of his party are more interested in putting partisan considerations before justice.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA SOCIAL TRANSFER

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

During the year and a half that the federal government has been in power, the reforms it has proposed have had only one purpose: to increase its inefficient intervention in several of the provinces' jurisdictions. More than ever, flexible federalism means that Ottawa decrees and the provinces must accommodate.

Will the minister acknowledge that the Canada social transfer not only offers nothing new or of interest to Quebecers, but also, on the contrary, that it brings the federal government closer and closer to its dream of creating a highly centralized Canada, which is unacceptable to Quebecers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has contradicted himself in his own question. What we are in the process of doing with the Canada social transfer is, first of all, keeping the fiscal burden under control, which will enable the federal government to continue transferring money for social programs to the provinces.

Second, what we are trying to do is give the provinces the flexibility they need to adapt their own programs to the needs of the people. I must say that I find it utterly absurd that a Bloc Quebecois member is actually criticizing the federal government for having given more power and flexibility to the provinces.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the real contradiction lies in the fact that it is irresponsible to impose national standards without pledging the corresponding funds.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crête: Will the minister not admit that everything that his government has done since it was elected, the single window

concept, the rationalization of employment centres and the creation of the human resources investment fund, goes totally and utterly against the consensus in Quebec, which is that Quebec must gain full power over labour?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. Everything we have done, everything we have said, whether it was regarding single window service, the fund for entrepreneurs or community initiatives, has addressed the requests and wishes of local communities.

Not only are we in the process of decentralizing, but we are doing it because that is what the regions have requested.

[*English*]

Let us be very clear what the member said in the preamble to his statement. He said that he, on behalf of his party, was against national standards in the CHST. The most important national standards in the CHST are the principles of the Canada Health Act. This government stands behind the Canada Health Act and so do the people of Quebec. He had better learn that.

* * *

• (1440)

TRANSPORT

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this highway 104 controversy is not going to go away, much to the dismay of the minister of public works. As I stand here, a lawsuit is being initiated by the Citizens for Fairness in the Wentworth Valley of Nova Scotia naming the minister of public works as a defendant. This moves us not only into morally and ethically wrong behaviour but also illegal actions.

Since the Prime Minister refuses to call in the ethics counsellor, why will this government not cut its losses on this mess now and commit to returning the misappropriated funds back to the Wentworth Valley bypass project on highway 104?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question of allocation of funds to highway construction, as the hon. member should know by now, is a provincial responsibility.

In the event that the Government of Nova Scotia or any other government in the country wishes to discuss the reallocation of funds, we will be prepared to do that, as we have done on dozens of occasions as a federal government over the past 10 years.

The case in question the hon. member refers to is a situation that arose when the Government of Nova Scotia decided to reallocate funds within the existing agreement. Section 12 of that agreement allows for the reallocation of funds by consensus.

If the Government of Nova Scotia wishes to reallocate funds to this or any other highway, as is the case with any other province where a similar agreement exists, we will look at it, because that is what the hon. member often refers to as being flexible federalism.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's ethics counsellor gets about as much work as the Maytag repairman. The only difference is the Liberal machine is in desperate need of repair.

I wonder if corruption is a federal or a provincial responsibility.

Since the Minister of Transport is also going to be named as a defendant, I will place the question to him. Will he recommend to the Prime Minister that he tell the public works minister to return the money he diverted to buy votes in his riding or at least step down pending the results—

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would urge you not to impugn motives of any kind in your questions.

I would ask the hon. member perhaps if he could rephrase that question, but just the question with no preamble.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to suggest the minister of public works would buy votes.

Would the Prime Minister be willing to look at the situation and ask the minister of public works to step down pending the investigation of the auditor general's report, pending litigation, pending the complaints from the Reform Party, pending Liberal—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. member stand in this House and lecture us on ethics is somewhat akin to listening to a tom cat talk about morality.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

* * *

• (1445)

[*Translation*]

JOB CREATION

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House in response to a question from the official opposition, the Minister of Finance admitted, for the first time and publicly, that Canada's economy is in a slowdown and might not recover until next year.

My question is for the Minister of Finance.

Given that, for the first time, the minister is admitting that the economy has slowed down and that, furthermore, there has been no net creation of jobs in the past six months, is the minister

prepared to drop his lax approach and come up with some concrete support and job creation measures?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I said the economy had clearly slowed down, I did not say that the slowdown would last the entire year. In the opinion of most economists, it is a pause, and we should see a recovery in the third and fourth quarters.

Having said that, as I repeated yesterday, I point out that over 220,000 jobs were created in the private sector, for example, in the past year—a fairly substantial number.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the Minister of Finance, the economy is in a slowdown at the moment. In his recent budget, he predicted that the 1996 slowdown would be even worse than this year's. Most economists are talking about a possible recession in Canada for 1997.

I would ask the Minister of Finance where the unemployed should look for hope.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development— Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hope may be found in the infrastructure program the government has set up. Hope may be found in the job creation programs of the Minister of Human Resources Development. Hope may be found in the programs of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and of the Minister of Agriculture. Hope may be found in the high tech policies of the Minister of Industry. Hope may be found in the policy of this government, which reversed the policies of the previous government in order to give Canada a real future.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the director of the mountain parks division of the department of heritage recently accepted a Japanese junket courtesy of CP Hotels. Canadian Pacific, it turns out, has major development plans in the Jasper and Banff national parks, which come under the mountain parks division of the heritage department.

Why was a top Parks Canada official allowed to accept a nine day junket from a corporation which has direct business dealings with his division?

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take note of the question and get back to the hon. member.

Is the hon. member suggesting that parks officials should not be promoting tourism in his region?

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, given the ethical standards set by the minister it is a wonder public servants did not ask CP for a donation to the heritage minister's dinner.

The actions of the director of mountain parks clearly violate Treasury Board guidelines and seriously compromise the heritage department's objectivity.

Will the ethics counsellor be investigating the matter or is the Prime Minister planning to handle this one personally?

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful the health budget can cover the cost of therapy for all the conspiracy syndromes members of the Reform Party have.

I understand the deputy minister is reviewing the matter to which the hon. member has referred and I will be happy to inform him of the results as soon as they arrive.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OVERFISHING

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during his visit to the European Parliament, Quebec's deputy premier openly condemned Canada for its action against Spain in the turbot dispute. This new change of direction by Mr. Landry goes against the support expressed by his leader, Mr. Parizeau, regarding our intervention, as well as by the Bloc Quebecois.

My question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Can the minister assure Canadian fishermen, particularly those in Quebec, that Mr. Landry's change of direction will have little impact on the issue of overfishing off Canada's coasts?

• (1450)

[*English*]

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his excellent question.

On behalf of all members in the House, including I am sure members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we are shocked at the statement of the deputy premier.

An hon. member: Over here in the Reform Party.

Mr. Tobin: Nobody would take the risk of speaking for you fellows.

We are shocked that the deputy premier of Quebec in Strasbourg condemned the Canadian government position in the

turbot dispute when it is clear all members of the House in all parties strongly support these measures to protect Canadian fishermen.

[*Translation*]

It is clear to me, and to Canadian and Quebec fishermen, that Mr. Landry's positions—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Tobin: Just a second, please. This is very important. Mr. Landry seems to be talking out of both sides of his mouth.

* * *

AMF TECHNO TRANSPORT

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

When he appeared before the transport committee, the minister refused to guarantee the survival of CN's subsidiary, AMF, which employs over 1,300 workers in Pointe-Saint-Charles, one of the poorest areas in Canada. The minister even said that AMF's situation was precarious.

Given the economic situation which currently prevails in Montreal, and particularly in Pointe-Saint-Charles, will the minister tell us why he refuses to guarantee that AMF will survive and that its 1,300 employees will not lose their jobs?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that AMF's situation is precarious. I hope that the hon. member will realize that other regions in the country have experienced the same situation. As a New Brunswick native, I can tell you that we had the same problem in Moncton, when CN decided to pull out of there, a decision which affected over 1,000 employees.

AMF's best chance of survival is to find a solution to CN's current problem in its negotiations with an international company interested in moving there. A solution must not only be found to the impasse related to the acquisition costs, but also to the productivity of that plant.

We all recognize the problem which exists at AMF, and I hope that CN and the eventual buyer will find a solution to the difficulties which, so far, have been a major obstacle.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for regional development in Quebec, agree that saving 1,300 jobs in Pointe-Saint-Charles should be at least as important for the federal government as buying capital assets to make CN more interesting for its future buyers? Beyond the minister's rhetoric, where is the hope for these 1,300 workers?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the possibility of commercializing CN is a very serious issue. So is, of course, the future of AMF, both for its workers and for greater Montreal. We are all aware of that, and every effort is being made to try to find a solution.

We will continue to co-operate with CN, in the hope of finding a way to reach an agreement which would ensure the sale and survival of AMF, which is a very important industry for the Montreal region.

* * *

[*English*]

HUGHES AIRCRAFT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week it was revealed the government is prepared to allow Hughes Aircraft to delete three main features of its contract to provide a new automated air traffic control system and stick Transport Canada with the cost of training and installation which was included in the original contract and lease us the equipment we were supposed to own.

• (1455)

Also, the completion date has been pushed back two years. To add insult to injury Hughes wants more money, and the government is actually considering giving it.

Will the minister please tell the House why Hughes was not told to live up to its original contract or have it cancelled?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member of the Reform Party who is critic in matters of transport obviously lives an exciting life. On one hand for months in the House he has talked about the cancellation of the Pearson contract as an example of what governments should not do. Now in the case of the Hughes contract he wants it cancelled.

We have to do the best we can in any commercial undertaking to arrive at a solution in the best interests of the Canadian taxpayers.

I have said that with respect to the Hughes contract and all of the CAATS arrangements so far the government is extremely concerned about them. We are concerned about cost overruns, about glitches. We are attempting to find a solution in the best interests of both air safety and the Canadian taxpayer.

The hon. member will have to decide whether he wants to cancel contracts, support contracts or try to negotiate out of a specific contract. In the case of Hughes I wish the hon. member would decide which way he wants to go.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my position is quite clear. It is the minister who is very inconsistent.

No value has been placed on the deleted items. No value has been placed on transport's new obligations and no figure has been given on how much transport is asking the Treasury Board for.

Knowledgeable air traffic controllers are now questioning the value of the diminished system. Will the minister agree to hold off on any amendments to the contract and have the Standing Committee on Transport review the whole issue and make a recommendation to the minister?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there were a knowledgeable air controller on that committee I might consider it.

Because we have to deal with this issue in a fairly short order we will proceed as best we can to deal with finding a solution to this problem. We will make sure whatever deal is arrived at is absolutely transparent.

As this matter came to my attention I immediately advised the auditor general of our concerns with respect to it. We will try to resolve a very serious problem.

The hon. member should recognize that our intention to commercialize the air navigation system, which I hope he will support, should avoid any problems like this occurring in the future.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

In spite of laws regarding safe storage of guns in Canada there are a lot of guns sitting behind kitchen doors. In order to flush a lot of those weapons out of the system and therefore reduce the need for compliance with the law, would the Minister of Justice in dialogue with the Minister of Finance consider an incentive, perhaps a small tax credit, for each gun turned into police as a way of making our communities safer?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to dialogue with the Minister of Finance, particularly in light of the suggestion for tax credit to rely on the legendary generosity of the Department of Finance.

The point the hon. member raises is important with respect to the safe storage of firearms. Registration aspects contained in Bill C–68 passed in the House last night are intended among other things to encourage compliance by owners with those very safe storage obligations.

With respect to firearms no longer wanted or where an owner wants to dispose of them, Bill C–68 provides that even in the case of prohibited firearms those who own those firearms can sell them to others in the same class. That was a change introduced on the recommendation of members of the Liberal caucus. Furthermore, firearms that are unwanted can always be surrendered at an amnesty or delivered to museums for a credit.

The suggestion made by the hon. member is an innovative one. I will be happy to take it up with the Minister of Finance and pursue it.

* * *

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Last year, the Minister of Agriculture declared a moratorium on the use of bovine somatotropin, or BST, to allow the dairy industry to adjust and to give the public the information it needs. Although these two requirements have still not been met, the minister indicated in this House yesterday that he had no intention of extending his moratorium.

Does the minister recognize that the public still does not have the information it needs on BST and that the dairy industry is in no position to meet consumers' demands for a way to distinguish dairy products with BST from those without?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while not necessarily accepting all the suggestions made in the hon. member's question, I would point out to him that a tremendous amount of information has been made available. There is obviously a difference of opinion with respect to this product.

Might I say that in all the very legitimate questioning about rBST we should be careful not to feed unfounded doubts and fears. We do not yet have the scientific analysis that is presently being conducted by the Department of Health. I think we should wait for it and we should get all the facts on the table.

In the meantime we should not engage in comments or allegations that question the safety of Canadian milk. To do so would be to harm the Canadian diary industry, including that very significant portion of the industry in the province of Quebec.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week's election in Ontario spelled the end of employment equity in the province because the new government is going to scrap this discriminatory legislation.

During the election the leader of Ontario's Liberal Party called employment equity outrageous and said that numerical targets in employment meant the same thing as hiring quotas.

The minister knows that Bill C–64 includes these same outrageous numerical targets. If the minister will not listen to Canadians, will he at least listen to his Liberal friends and scrap his own version of a quota bill, Bill C–64?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member possibly knows—it is not always easy to tell whether the Reform Party knows what is going on in Parliament—the committee has been holding hearings for the past four months on the employment equity bill and has listened to well over a couple of hundred representations from a wide variety of Canadians. One thing they all understand, except the hon. member, is that there is no quota system in the bill.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the political minister for Newfoundland.

Last week I met in St. John's with executive officers of the Newfoundland Dockyard Trades and Labour Council as well as Mike Apostilidis, president of the dockyard.

In view of the uncertainty about the future of the dockyard which employed 850 people last year, will the minister agree to a full independent review of the books of Marine Atlantic? Will he finally meet with the dockyard workers and not pass this off to his colleague, the Minister of Transport from New Brunswick? Will the minister finally stand up for the dockyard workers just as much as he stood up for the turbot in Newfoundland?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member from the other side of the country, from the great province of British Columbia, finally had an opportunity to visit Newfoundland. It is regrettable that it took a large convention and a sought after position to bring him to this part of the land, but we welcome him to the island.

I met with the dockyard workers and with the management this week in a meeting arranged by my colleague, the Minister of Transport. We had a very frank and open discussion about the future of the dockyard. There is currently an ongoing negotiation between an interested party and the dockyard management on a possible purchase of the dockyard. We will have an answer on the negotiation within a matter of days. Following that negotiation we will see whether or not it is successful. Other discussions are under way with the workers.

This problem requires careful attention, careful consideration, and will not be solved by unduly raising expectations or setting out simplistic solutions. I know my colleague who wants to assume the leadership of his party would agree with those criteria.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery today of the members of the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs of the British House of Commons, led by the Right Hon. David Howell.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1505)

The Speaker: Also I draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Ola Ullsten, present head of the World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development and former Prime Minister of Sweden.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 13 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 82nd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding a change to Standing Order 36 in relation to the acceptability of petitions.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 82nd report later this day.

I also have the honour to table the 83rd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs relating to the selection of votable items in accordance with Standing Order 92.

In accordance with that standing order the report is deemed adopted on presentation.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food which deals with Bill C-86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

It is reported with amendments.

* * *

OCEANS ACT

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-98, an act respecting the oceans of Canada.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

• (1510)

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE TO INDONESIA ACT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-333, an act to terminate Canadian assistance to Indonesia.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to introduce this bill which would terminate Canadian bilateral government to government aid and multilateral aid to Indonesia. Aid to NGOs that work in Indonesia and humanitarian assistance would be exempt.

To explain the purpose of the bill, I would note that human rights abuses in East Timor perpetrated by the Indonesian government are indisputable. Human rights organizations have reported evidence of gross violations, including repression of freedom of expression, arbitrary arrests, torture and killings. Similar human rights abuses go on elsewhere throughout Indonesia, including appalling labour conditions, the banning of the country's only free trade union, and the shutting down of Indonesian weekly newspapers.

Finally I would note that the Government of Indonesia has continually flouted international law and ignored United Nations General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for Indonesia's immediate withdrawal from East Timor.

For these reasons I believe the Government of Canada should terminate its bilateral and multilateral aid to Indonesia and call for respect of human rights.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

CANADA–UNITED STATES TAX CONVENTION ACT, 1984

Hon. Raymond Chan (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that Bill S-9, an act to amend the Canada–United States Tax Convention Act, 1984, be read the first time.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move that the 82nd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

I may say, just by way of explanation, that this very modest change to the standing orders of the House simply makes it possible to file petitions where there has been an interlineation on the petition but not in the text of it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present three petitions on behalf of over 200 constituents from my riding of Fredericton—York—Sunbury.

The petitioners call on Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada. This petition comes from the Calgary, Alberta, area.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families who make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege to present three petitions on behalf of the constituents from the Middleton and Margaretsville areas of Annapolis county, Nova Scotia.

• (1515)

One petition comes from the Digby and Weymouth area of Digby county in the federal riding of South West Nova.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present two petitions.

[*English*]

The first petition is from 60 Canadians, some of whom reside in the riding of Ottawa—Vanier. The petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

RIGHTS OF GRANDPARENTS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition which I would like to present is from 37 constituents of Ottawa—Vanier.

They call on Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to include a provision similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code, which states that in no case may a father or mother, without serious cause, place obstacles between the child and grandparents. Failing agreement between the parties the modalities of the relations are settled by the courts.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituent Valerie Morrow I would like to present two petitions under Standing Order 36.

The first petition protests the appointment of co–chairs to a political party.

ARSON

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls for stronger enforcement of the section of the Criminal Code which deals with arson.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present petitions signed by residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway as well as residents elsewhere in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House the fact that the current Criminal Code denies people who are suffering from terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to choose freely and voluntarily to end their lives with the assistance of a physician.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to ensure the right of all Canadians to die with dignity by allowing people with terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to the assistance of a physician in ending their lives at the time of their choice, subject to strict safeguards to prevent abuse and to ensure that the decision is free, informed, competent and voluntary.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from Canadians who point out that acts of discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians are an every day reality in all regions of Canada, that this kind of discrimination is unacceptable in a country known for its commitment to human rights, equality and dignity for all citizens and that the citizens who are so discriminated against pay taxes and make contributions to employee benefit plans and are entitled to the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens.

Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 777 people of British Columbia. I concur with the petition.

The petition states that we the undersigned residents of the province of British Columbia draw the attention of the House to the following: that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a real and hurtful form of discrimination in this country; that all forms of families in this country, those based on financial and emotional interdependency, are equally meaningful and important to the social well-being of Canada; and that both protection against discrimination and recognition of relationships based on financial and emotional interdependency are necessary to ensure the equal treatment of gays, lesbians and bisexuals under the law.

Therefore your petitioners request that the Parliament of Canada amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation as a basis for protection against discrimination and to include recognition of relationships based on financial and emotional interdependency.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from constituents from Fraser Valley West.

The petitioners ask that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

• (1520)

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present today on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

The first petition requests that Parliament not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase, sexual orientation.

FIREARMS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by 296 petitioners which will add to the total which I have presented in this House of 4,324 signatures opposing the gun legislation.

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from 161 of my constituents. They state that dangerous sex offenders and paedophiles should be locked up for life, that statutory releases should be revoked, that stiffer sentences should be imposed on violent offenders, that violent criminals should serve their full sentences and have time added for bad behaviour, and that a central registry of the names and addresses of violent offenders should be established.

INCOME TAX

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): The final petition, Mr. Speaker, is from 783 constituents who send the message to the government: "no new taxes".

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions, both asking Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prevent discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and they have my full support.

ALCOHOL

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these petitioners point out that alcohol is a drug and is addictive. They believe there is risk to the foetus when taken by women who are pregnant. They point out that drinking alcohol is a leading cause of death among young people. They also underline the fact that seniors can get into difficulties when there is an interaction between alcohol and medication taken. They believe that alcohol can lead to health problems and chronic illnesses. They point out that alcohol is toxic if it is taken too quickly in great quantity.

The petitioners want warning labels on containers in order to alert the population to this effect.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition points out that unnecessary violence and abuse in all forms, be it verbal, physical or other, in society in general on radio, television or by other means have become a major concern of the Canadian population. The petitioners point out that abuse and violence is not necessary to inform or to entertain.

They want government to ensure that the CRTC regulates violence and abuse. They point out that there have been some efforts and some accomplishments, but they encourage the government and the CRTC to do even more.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The petitioners call on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

This is a petition which I wholeheartedly support.

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to present six petitions adding 2,944 names to the already 14,549 names that have been placed before the House requesting that Parliament do something to keep dangerous offenders off the streets of our nation and in support of Bill C–240 which allows for post–sentence detention of dangerous offenders.

It is my pleasure to add more names to that growing list of concerned Canadians.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition from my constituents calling on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post–sentence detention orders and specifically by passing Bill C–240.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 174 and 178.

[*Text*]

Question No. 174—Mr. Robinson:

Does the government plan to participate with NORAD or NATO allies in joint research initiatives examining ballistic missile defence as proposed in the 1994 defence white paper and, if so, (a) what previous Canadian defence research, will the government propose to use as a basis for such joint research (b) will the Canadian government use previous research into an EHF space–based radar system as a basis for further joint research, and (c) what kind of new research will the government propose to initiate as a part of such joint research efforts?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): (a), (b) and (c) As outlined in the 1994 defence white paper, Canada is interested in gaining a better understanding of missile defence through research and consultation with like–minded nations. We expect that these consultations will address both limited missile defence for North America and theatre missile defence within Europe. Whether Canada will choose to participate in joint research initiatives will depend on what opportunities arise, and most significantly, whether these joint initiatives are cost effective, affordable, and make an unambiguous contribution to Canada's defence needs.

In the NORAD context, the NORAD renewal negotiations are set to begin this year. Joint reseach with the U.S. in ballistic missile defence will be discussed during the negotiations, however, the outcome of these discussions cannot be prejudged. Accordingly, it would be premature to speculate on the specific form and content of possible joint research activities in the absence of any agreement that such research should in fact take place.

Question No. 178—**Mr. McClelland:**

With respect to the October 24, 1994 signing of a treaty between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Republic of India on mutual assistance in criminal matters, (*a*) when the treaty was signed, was the government aware that India has in place a law known as TADA (Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act) and (*b*) can Canadians of Indian origin be threatened or prosecuted by Indian law as a result of TADA legislation?

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): (a) The preamble of the treaty between Canada and India on mutual assistance in criminal matters makes specific reference to Canada and India desiring to improve the effectiveness of both countries in the investigation, prosecution and suppression of crime, including terrorism related crime.

The Minister of Justice is unable to comment on the full scope of India's Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA) and on the extent of its extraterritorial reach, if any.

(b) The mutual assistance treaty does not make India's TADA legislation part of Canadian law. The treaty generally provides for assistance relating to the gathering of evidence for the purpose of a criminal investigation or prosecution pending in the state requesting assistance. The assistance contemplated under this treaty does not include the arrest of persons for the purpose of their return to the requesting state through deportation or extradition.

Requests for assistance made to Canada under the mutual assistance treaty are executed in accordance with canadian law once their execution has been authorized by the Minister of Justice. For this purpose the requests must contain information prescribed by the treaty. This includes the relevant law of the state requesting assistance.

There is no requirement under the treaty that an offence under investigation or prosecution in India also exist in Canada (referred to as double criminality requirement). This is common in mutual assistance treaties.

Canada may refuse or delay assistance based on grounds set out in the treaty. The treaty provides that assistance may be refused where executing the request would impair Canada's sovereignty, security, or public order and that assistance may be postponed where executing the request would interfere with ongoing investigations or prosecutions. These grounds are intended to protect the fundamental interests of Canada, where Canada is the requested state. They can be relied on in appropriate cases based on a consideration of the circumstances of each case in view of the treaty and the relevant law and could apply to

a request by India pertaining to an investigation under the TADA legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

• (1525)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is an important weekly event but I would ask that all motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 13 consideration of Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and on Motions No. 5 to 17 inclusive.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on this section of Bill C–41.

Coming to this House has been really quite instructive. One can learn from many members. I have learned from the member for Burnaby—Kingsway that it does one good to express exactly where one is coming from in terms of one's own personal perspective.

In keeping with that, before I speak specifically to section 718.2, I might state to the House very clearly where I am coming from. I stand clearly, unequivocally and in a very straightforward way in favour of and in full support of the traditional family unit as generally understood within society.

To that end, it might be of interest to the House for me to very briefly read something that is in the public domain that I wrote to an editor at the Calgary *Sun* last March. The editor had stated: "Decision targets family values" and "marriage and family, as we all know, are not only cornerstones of our society, but are the bedrock of our civilization".

I wrote:

> I tend to agree with him.
>
> The preferential treatment given to mom, dad and the kids, I believe is reflective of the value that our society places on the biological reality of propagation.
>
> There are many instances of cohabitation in our society: The single parent and child, siblings living together or good, long time friends of the same or opposite sex. They may choose not to become involved in physical sexual contact. To extend spousal benefits to homosexual partnerships and not to other couples would be a grave act of discrimination.
>
> A redefinition of family unit that would step outside of the obvious biological relationships to include same sex or opposite sex couples must include all relationships. It must not have reference to sexual orientation or activity. Otherwise, we would be extending a financial reward for sexual involvement between people who cohabit.
>
> Max Yalden, Canadian Human Rights Commissioner, has stated the Human Rights Act should be amended "to reflect today's reality" by prohibiting discrimination against gays, lesbians, bisexuals on the basis of sexual orientation. He is wrong. If we extend spousal benefits to people who cohabit on the basis of sexual orientation and not to all couples, we have truly engaged in an act of discrimination.
>
> Fooling around and ignoring the obvious reasons for spousal benefits will cost our society much more than countless millions or billions of dollars. It has the potential of costing society its cornerstone and the bedrock of our civilization.

I give that as a background because it is true that all of us arrive at this House with predisposed attitudes and values that come from our very soul. I want to make it clear what my motivation is in taking a look, hopefully, at the deletion of section 718.2 from this bill.

In reading the notes that were given to the Liberal members I was interested to see that they say: "We will keep our campaign commitments and send a strong message against hate crimes. As an election promise and a matter of fundamental human rights, Bill C–41 will not be subject to a free vote".

• (1530)

The heavy hand of the whip is coming down on all of the Liberal members in this House, and we have seen the devastation that will do to their political careers as long as they toil within the Liberal Party. However, that does not change the fact that there are many people within the Liberal Party who have a serious concern about this issue, I suggest perhaps because of the same reasons that I have stated from my own personal background and belief.

It is also interesting that this document given to the Liberal members includes what I consider to be some terribly erroneous advice. It reads:

> It is essential to list the grounds in Bill C–41. The hate crime section is meaningless without the list. In several court rulings, the Supreme Court of Canada has warned that any hate–related legislation must be very precise and must

identify target groups it intends to protect, otherwise it may be subject to constitutional challenge.

I think it passing strange that in exactly the same legislation the government is bringing forward a total patchwork in terms of alternative measures. In other words, it is saying in one section of the act we will not have any national standards and in the other section of the act saying that we must have precise standards. The question must be asked: Which is it?

Last evening I was very interested to listen in the debate to the hon. member from York South—Weston, who is a lawyer. I respect the fact that he would be able to read this bill as it is presently before the House and I concur totally with his perspective. In part, from *Hansard*, page 13767, he says:

What are those alternative measures? We do not in this legislation describe what those alternative measures are, what crimes will be subject to those alternative measures. In fact it says any crime. We do not know. Does that mean that a rapist, someone who is alleged to have committed a rape, can for example be diverted out of the criminal justice system and into some alternative measures? What can those alternative measures be? We do not know. This bill does not define what alternative measures are. The bill leaves it up to the attorneys general of the provinces.

For sake of time, I will not read further, but he went on to say—again, I concur with him totally—that what we have here is a total patchwork.

I ask the Liberals, I ask the justice department, I ask the parliamentary secretary: How can we have within Bill C–41 on one side of the coin an absolute patchwork and on the other side of the coin something that has to be very specific and very precise? The two things in the same bill do not make any sense.

I suggest to the Liberal members that in fact the advice they have received in their documentation, in their talking notes when they stand to talk on this act, is simply not good advice.

I suggest very strongly that section 718.2 is unnecessary. In the judgment of many Canadians, it is put in specifically so that the undefined term sexual orientation may be put into federal legislation. This is the first step of putting that undefined term into federal legislation. It is not an innocuous thing. It is not an inconsequential thing. It actually is the first step in a logical legal sequence for that undefined term to be included in the charter of rights and freedoms.

Again, I read from the Liberals' documentation. They tell their members:

We've heard a lot lately about the myths of "special rights". C–41 does not confer special rights. No one is "left out". C–41 protects all Canadians. Every Canadian has a nationality, a race, an age, a gender, a sexual orientation.

We've heard that C–41 will result in sweeping changes, including the recognition of same–sex marriages. That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, in the strictest sense of the term, that is nonsense. Bill C–41 will not achieve that objective on its own. I submit that the reason Canadians are concerned about Bill C–41 is because they see this very clearly as a very transparent, thin edge of a wedge that is an important stepping stone in order to get the undefined term sexual orientation included.

• (1535)

The Liberals know this. The justice department has received over 70,000 letters opposing this bill. Furthermore, until yesterday there had been 7,250 names in favour of the inclusion of sexual orientation in petitions presented to this House. That is 7,250 for, and 83,471 against. These are people in Canada who take the time to put their names on petitions, to gather these petitions together. Yet this government is prepared to absolutely turn its back on these representations from ordinary Canadians.

Mr. Keyes: Based on misrepresentation.

Mr. Abbott: It is interesting that a member opposite has said based on misrepresentation. May I suggest to that member that exactly the same statistics were used to theoretically justify the imposition of Bill C–68, the gun control, which was based on lack of information. Those polls are being quoted and were being quoted as justification by the justice minister.

Here we have 83,000 people taking the time to sign petitions and send them to this House, and they say those polls do not count, they are not based on good information.

There are none so blind as those who will not see. But for those who have eyes, I implore them to vote for the exclusion of section 718.2.

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honour to rise in the House to speak to Bill C–41.

There has been a great deal of confusion and misinformation being disseminated about this bill. Unfortunately, a lot of the verbal shadow boxing around Bill C–41 has almost entirely focused on one phrase in one clause in the overall bill. The term sexual orientation seems to have piqued the interest of many narrow minded individuals whose sense of reason has been drowned out by the self–righteous pontificating about the so called provision of special rights to designated groups and individuals.

Last week an impatient man approached me in my constituency office. He asked me whether I was going to vote yes or no for that "same sex benefits bill and special rights for gays". I proceeded to try to explain to the gentleman that he had it all wrong, that the legislation was not about same sex spousal

benefits or special rights for gays and that it had more to do with protecting individuals from hate motivated violence. The man stormed out of my office before I could get a further word in edgewise. That is exactly the kind of intolerance and confusion that underlines most of the opposition—especially from the third party in this House—to provisions in Bill C–41.

For the edification of the man who stormed out of my office last week and for many others like him, many to be found in the third party opposite, who may have forgotten or perhaps never took the time to find out what Bill C–41 was actually all about in the first place, I want to highlight for them the main objectives of this legislation along with some of the compelling yet often misunderstood and ignored portions of this bill.

Some of the most significant provisions of Bill C–41 are those related to enhancing the rights of the victim. This bill includes an unprecedented amendment to section 745 of the Criminal Code that would provide victims of violence with the opportunity to make a meaningful impact on the criminal justice system by presenting victim impact statements when convicted criminals apply for early parole consideration. This would ensure that victims of violent crimes have the opportunity to speak out about the harm done by the offender.

Quite frankly for me, and I know for another member at least in this House, maybe that is not enough. To my way of thinking, section 745 should be rescinded. But that is what is in the bill today, and it has gone a lot further than what members opposite, especially in the third party, are proposing. Therefore, the victim's experience will now be taken into account at the very least when deciding whether the parole ineligibility period of an offender should be reduced.

• (1540)

The bill also encourages tougher sentences for the abuses by offenders in positions of trust or authority. It encourages alternatives to fines for those unable to pay them and provides for stricter penalties for offenders who breach probation and provides cost effective alternatives to those expensive and often unnecessary formal court proceedings. Furthermore, the bill will allow judges greater leeway to impose certain conditions on an offender to ensure that the punishment fits the crime.

This bill follows through on the government's commitment to Canadians who have so passionately expressed the need for meaningful and progressive criminal justice reform. It should be noted that Bill C–41 adds a statement to the Criminal Code that provides clear direction from Parliament on the purpose and principles of sentencing.

The reforms provide a balanced and sensible range of options that address the public's need for safety, the victim's desire for restitution, and the important principle that serious offenders should be dealt with more severely than minor or first time offenders.

This legislation clearly indicates that the purpose of sentencing is to contribute to the maintenance of a just, peaceful, and safe society and to promote respect for the law by imposing just sanctions.

The statement sets out objectives for sentencing, which include protection of the public, rehabilitation, promoting a sense of responsibility among offenders, making reparations to victims and the community, and deterring crime. These objectives are guided by the idea that a sentence must reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender. In this regard, the courts will be required to consider aggravating and mitigating circumstances associated with a particular crime.

Accordingly, the proposed statement of principles indicates that when an offence is motivated by hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim, this must be considered as an aggravating circumstance. On this point, people have asked why hate motivated crimes warrant harsher sentences than non–hate motivated crimes, suggesting that such provisions and the use of the term sexual orientation would grant special rights and magical privileges to non–heterosexuals. Some people have even gone so far as to suggest that use of the term sexual orientation would encourage a homosexualist agenda, if you can believe it. Quite frankly, this is surely and simply ludicrous.

As stated by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, we are talking about the criminal law here. We are talking about crimes motivated by hate. To say that including sexual orientation in Bill C–41 is encouraging a lifestyle is like saying that because we have included religion we are encouraging people to become Catholics.

Hate crimes are distinct in that they are not only an attack on a single individual, they are also an attack on an entire group in our society. For example, if someone paints graffiti on someone's house, that person would probably be charged with mischief and the house owner would likely be the only victim. But if someone were to paint swastikas on one of the five synagogues in my riding of Hamilton West, the victims would include all members of the Jewish faith. Try to understand that, members opposite.

Mr. Stinson: Yes, tell us about the bar association. Come on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I would ask colleagues for the co–operation of the House on this subject matter, which has certain sensitivities. I certainly want to be able to hear the interventions of all members.

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, targeting members of a single group and attacking them simply because they belong to that particular group is loathsome, deplorable, and must be taken into consideration at sentencing.

With regard to the notion of special rights, perhaps someone can explain to me how protecting Canadians who are victimized by hatred and harassment constitutes special rights. Perhaps someone can explain to me how seriously punishing a neo–Nazi for splitting a person's head open with a baseball bat just because they are gay constitutes special rights.

• (1545)

Maybe someone can tell me how a humane government can simply ignore the plight of the innocent law–abiding Canadians who are sadly victimized by violent attacks just because of their skin colour, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation or mental or physical ability.

I wonder if someone can show me how reneging on our commitment to the overwhelming majority of Canadian voters, who elected me and my colleagues on this side of the House on a solid platform advocating equality for all Canadians and cracking down on crimes motivated by hatred, would advance the principles of Canadian democracy.

When we told Canadians that the sentencing practices in Canada must be responsive to their concerns and social values, we meant it. When we said heinous crimes motivated by pure hatred would not be condoned by a Liberal government, we meant it. When we said that we would protect the rights of all Canadians and strengthen justice in our nation by coming down hard on those who chose to victimize Canadian communities, we meant it.

As a member who was elected on a platform that emphasized the need for criminal justice reform, I am proud to stand on this side of the House with the right hon. Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and all my colleagues in support of this legislation and the Liberal notion of a humane and anti–violent society.

In closing, I move:

That Motion No. 17 be amended by striking out all of the words after "mitting the offence," and substituting the following therefor:

abused the offender's spouse or child, or

(i.1) evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused a position of

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I sat here until 11.30 last night. I just sat and listened to all of the debate. I laid my speech aside.

We often refer to this place as the highest court in the land. We should all be setting aside our ideology and our politics. We should be examining every bill to see whether it is good legislation. We are making the laws of the land in this place. As I sat and listened to the debate last night, I attempted to do it with an unbiased mind which is difficult to do but that is what should be happening in this place.

I am not an expert on all of the things that are going on here, it is impossible. I have been working a lot on Bill C–68. However, I listened to the various experts, people who analysed Bill C–41. Many of them come from the other side of the House and I listened to what they had to say. There is a variety of people in this place and there are some very serious concerns with this bill which have not been addressed.

Having listened to the debate and the arguments, I have come to some conclusions which I am going to share with the House. We really need to have democratic reform in this place. I have come to that conclusion in the last few weeks as I see the processes which are taking place. That is something which is desperately needed.

We stand and debate these laws. We look at them. Recently there has been the attitude to just get through with the debate; summer is coming so let us get this stuff through the House. Millions of Canadians out there will have to live with these laws forever more. We should not have the attitude of simply getting this done, having an arrogant, almost cavalier attitude about what is taking place here and just getting it out.

• (1550)

The negative impacts about this legislation were related yesterday. Canadians have expressed many concerns to us. Even people in the legal profession who have analysed this bill, lawyers at the top of the justice system, have seen the flaws and we continue to push this bill through. That causes me grave concern.

As I listened to the debate last night I saw some of the members opposite trying to portray themselves as being more compassionate than some of the other people in this House. They were trying to show that they were more tolerant.

In the end we have to look at the nitty–gritty, the facts, the very reasonable things people are saying about this legislation. We must not let ideology or politics blind us. Common sense must not be thrown out the window. We cannot play on people's emotions.

When the dust settles we are going to have to live with the facts. We are going to have to live with the content of Bill C–41. We are trying to explain our intentions in this bill, but good intentions do not necessarily make good legislation. That is why we are here discussing this and debating it and doing all the things we are doing. We have to listen to each other.

I have a question for the last speaker. I was listening to the debate his colleagues presented yesterday. The hon. member said that we are protecting the rights of all Canadians. If we are protecting the rights of all Canadians, why do we need a list of categories? Why do we need to even include this? It does not make sense to me. Do not all victims deserve equal protection? Why do we have to have categories of victims? If someone is assaulted by someone who is doing it just for fun, that is no different from doing it for some other motive.

I am going to speak on behalf of my constituents this afternoon on some of the things they have told me. I have received hundreds and hundreds of letters over the last year and a half on the issue of including the term sexual orientation and many other concerns. That is not the only concern they have with this bill but it is one that keeps coming up again and again. We need to listen. I have the honour and the privilege to speak on their behalf as I believe all members in this House should have.

To limit this debate to six hours is a travesty of justice and of democracy. I hope it is not an example of an arrogant dictatorial Liberal government, but I am afraid that is the way it is coming across.

I said I have the privilege of representing my constituents in this debate on Bill C–41. Many members of Parliament will be denied that so I consider it to be a privilege.

Voters have sent me to Ottawa to be their voice in Parliament. What we do is very important. We must not take anti–democratic measures as has been done. We would all be willing to go well into the summer to listen and analyse all of the aspects of this Bill C–41 debate. It makes me very sad. It should make every Liberal member who did not oppose this abuse of power sad as well.

The Liberals have the majority. They can use that majority to do almost anything they want to and voters can do nothing to stop them, until the next election. By forcing time allocation the Liberal government has declared its highest priorities to be gun control, MPs pensions and including the term sexual orientation in the sentencing legislation.

Personally I do not believe these controversial issues are priorities with the people of Canada. I am sure that if people knew how democracy was getting a kick in the teeth here in Ottawa today, a lot more concern would be expressed. Most people are not following all the debate here. I wonder if Liberals are hoping that voters will forget this by the time the next election rolls around.

There are some provisions of this bill for which I give my conditional support. I heard the reasons behind them and they are good. I support them particularly with respect to the restitution orders and victim impact statements. There are some excellent aspects to the bill.

• (1555)

Unfortunately, we have a long way to go before the victims of crime are treated with as much respect as the criminals. To this end I will continue to work on my victims bill of rights which I spoke about previously.

I support the Reform amendments to delete section 717 regarding alternative measures and to delete section 745.6 regarding the application for judicial review for premeditated murders.

The most controversial idea we are talking about is section 718.2(a)(i) and the reason the Liberal government has waited so long to get the bill before the House and why it had to invoke closure in order to get the bill through the House of Commons. This provision will call for greater penalties to be imposed if there is evidence the crime was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate.

We complained a lot about the term hate, but what about bias and prejudice? These things can be construed in many different ways. We do not know five or ten years down the road what will happen with bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation of the victim.

My first choice would be to support the Reform amendment to delete the section entirely. Reformers believe that the courts already take aggravating or mitigating circumstances into consideration when determining the length of the sentence to be imposed on a convicted offender. I agree with my colleagues that this is an attempt by the Minister of Justice to get the unnecessary and undefined term sexual orientation into a piece of legislation so it can be used as justification for amending the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Reformers believe in true equality and that all Canadians are equal before the law. Every time the government divides us into different categories it creates the politics of envy, which divide us rather than unite us. We should not have all of these groups mentioned in our legislation.

Back on March 24 the *Globe and Mail* editorial writers made the statement: "The real problem with section 718.2 is not that it refers to homosexuals but that it is proposed at all". They go on to give many other valid points.

Because of the time allocation I will not have a chance to finish my remarks.

We need to take a serious second look at this matter. The Liberals are opening a door with this legislation which should remain shut. We should take more time to look at this because the concerns which Canadians have expressed to me are real and legitimate ones which need to be addressed. I wish I had more time to do that.

Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–41 covers a wide range of sentencing initiatives, including provisions aimed at assisting victims of crime, improving the administration of justice in Canada and

tougher sentences for those offenders who abuse a position of trust or authority. The bill also includes harsher sentences for crimes based on hate for a particular race, nationality, colour, religion, gender, age or sexual orientation.

In discussions with constituents, by correspondence and through the electronic media I have heard from many opponents of Bill C–41. Most of the opposition regards the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the bill. Opposition to the bill seems to be based upon fundamental misunderstandings about the intent and also the consequences of passing Bill C–41 into federal law.

Bill C–41 asks the court to take into consideration not only that a crime was committed, but that the offender was motivated by hatred against the victim based on the listed grounds which, as I have stated, include race, nationality, religion, age, gender or sexual orientation.

• (1600)

I have emphasized to concerned Canadians this provision of the bill comes into effect only once a crime has been committed. Bill C–41 does not create any new crimes. It does not make moral opposition to homosexuality a crime and it does not affect freedom of expression.

I have worked hard to correct the spread of misinformation by explaining to religious communities Bill C–41 will not prevent churches and religious instructors from talking about their beliefs regarding the morality of homosexuality. The bill is not creating any new hate crimes or expanding hate provisions in law.

The other major concern with Bill C–41 is that by including the term sexual orientation in federal legislation we are setting a major legal precedent. As the Minister of Justice has told the House, sexual orientation is not a new term and has been in use in Canadian legislation since 1977. It appears in provincial human rights legislation in eight jurisdictions within Canada.

Another misconception I have encountered is that by not defining the term sexual orientation, Bill C–41 will open legal loopholes that will legitimize the actions of paedophiles. Once again, the Minister of Justice has listened to this concern and has assured Canadians the term sexual orientation is included in provincial human rights legislation and that Canadian courts and tribunals have never had trouble understanding or interpreting the term which is unambiguous and does not include acts set out in the Criminal Code.

The bill makes an important statement that society will not tolerate crimes committed against individuals simply because of their race, religion, colour, gender, age or sexual orientation. Bill C–41 protects all Canadians. All Canadians have a nationality, a race, a gender, an age, a religion and a sexual orientation. Bill C–41 is an important part of the government's efforts to improve public safety, enhance the rights of victims and protect the rights of all Canadians to participate fully in the social and economic life of their country.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to address the issue of the statement of purpose and principles in Bill C–41.

I fear the government is misguided on this issue. The bill instructs judges to consider as aggravating circumstances in sentencing any evidence the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim.

Judges have latitude already in sentencing. They have been known to use it to hand out harsher sentences for crimes they consider particularly harmful to society. Why pass a law that asks them to be tougher in a few select categories? All crime and violence should be condemned and the punishment should be in proportion to the crime.

I agree with my colleague from Central Nova that respect for our justice system stems from the notion we are all equal before the law. I do not see that principle reflected in the statement of purpose and principles of Bill C–41.

I hope none of us disagrees that it is completely unacceptable and abhorrent that anyone should be the object of violent attack for any reason. Why should one form of assault be judged or condemned as more unacceptable than another?

• (1605)

In my mind any assault is completely unacceptable and should not be tolerated regardless of motivating factors. It is the crime that needs to be judged, not whether the accused held a personal bias toward the victim.

Any type of act based on hatred for a group for whatever reason should be recognized as something intolerable in society. Section 15(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982 states that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection.

I believe Bill C–41 will to change this. It will say certain crimes against certain victims are worse than the same crime against any other victim. That is against the fundamental principles of the charter of rights, that every Canadian has the same equal right to protection under the law of Canada.

I also fear the inclusion of the words sexual orientation in the statement of principle is a back door attempt at eventually legalizing same sex benefits and same sex marriages. It has been reported that on March 30, 1995 in New York City at a UN meeting the top Canadian officials at the United Nations were pushing for homosexual rights internationally so they can

compel domestic compliance in Canada and justify the route they are taking with Bill C–41.

The government should be up front about its agenda and should also listen to Canadians. The hon. member for Scarborough West recently shared some telling information with other members about the statement of principles on Bill C–41 and the government's intention to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act. According to the member for Scarborough West 631 petitions have been presented in the House on the issue of sexual orientation. Of these petitions 87 per cent were against the sexual orientation amendment to the CHRA and/or against including the phrase sexual orientation in the statement of purpose and principles of bill C–41.

My feelings on this matter are the same as those of the members for Scarborough West and Central Nova. In the face of this overwhelming opposition why is the government not listening to Canadians, for this is a slippery slope for Canada, a slippery slope the government is taking for the traditional family unit, and it is a dangerous route that will eventually become an avalanche if it is adopted in the House.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while there is much that is laudable in Bill C–41, public concern has focused on one issue, the inclusion of the words sexual orientation as one of the categories for which crimes motivated by hatred would merit stricter sentencing in section 718.2 of the bill.

I have listened to those concerns from my constituents who have spoken to me personally and hundreds who have written letters to me, and I share their views. I do not feel the words sexual orientation should appear in the bill and I support the amendment proposed by the member for Ontario to remove the list of categories altogether.

It is important to explain the basis of my objections as there is a misconception that opposition to including sexual orientation as a category in this bill is in itself motivated by hatred of homosexuals. Nothing could be further from the truth.

My riding contains a significant gay community. I have met with some of its organizations and have been very active in trying to address its concerns. I am also strongly opposed to so–called gay bashing or any crimes motivated by hatred against a minority group in society. That is why I support the bill in requiring stricter sentencing for assault and other crimes motivated by hatred.

Yet I cannot bring myself to support the inclusion of sexual orientation as a legal category in the bill, as it seems to me there may be unintended consequences of this inclusion that may affect our definition of the family, freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

• (1610)

When the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was being drafted the then justice minister, the current Prime Minister, said the term sexual orientation had not been included in section 15 because of the problem of the definition of those words. Speaking of sexual orientation he then stated: "Do not ask me to tell you what it is because those concepts are difficult to interpret, to define, and that is why we do not want them in the Constitution".

Why should a term too vague for the Constitution of Canada in 1981 suddenly be clear as day in 1995? Some hon. members have proposed amendments to define this term for greater clarity but I think the wiser approach is to avoid the problem altogether by striking the list of terms from the bill.

I fear that by including the words sexual orientation in federal law for the first time without clarification or definition, we are extending an invitation to the courts to read sexual orientation into other statutes as they have done with the Canadian and Alberta bill of rights in previous provincial court decisions. The legitimacy of this reading in has not yet been ruled on by the Supreme Court of Canada. By including these words in a section 15 like list in a federal statute we are saying as federal legislators that what we did not want to include in 1981 we want to include today.

The courts may well turn to this wording for guidance on other matters. What we have already seen is not encouraging. The Alberta Court of Queen's Bench ruled the Alberta human rights code had to be read as if sexual orientation was included in the Vriend case, which meant a private Christian Reformed college had to hire a teacher who was a practising homosexual despite its religious objections to his behaviour.

In recent years we have seen attempts to deny the Salvation Army the right to use municipal property in the city of Toronto as it will not hire openly homosexual employees or clergy.

We have seen Catholic school boards in Montreal forced to rent property to homosexual organizations all on the basis of including sexual orientation in human rights legislation and despite freedom of religion and freedom of association.

Two weeks ago in Ontario a provincial court judge ruled homosexual couples were eligible to adopt children despite the fact that the legislators had defeated a similar measure only a few months before.

If we as federal parliamentarians choose to include the words sexual orientation in federal law for the first time we will only encourage the courts in this practice at a time when many Canadians are questioning whether the courts are being too swift in striking down the decisions of elected legislators.

While this bill may be a simple sentencing bill, not the charter or a human rights bill, our use of this language sends a message to the courts they may choose to interpret in ways we had not intended.

We may not want to prevent a Salvation Army band from playing a Christmas concert for the poor on public property. We may not want private religious schools to be forced to hire openly homosexual teachers despite their religious teachings. We may not want paedophilia to be accepted as a legitimate sexual orientation. That is what may happen not because of this bill but because of what the courts may choose to do in applying this statutory language in other unrelated contexts.

I hope I have made it clear why I, without any personal disrespect or malice toward homosexual persons, do not feel it would be prudent to include the words sexual orientation in this legislation. We are opening the door to the use of this language in other contexts that may lead to legitimizing other forms of sexual orientation we would not want to approve or to the use of the concept of sexual orientation to harm the rights of religious and other groups to freedom of religion, freedom of expression and freedom of association.

The whole problem can be avoided by accepting the amendment by the member for Ontario and eliminating this contentious list of categories altogether.

If the purpose of the bill is to ensure crimes motivated by hatred are more severely assessed in sentencing, let us leave it at that. If the purpose is to create a precedent of recognition of the concept of sexual orientation, a concept the Prime Minister felt was too ambiguous to include in the Constitution of 1981, one that might be used in other contexts we would not approve of as legislators, then this section of Bill C–41 does not deserve the support of the House.

• (1615)

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be addressing Parliament today on Bill C–41. To say the least, the legislation has caused quite a stir.

The government has introduced close to 100 bills since the election but next to Bill C–68, the gun bill, no other bill has raised the kind of attention this one has.

Although the bill is extensive the focus has been on just one small section. However the implications of this one section are great and could create a social shift in the Criminal Code. The general intent of the bill is reasonable. The Criminal Code needs to be overhauled in terms of its sentencing guidelines. The code is rather weak and soft as I know all Canadians will attest. Canadians want a code that will protect them and keep our streets safer.

On the first day the bill was brought before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, November 17, 1994, the minister was present as a witness. I was at that hearing and listened closely to what the minister had to say. In particular I listened to his reasoning behind section 718.2, the clause that would increase penalties for those who commit crimes while at the same time they might have thought about someone's sexual orientation or religion or whatever.

With regard to section 718.2 the minister stated:

> It's there, provided that a court that imposes a sentence shall take into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances. In connection with aggravating circumstances, the court must consider evidence that the offence was motivated with bias, prejudice or hate based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or the sexual orientation of the victim.

As a court officer for over 20 years I have sat through enough court cases to know that judges already take into account all these factors in sentencing. I ask the justice minister, if something is already being done in the courts on a regular basis with innovation and flexibility, why it is necessary or appropriate to write them into the code and thereby stultify what is presently working. Where are the events in the community of such a pervasive nature that begs this kind of legislative response?

I refer to another piece of testimony given by the minister on that day. The minister stated:

> I'm asked why not define the term "sexual orientation"—there's no need to add a definition. It's perfectly clear what the intention of the legislation is.

The minister in that committee finally stated what he thought was a definition of the term sexual orientation. He said:

> That interpretation of that provision has been that sexual orientation encompasses homosexuality, heterosexuality and bisexuality.

Fine, I can understand that definition. Why is it then that when an amendment is proposed at the clause by clause stage to add such a definition to the term sexual orientation—and I may say the identical definition the minister stated at the committee—every Liberal member except three voted against it?

Witnesses had come before the justice committee and stated that sexual orientation could mean anything, including transsexuality and even pedophilia. Canadians need to know the direction the government is taking. I think they are observing that it is downhill. This type of leadership is unacceptable and must be highlighted so that the public can see. Then it can infer what kind of government we have.

I quote from the minutes of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs a question I asked of John Conroy from the Canadian Bar Association on the definition of sexual orientation. I said to him:

> —to my mind, the term "sexual orientation" is pretty broad. It could involve all kinds of repugnant possibilities, even those that are illegal. So could you address your mind to the definition of the term "sexual orientation" and support what you are saying when you say that it is carefully and narrowly drafted? I ask this because my assertion is that the term "sexual orientation" is not defined and is too broad.

Here is the response that was given to my question:

> I would take the definition that you raised a minute ago. That has certainly been the definition I've always understood: homosexual, heterosexual, or some other sexual orientation. It could be any kind of sexual orientation, and it could be something that, as you say, is illegal.

The definition could be any kind of sexual orientation. One would assume from this that someone who practises bestiality, pedophilia or transsexuality would be considered under this section. The minister says no, but he is unwilling to define the term sexual orientation. His social agenda is clear and it has little to do with getting tough on crime.

• (1620)

The proposed sentencing guidelines are redundant and ill considered, injecting politics and social fashion into the administration of criminal law. Judges already have wide discretion in sentencing within limits provided by the courts of appeal. They often use this discretion to hand out particularly harsh sentences for crimes they consider harmful to society.

As far as I can determine, the government has presented no evidence that judges are being unduly lenient with criminals motivated by hate as compared to the leniency for other offences. Why pass a law that in effect asks judges to conform in accordance with a fashionable list?

The Criminal Code is not a toy or a political manifesto. Nor should it be a showcase for the government's style. It is the law of the land, the moral border of tolerance where the state will intervene. Before the government makes any changes to the Criminal Code it should show first that there is a problem and, further, a problem that can be effectively addressed by the criminal law. Demonstrate, then legislate.

The problem contemplated by section 718.2 of Bill C–41 relates to an important principle. I said from the very beginning, and I will continue to say it, that the legislation ignores the fundamental principle that everyone is equal before the law. It suggests that violence against one person is less or more significant than against others, and that it provides special recognitions and advantages to select groups of people. I do not believe it is a wise course for the administration of justice.

Several years ago a boy was murdered in Calgary by a young offender. His reasoning: the victim was overweight, shy and too brainy for his liking so he stabbed him to death. Not one of these characteristics is in the listed schedule in Bill C–41. Clearly the young boy was victimized based on discrimination of aforethought. Where does the list of discriminating characteristics end? The list is indefinite and that is why the Reform Party wants clause 718.2 of the bill removed to keep all persons equal before the law.

The courts already take into account the surrounding circumstances of the offence at the time of sentencing. If someone commits assault causing bodily harm that person is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years. The judge makes the decision concerning the length of the sentence not exceeding 10 years.

As it currently stands, if the judge feels that a person was assaulted because of religion, the accused could be given a term of up to 10 years in prison. What many do not understand is that even if the amendments to Bill C–41 come into force, the maximum penalty the judge can give in such a case is still 10 years. The legislation will not strengthen the limits of the Criminal Code.

It is evident that section 718.2 is not presented for any criminal justice purpose but rather to mollify some loud political voices. This section of the Criminal Code is for a social fashion purpose, what is currently politically and socially correct as defined by the Liberals.

By slipping section 718.2 into Bill C–41 the government manoeuvres one step closer to its overall agenda to include homosexuals in the Canadian Human Rights Act, which would then enable gay couples to claim spousal benefits and perhaps overturn by legal challenge any pro–traditional family social policy of the federal government. All in all section 718.2 should be deleted from Bill C–41. Deleting it would make it a better piece of legislation and more in line with the true will of the Canadian people.

I want to address another amendment that we as a party have proposed. It is simply to delete anything to do with section 745 of the Criminal Code. The clause has no right to be part of the code at all. Bill C–41 should not be referring to it. I know the member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce feels differently as this had become his legacy when he was the solicitor general. Liberals see section 745 as the glimmer of hope. Reformers see a life sentence as just that, a life sentence. Life should mean life.

Today a court in Ontario is in the midst of the very disturbing trial of Paul Bernardo. He is charged with the murders of two young girls. If convicted he could receive a life sentence, but because of section 745 he could be walking our streets in 15 years. I cannot even bear to think of the possibility of this occurring. Yet the bleeding hearts condemn Reformers for even thinking of repealing this offensive section.

The member for York South—Weston has a private member's bill at committee stage that would get rid of section 745. If clear heads prevail, the bill will pass through the committee stage. The bill passed second reading and I believe that 74 members of the Liberal caucus supported it. We have hope then that our amendment will have similar results when it comes to a vote. When 74 Liberal members vote differently than the justice minister and the Prime Minister, one can only come to the

conclusion that these members are simply doing what is right for the justice system in our society.

• (1625)

Repeal of section 745 represents what the majority of Canadians want. It is a bellwether issue to measure the appropriateness of the social philosophy of the section 745 defenders. Who could ever even vote for and support in Parliament any MP who has the kind of mind that would continue to defend section 745? Canadians want it repealed. I hope the government is listening.

In conclusion I am saying that the underlying social philosophy of Bill C–41 is a measure of the basic value structure of the Prime Minister. He alone is ultimately responsible and accountable for the devalued tone of the bill's inherent message. Everything in the bill has his stamp of approval.

The Prime Minister sometimes appears as a likeable guy. However his legislation and values represented in the bill are not very likeable. The bill does not represent mainstream Canadian values. Consequently it is revealed that neither does the Prime Minister. Improvement will only come with a new government.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would love to tell you today that I rejoice in participating in this debate. I must confess that I do not. Like many members I suppose I hesitated before doing so.

I speak in the House as a practising Roman Catholic, a pro–life supporter against euthanasia. I believe strongly in what hon. members would consider to be family values. I also speak in favour of the bill before us today. I suppose it would be far easier to keep quiet.

However the debate I have heard over the last couple of days has put me in a position where I feel I have to speak. Lest any member think that I am wearing my MP hat as opposed to my whip hat and so on, I say to the House and to all hon. members that there is no difference. I cannot take off the jacket and tie and put on the team jersey when I feel like it. I have to reconcile the fact that I operate in both roles at the same time and all the time.

Some of the things I have heard make it such that I feel compelled to express my views on the issue. I want to address two topics: first youth offenders and second the hate crime provision.

[*Translation*]

On the topic of young offenders, I must say that I was disappointed with some of the speeches I heard yesterday. I am the father of two teenagers and the remarks made by the hon. member for Wild Rose yesterday aroused in me a feeling of helplessness to see what I would call a generalized inclination to tar young people in this country with the same brush by ascribing criminal tendencies to all, most or at least a large number of 16– and 17–year olds.

[*English*]

Paragraph after paragraph of the speech of the member for Wild Rose—and I have a copy of *Hansard* before me—describe 16 and 17–year–old hooligans. They indicate that sentences are inappropriate for young criminals, that youths raised in poverty have no excuse for adhering to a life of crime; that alleged dysfunctionality was not a reason to be a criminal; and that 16 and 17–year–old butchers have to be treated like their victims and so on.

All of us want sentences that are appropriate and that fit the crime.

• (1630)

Each one of us has a moral responsibility in the Chamber when we speak to ensure what we say does not create more misery than the good we are pretending to espouse in our views.

[*Translation*]

Which brings me to my second topic: hate crimes. Never, since first arriving in this House a long time ago, have I read letters from constituents and others expressing such disturbing grievances.

[*English*]

Let us remember the bill is about sentencing with regard to crimes already committed.

[*Translation*]

I received letters and preprinted cards from people in other ridings, like this one, which talk about the government wanting to legitimize the lifestyle of a group that undermines basic family values.

I have here another letter I have received.

[*English*]

Another letter says Bill C–41 would harm the rights of parents to protect their children, the rights of institutions to have a preference over adoption policy, historical rights of freedom of religion, the right of religious institutions to have hiring practices consistent with their religious belief and so on.

I am not mocking anyone, I say to the hon. member across, and if he had listened carefully the letter I am reading does not come from a constituent. The hon. member may make fun of what I have to say but I do not believe anything we do which in any way shows that kind of intolerance is beneficial to any of us. If the hon. member will be patient, once I finish my speech he can give us his wisdom.

The B'nai Brith of Canada, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the chief of police of the Ottawa–Carleton regional police force, the Canadian Jewish Congress and others have all asked us to support this legislation. I have in hand a letter from the United Church of Canada talking about the bill and the need to have it, talking about hate crimes, crimes are motivated by the vulnerability of certain individuals and groups within society. It urges these groups to be explicitly included.

I must say with regret that my church did not send a letter of support of this kind. I do not wish to elaborate on that but I have to state it because it is a fact. That does not change what I believe to be intolerance on the part of some, lack of knowledge on the part of others and selfish motives on the part of yet others making it such that the debate today has taken on the ugly tangent I see attached to it.

[*Translation*]

It is unfortunate that, as we sit here asking questions on a bill partly aimed at protecting hate crime victims, there is so much controversy surrounding this bill.

[*English*]

One amendment says that for greater certainty, referring to sexual orientation, it does not include preference toward any sexual act or activity that would constitute an offence under this act. That is to clarify that presumably a sexual activity that would be criminal would not be legal by virtue of passing the bill.

• (1635)

The minister indicated there was no need for such an amendment. Notwithstanding that, for greater certainty he put one in. If they are clear in their conscience members opposite will look at group No. 7, Motion No. 24:

> For greater certainty, conduct that constituted an offence under the Criminal Code before the date on which this section comes into force constitutes the same offence after that date.

In other words, for greater certainty anything that was criminal before is reaffirmed this way in the same way as we reaffirm through a greater certainty clause in the gun bill with respect to a certain group. We have done it again here just to ensure there was no doubt.

Will that make the members who are heckling right now vote for the bill? I regret to say that probably will not happen.

[*Translation*]

What we must do in this House, if we see ourselves as living in a mature democracy that has embraced certain basic rights, is not only to believe in these rights but also to ensure that some groups in our society do not become the victims of intolerance. The least we can do is not to make speeches in this House which promote intolerance against others.

[*English*]

Today we are not having a debate or a speech about family values, about the promotion of gay rights or anything like that. They have nothing to do with the bill. They could have something to do with other bills and we will deal with those when the time comes if and when it does. Those are not the issues before us today. The issue before us today is the protection of victims when crimes have been committed. That is what we have to remember. To twist that in order to achieve some other objective is not correct. It is not the kind of tolerance I was brought up to live with and to live by. I ask my colleagues to share with me in that kind of tolerance toward other people, as I was taught to do in the church of which I am a member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Davenport, the environment.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C–41.

I begin by voicing my absolute disgust with the government in its move to invoke time allocation on the bill. Bill C–41 is an important bill with serious implications. My constituents of Comox—Alberni deserve to have their opinions heard through their representative in the House. The government's move to silence MPs by preventing reasonable debate of legislation is undemocratic and unprincipled.

Bill C–41 proposes to amend the Criminal Code to restructure sentencing provisions contained in the Criminal Code and rules for evidence and procedure for use in the sentencing process. Bill C–41 ensures harsher penalties are imposed for crimes motivated by hatred based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation.

I agree with the concept that legislation should provide for victim impact statements to be used in court proceedings. The Reform Party has also been a strong advocate of victims' rights and it is high time this be given priority by the government. However, the bill before us hardly addresses the issue. Bill C–41 does little to protect victims' rights.

The bill provides only for written statements to be filed with the court, which is simply not adequate. The bill fails to provide for oral or written statements to be made directly to the court by the victim or by the victim's representative. With this provision the legislative proposals are virtually meaningless.

If the government is serious about victims' rights, provision to allow for both oral and written statements to be made directly to the court by either the victim or the victim's representative should be provided for.

When the Reform Party suggested a number of amendments to the bill at committee stage which would provide for these provisions, the lack of commitment by the government was demonstrated when all amendments were voted down by the Liberal majority in committee.

• (1640)

As much as I support provisions for victim's rights, I am dismayed to note that passing this legislation will hardly change the status quo.

The implications of victims' rights within the bill may be insignificant. However, I have serious reservations about the implications of section 717, which requires serious revision before it is passed by the House.

Section 717 proposes to make provisions for allowance to bypass court proceedings for those accused of offences. If an accused person admits to committing or to having involvement in an offence this section would eliminate the use of the courts to determine guilt or sentencing.

Reform supports the use of alternative measures for specific offences, particularly non–violent offences, but this clause is too open ended. Offences punishable by alternate measures are not specified and this needs to be spelled out more.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police recommended section 717 be amended to restrict the availability of the program to persons who have committed less serious offences as well as first time offenders. I support such an amendment before the bill becomes law.

In addition, the bill fails to give any indication of what will constitute an alternative measure. This must be spelled out. It is not enough to delegate responsibility to the provinces because even though provinces are given authority to design their own system there will be vast differences in measures from province to province.

When Reform proposed an amendment to clarify the situation the Liberal majority voted it down in committee. Without clarification the bill leaves the system of fair trial and punishment wide open to abuse.

I cannot support section 717 without the necessary amendments, which the government is unwilling to make. As it stands, section 717 should be scrapped.

Another section which needs serious revision is the controversial hate section 718.2. It has raised the ire and concern of many Canadians. Section 718.2 stipulates that a court which imposes a sentence shall also take into consideration that sentences should be increased or reduced to account for any relevant, aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offence or the offender.

Furthermore, the bill goes on to propose that sentences take into account that evidence the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim shall be deemed aggravating circumstances.

One problem with this section which has been raised by many Canadians is the loosely defined use of the term sexual orientation. Canadians have repeatedly attempted to get their concerns regarding this section heard by the government. Numerous petitions and calls in the House for a legal definition of the term sexual orientation in the bill have fallen on deaf ears. The government still insists proceeding with the section as it stands; so much for consulting the people.

Without a definition of sexual orientation the government is leaving itself wide open to a whole new era of legal challenges. The bill opens the door for the public and courts to define sexual orientation as they see fit. This could include legitimizing paedophiles' engaging in sexual activities with young children, suggesting that because it is their sexual orientation it is a legitimate activity. This is nonsense. It is a major concern. Canadians are aware there has been an active movement for paedophilia to be considered a legitimate sexual orientation. This has to be addressed.

Another problem with section 718.2 is it opens the door for all kinds of confusion before the courts. If a person who fits into any one of the categories has been assaulted, this person will have the right to insist the crown attorney show the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on sexual orientation of the victim.

Clearly bias, hate and prejudice against another person should not be tolerated. However, opening up this section as a basis for increased penalties opens a can of worms the government will not be able to close.

• (1645)

In determining appropriate sentences for crimes, courts should only consider the nature of the offence: Was it a robbery or a sexual assault? Was violence involved? Whether or not the offence was directed against a heterosexual or a homosexual, a Catholic or an atheist, a Caucasian or non–Caucasian is simply irrelevant. The whole concept of adding hatred threatens equal treatment under the law.

Hatred, bias and prejudice cannot be defined. The nature of the crime should be judged and punished accordingly, not the race, religion or sexual orientation of the victim or the perpetrator. It should not matter who or what kind of person the victim or perpetrator is when a crime is brought before the courts. Law has no business investigating or questioning these attributes. In doing so the proposed law will infringe on the civil rights and liberties of individuals.

Just as this government proposes to impose on civil rights and liberties of Canadians with its prejudicial hiring quotas in Bill C–64, the act to impose hiring equity, the government also proposes to entrench inequities through this bill. Just as all

Canadians should be able to compete equally for jobs irrespective of race, religion, gender or disability, so should all Canadians be able to defend themselves in a court of law regardless of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation.

Canadians will not tolerate the big brother attitude of this government. The Liberals may be able to hide from Canadians the contents of their bills now by invoking closure on debate but Canadians will not be silent when their rights and liberties are threatened.

Over 71,000 Canadians have petitioned this House not to pass Bill C–41 as it stands. Over 10,000 letters opposing this bill were delivered to the justice minister last week. The justice minister has received over 70,000 letters opposing this bill. There is no question Canadians clearly do not agree with the Liberal government on this issue.

The minister states that he consulted with Canadians before implementing legislation, but with whom did he consult on Bill C–41? The growing arrogance of this government is becoming very apparent and Canadians simply will not continue to tolerate it.

Come next election the message of Canadians will be loud and clear. Just as the people spoke in the 1993 election, so they will speak in 1997. The government may be able to ignore and silence the will of Canadians today but no government is above the democratic voice of the people. The Liberals, like the Conservatives before them who did not listen to the people, will go down in flames.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, originally, my speech was supposed to be in French but as you know, this is an issue that has caused some controversy in many parts of English Canada and especially among representatives of the third party here in the House.

[*English*]

There is only one part of this bill which is controversial. Let us cut to the chase and talk about that one part, namely crimes motivated by hatred, particularly hatred of a person's sexual orientation.

In this debate, we have heard that sexual orientation is an ambiguous term. Not only is this term in the bills of rights in almost all of our provinces, but only two weeks ago the Supreme Court of Canada acknowledged that sexual orientation was a form of discrimination and used those specific legally definable words.

We have heard talk about special rights being given to one segment of society. This bill does not give anyone special rights. It tries to restore basic human rights which are being stolen from some segments of our society.

Gangs of neo–Nazis are not prowling the streets looking for straight, white males to beat up and throw off cliffs. There are however gangs of neo–Nazis beating up and killing gays.

We have heard that looking at intent sets a dangerous precedent for our criminal justice system. Intent is the basis of our entire criminal justice system. After all, what is the difference between manslaughter and first degree murder if it is not the intent of the perpetrator? The sentence for the latter is life in prison, yet both deal with killing.

• (1650)

We have heard the argument that a crime is a crime and that punishment for beating and killing should be the same for all people. There are different crimes and the punishment should fit the crime.

When a Jewish cemetery is desecrated the damage is not to property, it is to the entire community. As a result Jewish people feel unsafe in their homes as they recall their history and an entire segment of our society is scarred. That is exactly what the neo–Nazis want. When a gay person is beaten or killed it is not simply that person who is murdered but the entire community is victimized. This is exactly what the neo–Nazis and bigots of all kinds want.

We have heard the right wingers talk of conspiracy and agendas. The only agenda is that of the radical religious right trying to advance religious beliefs on the Canadian public. After all, this is not about new rights but about saving lives. The polls show that the Canadian public overwhelmingly wants this legislation, more than those who wanted gun control and that was well over 70 per cent.

I realize there are some members in this House who feel their personal religious beliefs are more important than either their constituents' views or an individual's fundamental rights and freedoms. However I would urge them to follow the lead of Quebec, the only province in Canada which has an official religion and the first province in Canada to acknowledge that there is widespread discrimination based on sexual orientation.

I would also urge these members to remember what we are talking about here. We are not talking about same sex benefits. We are not talking about adoption. We are talking about stopping gay people from getting systematically beaten and killed by bigots of all kinds.

Not too long ago a person walking across the bridge out here from Hull to Ottawa was seized upon by a gang of so–called neo–Nazis. His crime was only that these bigots thought he looked gay. The media later made a point of saying he was not gay but that should not have been relevant. This young man was thrown to his death at the foot of the cliff beneath these Parliament Buildings because the neo–Nazis thought it was good and right to kill gays.

I know some of my colleagues believe that their religion prohibits homosexuality. I also know that their religion prohibits killing. In Christianity the basis for the former is an obscure passage written in prose and the latter is one of God's Ten Commandments. I sincerely hope they will see their duty clear and join us in trying to stop these killings once and for all.

As a Roman Catholic and as a married man, I fully recognize the obligation of this House to recognize equal rights for all. All we are asking is that these fundamental rights which we hold especially on the government side be extended to all Canadians and that includes gays and lesbians.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to enter into the public debate on Bill C–41. I was just having a private debate with one of the government members on the controversial section 718.2.

There are some good points in this bill as well as the bad ones. The emphasis has been on section 718.2 regarding the phrase of sexual orientation. I wish to go on the record as being totally and absolutely opposed to the point that we would introduce that phrase and give the protection under the Criminal Code.

I may be wrong but I think this is the first time the House has given to people the protection of sexual orientation which is totally undefined, whatever their sexual orientation may be and however repulsive that may be to a large number of people. They will now be protected under the Criminal Code.

If we go back to the charter of rights and freedoms that was passed in 1980 at that time the House specifically said that sexual orientation shall be left out. Then we found that the courts have introduced it. They said it shall be read in. I wonder who gave them the power to read it in when this House said it shall not be in there.

• (1655)

Thousands and thousands of petitions have been presented in this House and the government has not listened to any one of them. There is an article in today's Ottawa *Sun* regarding some members of the Reform Party who delivered to Parliament in a wheelbarrow thousands and thousands of letters objecting to the term sexual orientation. Not one of them was listened to by this government.

I do hope government members took note of what happened in this province last Thursday when the government was thrown out for not listening to the people. A new government was introduced which promised some serious policy, not only in balanced budgets but also in social reform.

Most unfortunately, perhaps the Liberals will pay more attention to that than the tens of thousands of Canadians who have registered their strong disapproval to this clause. It has identified certain segments of society and has given them special protection. That special protection is not available to anybody else. We pride ourselves as Canadians for being fair, treating everybody equally, that no one is better or worse than anybody else.

Yet because of a person's sexual orientation, which is undefined and may be reprehensible and disgusting, that person is not only protected but we are also going to mete out a more severe punishment to people who are victims within those groups than those who are victims of a group not mentioned in the section. That is why I find it repulsive. It is not only the fact that sexual orientation is in here which I find repulsive, but also the fact that a few Canadians have been identified and are being told that they are entitled to special treatment but nobody else is. All of us are supposed to be equal in the eyes of the law but we now find that is not the case.

I fully expect the citizens of Canada will remember this at the next election. They will ask MPs how they voted on June 14, 1995 on Bill C–41 when this type of amendment to the Criminal Code was introduced for the first time. I am fairly sure a large number of people who voted Liberal last time will not be voting Liberal the next time based on the fact that the Liberals have totally ignored the wishes of Canadians and have pushed this through much against their will.

Moving on to other sections, section 745.1 deals with people under the age of 18. Because we have focused on section 718.2 we have not talked about the other sections. Section 745.1 deals with the sentencing of people under the age of 18 convicted of first degree murder and second degree murder who shall be eligible for parole between five and ten years.

No more than 10 years shall the person spend in jail if he or she commits a murder in this country while under the age of 18. No more. What is the value of human life when we let our young people run through the streets committing murder and violent crime and we say the maximum is 10 years in jail for the crime?

There is a trial going on at this very moment which has despicable and heinous videotapes of the most repulsive crimes that perhaps have ever been committed in this country. Had these people been under the age of 18, the sentence would have been no more than 10 years in jail.

Where is this country going when it comes to criminal justice? Canadians from coast to coast are saying that they want safer streets and safer communities. And we turn around and pat those criminals on the head saying: "Do not do it any more. Perhaps you should know better".

It is time we got tough on crime, time that we told criminals we do not want to see them back in court again. The sentence should be appropriate. It should give them the message that we are serious about being serious on crime.

Section 717 regarding alternative measures and sentencing allows more appropriate sentencing. A couple of weeks ago we heard that a court in Saskatchewan banished a native for one year to live in isolation because he raped and humiliated someone. That is not sufficient.

• (1700)

If we are going to give the courts the right to alternative measures then we should have some real serious messages built into the system that the punishment must fit the crime. To banish someone to the wilderness who is perfectly capable and acquainted with living in the wilderness is basically to tell him to go home for a year and stay there. When this country is totally and absolutely fed up with violence against women and everybody, we find that a sentence like that is repulsive.

We already have a private member's bill to try to repeal section 745.6. That is the open door for people who are sentenced to life in prison with no parole for 15 years. It used to be the faint last hope and now we find it is the open door to get back on the street. That also has to be closed.

I have one final point, on section 722. We have to applaud that one, because it now gives victims the right to be heard in court. We must say that is an advancement, because victims need to be heard. We need to hear the pain they have suffered. It is time that criminals realized they are destroying our society and society is going to speak back and hit back to ensure that criminals get the message once and for all that we have had enough with crime and criminals. We want to do what we can through tougher sentencing and tougher laws to ensure that crime statistics start going down rather than up.

I could speak all day on this particular subject, but I think I have put my point across. There are five bad points and one good point in this bill. Therefore, I think Reform and everybody else in this country wants this bill defeated.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–41 has proven to be a very controversial bill based exclusively on the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in section 718.2, two words in a bill that runs 75 pages in length. These objections, even with a cursory study, do not stand up to scrutiny.

First I want to briefly deal with what the rest of C–41 talks about. C–41 provides the courts with a clear statement of principles and guidelines to be considered when sentencing offenders. Sentencing is a very delicate balance between competing principles. There is far more to consider than simply locking up the offender and separating him from society. This is not to say that the safety of society must not be the paramount goal, but we must also rehabilitate where we can and use our limited financial correctional resources in the wisest possible fashion.

Canada has one of the highest rates of incarceration in the western world. This is not because we are a violent or lawless people. On the contrary, only 10 per cent of crime in this country actually involves violence. Over half of all crimes involve property, not people. And frequently offenders are locked up not because they represent in any way a threat to society but because we simply do not know what to do with them. We do not have the resources at present in our code.

For example, nearly a third of the people liable to incarceration in our provincial jails are in that situation because they could not pay fines. Particularly hard hit of course are aboriginal and poor Canadians. The bill provides measures to help the provinces collect outstanding fines through the civil court system or levy community service or withhold provincial licences or permits in lieu of fines.

The bill also takes into much greater account the victims of crime, the people so often overlooked in the sentencing process. The new law will revise the parole provisions of the code. Henceforth, when an offender brings an application for an earlier parole eligibility date the court will specifically be required to take into account the perspective and evidence of the victim or the victim's family in deciding whether permission should be granted to the applicant to seek early parole.

• (1705)

The bill also gives priority to the principle of restitution. Offenders must be made to understand the consequences of their crimes. To do this, the code will be amended to ensure that restitution orders can be enforced through civil courts like any other court order, through garnishment of wages, seizure, sale or otherwise. At the same time, the restitution order will not preclude the victim from suing for damages in the civil courts in that province.

Jails should be reserved for those who need them. Bill C–41 proposes alternatives to create a more equitable, less costly, and more effective system which Canadians can trust. It introduces a diversion program for adults guilty of minor crimes, for instance shoplifting, that will allow the courts to divert the offender into a program of community service and counselling to deal with the problem in a more humane and less costly manner.

Another new aspect of the bill is the conditional sentence. This provision will give authorities the discretion to have the offender serve his or her sentence in the community where—and I want to stress this—the court is satisfied that the offender would not endanger the safety of the community. If the offender does not comply with the conditions imposed as part of that sentence, he or she is brought back before the court to explain. If the court is not satisfied, it can order that the remainder of the sentence be served in custody.

Last, Bill C–41 will require that a judge passing sentence state her or his reasons and enter those reasons in the record of proceeding. This will increase public understanding of the judicial decision making process, encouraging judges to make consistent, well–informed, reasoned decisions based on the principles enunciated in the bill.

Now to section 718. Hate crime is increasingly manifest in Canada. There are over 40 organized hate groups operating in Canada today, and there is no evidence that the number is abating. It is with this in mind that the Liberal government has moved to toughen up the Criminal Code to crack down on crime and to make it known in absolutely unequivocal terms that we cannot and will not allow hatred and prejudice to tear us apart in this country. This was our promise to the Canadian people during the election campaign. We say now that crimes motivated by hate will be and indeed must be more severely punished.

Hatred comes in many guises. There is neo–Nazism, anti–Semitism, racism. They are only the obvious forms. Prejudice based on sexual orientation is just as real and one of the most common forms of discrimination we encounter today.

Some studies estimate that as much as 12 per cent of the population is gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Others purport to put the number as low as 3 per cent. Whatever the percentage, be it 1 per cent or 50 per cent, the fact is that we cannot tolerate prejudice and hate motivated crimes against any segment of our population, no matter how small. In fact, I will argue that if it is smaller then they need our protection more, since they do not have the numbers to protect themselves.

Studies show that as many as one–third of the people we are talking about here—or they are talking about, that great they over on the other side—have been threatened or subjected to violence simply because of who they are. According to the Metro Toronto police force, hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation today represent the third largest category of hate related offences.

The evidence all points to a steady increase in hate crime, particularly in the United States. It is naive to think that this does not spill over to Canada. If we contemn hatred, we must contemn all hatred, not just against some groups, but against all groups equally.

Some people have expressed a concern that the new law would legalize pedophilia. Let us be perfectly clear here. This legislation does not legalize any sexual activity that is currently outlawed, and the bill explicitly states so. A person's sexual orientation no more includes pedophilia than it does sexual assault or incest. I wonder how many heterosexuals think of themselves as rapists.

People who violate the sexual offences in the existing Criminal Code will continue to be punished to the full extent of the law. In fact, section 718.2.(ii) of the bill will allow for even harsher sentences to be imposed on sex offenders where the victim is in a relationship of trust to the offender, for example, where a doctor molests a patient, a teacher a young student, a babysitter his or her charge, or a priest his parishioner.

I have also heard it said that the new bill will make it a crime to speak out publicly against homosexuality. Again, let us be perfectly clear. It is the right of every Canadian to be able to speak his or her mind. A church sermon expressing a moral view is not a crime. Freedom of speech and religion are both specifically protected under our charter of rights and freedoms.

• (1710)

Bill C–41 as a sentencing bill will become operative only after someone is found guilty of a crime. Only at the sentencing hearing may a judge hear evidence that the crime was motivated by hatred, and only then may the judge take it into account in passing sentence.

Some critics have expressed concern that the bill will open the door to sweeping changes leading to the recognition of same sex families or gay and lesbian spouses. Bill C–41 does not and will not have this effect. You are in the wrong act, people. It does nothing more than what it appears to do. It is a bill to give the court guidance in determining a sentence where a crime has been committed. The bill does not advocate or encourage any lifestyle, nor does it undermine in any way the traditional family. It does not even speak to the subject. It is relevant only to the criminal law.

Bill C–41 is about many things. It is about the right of everyone to live as they choose within the law and to live their lives free from fear. It is far more than a debate on sexual orientation. It is about sentencing. It is designed to restore faith in our courts, faith in our system of justice, and faith in our communities, where people need to be reintegrated.

I urge all members of the House to give their support to this important bill.

I must say that I have felt ashamed in the last two days about statements of intolerance I have heard in the debate. I hope I never rise again saying that I feel ashamed about statements of intolerance in the greatest democracy in the world today, Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.12 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, 1995, and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in the interest of avoiding reading the list of motions aloud, I think you might find a disposition on the part of the House to consider that all the motions have been put, the division demanded and deferred, so

that we can proceed at once with the ringing of the bells for the division.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, if we could have unanimous agreement that after the vote on Bill C–41 is complete the House would adjourn for the evening, we would be agreeable. Otherwise we will not give unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I will not partake in the negotiations. I will simply put the motion as proposed by the parliamentary secretary and await the decision of the House.

The proposal of the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is that the House deem moved and seconded, deem read, deem deferred for a recorded division. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent.

The question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 16, with the following:

"amined that substance and stating the result of".

Motion No. 20

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended in the French version, by replacing line 40, on page 33, with the following:

"garde d'enfant auxquels s'expose une".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

(Motion negatived.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 20. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

We will now move to Group No. 4, Motion No. 19.

Hon. Raymond Chan (for Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C–41, in Clause 6, be amended

(*a*) by striking out line 4, on page 26, and substituting the following:

"prison calculated in accordance with regulations made under subsection (7), and";

(*b*) by adding, immediately after line 21, on page 26, the following:

"(7) The Lieutenant Governor in Council of a province may make regulations respecting the calculation of the costs and charges referred to in Clause (5)(*a*)(i)(B) and in paragraph 734.8(1)(*b*)."; and

(*c*) by striking out line 5 on page 30 and substituting the following:

"conveying the defaulter to prison, calculated in accordance with regulations made under subsection 734(7)."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We will now move to Group No. 5, Motion No. 21.

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended by

(*a*) replacing line 9, on page 44, with the following:

"743.6 Notwithstanding subsection"; and

(*b*) by deleting lines 27 to 32, on page 44.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion negatived.)

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-41, in Clause 6, be amended:

(*a*) by deleting lines 26 to 49, on page 47, lines 1 to 45, on page 48 and lines 1 to 24, on page 49; and

(*b*) by replacing lines 26 and 27, on page 49, with the following:

"ment served for the purposes of section 745 or 745.4, there shall be included any".

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-41, in Clause 24, be amended:

(*a*) by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 62, with the following:

"ences to "745", "745.1", "745.4" and "745.5", respectively; or"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 3, on page 63, with the following:

"745.1, 745.4 or 745.5, there shall be".

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-41, in Schedule IV, be amended by deleting item 44, on page 74.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 23 and 25.

Hon. Raymond Chan (for Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-41 be amended by adding immediately after line 28, on page 63, the following:

"25.1 For greater certainty, conduct that constituted an offence under the Criminal Code before the date on which this section comes into force constitutes the same offence after that date."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

• (1740)

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: Colleagues, we are going to have a few votes this afternoon. We are going to take it nice and easy so that everyone understands what is going on. We are not going to rush at all. Here we go.

The first question is on Motion No. 3. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 3 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 4. A negative vote on Motion No. 3 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 4.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 278*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—47
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Landry
Lastewka
Lebel
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
1Solomon
Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons

Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Young
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wayne
Wood
Zed—179

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1750)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 279)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Crête
de Savoye
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Johnston
Langlois
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Robinson
Schmidt
Silye
Solomon
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—87
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Jennings
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Ringma
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Cohen
Cowling
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Alcock
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague

Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Young
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Rideout
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Zed—140

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1800)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 5. We are now in Group No. 2. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion Nos. 6 to 17 inclusive. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 6.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 280)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
Strahl
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—48

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Landry
Lastewka
Lebel
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez

O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
Solomon
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Young
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Zed—180

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1810)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 6 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 7 and 17. A negative vote on Motion No. 6 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 7 and 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 281)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Serré
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood—53
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Iftody
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)

Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Landry
Lastewka
Lebel
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Young
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lefebvre
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Sheridan
Solomon
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wells
Zed—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (1820)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 7 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 8 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 7 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 8.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 282*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Morrison
Payne
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood—59
Ablonczy
Bhaduria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Iftody
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Ramsay
Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Ianno
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Sheridan
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Young

Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lebel
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wells
Zed—166

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1830)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

We are still on Group No. 2. The next question is on Motion No. 8. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 8 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 9 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 8 necessitates the question being put on Motions 9 to 11.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 283*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Arseneault
Bhaduria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Jennings
Jordan
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Morrison

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Iftody
Johnston
Loney
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata

Payne
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Szabo
Volpe
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood—65

Ramsay
Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Thompson
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Crête
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard

Alcock
Althouse
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Ianno
Jacob
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap–Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson

Rocheleau
Rompkey
Sheridan
St–Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Wells
Zed—157

Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Walker
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (1840)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 284)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Langlois
Lebel
Loubier

Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
de Savoye
Duceppe
Fillion
Godin
Jacob
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier

Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
St-Laurent
Venne—33

Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bélair
Catterall
Comuzzi
Dhaliwal
Duncan
English
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Jennings
Jordan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Walker
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Wood

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Augustine
Benoit
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Caccia
Chan
Cummins
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Johnston
Keyes
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Morrison
Pagtakhan
Phinney
Ramsay
Ringma
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Vanclief
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams
Young —114

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy

Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1850)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 285*)

YEAS

Members

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
de Savoye
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Langlois
Lebel
Loubier
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Robinson
Solomon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—37

Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Dubé
Fillion
Godin
Jacob
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Shefford)
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benoit
Bethel

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Augustine
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua

Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
Meredith
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Ringma
Rock
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams
Young

Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Catterall
Chamberlain
Cohen
Cowling
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duncan
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Johnston
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Terrana
Thompson
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
White (North Vancouver)
Wood
Zed—178

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

We are still on Group No. 2.

• (1900)

The next question is on Motion No. 11. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 11 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 12 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 11 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 12.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 286)

YEAS

Members

Cummins
Gouk
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Jordan
McTeague
Morrison
Serré
Silye
Stinson
Volpe
White (North Vancouver)

Forseth
Hanrahan
Hill (Macleod)
Hopkins
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Solberg
Strahl
Wappel
Wood—24

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Augustine
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bhaduria
Blondin–Andrew
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Catterall
Comuzzi
Dhaliwal
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Flis
Fry
Gauthier (Roberval)
Goodale
Grubel
Guay
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Jennings
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap–Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McLaughlin
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Solomon
Speller
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Young —105

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bélair
Caccia
Chan
Crête
Duceppe
Duncan
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Langlois
Lee
Loney
MacAulay
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nault
Nunziata
Peters
Phinney
Ramsay
Ringma
Robinson
Rompkey
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Vanclief
Wayne
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (1905)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 12 in Group No. 2. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 12 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 13 to 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 12 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 13 and 15.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 287*)

YEAS

Members

Cummins
Forseth
Hermanson
Hopkins
Jordan
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Serré
Silye
White (North Vancouver)

Fontana
Harper (Calgary West)
Hill (Macleod)
Hubbard
Lee
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Nault
Shepherd
Wappel
Wood—22

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Allmand
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bergeron
Blaikie
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caccia
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finestone
Gilmour
Gouk
Guarnieri
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Johnston
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap–Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney

Ablonczy
Althouse
Benoit
Bhaduria
Blondin–Andrew
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélair
Chan
de Savoye
Duncan
Epp
Gauthier (Roberval)
Goodale
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hoeppner
Jennings
Keyes
Leroux (Shefford)
MacAulay

MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Manley
Manning	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata	Peters
Peterson	Ramsay
Rideout	Ringma
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Schmidt
Simmons	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)	Strahl
Thompson	Wayne
Williams	Young —74

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin-Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

• (1910)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 lost.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like you to clarify two things for me. I have noticed that a lot of government members are going in and out of their seats. I believe—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: The hon. whip of the Reform Party has the floor.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask you to please check the record on the last vote on Motion No. 12. I believe you will find the minister of immigration cast his vote and should be in that total, but before the totals were given he left his seat. That vote should not count.

The Speaker: Colleagues, you will recall earlier in the night I asked you to kindly stay in your seats from the beginning to the end of each vote. Perhaps one or two members did leave a bit earlier. I cannot see all members at the same time. I appeal to you that when a vote begins, once you vote please stay in your seat until the vote is terminated.

I will do it this one time. Because an hon. member questioned another hon. member's presence, it is very simple, did the hon. minister of immigration leave his seat during the vote?

• (1920)

Mr. Marchi: Yes.

The Speaker: There it is. His vote in this instance I rule will not count by his own admission.

I ask members to please abide by the rules. We will get through these votes, they will just take a little while.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 13 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 14. A negative vote on Motion No. 13 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 14.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negatived on division:)

(Division No. 288)

YEAS

Members

McTeague	Serré
Skoke	Steckle
Wappel	Wayne—6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bhaduria
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Caccia	Caron
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Godin	Goodale
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Hopkins	Jennings
Johnston	Keyes
Loney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Mayfield
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard	Nunziata
Paré	Peterson
Ramsay	Rideout

Ringma
Schmidt
Simmons
Solomon
Thompson
White (North Vancouver)
Young —67

Rompkey
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (1925)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 289)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Augustine
Bertrand
Blondin–Andrew
Boudria
Caccia
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
English
Finestone
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap–Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
Mifflin
Murray
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Rideout
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Verran
Walker
Wells
Young —91

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bhaduria
Bonin
Bélanger
Chan
Discepola
Duhamel
Fewchuk
Flis
Gallaway
Goodale
Grose
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
Malhi
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
de Savoye
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Jennings
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Solomon
Steckle
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)

Althouse
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Crête
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Johnston
Lebel
Manning
Mercier
Ménard
Paré
Pomerleau
Ringma
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Speaker
Stinson
Venne
White (North Vancouver)—62

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall

Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy

Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1935)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 carried.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I seek some clarification from the Chair. My understanding is that the effect of Motion No. 14 by the member for Scarborough West is to insert a comma into the legislation. Can you confirm that, please, or can the author confirm the effect of that amendment?

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to confirm that the amendment adds a comma. I am very happy that the government supported it.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 15. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 15 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 15 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 16.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on the Motion No. 15, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 290)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Bélisle
Crête
Dubé
Dumas
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Lebel
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Paré
Pomerleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne—33
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
de Savoye
Duceppe
Fillion
Godin
Harris
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Venne

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bridgman
Caccia
Chan
Cummins
English
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Goodale
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hill (Macleod)
Lincoln
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McGuire
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Nault
Phinney
Ramsay
Ringma
Rock
Scott (Skeena)
Simmons
Speaker
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Volpe
Wappel
Wood—79
Ablonczy
Anawak
Augustine
Benoit
Bhaduria
Boudria
Bélair
Catterall
Comuzzi
Duhamel
Epp
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harvard
Lee
Loney
Manning
Marleau
Mayfield
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Milliken
Morrison
Peters
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stinson
Vanclief
Walker
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (1940)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

Mr. Szabo: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My Motion No. 16 calls for stiffer sentences against spousal abusers. Today in debate a motion was put by the hon. member for Hamilton West to amend Motion No. 17 that had been moved by the Minister of Justice.

I am pleased that Motion No. 17, as amended, would very nicely cover the intent of my motion. Therefore I ask for unanimous consent of the House to withdraw Motion No. 16.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion No. 16 withdrawn.)

• (1945)

The Speaker: The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on the amendment, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 291*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Arseneault
Barnes
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Crête
Cummins
Discepola
Dubé
English
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Maloney
Marchi
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mercier
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Sheridan
Simmons
Solomon
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Ablonczy
Anawak
Assadourian
Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duhamel
Epp
Flis
Forseth
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gray (Windsor West)
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hill (Macleod)
Ianno
Jackson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Manning
Marleau
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
St–Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Wood—150

NAYS

Members

Benoit
Duncan
Hart
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Ringma
Strahl
Bridgman
Gilmour
Johnston
Ramsay
Solberg
Williams—12

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond–Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin–Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (1950)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

This is the last question, my colleagues, in Group No. 2. The question is on Motion No. 17 as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, as amended, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 292*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Assadourian	Barnes
Beaumier	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blaikie
Blondin–Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Bélair	Bélanger
Caccia	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Cohen
Comuzzi	Crête
Culbert	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duhamel
Duncan	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Harvard
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Langlois
Lastewka	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Lee
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
MacAulay	MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Maloney
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Silye
Simmons	Skoke
Solomon	Speaker
Speller	St–Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood—158

NAYS

Members

Benoit	Bridgman
Epp	Gilmour
Hart	Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Ramsay	Ringma
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Strahl	Williams—14

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Asselin
Bachand	Blondin–Andrew
Bouchard	Calder
Canuel	Clancy
Copps	Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
Dingwall	Dupuy
Easter	Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)	Gerrard
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Laurin	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Marchand
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Plamondon	Proud
Regan	Sauvageau

• (1955)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17, as amended, carried.

We are now beginning Group No. 3. The next question is on Motion No. 20.

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 293)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duceppe
Epp
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Nunez
Pomerleau
Ringma
Rocheleau
Solomon
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—59

Ablonczy
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dubé
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Jennings
Langlois
Leroux (Shefford)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Morrison
Paré
Ramsay
Robinson
Schmidt
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Campbell
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Gagliano
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Hickey
Ianno
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Milliken

Alcock
Anawak
Augustine
Barnes
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Caccia
Catterall
Chamberlain
Cohen
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maheu
Maloney
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna

Mitchell
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Rideout
Rompkey
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Young

Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wood
Zed—116

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (2005)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 lost.

We are now on Group No. 4. The next question is on Motion No. 19.

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 294)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellehumeur
Bertrand
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brushett
Bélisle
Campbell
Chamberlain
Cohen
Crête
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duhamel
Fewchuk
Finlay
Gauthier (Roberval)

Alcock
Althouse
Assadourian
Barnes
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
Culbert
Discepola
Duceppe
Eggleton
Finestone
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)

Guay
Hubbard
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Loubier
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manley
McGuire
Murphy
O'Brien
Peters
Phinney
Robillard
Rompkey
Speller
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Wayne
Young —80

Harvard
Jackson
Langlois
Loney
MacAulay
Maloney
Massé
McLaughlin
Nunez
Patry
Peterson
Rideout
Rock
Solomon
Stewart (Northumberland)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Volpe
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Duncan
Gilmour
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Ramsay
Schmidt
Stinson
Thompson
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cummins
Epp
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—36

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (2010)

After the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: The Table would like some clarification. Either the member of Parliament for Beaver River voted twice or someone like her voted. Would she tell us if she did vote and if she did, which way she voted.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Fortunately there only is one member for Beaver River in this House. I am about as tired as the woman who is calling the vote. She is exhausted. I stood to try to expedite it. I am in fact a nay.

The Speaker: I do not know if this is in order but maybe the hon. member for Beaver River could pass this time.

Miss Grey: I am happy to pass, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 19 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 22. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 23 and 25.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. On December 13 the House passed at second reading private member's Bill C-226, which deals with section 745 of the Criminal Code.

The House in principle supported the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code. This amendment to this piece of legislation purports to amend a bill or a section of the Criminal Code Parliament has already pronounced on in terms of repealing it at second reading.

The private member's bill is presently before the justice committee. I seek some direction from the Chair as to whether this amendment and the section in this bill are in order.

• (2020)

The Speaker: I have been asked for a ruling. I rule these amendments are in order because the other bill is not now before the House and therefore we will proceed with Motion No. 22.

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 295)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Duncan
Gilmour
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hoeppner
Johnston
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McTeague
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Solomon
Stinson
Terrana
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—47

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Cummins
Epp
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Maloney
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McLaughlin
Meredith
Nunziata
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bergeron
Blondin–Andrew
Boudria
Brien
Bélanger
Caccia
Caron
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Comuzzi
Duhamel
Dumas
Eggleton
Fillion
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagliano
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Godin
Goodale
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Harvard
Hubbard
Ianno
Jackson
Jacob
Kirkby
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu
Malhi
Marleau
Massé
McKinnon
Mercier
Minna
Mitchell
Murphy
Murray
Ménard
O'Brien
Paradis
Parrish
Patry
Payne
Peters
Peterson
Pomerleau
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rock
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré
Shepherd
Sheridan
Simmons
St–Laurent
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Young —75

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Asselin
Bachand
Blondin–Andrew
Bouchard
Calder
Canuel
Clancy
Copps
Crawford
Dalphond–Guiral
Daviault
Debien
Deshaies
Dingwall
Dupuy
Easter
Gaffney
Gagnon (Québec)
Gerrard
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Irwin
Lalonde
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ouellet
Plamondon
Proud
Regan
Sauvageau

● (2025)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 23 and 25 lost also.

We are now at Group No. 7. The next question is on Motion No. 24.

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 296*)

YEAS

Members

Alcock
Allmand
Althouse
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellehumeur
Bhaduria
Blaikie
Blondin–Andrew
Boudria
Bélair
Bélanger
Caccia
Chan
Comuzzi
Crête
Culbert
Discepola
Dromisky
Duceppe
Duhamel
Dumas
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Finlay
Fontana
Forseth
Fry
Gagliano
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Guarnieri
Guay
Harvard
Hubbard
Ianno
Jackson
Kirkby
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap–Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Loney
Loubier
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap–Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu
Maloney
Manley
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick
McKinnon
McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague
Mercier
Minna
Mitchell
Murphy
Murray
Nunez
Nunziata
O'Brien
Pagtakhan
Paradis
Parrish
Patry
Payne
Peters
Peterson
Phinney
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Sheridan
Simmons
Skoke
Solomon
Speller
St–Laurent
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Telegdi
Terrana
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Venne
Wells
Young
Zed—107

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman
Cummins
Duncan
Epp
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Hanrahan

Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—44

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall
Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan
Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy
Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

● (2035)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was sure which way I voted. I should like to seek unanimous consent of the House to give a great round of applause to Audrey O'Brien who has been on her feet for hours and called every vote here tonight.

Mr. Fontana: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now that members of the Reform Party have been gracious enough to pay tribute to someone who has done a lot of work for us tonight in counting the votes, perhaps they would stop playing games and get on with the votes.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Neither of those were points of order.

Mr. Hermanson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member on the other side impugned that we do not take serious the democratic process. I would ask that he withdraw the comments.

The Speaker: We have been at it now for three hours. Everything is going quite well. I am reminded of the story of the elephant and what he said when his tail was cut off. He said: "It won't be long now".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(*Division No. 297*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beaumier
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harvard
Hubbard
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Augustine
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Comuzzi
Crête
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Ianno
Jacob
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lebel
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau

Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Serré
Simmons
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wood
Zed—167

McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Rideout
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Solomon
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wells
Young

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Grubel
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
Bachand
Bouchard
Canuel
Copps
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dingwall

Asselin
Blondin-Andrew
Calder
Clancy
Crawford
Daviault
Deshaies
Dupuy

Easter
Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond
Irwin
Laurin
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Regan

Gaffney
Gerrard
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Marchand
Ouellet
Proud
Sauvageau

• (2045)

After the taking of the vote:

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not think the name of the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley was called. I was listening quite carefully and I would like to ascertain whether it was correctly registered.

The Speaker: His name was called and recorded.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 37, because of the delay, Private Members' Business will be rescheduled for another sitting.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House agrees to amendment number 4(*a*) made by the Senate to Bill C-69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundary commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries, and this House disagrees with amendments numbers 1, 2, 3, 4(*b*), 4(*c*), 5 and 6 for the following reasons:

The bill was, in accordance with the new procedures of this House, prepared by a committee of the House. While amendment number 4(*a*) corrects an omission, the other amendments address points, each of which were supported by members representing at least two of the three parties officially recognized in the House. Taken together, the bill represents a balance aimed at improving the responsiveness of the system of readjusting electoral boundaries both to rapid shifts of population and to the operative realities of effective representation of the people, a balance that, in the opinion of this House, requires:

(*a*) in view of the varied Canadian geography and demography, the retention of a variation of up to 25 per cent from the electoral quota of each province (addressed by amendments number 1 and 6(*a*));

(*b*) the avoidance of unnecessary electoral boundary adjustments in provinces where shifts of population do not require them (addressed in amendments number 2, 3, 5, 6(*b*)(i) and 7);

(*c*) the clear acceptance of the non–partisan status of members of commissions through the provision of parliamentary oversight of appointments (addressed by amendments number 4(*b*) and 4(*c*));

(*d*) the retention of the definition of "community of interest" developed on a non–partisan basis by currently serving elected representatives, through a consensus of all parties, in the House of Commons Standing Committee rather than the substitution of another definition (addressed by amendment number 6(*b*)(ii)).

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to support the motion proposed by the government House leader in respect of the Senate amendments to Bill C–69.

The motion before the House accepts one of the amendments proposed by the Senate to this bill and rejects the other amendments proposed.

I am pleased to support the motion before the House.

Mr. Gilmour: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, under a little used section on Private Members' Business, could the Speaker indicate whether that private members' motion will be within the closing session of the next seven days.

• (2050)

The Speaker: In response to the question of order it is the responsibility of the Speaker to reschedule this private member's day within the next 10 days.

It is my intention to try to reschedule it before the end of this session. This session is scheduled to finish in the next seven days and I will attempt to put it on there.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to assist you in rescheduling it at 3.30 this morning.

I want to go ahead with the speech I have before me. This is an attempt to obstruct my speech and I hope the Chair will put a short end to it.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in light of the proceedings earlier this evening it might be wise to now move that the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has the floor and the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster cannot move that motion as a point of order.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, the government fulfilled its obligation in respect of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act when it appointed a committee to draft and bring in a bill to the House. The procedure and House affairs committee, which I have the honour to chair, worked for a considerable period of time drafting and bringing in amendments to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. In most cases the amendments were agreeable to all the members on the committee.

There were only a couple of items on which there was disagreement. I am sure that will be reflected in the speeches from the other parties in the course of the evening. Basically there was substantial agreement on the elements of the bill.

The end result of the work the committee did was to give Canadians a more open, transparent and effective system of readjusting electoral boundaries. The bill which was brought to the House by the government based on the committee report and in substantial compliance with the committee report was adopted by the House following on that committee's work.

In other words, there had been consensus at the beginning. There was consensus basically all the way through, although I respect the fact the opposition parties voted against the bill in the end for two different reasons. One was unconnected with the bill and condemned the bill for something it did not contain. The other was due to disagreement with one of the provisions in the bill which carried on a provision from the previous law that allowed for ridings that vary by more than 25 per cent from the provincial quotient.

As I have indicated, the motion proposed by the government House leader agrees with Senate amendment 4(a) which would add a requirement to the law that members of a boundaries commission be resident in the province for which the commission is established. That was omitted from the bill largely by oversight on the part of the committee and we are happy to agree with the Senate that the provision could be fixed. I acknowledge the oversight on the part of the standing committee and I am glad to see it corrected by this amendment.

• (2055)

However, the other amendments proposed by the Senate in my submission are unacceptable because they would repeal the most important innovations set out in Bill C–69, each of which was supported by at least two of the parties in the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs when introduced and considered in that committee.

These amendments therefore upset the balance struck by the standing committee in improving the system for electoral boundaries and in my view should therefore be rejected.

I respectfully disagree with Amendments Nos. 1 and 6(a) to reduce the maximum deviation from the electoral quota for a province from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. This quota was agreed on after extensive discussion, after extensive hearings in the committee and I admit over the objections of the Reform Party which wanted to reduce the quota to 15 per cent. There is a genuine difference of opinion on that. Members of the Reform Party will likely maintain that difference of opinion tonight.

Members of the Bloc and members of the Liberal Party are both of the view that in a country as large and as geographically diverse as Canada limiting the boundaries to 15 per cent of the provincial quotient, a deviation of 15 per cent either way, would be too restrictive and might result in serious inequities, leaving members to represent enormous ridings scattered over a vast distance with very few people in them but obviously trying to make up for the lack of population by adding to those ridings in a very substantial way.

We do not feel the system in the past has worked that badly. The most recent set of commissions has done a poor job and we have come up with a new and better way of appointing of those commissions and in our view a better way of having the commissions work where there is public input early in the process. That was a provision agreed on by all parties in the committee.

I also disagree with proposed Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6(b)(i) and 7 which would repeal the provisions that would avoid unnecessary electoral boundaries readjustments in provinces where shifts in population did not require them. Again, this set of provisions was agreed to by all parties.

Why would we spend money on having an electoral redistribution in a province when there has been no significant change in the population, no new seats in the province and the boundaries are more than adequate? Yet the committee formed that view very strongly. We put this in the bill. The Senate has decided in its view this should come out. We disagreed with that and are requesting the Senate simply acknowledge the House is insisting on these amendments and accept that we disagree and allow the bill to proceed.

Amendments Nos. 4(b) and (c) which in my view are unacceptable eliminate the provision of parliamentary oversight of appointments to electoral boundaries commissions. The appointment process in our view had flaws. The committee agreed on this. After extensive discussion in committee we agreed on this new appointment procedure.

Mr. Speaker, under the procedure in the bill you have the right to make nominations of persons to act as commissioners. Those names are to be submitted to the House of Commons and will be considered here. If members object motions can be moved that if carried could result in your having to come up with a new appointment. We think that is a fair and reasonable way to proceed. We supported it. The House supported at the time the bill came here and we hope it will be supported in the Senate later.

Also we disagree with Amendment No. 6(b)(i) which would redefine community of interest by incorporating the definition recommended by the royal commission on electoral reform and party financing. I think all members of the committee considered whether to adopt that definition. The definition was agreed on after extensive discussion among all members of the committee, and there was substantial agreement on it.

[*Translation*]

Bill C–69 was a good agreement, approved by all committee members on almost all points. There are, however, some clauses in the bill that are not to everyone's liking.

The member for Bellechasse, who is here now, did not agree with the bill, because he felt certain provisions were not included. He will probably talk about them in his speech. That is fine, but unfortunately everybody cannot have everything they want in the bill.

• (2100)

We have before us a fine bill, and I hope that all the members here will support the motion currently before the House proposed by the government House leader to send these amendments and the wishes of the House to the Senate for its consideration and quick adoption of the bill.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to move that the House do now adjourn but to speak to the substantive motion addressed by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

First of all, I may say it is rather ironic that a House whose members are appointed by the governor in council, by cabinet, to all intents and purposes, to sit until the age of 75 tries to teach us a thing or two about democracy in connection with such basic issues as electoral boundaries readjustment.

I am very pleased to see that the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is listening carefully to my speech, as is the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine. We have worked very hard without a hint of partisanship. I would also like to mention the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior who showed a great interest in this bill. The hon. member was instrumental in having the bill drafted in its present form, especially one specific point that I will discuss later on, and I am referring to the 25 per cent deviation from the electoral quota.

I said earlier that the non–elected House, the Canadian Senate, wants to teach us a lesson about democracy, and I think there is something fundamentally wrong with this Parliament. It should be up to us to say that the other House should either cease to exist and be abolished or its members should be elected, one or the other.

In any case, the process started a long time ago with Bill C–18 which suspended for a certain period of time the work of commissions which had already been appointed until June this year so we are getting close to the deadline, and the Committee of the House on Procedure and House Affairs was subsequently instructed to draft a bill.

Strictly speaking, it is not a government bill, although it was tabled on behalf of the Government House Leader. This is a bill that was drafted in committee, before the Standing Committee of the House on Procedure and House Affairs, as I said before.

There was a very broad consensus among committee members on most clauses. In fact, there were far more items on which we agreed than on which we disagreed.

Unfortunately, there was one item on which we could not agree and since it was a fundamental rule, the crux of the whole debate, this meant that the official opposition, the Bloc Quebecois, could not vote for Bill C–69 on third reading. This item was the subject of a motion that I tabled in this House and that was defeated, a motion that guaranteed Quebec a minimum representation rate of 25 per cent, irrespective of its population at the time of the census.

We hope we will never have to apply this minimum guarantee, because in the next federal election, I assume or in any case I hope we will then be living within a new Quebec–Canada partnership so that this legislation would not apply to Quebec, which will have its own legislation that will apply to Quebec's 125 ridings.

• (2105)

This basic characteristic of holding 25 per cent of the seats was, and still is, related to the fundamental notion that Canada has two founding peoples, not equal in numbers but equal in rights. A pact, an agreement, was made in 1867 between two nations: the anglophone nation and the francophone nation.

They decided to pool certain things to be managed by this Parliament and they decided to grant the legislatures of the founding provinces, and those which subsequently joined confederation, specific jurisdictions which made them autonomous and sovereign states, when it came to their spheres of jurisdiction. Did they ever fool us in 1867. And I use the polite term, because I cannot use any other in this House.

Today, the interpretation of events given by our Reform colleagues, in particular the hon. members for Calgary West and Kindersley—Lloydminster, has made us realize that the Canada of today is no longer a bicultural and biethnic country, but a multicultural and multiethnic one: this is not the Canada of 1867, the one in which our fathers, mothers, grandfathers, grandmothers and ancestors so strongly believed.

In 1965, the premier, Daniel Johnson Sr., said that Canada will be made up of two nations and two cultures or it will cease to exist. We have already seen this in practice, the proof. Just look at what is happening today. This is what Mr. Johnson said in 1965, Sir George–Étienne Cartier said in 1867, Louis Riel said after him, and Franco–Ontarians were saying at the time that they were making demands—remember Regulation 17 in Ontario— at the time that they were pursuing the issue of having to fund public schools and fund their own private schools, because public funding for their schools was dropped altogether. These are the kinds of things that tend to be forgotten in this country.

There is a tendency to forget the heroic battles led not only by francophones in Quebec, but by francophones outside it and by Acadians to protect their rights. These were major battles. The fight against the Greenway laws in Manitoba. From 1889 on, the rights of francophones were suspended in Manitoba and they were only restored by the Supreme Court almost 100 years later.

Over the past 100 years in Manitoba, the percentage of francophones has gone from 50 per cent, one in every two Manitobans was francophone, to 4 per cent. That is the result of having no constitutional guarantees.

If only we had known. We had no way of knowing or those who should have seen it coming did not. And now we are faced with a situation where the survival of francophone communities, in particular outside Quebec, is a daily struggle. Even the survival of the francophone community in Quebec is a weighty issue, and we have to deal with it every day because each new day brings with it new menaces.

Do not forget that we only represent two per cent of the population on the North American continent. Therefore, we should be equipped with some legal protection in our battle as North American francophones. Where were those who, in the Senate, claimed to have promoted a guarantee of 25 per cent for Quebec?

Where was the senator for Stadacona, the one who claimed to have promoted protection of 25 per cent of seats for Quebec? Where was the senator for Lasalle, the one who claimed that Trudeau had made an offer that Quebec had rejected?

There is nothing in the Senate's report about a guarantee of 25 per cent. The Senate's greatest omission is to have failed to consider the issue of representation for Quebec and probably francophone communities as well, to ensure a guaranteed minimum in this House.

We must not forget that other provinces such as Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have, because of the senatorial provision of 1915, a constitutional guarantee of never having fewer members in this House than they have senators in the Senate.

Quebec does not have this guarantee. The national home of the francophone people in Canada has no guaranteed representation in this House.

• (2110)

Some passages in Canada's history have been forgotten. Oddly enough, the forgotten bits almost always have to do with one party. I think that we are at the point where, to solve this puzzle, we are going to have to cut our losses and define what should have been defined in 1867, go back to the real spirit of the founding fathers, which was to see the two nations work together, as equals, neighbours and partners.

The Senate's motions in amendment are totally unacceptable, except for one, which merely corrects a technical error we made. The first amendment proposes reducing the allowable variation from the provincial quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. For Quebec, which, like Ontario by the way, has no constitutional guarantee as I mentioned earlier—we think about franco–Ontarians who are scattered across a large area and have no more protection than Quebecers at that level—reducing the allowable variation from the quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent directly imperils the ridings in the Gaspé Peninsula and the Lower St. Lawrence.

I can hear behind me my colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, who represents a riding that would be directly affected if the allowable variation from the quota were reduced to 15 per cent from 25 per cent. The only way it would be possible to guarantee adequate representation would be to eat into the metropolitan region of Montreal, to ask ridings in that area, Montérégie and the Laurentides to have 125 per cent representation everywhere. Given the territory, given the uniqueness of the people there, given the fact that the Magdalen Islands are stranded out in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, there is no way we will be able to maintain adequate representation in these regions if we have to accept that the allowable variation from the quota will be reduced from 25 per cent to 15 per cent.

It would also be impossible to keep the riding of Manicouagan, which stretches far to the north and we would be putting at risk ridings like Abitibi, at least in the future—not with the current figures but in coming censuses, if this law were to apply in Quebec.

The same reasoning would certainly apply regarding the boundaries which would be imposed in Ontario's north.

I believe that by maintaining the 25 per cent variation which has been the standard for the past 30 years, ever since the first legislation on electoral boundaries readjustment, we have kept a very sensible provision on the books that allows for making adjustments where necessary.

The 25 per cent variation reflects the situation in rural Canada. The fact is that in Quebec and Canada we have a number of cities with a high population density because of developments that have taken place during the past fifty years. However, rural Canada, which in the process lost some of its population, must maintain a strong and powerful voice in this House.

In the past few days, and I do not have to elaborate, we have seen the effects of reduced rural representation in this House. Some votes would probably have been different if rural areas had been represented as they were 30 years ago in the House of Commons, when the regions were far better represented.

Obviously, we cannot support the first amendment proposed by the Senate. Therefore I suggest retention of the variation of up to 25 per cent from the electoral quota of the province when establishing electoral boundaries.

The Senate also suggests deleting provisions that would allow 20 members of this House to challenge appointments made by the Speaker of the House to provincial commissions instructed to establish electoral boundaries.

I believe this provision is a guarantee that will simply encourage the Speaker to conduct consultations prior to these appointments with the various political parties recognized in this House.

• (2115)

I would be very surprised if appointments made by the Speaker of the House following consultations with the recognized parties were subsequently criticized by members. I think it is quite simply a precaution to ensure that the process follows normal procedure.

So the Senate is asking us to remove this provision. The non–elected House is saying: "You who have been elected by the people do not even have the right to discuss who will sit on provincial commissions and who will be appointed by your Speaker". Let them get on with their own rules, but they better not meddle with ours.

If they want to discuss, we will discuss. We will not, however, be told how to behave by the non–elected House, by the honourable senators, who do not have to put their head on the chopping block every five years, like the members of this House, and who are not accountable for their actions to the public, who are accountable to no one. We will also not support the Senate's proposal with respect to allowing this House to overturn an appointment made by its Speaker.

The Senate is also proposing that the provisions providing exceptions to the establishment of a commission after a decennial census be removed. The best example in this regard is the Province of Newfoundland and the region of Labrador. The latest census reported a change of fewer than 1,000 persons over the previous one, if memory serves me, in Newfoundland and Labrador. However, a provincial commission was set up and it turned the whole electoral map upside down.

We had provided, in Bill C–69, that no commission would be set up in such a situation. We can see that the population did not change and that the population did not shift from one region to another, and so no commission is set up. Taxpayers' money is saved, and people continue to feel they belong to their region. The people of St. John's, Newfoundland, know that they are going to vote in St. John's East or St. John's West or some other riding— Bonavista, for example—it does not matter, the feeling of belonging remains. So, why set something in motion when

there is no need to? We will also oppose the motion the Senate is sending us to this amendment.

We are also asked to eliminate the discretionary power of the provincial commissions to reject changes to the electoral map if these changes are not significant enough. Excessive change must be avoided. Many, I would say, even, almost all, members appearing before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in June and July of last year, made the same complaint, regardless of their political affiliation, with a few exceptions among Reform Party members, who wanted to muddle things even more.

But the Liberal and Bloc members who appeared before us all shared the same concern. They wanted to retain this sense of belonging, so that someone who lives in Lachine, for instance, will not be in one riding for one election, in another riding for the following election, and goodness only knows where for the provincial election in between. This was one of the concerns expressed by all the members who appeared before the committee.

Therefore, the provincial commissions should, of course, have discretion to correct certain small problems that may arise because there is a realization that, at a given time, a municipality has closer ties with a nearby town or, economically, leans in a particular direction. The commissions should be able to make these small changes, but not to turn everything upside down if there is no need to. Here, as well, moderation is preferable.

• (2120)

The Senate is also proposing that the notion of community of interest be redefined. In clause 19(5) of the bill we set out the criterion of community of interest as follows:

> —"community of interest" includes such factors as the economy, existing or traditional boundaries of electoral districts, the urban or rural characteristics of a territory, the boundaries of municipalities and Indian reserves, natural boundaries and access to means of communication and transport.

The amendment proposed by the Senate would make community of interest the basic criterion from which all subsequent changes would flow.

Let us remember that the amendment which the Senate is proposing and on the basis of which we would have to decide electoral boundaries must be read with the other amendment being proposed by the Senate, which is to reduce the variation from the quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent, in other words a minimum variation, with community of interest as the basic criterion. The criterion of community of interest is extremely important, except that it comes up against the mathematical wall of the 15 per cent deviation. They cannot seriously be telling us that the boundaries will be defined on the basis of community of interest, having just said that the variation is only 15 per cent, because the criterion of community of interest is subordinate to the 15 per cent variation which the Senate is also proposing.

Therefore, not only am I of the opinion that we must not change our definition of the criterion of the community of interest, but that we also have to retain a variation of 25 per cent from the electoral quota of each province in order for the two criteria to have a real impact in practice. The constituents of Bellechasse, my riding, should know what to expect from one election to the next, which parish could become part of the riding and which one could cease to be, what minor or major adjustments could be made to take demographics into consideration, but still take into consideration the community of interest.

This community of interest is not an abstract notion, it is a notion that can be seen in action. And the people in the best position to define communities of interest, all partisan politics aside, are probably the hon. members of this House who, each day, each week or each month, depending on the distance they have to go, travel the roads of their ridings. And when there are no roads, they take the plane, or use a helicopter, sometimes even a snowmobile or a dog sled—whatever means of transportation is available.

Therefore, who is in the best position to define a community of interest? I will not pass judgment on my own case, but, take the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior, whose riding is huge, for example. Is it he who is in the best position to talk about the community of interest in Cochrane—Superior and to tell us that the town of Kapuskasing is the community of interest for such and such a region or is it a senator from Ontario representing this region who is in the best position to talk to us about it? There can be only one answer: the representatives elected by the public, whose basic mandate is to defend the interests of all of their voters, of everyone who voted for them, of course, but also the interests of everyone, of everyone who voted against them, of everyone who did not vote or have the right to vote, because MPs basically are the representatives of everyone who lives in the territory they represent. What an important role! A role which must not be subordinate to the interests of a minority appointed to the other place, most of whom are there for purely political reasons and were either defeated or were never successful in getting elected in general elections.

It takes some nerve to come and propose amendments on behalf of people who were defeated, people who, with a few notable exceptions, just cannot get elected.

It is high time we slashed government spending, and one of our first decisions should be to suspend the other House for a time, perhaps five years, to find out whether we really miss it. This could be in the form of a constitutional amendment or we could agree to get rid of the Senate for five years. If we really need it, nature, like Parliament, abhors a vacuum. We will create a new Senate and make new appointments according to a system

to be determined by the Canadian people, by the members of the other House.

• (2125)

But for the time being, we should get rid of the surplus. Let us have a garage sale but keep the main House, the House of Commons. We represent the people, and we are elected by universal suffrage. The rule should be that from the president of the largest mining company down to the worker doing the simplest tasks, everyone has the same right to vote so everyone should have the same access to his member of Parliament. The House is what counts.

In Canada there is a consensus on at least one thing: there is one House too many at the federal level, and it is certainly not the House of Commons where people's elected representatives speak on behalf of the people, but the Senate. The problem is to decide whether we should reform the Senate or get rid of it. I suggest getting rid of it for five years.

The Senate does have its uses, however. It pointed out that we had overlooked a clause that would provide that commissioners should reside in the province for which they were appointed. That is what the Senate pointed out to us. This from parliamentarians who in most cases do not even have an office in the senatorial district they happen to represent.

A legal adviser earning a modest salary could have done this. Our employees are not overpaid, and members of the House are not overpaid either for the work they do. If they are, it will be up to the voters to determine whether the member who represents them is getting too much money for the kind of work he does. That is up to the electorate in a general election.

One or two legal advisers could have pointed out that the clause was missing. We do not need a House with 104 individuals and their staff, their operating budgets and all the expense and waste of time that entails. How many bills are languishing before the other House right now?

The bill concerning Pearson Airport has been lying around for quite some time. It was passed in this House when the government first came to power, by a House of Commons that had just been elected, and then put on hold by the other House.

The same thing happened to Bill C–69. In this case, it is even worse because Bill C–69, which concerns electoral boundaries readjustment, is not a case of gerrymandering and is not intended to give special privileges to parliamentarians. Bill C–69 met with a very broad consensus on its wording, with the notable exception of the request for a minimum of 25 per cent of the seats for Quebec. We will have a chance to get back to this issue in the debate that will take place this fall in Quebec. In our proposal for partnership to be extended to Canada, we will suggest a number of institutions where we will have a representation rate of 25 per cent.

That being said, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands indicated when he spoke for the government, we will only support the Senate motion that would make it mandatory for a commissioner appointed for the purpose of electoral boundaries adjustment to reside in the province for which he or she is appointed.

I hope that when it comes to a vote, the Senate will sit up and take notice and stop these delaying tactics that are useless, futile and cost money. They prevent us from allowing electoral boundaries readjustment to take its course and, I also hope that these commissions can be set up again so that hon. members and the public will be able to resume the process under the rules established by Bill C–69, and we will have a balanced electoral map for the next general election, in which I do not hope to participate.

[*English*]

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–69 rings a familiar bell. It was Yogi Berra who said it was déjà vu all over again.

This issue of electoral boundaries readjustment will not go away. Before we get into the amendments that have been proposed by the Senate to deal with Bill C–69, we should quickly review the chronology of events which have led us to today when we are dealing with this bill yet again.

• (2130)

I first became aware of some perceived problems with the electoral boundaries readjustment process when the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands cornered me one evening and said: "We have a real problem with the new electoral maps that are being presented by the electoral boundaries commissions. They are just incompetent. They are doing a terrible job. The boundaries are all drawn in the wrong places. They have made some grave errors and our caucus feels we have to do something about it. We can't put up with this type of incompetence." He suggested that a major review of the whole process needed to be undertaken.

This was shortly after we had launched out on this first session of the 35th Parliament. In fact you could say that those of us who are newly elected were launched from the electoral womb out into the cold, cruel world. It seemed like a number of Liberal MPs were rather unhappy with the uncomfortable climate they found themselves in. They were not prepared for the political realities.

I think there was a little revolt in the Liberal caucus, which I suspect was mainly composed of Ontario members of Parliament, and probably some Atlantic Canada members as well, who found that their boundaries were redrawn and that those people who had elected them and the organizations that had won the election for them had suddenly become irrelevant. They were concerned. They were inexperienced parliamentarians, many were inexperienced politicians, and they were not able to cope with the prospect of change.

With this revolt in the Liberal caucus the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands came with all of this concern. We asked what the problems were. When it came down to brass tacks it was not so much the system that was the problem but the outcome of that system with which they were unhappy. They felt the way to solve the problem was to pretend it never happened, strike new commissions all across Canada and let them redraw the boundaries in a way the Liberal government might find more acceptable. They were quite certain they would be able to draft some master plan, some revolutionary new boundary readjustment plan that would solve their problems.

In March 1994 the Liberals introduced Bill C–18. Not surprisingly, they time allocated the bill. We thought that was extremely unusual. What was the emergency? After all, we had just been elected and they were time allocating this Bill C–18 to suspend the electoral boundaries process so they could cook up some new and wonderful scheme to readjust our electoral boundaries.

We have seen time allocation and closure imposed on this House many times. We should have know then what was coming, that this government is not prepared to deal with reality. It finds unacceptable any opposition whatsoever and uses its clout and the might of its majority to ram things through the House with very little regard to other members.

After the government had suspended the process it had to launch a new process, so it introduced a motion to this House, Motion No. 10. I have an Order Paper from Tuesday, April 19, which has Motion No. 10 in it. For the record I will read the motion:

> That the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be instructed to prepare and bring in a bill, in accordance with Standing Order 68(5), respecting the system of readjusting the boundaries of electoral districts for the House of Commons by Electoral Boundaries Commissions, and, in preparing the said bill, the committee be instructed to consider, among other related matters, the general operation over the past thirty years of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, including:
>
> (a) an assessment of whether there should be a continual increase in the number of Members of the House of Commons after each census, as now provided in section 51 of the Constitution Act;

I will break there for one minute and review what happened with regard to that instruction put forward in Motion No. 10.

We considered the expansion of the House that is called for under the existing provisions of the electoral act and the Constitution of the country. Our seats currently are 295. Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, we are pretty well stretched to the maximum, but we are going to have to find room for six more seats in this House. It seems very odd that we would want to be adding seats to this House when the trend in Canada is to go the other way.

Currently in my province of Saskatchewan a provincial election is being fought, and it is being fought for fewer seats than in the last election. In 1991, 66 seats were available for the taking in the election. In this current campaign only 58 seats are available to be contested.

• (2135)

I understand there was an election in Ontario the other day. We do not hear too much about that election from members on the other side, but I happen to know that the successful campaigners were also campaigning for a reduction in the size of the Ontario legislature. They wanted to see fewer seats in Queen's Park, not more. And they won. I think they wanted to reduce the seats by something like 30 per cent, if I am not mistaken.

However, do the Liberals in Ottawa, listen to the Canadian public? Do they think Canadians want smaller government or less government? Did they take it seriously when this motion was drafted that stated we should look at reducing the size of the House or freezing the number of seats so it could not expand? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. They thought they had it made. They thought they were in lotus land and that no one was going to take away any of their seats. They refused to consider reducing the number of seats in this House of Commons. They wanted it the way it was. In fact they wanted more seats. They refused to do anything that would keep this House from expanding. It would have to go on to 301 seats, and in future years, after censuses, they would see even more seats added to this House.

That was the first point in Motion No. 10, to deal with freezing the size of the House and reducing the number of seats in the House, but to no avail.

The second point in Motion No. 10, point (b), states: "A review of the adequacy of the present method of selection of members of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions". Now these commissions were supposed to be terrible. They had done a terrible job, so we really had to revolutionize the way we structure these committees and the way they choose these commissions.

The Liberals scratched their heads and tried to think of ways in which they could recraft the appointment of these commissions. They tried to think of ways in which they could restruc-

ture them. It was almost to no avail. There was a little tinkering around the edges and a few little new wrinkles were put into the process. But if we look at Bill C–69, the bill we are debating here tonight, we will see that the composition of the commissions and almost every aspect of the commissions is very similar to what was in place before.

We have to wonder about the concerns the government expressed in the first place about the way in which the commissions were chosen or appointed and the way they were to function.

We go on to point (c). Point (c) of Motion No. 10 states: "A review of the rules governing the powers and methods of proceedings of Electoral Boundaries Commissions, including whether these commissions ought to commence their work on the basis of making necessary alterations to the boundaries of existing electoral districts wherever possible".

I will admit that there have been some improvements in this area. The fact that there have been some improvements does not justify suspending the process, wasting $5 million of taxpayers' money and getting ourselves into the bind we now find ourselves in, still dealing with Bill C–69.

Those improvements could have been introduced without suspending the process and they would have come into play when the next boundary readjustment took place. While this is one small reward for the fruit of our labour, it certainly was not justification for all the pain this House has had to go through, the procedure and House affairs committee has had to go through, and those Liberal MPs who were so concerned about the process have had to go through.

Point (d) in Motion No. 10 states: "A review of the time and nature of involvement of the public and the House of Commons in the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions". Here again some minor changes were made. Hopefully they will be improvements. They were certainly ideas or proposals the members of the Reform Party in the procedure and House affairs committee saw as small improvements. Again, this certainly was not justification for the suspension of the process and for the dilemma we now find ourselves in, having to deal with Bill C–69 once again.

When I began my speech tonight I talked about this all beginning before March 1994 when a panicked member for Kingston and the Islands said: "Disaster has struck. The sky is falling. Our electoral process has broken down and it is irreparable. We have to fix it."

The Liberals introduced Motion No. 10 on April 19, 1994, and with very little improvement over what we had prior to that.

• (2140)

What did we do? Like all good parliamentary committees, we brought in witnesses. Sometimes the government agrees to bring in witnesses and sometimes it does not. If it is dealing with electoral boundaries, which affects MPs, it is very important that members of Parliament be allowed to appear as witnesses before the committee. It is imperative. No MP should be denied the right to appear before the procedure and House affairs committee. However, if it happens to be MPs' pensions, members of Parliament have no business appearing before the procedure and House affairs committee. They were refused the right to appear before the committee. The Liberals found this issue very embarrassing. We have to question the motives of the Liberal government.

However, we had members of Parliament appear before the committee. We also had expert witnesses who appeared before the procedure and House affairs committee. They told us that we have one of the best processes in the world. We talked about what they did in Australia, what they did in Europe, and how the process works in the United States.

When we started to draft Bill C–69 on the basis of the information from the witnesses, we made very few changes. Commissions are still composed of three members. One is still appointed, the chief justice of the province, and two are selected by the Speaker. There are a few new wrinkles and a little more consultation in the process. That is fine, those are small improvements. But again, there is absolutely no reason to suspend the process, as was the case in Bill C–18.

We heard the witnesses and we met with the government House leader, who appeared as a witness before the committee, and then we began going through the clause by clause study of the bill. We made some changes and achieved some improvements. We found that during our initial discussions with Liberal members on key issues of the legislation there was co–operation and often agreement.

I remember the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands telling me: "I think 15 per cent variable quotient is superior to 25 per cent. I agree with you absolutely." However, as we got near the end of the crafting stage of the bill suddenly 15 per cent was just impossible. "It is unacceptable to my members", he said. He said that it had to be 25 per cent, that it just would not fly if it was 15 per cent. Suddenly the members in the committee who had been saying yes, it is reasonable to have a 15 per cent variable quotient, withdrew that support and went back to the comfortable old familiar 25 per cent variable quotient. Here we are in Canada, in 1995, a modern, highly educated, highly developed country, and we have to stay in the dark ages; we have to stay in the days of yore and allow for a wide variant of at least 25 per cent.

We met with Elections Canada officials and they were extremely helpful. They helped us with the technical components of the bill and they provided resources that helped us in the crafting of the bill.

While the Liberals were inflexible on key principles such as the schedule and the variable quotient, and to a degree on the communities of interest, although we were able to make some small improvements there, this bill was passed here in the House of Commons earlier this year and sent off to the Senate.

I should backtrack for a minute and talk about the Liberal backbenchers who came to appear before the procedure and House affairs committee. They were mainly rural members and members from large, growing, urban areas. It was quite interesting to watch the rural members saying "We want to make sure the bill is drafted in such a way that our already very large rural ridings will not be made any larger, so that in areas like northern Ontario, where we have few rural ridings, we will not lose some of those and have even fewer rural ridings and more urban ridings". They were very concerned about that. The Liberal brass, the chairman of the procedure and House affairs committee and other Liberals said "Don't worry. Everything will be fine. We will leave the 25 per cent variable in there and you will be all right."

The members from the large urban ridings came before the committee and said "We are very concerned. Our areas are growing so quickly and we are concerned that we will be representing 200,000 or 300,000 people, like we are now, if we do not have a readjustment process that takes into consideration the growth in our areas."

Now the Liberal brass had to worry about another problem. They said "Don't worry, we have the 25 per cent variable quotient". They said: "We will make sure your ridings are smaller when we start out so there is room to grow and they will not become too large". They are trying to pull the wool over their own members' eyes.

• (2145)

It cannot be both ways. We cannot have the large growing urban ridings with a small population and maintain a smaller rural riding to keep from eliminating rural ridings. It is impossible. The Liberals try to say one thing to urban members and another thing to rural members to try and sneak this through all on the basis of a 25 per cent variable quotient. It reminds me of Liberal economics: It just does not work and it gets us into trouble. The government is going to pay a price for miscommunicating to its members.

The bill was sent to the Senate without Reform approval. There were flaws. Principles were violated that should not be violated, principles of democracy and proper representation. But the government had its way and the bill was sent off to the Senate. Lo and behold, as our leader has aptly said, the place which is known more for its consideration of protocol, alcohol and geritol actually must have read some of the speeches the Reform Party made with regard to the bill because it actually came up with a couple of conclusions that were the same as ours.

We will be speaking to the amendments proposed by the Senate. The hon. member for Calgary West will deal with them in more detail.

In my concluding remarks I will talk about what is going to happen if we expand the size of the House. What does bigger government mean for Canadians? I just got my statement of expenses, what it costs to keep me as an MP here in the House. We have the average as well, so we know these figures are similar for all members.

Currently there are 295 members. The average travel cost of members of Parliament using the 64 point system is $32,885. If we add six more members as Bill C–69 recommends, the costs would add up to over $400,000 because there are telephone costs and other office costs that are not included in the MOBs. If we take the $66,000 it costs to keep each MP and multiply it by six, it comes to about $400,000. Then there is the MOB which is about $185,000 each. If we multiply that by six it adds up to approximately $11 million in additional costs. Then of course there are our salaries of approximately $64,000 which if multiplied by six comes up to $385,000. The expense allowance of $27,000 multiplied by six comes out to $160,000.

Then there is the big one so many people have been talking about, the pension. Of course, Reform MPs will opt out of the pension plan. However if the impossible happened and the six new MPs were Liberals or Conservatives, and I hope that does not happen, or NDPers or members of the Bloc, we could look at about $1 million per MP for pension costs. That would be another $1.1 million.

We are looking at about $20 million or $25 million just in the basic costs of more MPs in the House, not including the costs of handing out contracts if members of the House are trying to wheel and deal and get special deals for—

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I find it curious that we are talking about costs and this is the same member of the same party who just took us through three hours of voting at $48,000 an hour when we could have done it in half an hour.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I see by the clock that it is 9.50 p.m. The House was scheduled to sit until 11.30 p.m. because of a special government order. Therefore this party has not cost the Canadian taxpayer one cent. We are taking democracy seriously.

This means that the added costs of having extra members here—

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, there would not have been a waste because there would have been more legislation put through the House.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' rationale is sometimes very hard to understand. They do not seem to think that debate and taking the votes seriously is important. They have become so arrogant on that side that they think just because they introduce a bill it should get speedy passage through this place without the cut and thrust of debate and serious consideration in voting.

• (2150)

There were a lot of members tonight who put great effort into some of the amendments on that bill. Members on that side would have quickly rushed through the process without allowing those members to stand and vote for the principles in which they believe. We know the Liberals do not believe in free votes because they sent talking points around saying that it was not a free vote. The Liberals want to bring six more MPs in here and tell them that they do not want free votes. The Liberals want them to be their little voting machine slaves. It is a shame and this House deserves much better than what the Liberal government is giving us.

The government is supporting one of the amendments that came back from the Senate. I assure the House that it makes sense. We will be supporting it as well. That is the commissioners must be residents of the province which they are serving.

There are some other changes. The Senate suggested that the variable quota be reduced from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Of course, the Senate heard us arguing a very good case here in the House and agreed with it. I believe there is one other amendment Reform can support. The other amendments we do not find acceptable.

Part of the reason for the problem tonight was because the Liberal government mismanaged this evening's activities. We talked to the Liberals. We wanted to arrange the situation much better than we did, but they were not interested. It is very typical of what they have done with Bill C–69. They have mismanaged the process. They have set targets which they cannot reach. They have tried to pass legislation that is unacceptable to Canadians. It is receiving obstruction or meeting a roadblock in the Senate and with real justification.

In wrapping up, I want to thank the Senate for sending this bill back. I certainly wish the Senate had been elected so that it would have more legitimacy. It could do this on a more regular basis. It could offer sober second thought, as it is supposed to, to legislation this House passes that is ill conceived and not of the quality Canadians deserve.

The government has introduced a motion to send this bill back to the Senate with some amendments. These amendments do not concur with the wishes of the Reform Party because of the arguments that not only myself, but my colleague from Calgary West and perhaps some others will bring forward.

I would like to move an amendment to the motion. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House agrees to Amendments Nos. 1, 4(a), 6(a) and 6(b)(i) made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundary commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries, and this House disagrees with Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4(b), 4(c), 5, 6(b)(ii), 6(c) and 7.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair will reserve on the amendment to see if it is valid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, who commented rather negatively on the reception given members by the standing committee, that it must have taught him a lot about Quebec. When I made my proposal on the ridings in eastern Quebec, he asked me whether it was to protect the ridings of real French Canadians, to use his expression. He felt that what was happening was self–serving. So, we had an opportunity to give him a good history and geography lesson and show him that there is also a strong anglophone minority in eastern Quebec and in the Gaspé.

• (2155)

We argued that the ridings should be left as they were. One of the reasons was in order to support this section of the population, which is both substantial and historically important. These people are the descendants of the loyalists, who came and settled of their own volition, particularly because they were fleeing a system they could not live with. I was quite surprised by the hon. member's ignorance of these facts. I hope he has learned an important lesson he will long remember, that there is an anglophone minority in Quebec and that it is scattered pretty well throughout the province, in the Gaspé—

An hon. member: They are well served.

Mr. Crête: They are indeed well served, as the member says. In the Gaspé, for example, the anglophone minority has college–level courses in English in Gaspé. For all of the Gaspé, there is a regular service and regular train service is maintained because, for one reason, many of these people have family in Ontario and elsewhere. They are very well served in many places.

I particularly wanted the member to realize that not only improper things had happened in committee, that one person at least learned something.

My question concerns another matter. Does the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster not think that the Senate could have considered many other aspects of the legislation? Including the fact that a little more than half the Reform members were

elected by fewer than 40 per cent of the electorate and that their democratic claims are not really very high.

Could the Senate not have looked at that? While it was doing a superficial job, it could have gone a little further and looked to see if the members in the House representing the fewest voters were not members of the Reform Party?

[*English*]

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from my colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

I remember the procedure and House affairs committee meeting the hon. member is reflecting upon. That committee meeting was held just a few days after one of his colleagues made the suggestion that in the referendum we expect to be called this fall, if the separatists have the courage to call it this fall, only old stock Quebecers should have the franchise. Those are not my words. I am quoting his colleague. In other words, only old stock Quebecers should be allowed to vote. Those are not my thoughts and I would certainly not suggest that but one of his colleagues did.

I saw some of the flip-flopping on the whole electoral boundaries issue. For a while the critic for the Bloc was in favour of the bill then later opposed it. He supported some parts of it and then was not sure.

I began to wonder what was the rationale for the Bloc's arguments regarding Bill C-69. I asked the hon. member the reason. I asked whether the member was trying to design an electoral system in Quebec that would give the advantage to old stock Quebecers. That is a very honest question in light of the comments his colleagues made, not mine. I assure the hon. member that I am not as ignorant of the situation in Quebec as he might have this House believe.

This goes to the more important issue of democratic principles. If his colleagues can suggest that democracy can be abused to the point where only certain people would have a franchise based on their ethnicity, that causes some concern as to whether or not they are legitimate spokespersons for the democratic process and the whole process of determining how the electoral boundaries readjustment act is crafted.

The other very interesting question is, why would they even care? If they lose the referendum, they have lost the argument. That means Quebecers have decided they want to stay in Canada. I suspect that is what Quebecers will say when the referendum is held, if it is ever held. Why would they care? They have lost and would not represent Quebecers.

On the other hand, if the separatists win the referendum in Quebec, they say they are going to leave, that they are going to separate. It is going to be unilateral and they are gone. Therefore what do they care about how Canada crafts the electoral boundaries readjustment act?

It just shows how irrelevant the Bloc Quebecois is to legislation we are considering in this House. It shows how irrelevant the Bloc is as Canada's supposedly loyal official opposition.

• (2200)

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been speaking about keeping the number of seats as they are at present. Under such a proposition the province of Saskatchewan would lose about two seats, which would mean that almost 20 per cent of the seats in Saskatchewan would be lost.

Does he agree that the province of Saskatchewan should lose almost 20 per cent of its representation in the House?

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I touched on that in my speech. Saskatchewan is seeing a reduction in the total number of MLAs. They have gone from 66 to 58. The people in the province with whom I have talked applaud that. They want less government.

If we start reducing the number of seats in the House of Commons the way we proposed in the procedure and House affairs committee, Ontario would lose a few seats as well. The province of Quebec would lose a few seats. Instead of B.C. increasing its number of seats it would lose a few and, yes, Saskatchewan would lose a few.

We are fair minded in Saskatchewan. We know what we could lose. We believe in smaller government and we are prepared to accept it.

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment of the hon. House leader of the Reform Party is acceptable as to form.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, in replying to questions from my colleague, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster suggested that I had acted inconsistently and without due consideration on the committee. I wish to point out that, throughout study of Bill C-69, I supported the proposals made, offering my critical analysis.

It was not until report stage, in the House, that an amendment was proposed to guarantee Quebec 25 per cent of the seats. It was from that point on that I decided I could no longer support Bill C-69, not because it had been badly drafted, but because the issue of the 25 per cent guarantee for Quebec was not accepted by the majority of members in this House. I therefore voted against it at third reading.

I wish to point out the facts, so as not to give rise to a debate as indicated in Beauchesne.

[*English*]

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): I rise on the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If you were to review that point you would find there is no point of privilege. If you were to review the blues on the speech of the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster you would see that he merely stated a fact, that there were several changes of position by the Bloc Quebecois in the course of the electoral redistribution debate.

The Bloc member is certainly capable of describing what was his motivation. I think you will see that the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster was simply establishing the fact he behaved that way, and in any case it is not a violation of his privileges to do that.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that I do not doubt the abilities of my colleague, the hon. member who served with me on the procedure and House affairs committee, but I brought into question why he and his party would change position on the electoral boundaries process from supporting the government to opposing the government. In fact I believe they changed critics. I think that is fair comment. I do not think I made any personal allegations against the member.

If the House deems that I did, I would certainly withdraw them. It was certainly not my intent. I was trying to deal specifically with the positions taken by the Liberals and the Bloc Quebecois with regard to all the legislation including Bill C–69 which we are debating this evening.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues know very well that the Chair always takes questions of privilege seriously. I will therefore reread the blues and, if need be, communicate my decision to the House as soon as possible.

• (2205)

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would find it interesting, as I begin my speech, to go over the reasons that led the Bloc Quebecois to intervene on several occasions during study of the bill on the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

The Bloc Quebecois was elected to defend the interests of Quebec, and in that sense, faced with this bill, it has shown its complete respect for democracy by making no assumptions about the choice Quebecers will make in the referendum. We wanted to ensure that, in the event that Quebecers voted no, they could continue to have the advantage of the best electoral map possible in their continued representation within the government of Canada. But I am sure they will decide to vote yes, for a number of other reasons.

To answer the member's question, I have no doubt that Quebecers will decide to vote yes, for all sorts of historical reasons. For more than 125 years, and particularly over the last 30 years, they have tried everything they could to change the system and they were never successful. The most recent example was here in this House, when the Liberal majority refused to give Quebec the 25 per cent minimum it was asking for. This 25 per cent minimum, already agreed to in the Charlottetown accord, would have been a demonstration of respect for Quebec, but the present Liberal government, under the direction of the Prime Minister we all know, refused to make this minimum gesture. This is one more reason, symbolic but practical, why Quebecers will opt for full control over their future development.

I have spoken to this bill several times. I participated in debate at each reading and in committee, always to argue that rural regions must have adequate representation.

Unfortunately, I have never at any stage seen amendments that are as out of touch with Canadian reality as those put forward by the Senate. Before talking about the substance of the amendments, I wondered why the Senate was so out of touch with Canadian reality. Why do senators seem to be from Mars rather than from the country in which we live?

My first thought was that it was certainly not for lack of travel since, as we know, our senators travel a great deal within Canada. They travel at taxpayers' expense on a regular basis. There must be a real reason why senators decided, among other things, to demand that the maximum variation from the quota, which makes it possible to determine the number of ridings, be reduced from 25 to 15 per cent.

I found a reason which I think is significant: an amendment like this one will, somewhat insidiously, impose even greater restrictions on Quebec representation. In fact, if we look at the current electoral map as a whole, we see that there are constitutional, historic protective measures for very small ridings, like those in Prince Edward Island. Although I have no intention of depriving the people of that province of their members of Parliament, the Tories' amendment would give Quebec ridings even less weight because lowering the maximum allowable gap to 15 per cent would reduce the total number of members and expand the areas represented by members to an absolutely unrealistic extent.

Consequently, to replace the 25 per cent variation by a 15 per cent variation would be somewhat disrespectful of Canadians and Quebecers, while also showing a total ignorance of geographical considerations, as well as a systematic attempt to promote centralization. Indeed, to define boundaries strictly in

terms of arithmetic would result in an overrepresentation of urban areas, while also promoting a migration to those urban centres, something which, in the long term, would be very harmful to Canada's future. Should there be a snowball effect, it could lead to the situation which exists in some southern countries, where there are very large cities with shanty towns, while the rest of the territory is very sparsely populated and people have access to very few adequate services to ensure their future.

Let us not forget that Canada was not developed by concentrating its population in certain areas. Indeed, it was always felt that the territory as a whole should be populated. However, the amendments proposed by the Senate would go against that historical pattern. I find it quite disturbing that a House of non–elected representatives would come to such conclusions.

• (2210)

Another rather surprising amendment by the Senate provides that a group 20 MPs would no longer be allowed to challenge appointments to electoral commissions. We, as elected representatives, and this is particularly true when we form a sufficiently large group, should be considered a watchdog, for the public, regarding this issue. I think that the Conservative amendment would have an effect opposite to the intended one and could create many more unacceptable situations.

There is another aspect to the Senate amendments which I would like to bring to the attention of the House and I am referring to the different definition it gives of "community of interest". The people in the Senate use the same words as before but provide a definition that restricts the concept of community of interest to demographic and geographic considerations as well as the existing boundaries of municipalities. However, the definition now no longer considers the human factor.

For instance, in a riding like Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup which I represent, there are 55 municipalities and four regional county municipalities I have to cover. Perhaps the senators overlooked this or perhaps some of them are not aware of this because they were never members of the House of Commons, but a member has to sit in the House four days a week in Ottawa, spend day five in his riding and on the weekend participate in social activities and meet his constituents. In a riding like this one where there are 55 municipalities, we get to the point where people are no longer able to meet their member of Parliament.

Narrowing the definition of community of interest and decreasing the quota will lead to situations that make no sense at all. If we look at the draft electoral map the commission used to conduct consultations in my riding, if, for instance, the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup were to go on in the same way until the next election, it would include 72 municipalities. From 55 to 72, I do not know whether you have any idea what this means in the way of additional work, but it has the effect of creating an even greater gap between the voter and the individual who is supposed to represent him.

Shutting off communications between constituents and their elected representative has the somewhat perverse effect of strengthening the power of the other House which cannot claim to represent the electorate. Our strength has always been that we can say we are there to represent the people. Even more so when we represent more than 50 per cent of the population, as in the case of most members of the Bloc Quebecois, many Liberal members, but only a few Reform Party members. But in any case, the way the legislation works, we are elected by the people, and as far as I am concerned, that is the principle that gives us the right to have the final say on bills, as opposed to the Senate.

Distancing us from our electorate would help weaken the link between the electorate and government decisions and would give very bad results.

In particular, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the effect that such a decision as reducing the variation from the provincial quota from 25 to 15 per cent would have on eastern Quebec. Currently, there are five ridings in eastern Quebec: Gaspé, Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine, Matapédia—Matane, Rimouski—Témiscouata and Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, which is my riding. Keeping these five ridings, even with the current map, would require a decision from the electoral commission. But, if the variation were reduced from 25 to 15 per cent, which is now being called for, it is certain that one riding would disappear, possibly two. This would have the following effects on all of the inhabitants of those areas: it would encourage depopulation and the neglect of their regions and it would take the weight of representation away from these people who are in one of Quebec's resource regions. The same thing would happen in several other regions in Canada.

• (2215)

We have discussed issues like unemployment insurance reform, where the first proposal was quite bureaucratic, which was to create a two–tiered system: one for people who do not use it often and one for people who do. If the representation of the people from these regions is reduced, decisions which are out of sync with their reality will be more readily accepted.

If the human resources development committee had not been able to meet with Quebecers and Canadians across the country, it would not have achieved the result that it did, which was to convince the government that this proposal was not in sync with reality.

It is true for other legislation as well. When it comes to a vote, in the end, if there are fewer members representing these areas, the country's future will suffer. It is not true that Canada comprises only large centres and nothing else. The people who represent these various parts of the country must be given a real

right. If they are not, we will be facing very negative situations in the medium term.

By way of example for the members of the House, I would point out that, when the rural fact is denied in one way or another, the voters always have the last word.

The Conservative government had set up a devastating post office strategy. They believed, in good faith, that a significant number of municipal post offices had to be closed. We saw the results in the election. I do not say this is the only reason for the change in government, I think there were a number of good reasons for it. However, the fact that the people in rural settings felt they would not be properly represented by those they had elected led them to terminate the relationship, because they felt not enough attention had been paid to this detail.

If we do not permit the rural communities sufficient representation, we will find ourselves in the same situation.

It is perhaps understandable that an institution, such as the other House, should be so far removed from the concerns of the public that it does not give the importance of representation its due, but I think it is our responsibility here in the House, because we are elected by the people, to bring things back to reality. The quota is perhaps the most important criterion. In talking of a variation in the quota in defining boundaries, 25 per cent was rightly given as the most reasonable variation. In this regard, the member for the Reform Party preceding me argued in support of the 25 per cent.

If members appearing before the committee representing urban centres felt that 25 per cent was the maximum permissible and those representing rural communities felt it was the minimum, it seems a pretty reasonable choice over the figure of 15 per cent. This figure would mean completely absurd situations and the combining of communities that had nothing in common simply in order to satisfy arithmetical criteria, which should not be the case in my opinion.

To conclude, I want to say that we should take this opportunity to ponder the usefulness of sending bills to an institution such as the other place. In fact, nowadays, in the society we live in we can no longer distinguish, as was done 100 years ago, between members of the Commons and the Lords. We should keep in mind that our system is based on the British one and that a non–elected house was created to advise members coming from the working class and whose real wisdom was in doubt due to their lack of education. I do not believe that this was ever a problem, but more than ever today, one cannot assume that elected members are less educated. In this respect, we can hold our own to the same degree as any senator. This situation no longer reflects today's reality in this country.

• (2220)

Keeping this in mind, this bill shows that we could perhaps find a better use for the $40 million the Senate costs every year.

To conclude, I do hope that this is the last time we will revisit the changes to the electoral boundaries. For my part, I am convinced that the electoral map will never again be used in Quebec, since in the fall, we will decide to take full control of our destiny. After the referendum, we will suggest to the rest of Canada an association which will put an end to the constitutional industry, ensure that neighbours of equal status deal with each other on an equal footing, and eliminate the negative effects, the useless spending and the overlap due to the present system, so that we can debate the real issues, and each of us build our own house as we really want it.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of having the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup as my neighbour, in the next riding. The riding that he has the honour of representing shares its eastern border with my riding of Bellechasse, so that we have a common border. The communities of Saint–Roch–des–Aulnaies, Sainte–Louise–des–Aulnaies, Mont–Carmel, that is from the St. Lawrence River to the Maine border, are the eastern limit of the riding of Bellechasse.

My colleague from Chicoutimi was saying that it is a beautiful riding. Indeed, all the ridings that we represent are the most beautiful in Canada or in Quebec, because that is where we live, those are the people that we represent. So, it is quite normal for us to think that our ridings are the most beautiful. The South Shore, most of which I have the honour to represent with my colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, is definitely a beautiful region.

These ridings may look alike in many respects, with more or less the same number of municipalities, about 60 of them, and with the new map, about 70. I now realize that it took me about 18 months before I managed to cover my whole riding. I do not know about the member for Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup; perhaps he will have the opportunity of enlightening me by answering my question.

I am bringing up the point raised by the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster in committee and here, during debate. Let us expand rural ridings; that is no problem, we can simply have more staff. Let us add two or three assistants in the ridings. However, as far as I know, on the ballot, we do not vote for parliamentary assistants, for riding assistants, we vote for the member of Parliament.

Any constituent in my riding, whether living in Saint–Pamphile– de–l'Islet, in Saint–Jean–Port–Joli, in Lac–Etchemin, in Bromont or in Sainte–Claire–de–Dorchester, has the right to meet me. As a rural member, I find myself in a situation where these constituents, because of distances, because of all the

restraints, because of the multiplication of municipal councils and other municipal and regional organizations, are less able to meet me than the constituents of an urban member.

I want to ask my hon. colleague whether he has the same problems and whether he believes, like the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, that the increase in constituency staff will compensate for the extension of rural ridings in such a way that the voice of rural constituents will be adequately heard in the House?

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, place names like Saint–Roch–des–Aulnaies and Sainte–Louise–des–Aulnaies help me answer the hon. member's question. A few weeks ago, we had the opportunity to meet with mayors of that regional county municipality.

Our discussions dealt with the decentralization requested by various regions in Quebec. To go to that meeting, I had to travel 75 kilometres through the regional county municipality which includes those two communities, at one end of my riding.

That shows that having a larger territory would not be a suitable solution, because we already have to cover a very large territory.

• (2225)

However, I would like to suggest another solution. I think the hon. member for Bellechasse will agree. We realize that double representation should be eliminated because it serves no purpose. Today, we have federal MPs and provincial MNAs whose ridings overlap and whose jurisdictions overlap also. One never knows who is responsible for what. When people come to us in our ridings, the last thing they want to know about is whether their question concerns a federal or a provincial jurisdiction. The only thing they know is they want to see their member.

This is what Quebecers came to realize. A great many of them, over 70 per cent of Quebecers according to the polls, would like to deal with only one member of Parliament, someone who would represent them at a National Parliament in Quebec City and who could probably be sent to the joint Parliamentary assembly in Canada to make suggestions on how to manage the partnership between Quebec and Canada once Quebec has opted for sovereignty.

We would then be able to reduce a lot of the unnecessary costs and settle many of the problems we currently have. As federal MPs, if we have to call a provincial MLA who is not a member of our own party, we find it a bit awkward. Oftentimes, when our constituents come to us, they do not know if they will be able to find a solution to their problem at one level or the other. It is up to us to try to find out if there are provincial or federal programs that can be helpful to them. I think this is where we have a problem.

Finally, I want to say that in a region like mine, the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, as well as in the riding of Bellechasse and all along the shores of the St. Lawrence, home to the only French–speaking community in North America, where a lot of Lévesques, Pelletiers, Ouellets are living—

Mr. Langlois: Crêtes, Langlois.

Mr. Crête: Langlois and Crêtes, as well, yes, although there are not so many Crêtes in that area, I think.

I want people to realize that Quebecers have gone beyond the plumbing all the way to the architect's plan. We, in the Bloc Quebecois, are here to protect the interests of Quebec, which is why, during this debate on the redistribution of seats, we have tried to ensure that Quebecers are as well represented as possible. We are a few months away from a much more crucial decision which would not only ensure us an adequate representation, but also give us full control over our own development. I think this is what the future holds for the province of Quebec and this is what Quebecers will decide.

[*English*]

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, first let me explain exactly what it is we are debating tonight.

At the moment we are debating Senate amendments to Bill C–69 which amends the previously amended bill from the Senate, Bill C–18, which sought to amend and suspend the Electoral Boundaries Commission. If that explains what we are doing, let me add a little more. If we accept all or some of these amendments the process will continue amended. It will amend Bill C–18 which will then be suspended. The amended process will begin again and we will have amended boundaries for the next election.

However, should we decide not to proceed with any of this, the process continues just as it was before with no amendments whatsoever. This is the incredible journey we have been on in the government's quest to, for reasons that are becoming less and less clear by the day, redo the electoral boundaries all over again. I think I will stop there before I confuse myself.

The member for Bellechasse addressed a very interesting point in his speech. He really addressed the role of the Senate in making these amendments. It is an interesting question because I think all members of the House feel some concern about the role of the Senate. We are here at the end of the 20th century, nearly the 21st century, and we will be one of the very few countries even if we include the non–democratic world that actually has a quarter of the seats in its Parliament unelected.

• (2230)

There are two proposals to deal with that, as the hon. member for Bellechasse suggested, either of which would be preferable to the status quo. One is to abolish the Senate, the proposal of the Bloc Quebecois. I find it interesting that it comes from the Bloc because Quebec was the last province to eliminate its own upper house, in 1968, in the living memory of virtually every member of this institution.

At the same time, Mr. Parizeau has created a council of ministers, a council of unelected regional advisors, to really parallel the very role the Senate is supposed to play in the Chamber, which it does not. It was admirable innovation by Mr. Parizeau. I do not know if it is working quite as he hoped but it is interesting that he would appoint an unelected second cabinet.

We prefer to have the Senate elected but the question we have to ask ourselves, given the government supports status quo federalism and does not believe in changing anything and believes in appointed senators, is what the senators are supposed to do. Senators have constitutional responsibilities to execute. Bills go to the Senate, the Senate is paid to consider those bills and the Senate has considered those bills.

The Senate has suggested six sets of amendments. It has taken some time to study these. In all honesty, although some of the people in the Senate are not my favourite people and that is probably an opinion they share, they have conducted themselves very responsibly on this issue. They have examined a case in which Parliament has grossly abused its authority in a way that is irresponsible financially because it is costing us $6 million. It is irresponsible democratically because it is suspending a process set up by Parliament to be independent. It is irresponsible in a basic governmental sense. The reasons for doing this are obviously for self–interest in interrupting this whole process, so evident it is quite embarrassing to this body.

The Senate has examined these things and proposed a number of amendments. I do not support all its amendments. If I have time I will go into describing why I support some and why I do not support others. The Senate has looked at a number of issues that need examination and has given us an honest opinion. Certainly no one here doubts the chairman of the committee in the Senate that examined this bill is an outstanding constitutional expert, Senator Beaudoin. Everybody recognizes that and certainly he has tried to play a useful role in this debate.

[*Translation*]

It is also interesting to note that the Bloc Quebecois's opposition is based on the absence of a guarantee of 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. The hon. member for Bellechasse has repeated this fact tonight. It is also interesting because that would obviously be an unconstitutional amendment to this bill. Senator Beaudoin knows that, as do all the constitutional experts, but this is also interesting because it must be remembered that the solution to these problems, as far as the Bloc Quebecois is concerned, is in fact a Parliament where Quebec would have 0 per cent of the members.

• (2235)

The important course taken by Quebec at the present time, the course taken by its premiers over the last thirty years, would have disappeared, and this is the solution. Quebecers should not forget that. The Bloc Quebecois's solution does not guarantee 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. Its solution lies in a Quebec with 0 per cent of the seats in the Parliament of Canada.

[*English*]

Let me go over these amendments in some detail to give my party's considered position on them. To repeat what the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster said, one amendment is certainly acceptable to the Reform Party, just as it is acceptable to the government. In Amendment No. 4(a) the Senate is proposing to add a requirement for the two non–judicial commissioners to be resident in the province for which the commission is established. The Senate recognized that is a tradition and something that really should be in the bill.

It is fair to say in the committee that studied this bill, of which I was a member, this requirement was inadvertently omitted by the technical drafters. This is an amendment the Liberal government will accept and which we are certainly prepared to accept. Our amendment also accepts this change and clarifies something that should be in the bill. It would be an abuse to have a commission that contained members who were not resident in the province.

Consistent with what we have advocated in the past, the Senate has proposed that the allowable deviation from the provincial quotient be reduced in its general application from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. This is was one of a series of amendments the Senate is proposing because it felt, not without some justification, we have drifted so far from voting equality in a number of clauses of the bill that there needs to be some correction. Independent of that we in the Reform Party had already supported this consideration when the bill was before committee last summer and also when Bill C–69 was in the House.

Our view is there should be more equalized voting power, that the 15 per cent discrepancy should be acceptable between various rural and urban constituencies in all but the most exceptional cases. That would achieve this. We argued for this at all previous stages of the bill.

The contrary argument is there need to be special discrepancies for rural areas but 15 per cent is a wide discrepancy. It means a variation from 85 per cent to 115 per cent. We would actually have quite a wide variation in the number of constituen-

cies plus the fact the bill actually allows for exceptional circumstances that go beyond that, not just those laid out in the senatorial clause or the grandfather clause of the Constitution but discrepancies that go over and above that for exceptional ridings in the far north of the various provinces. We propose in our amendment that this amendment from the Senate be accepted and we have argued for it at all previous stages of the bill.

The Senate has proposed along the same lines in its Amendment No. 6(b)(i) to eliminate the provision that a commission will only recommend changes to existing electoral district boundaries where the factors set out are significant enough to warrant such a recommendation. This was basically designed to encourage the commission to give greater consideration to electoral boundaries.

We had a lot of debate on this and related topics in committee.

• (2240)

The government should remember I was troubled by the comments of the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader in the House and before the Senate committee on legal and constitutional affairs. He really tried to convey the impression there had been massive agreement on this legislation.

In our case we disagreed fundamentally with the entire purpose of this legislation, with the idea of suspending electoral boundaries right from day one. We had questioned also the purpose of re–establishing the commissions prior to the next census when it would be necessary. There were disagreements beyond that in terms of the amending formula, for the number of seats in terms of the quotient. Beyond that there were many items in which we had multiple differences before arriving at an agreement.

When the member for Kingston and the Islands suggests we had agreed on all these areas, we had agreed on all these areas only after our first, second, third, fourth and fifth preferences in many cases had been rejected.

To say there had been enthusiastic agreement about all these things from the Reform Party is certainly an exaggeration. As he knows and knows full well, both opposition parties and particularly the Reform Party have opposed this bill at every important stage of its development.

With regard to Amendment No. 6(b)(i) the Senate has in its consideration come upon something that deserves re–examination. There are probably a lot of things like that, given the timetable forced on this bill. The re–examination here is that there should be this special factor, clause 19(2)(c), that if factors are not significant enough to warrant such a recommendation the commission should not recommend changes.

That is covered in several other clauses of the bill, as the Senate pointed out. There is the definition of community of interest which describes existing constituencies as one of the most important basis of any new electoral map. Wide deviations are already allowed, the 25 per cent plus additional consideration for constituencies that go beyond 25 per cent in come cases. There are already many factors in the bill that give a very high priority on keeping existing ridings intact.

As well, the bill as it is now probably provides to members a bit of a false assurance. One of the things we were told in our committee hearings last summer by people who had been involved in the drafting process is to stop thinking of our ridings as individual ridings. This is a trap that we fall into as members of Parliament. We represent a riding and if that riding changes we see that as a change to our riding. Commissions do not draw ridings, they draw boundaries to ridings. It is impossible to change one riding without changing another riding.

Once the criteria set out in the act require a change to any riding, almost always that has a domino effect that impacts on the vast majority of ridings in a province. Therefore in practical terms once one hits the basic triggers laid out in the bill it is impossible to preserve existing ridings exactly as they are in any case.

For that reason the Senate has pointed out a consideration which is probably not terribly useful and which the House should withdraw. That is why in our amendment we propose accepting Amendment No. 6(b)(i) from the Senate.

Let me now talk about those Senate amendments the House should continue to oppose. In doing so I will lay out the considerations the Senate did give in suggesting these amendments. In every case they have some merit and we should understand the reasoning.

The Senate proposed to eliminate this new clause we have in the bill that would give 20 members of the Commons the ability to challenge the Speaker's appointments to boundary commissions. The Senate did that for a couple of reasons. It was concerned about the role of the Speaker. The Speaker is required to give rulings every day and his impartiality is an important criterion of his effectiveness. The concern was that setting up a mechanism in a bill that allowed people to challenge the Speaker in and of itself provided a situation where the Speaker's authority could be easily undermined not just on this issue but on a number of issues.

• (2245)

The Senate was concerned about the introduction of fairly blatant partisan politics into the process. I would not deny that is the case. In supporting this amendment we in the Reform Party recognize that it would force the Speaker to consult with all three parties and maybe in some cases with representatives of other parties.

We did that not because we prefer partisanship but because we have come to the conclusion that a certain amount of partisanship may enhance the independence of the process. Let me explain what I mean by that.

There is no doubt that the process we have today is independent. If we look at it on paper it is independent. It was established in 1964 and nobody has suggested that it leads to undue political interference. However, what has the reality been since 1964? The reality has been that every time boundary commissions have made proposals for change, the House of Commons has intervened not to interfere directly in the process but to use its power to quash the process completely.

In a sense the House of Commons can always interfere, and it interfered on a grand scale. In the past the outcome of that interference has been a new formula for distribution of seats among the provinces under the Constitution. This time that particular route was rejected and we made no major changes along those lines. That was fairly blatant political interference.

We in the Reform Party are hoping that the process of consultation, which will ensure that the Speaker not only hears from the government but hears from all parties, will bind all parties and all members into the process so they do not invent the kind of wild stories and conspiracy theories that were necessary to justify the kind of interference we had in 1994. That is what we are hoping and I think the Senate should take that into account. There is a dynamic here. The dynamic is partisan. We have been unable to secure true independence and we feel this is the next best alternative.

These appointments are not a ruling by the Speaker and thus challenges to his appointments. While they would be embarrassing and would certainly undermine the credibility of the Speaker were he to propose any kind of commissioner that was not accepted on a partisan basis, it is certainly not likely to be seen as a non–confidence motion.

I would like to continue to analyse some of the amendments. The Senate proposed to eliminate the use of the special trigger based on population shifts for the very establishment of a boundaries commission in the first place. The Senate was concerned that we were in effect violating the Constitution by not automatically having boundary commissions, and that because the boundaries would not be considered in a certain province it would easily put the legislation before the courts in some kind of a court challenge.

Once again the Senate has something which it has a right to consider. I believe in this case that the senators are fundamentally wrong. Senator Carstairs argued, and I think she is correct, that the Constitution requires only interprovincial decennial redistribution and not intraprovincial decennial redistribution. In other words, the failure to have intraprovincial decennial redistribution would not in our view contravene section 51 of the Constitution Act.

As well, by not changing the boundaries if they are at least within 25 per cent we are in effect reasserting boundaries that already exist and that presumably have survived any previous court challenge.

The reason we supported the measure originally was that it was a considerable cost saving. In the redistribution that will likely recommence after the bill is passed, it will not be necessary to re–establish commissions for Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, as well as the Northwest Territories. That will save over $1 million in the next process.

While the Senate has raised some concerns of a legal nature, I believe they are incorrect. I also believe they are dealing largely with theory. I believe very few people would challenge a redistribution simply because it failed to change a riding that already existed.

• (2250)

Finally I will comment on the redefinition of community of interest the Senate is proposing. Its definition came from the Lortie commission which had a number of worthwhile recommendations on the electoral redistribution process. We in the Reform Party worked hard to provide another definition because we fundamentally reject the Lortie commission's approach that there basically be affirmative action–racial kinds of criteria involved in the drawing of boundary commissions.

The Senate and the Lortie commission have some legal support in suggesting that there are court decisions. There are legal precedents that not only recommend this but, in the case of some courts, are actually pushing this kind of approach. Whether or not that is the case, it is in our view clearly contrary to the best interest of our country and to the idea of a non–racial Canada that we support. We feel the Lortie commission and the Senate are mistaken in that regard. We were satisfied that all three parties in the committee agreed that approach was not appropriate.

That is the Reform Party's review of the various amendments the Senate has proposed. I hope it sheds some light on why it proposed them as well as why we accept or reject them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to thank and commend the hon. member for Calgary West for wanting to know more about the institutions which will be proposed to Canada by a sovereign Quebec. I think he should be reminded, and I want to reassure him on this, that the parliamentary assembly, one of the institutions provided for in the economic association proposal, will be an elected assembly.

The members of this assembly will be elected by the Parliament of Quebec and the Parliament of Canada or all parliaments in Canada together, depending on the type of representation they choose. They will not be appointed randomly. This joint assembly will bring together elected members from Quebec and Canada.

A decision on this economic association proposal will be made after the people of Quebec have voted in a referendum to take full control of their own development, which means passing all legislation, collecting all taxes and making agreements, including perhaps an economic partnership agreement with Canada. It is very interesting to share views on this proposal. I suggest that the hon. member for Calgary West do so at some point in time.

Quebecers will have to choose between a federal system in which they have very few powers and another one in which they will have 100 per cent of the powers in the Quebec Parliament, which has always been the heart and cradle of the Quebec nation, formerly referred to as the French Canadian nation. This nation will have the credibility and strength required to negotiate with Canada a mutually satisfactory agreement to get us out of the constitutional mess we are in.

I would like the hon. member to tell us if he would be prepared to talk his colleagues into accepting the referendum results if, as I suspect, it meant that Quebec achieved sovereignty and took full responsibility for its development in the future.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I find the member's remarks very interesting. I am a bit confused. I think Quebecers will be just as confused as I am during the referendum campaign.

In responding to the member for Bellechasse, the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup talked about the need to have only one member in Quebec City and only one level of government and the need to eliminate duplication and overlap, as members of the Bloc always say.

• (2255)

Now, in the agreement signed by the three sovereignist leaders, we see a proposal for a new Parliament for an independent Quebec and the rest of Canada, and not only a Parliament, but also a new cabinet, and we know what will happen. There will be public servants, offices, etc. They are also proposing a tribunal to solve some problems between the two nations.

In fact, they are proposing a new level of government with independence. I think that it is contrary to the commitment of the Parti Quebecois, which is to eliminate a level of government, and we must take into consideration the fact that this PQ government has already promised to hire all federal public servants here, in Hull. I cannot understand this position. It will be interesting to see how they will explain to Quebecers the creation of a new level of government after independence.

Regarding the member's question, he asked me if I would accept the result of a referendum. Obviously, we cannot recognize Quebec's power to determine the future of all the provinces, but the result of a referendum is clear. It is the expression of the will of the people. If the result is affirmative, it means that the majority really wants to separate, and if the result is negative, it means that they want to remain part of Canada. What I want to know now is if members of the Bloc will accept a negative result this time.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have thirty seconds left so I will simply say that on the issue of civil servants, we now have 18 percent of all civil servants and 24 per cent of the population. When federal civil servants join the Quebec public service, there will be a significant economy of scale for us and we will be better off.

As for accepting the results, I will return the question to the member. Does he believe that people who form a nation, and who have fought for the last 250 or 300 years to obtain the complete control of that nation, will stop now? The struggle will stop only when Quebec is absolutely sovereign and that is the answer of Quebec sovereignists.

Mr. Harper: Mr. Speaker, as I said many times before, I am not a Quebecer, but here is how I understand Quebec's history: Quebecers want to form a society within a bigger Canadian society. They want to keep both their Canadian identity and their Quebec identity and that will only be possible in a federal state.

The Deputy Speaker: Before giving the floor to the member for Chicoutimi, I should perhaps bring to the attention of all members Standing Order 18 which states, in part:

> No member shall use offensive words against either House or against amy member thereof.

[*English*]

I draw that to the attention of all members and obviously not just the member who is about to speak. I remind members that the rules bar us from using offensive words against either house or any member thereof.

• (2300)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Calgary West, who has been in this House for a year and a half now, and has finally realized that Bloc Quebecois members are first and foremost sovereignists. And of course, this means that what we are seeking is that one day there will no longer be any Quebec members in this House.

This is the reason why, as long as Quebecers are part of the federal experiment, Bloc Quebecois members will oppose any change to the present formula for riding distribution. Its effect would be to weaken Quebec representation in the House of Commons, as long as Quebecers have not made up their minds on a new social covenant.

The present formula for the distribution of seats is not perfect because, historically speaking, during the 126 years of existence of this federation, Quebec has never had its rightful share of seats in the House of Commons. The six amendments proposed by the Senate, far from improving the content of the bill, actually make the situation even worse for Quebec. This is like the Robin Hood principle in reverse. We take from the poor, Quebec, to give to the rich, the rest of Canada.

The first amendment would reduce the maximum variation from the provincial quota from 25 to 15 per cent. What a nice equity exercise on the part of the non–elected members of the other place. According to the thinkers of the other House, one of the fundamental conditions of democracy is the fair mathematical share of regional representation.

I must admit that this is a very nice principle, but it does not explain the senate clause and the grandfather rights.

While the Senate is concerned about a perfect equality within the provinces, it seems to forget that there are several ridings in English Canada that do not even have 35,000 people. I am talking here, among others, about four ridings in Prince Edward Island, the riding of Labrador, the riding of Yukon and a few others. So, where is the senators' concern for equality for the voters in these ridings?

This amendment does nothing to improve this bill, and they know it very well. Besides, they even ignored what one of their peers was telling them. Senator Jean–Claude Rivest, a former advisor to Robert Bourassa, was demanding, like us, in the Bloc Quebecois, that Quebec be given 25 per cent of the seats in Parliament.

I would remind you very briefly that, concerning Quebec's share of seats, the 1985 Act on Representation is quite clear.

• (2305)

In fact, it stipulates that the returning officer must take into account, before distributing any other seats, the fact that 25 per cent of all seats in the House of Commons must be assigned to Quebec.

I am taking the liberty of reminding the House, with all of the respect it merits and which holds traditions so dear, that since the very first parliamentary session, Quebec has always enjoyed at least, and I stress at least, 25 per cent of all seats. This is neither an acquired right nor a favour that Canada has bestowed on Quebec: it is a simple mathematical calculation governed by the Constitution Act, 1867, and by clauses 14 and 15 of the act to provide for the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

It would therefore be a shame, and actually inadmissible, to put an end to this tradition which has been handed down from the very first Parliament. Why put an end to the tradition? Simply to compensate, yes, I said compensate, English Canada for having kept its allegiances straight when voting. Do not forget that Quebec was the cradle of Canada. Quebec brought it into this world, and not the other way around. The first amendment will not only reduce the maximum variation from the province's quota, but could also wipe certain electoral ridings right off the map.

Yes, the population of several of Quebec's rural regions has been steadily declining over the past several years. The government knows it. So, what is it doing about it? With this bill, it is ensuring that English Canada will get additional ridings, and that Quebec will lose a few. What a great exercise in democracy! This is what I would call the Robin Hood principle.

The other amendment I find particularly disturbing is amendment No. 6 which seeks to redefine the concept of community of interest.

The senators suggest establishing boundaries based on demographic and geographic considerations. I realize that to say this amendment totally ignores the human aspect is to say the obvious. It is unfortunate, and it makes no sense at all. On paper this might work, but theoretically, realistically, practically, on a day to day basis, we cannot ignore the human factor because in the end it determines how things work.

For a riding like mine that borders on several municipalities and has a very large territory, this amendment could be a disaster. Take the riding of Chicoutimi. Last year, when the federal electoral boundaries commission came to the riding, it suggested taking the municipalities of Ferland–et–Boileau, Saint–Félix–d'Otis, Rivière–Éternité, L'Anse–Saint–Jean and Petit–Saguenay away from the riding of Chicoutimi and annexing them to the riding of my colleague, the hon. member for Jonquière.

This problem illustrates the importance of community of interest. In fact, these small rural municipalities on the Lower Saguenay, those the commission wanted to take away from my riding, have always considered La Baie, one of the larger cities in the riding of Chicoutimi, as their economic and social centre.

• (2310)

Most of the services used by the people in the Lower Saguenay are located in La Baie. The closest employment centre is there, as is the small business development centre. Ferland–et–Boilleau, the municipality closest to the riding of Jonquière is 45 km away. This is the community of interest proposed by these amendments. It seems rather unreasonable to me.

A bill cannot be permitted to push aside—and I mean push aside—the human factor without a thought in order to establish electoral boundaries. This is a serious mistake, and I find it most regrettable. My comment is, simply: "Stop wasting taxpayers' money with useless and pointless bills. Let us get down to the real problems of our society, which are growing with every passing day".

It is time to deal with the economic slowdown, when statistics indicate that for the sixth straight month there has been no net job creation in Canada. The government is setting an example by its inertia in this area.

The Prime Minister is too busy to study a new plan for reducing unemployment insurance benefits. Perhaps he thinks it will help the growth of employment, which is in a state of exhaustion. Let us stop wasting our time and taxpayers' money and get down to this country's real problems.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to make this presentation.

I have come to this place with high ideals and really wanting to understand the whole Canadian scene. I have been very privileged to have my place in Parliament here right next to the members of the Bloc and to hear the presentation we just had.

I have some questions for the member. One is that he indicates that it is somehow fair that the Quebec people should have 25 per cent of the members of Parliament, irrespective of their population. On the other hand, he speaks of the lack of fairness when there is not a proportional representation in other parts of the country. I would like to ask him how he can defend from a fairness point of view that particular model.

I certainly have respect for the people of the province of Quebec. I have said this before. During our campaign we had people there who sported bumper stickers that said "My Canada includes Quebec". Certainly I have that personal conviction. Regardless of what happens politically in that province, we will not take a chainsaw and cut them out and float them off into the ocean. They will remain physically here, with whatever kind of political arrangement we have.

I would like to have him explain how he proposes to justify that in perpetuity they should have an advantage over other Canadians in this particular regard and how he thinks that might generate more love and understanding toward them from the rest of Canadians.

• (2315)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. With regard to my preamble, I believe I answered his question when I said that the present seat distribution formula in this place was not perfect. One must remember that historically Quebec never had its fair share of seats in the House of Commons over the last 125 years.

In order to stop the gradual erosion of Quebec's influence in our federal institutions and, especially—and I think this is the key word—to reaffirm the Canadian duality, members from the Bloc demand that Quebec retain 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons as long as we are part of the federal experience.

As you know, in the fall, Quebecers will decide their political future. The member emphasized this in the preamble to his question. It is then that Quebec, depending upon the choice made by Quebecers, will be either a province or a country. This is the choice Quebecers will have to make. In the meantime, they know that if Quebec remains a province in this federal system that cannot be renewed, this province will be limited. It will remain a colony of English Canada and we will remain a minority forever and ever.

An hon. member: Amen.

Mr. Fillion: Amen. And we will naturally be ruled by the present unitary federal government, whereas we would have a new lease on life if we became a country. I hope Quebecers will make that choice. I am convinced they will. Then, with new and more efficient methods, we will proudly develop this country.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure for me to let the member for Elk Island have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, the member did not answer my question. He simply restated what he said before about the history and the present formula which I already know. What I want to know is how he defends the premise that the number of members of Parliament from the province of Quebec and only from the province of Quebec should not be related to the population.

In the past it has been a fixed number of 75. We know that relative to the rest of Canada, Quebec's population has gone down. The mathematical fact stands. If it were not for that we would not be asking for more members in the House. That results when either the population of Quebec goes down or the population of the rest of the country goes up. That necessitates more members in this House by the present formula.

How is it that the Quebec members believe that they and they alone do not have to submit to the same rules of representation by population that the rest of Canada does? How does he justify that?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, of course, here we must refer to the notion of the two founding nations. If Quebec had been respected when this country was formed, it would not have been allowed 25 per cent of seats in this House, but 50 per cent.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fillion: Yes, fifty per cent of seats. Two equal founding nations means a 50:50 sharing. Whereas now we are claiming our fair share of seats, that is 25 per cent.

• (2320)

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short comment. Like my colleague from Chicoutimi, I had the opportunity to hear the hon. member for Calgary West, who seems to already understand a large part of the proposed agreement to be submitted to Quebecers for ratification in the fall. We all understand, of course, that the Canadian fibre was first woven in Quebec, in Lower Canada, in Ontario, and that we in Quebec naturally propose to repatriate our own powers, while opening the door to a European–type model and proposing economic integration and a certain kind of political association with Canada.

Since Quebec is about to propose to Canada the free movement of goods, people and capital, as well as the establishment of some common institutions, does the hon. member for Chicoutimi agree that, contrary to what our colleague from Calgary West said, a major economic integration would prevent any region of Canada from being isolated from the others, and that this free movement, this major economic integration, would involve some political integration and a common political institution to manage the agreement, the partnership that would result not from a law imposed by a foreign Parliament but from a treaty freely negotiated between Canada and Quebec?

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that, when Quebec becomes sovereign in the fall, you will see no boundaries or barricades being built between Quebec and Ontario or the other provinces. It is therefore in the best interests of Ontario and the other provinces to do business with Quebec. Rules can certainly be drawn up at the political institutions level, through discussions between members from Quebec and Ontario, to govern trade. In that case, I feel every Canadian province would stand to profit from the birth of this new country.

[*English*]

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member who has just been speaking continues to mislead the House by talking about sovereignty association. He is a separatist and he should tell it as it is. He is a separatist and he should stop misleading the House.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order, however, the hon. member for North Vancouver now has the floor on debate.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I feel tempted to repeat what I just said and maybe I will as part of my speech.

Before beginning my remarks on Bill C–69 I would like to remind the House that almost two years after the 1993 election the debt and deficit has risen by almost $100 billion. That is just in the two years since the Liberal government took office.

In the past 24 hours the government has spent almost $100 million more than it took in. That is about $4 million per hour or $67,000 per minute in money we simply do not have, money we have to borrow. This borrowed money continues to collect interest that adds to the more than $550 billion debt burden our children and grandchildren will have to carry.

Some weeks ago at a public meeting in Vancouver the Liberal member for Halifax said that as a traditional tax and spend Liberal she had crashed and burned when the Minister of Finance announced his budget in March of this year. If serious action is not taken very soon to seriously start addressing the problem of the debt and deficit, the hon. member is sure going to crash and burn again and again and again. It will be to the point where the international lenders will stop supporting our foolishness.

• (2325)

Today we find ourselves debating again Bill C–69, which exists simply because of Bill C–18, which we debated earlier in 1994. I said then that the Liberal government should be ashamed of itself because of what it was doing. It was imposing the will of unhappy Liberal MPs on the voters of Canada. It was probably because they were worried they would not be re–elected to collect their gold–plated pensions at the pension trough. They were worried that if the boundaries changed they would not be able to collect their pensions.

They have protected the content of those pork barrel pensions with Bill C–85, which they are also ramming through the House this next week or so. Now they have brought back the electoral boundaries issue in a last ditch attempt to control the shape of their ridings. Without regard to the huge investment of time by the Electoral Boundaries Commission and without regard to the millions of dollars that have already been spent on a non–partisan process, the government is still trying to jam through ill–conceived and selfish political agendas.

Politicians have no business setting their own electoral boundaries. Human nature being what it is, some members might be tempted to act in their own interests, to trim areas of opposition from their ridings or to add little areas of support to their ridings. Even if that did not happen, there would be the suspicion of course that it was happening.

The important thing is that the whole process should not only be non–partisan but it should be seen to be non–partisan. Politicians should have absolutely nothing to do with the process.

One of the disturbing parts about this whole process is that the increase in population in the province of B.C. entitles us to two more seats in the House under the present rules. Even if we were to hold static the number of seats we presently have, at the very least they should be redistributed so that B.C. has a greater proportion of the seats.

I vigorously oppose Bill C–69.

An hon. member: Fifty per cent.

Mr. White (North Vancouver): My hon. colleagues say we should have at least 50 per cent. Sometimes I would agree with them. The west obviously has a much more sensible attitude to politics than we have seen over on the opposite side of the House. We could certainly do with a greater percentage of the seats.

I am proud that Reform Party members stood against the government's attempts to ram through Bill C–18. They tried to do it in a clandestine fashion on a Friday afternoon when they thought no one would notice. I am proud that my colleagues stood and prevented that from happening.

Canadians are starting to see time and time again that Reformers stand up for democracy while the government continues to practice the old line Victorian style of politics. It punishes any Liberal MP who dares to represent their constituents by voting against a government bill. That method of operation is completely outdated. It is not appropriate to the information age. It may have been perfect in the olden days when the present Prime Minister first came to the House, but it is totally inappropriate for the information age. Shame on this government.

In previous Parliaments the issue of constituency representation in the form of free votes was never an issue because the three worn out, old style, dictatorial, arrogant, old line parties all played the same game of agenda politics. They never did want to and still do not want to govern the country according to the wishes of the majority of Canadians. They simply saw government as an opportunity to enact their own political agenda without regard to the concerns of Canadians.

The pressure for change is here in this House today and it is not going away. At the moment, with the exception of Reform MPs and a few independent minded Liberal MPs, most MPs are nothing more than voting machines; no matter what their constituents say, they follow the orders of the Prime Minister when they come into this House to vote. All of the debates, all of the questions, all of the committee meetings and hearings, all of the witness testimony, all of the travel junkets are nothing more than make work projects to keep MPs busy between votes. Those votes we already know the outcome of because the Prime Minister had already decided before the first word of debate was spoken.

• (2330)

Last year the government introduced approximately 60 bills. We debated them. We questioned them. We commented on them. At the end of the term we had passed 60 bills. We may as well have piled them up on a table 60 high and come here for one hour on one day and voted once. The outcome would have been exactly the same.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver North will have 14 minutes left the next time the bill is debated.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I asked the Minister of the Environment whether the government planned to regulate emissions of dioxins, furans and hexachlorobenzenes from incinerators. I also asked whether the federal guideline for human exposure to dioxins and dioxin related compounds was adequate to protect human health. In response the minister stated that the exposure levels for dioxins and furans were under review by Health Canada.

Dioxins and dioxin–like compounds such as furans are highly toxic chemicals produced when various types of waste, particularly chlorinated plastics, are burned. Every day Canadians are exposed to dioxins and carry this persistent toxic compound in their bodies.

At present Canada's dioxin guideline is set at 10 picograms per kilogram of body weight per day. It has been maintained that this level of exposure is safe. However a recently published review, which took three years to conduct, in the United States by the Environmental Protection Agency pointed to dioxin being even more dangerous than was originally thought. The Environmental Protection Agency's reassessment found that even at extremely low levels dioxin affects human development, reproduction capacity and the immune system. The Environmental Protection Agency's reassessment of dioxin strongly suggests that safe levels of exposure set so far in the Canadian guidelines may no longer be safe or acceptable.

The time has come to shift the burden of proof so as to protect the environment and public health in this respect. The existence of safe doses needs to be re–examined because evidence from human epidemiological studies, from animal cancer studies and

from biochemical research tells us that dioxin represents a cancer hazard to people.

The findings of the Environmental Protection Agency suggest that the environment and our own bodies are already overburdened with dioxin–like compounds. Given the persistence and toxicity of dioxin and dioxin–like compounds, one must conclude that the prudent course of action would be to prevent pollution, coupled most importantly with a reduction in our dependence on dioxin producing activities such as incineration.

In this context I ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to inform the House whether the federal government intends to take steps to phase out airborne dioxin emissions from incinerators across Canada and to reassess the Canadian guidelines for exposure to dioxins presently set at 10 picograms per kilogram of body weight per day.

I am looking forward to hearing the parliamentary secretary's reply.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the major source of dioxins and furans identified in Canada today include municipal and hazardous waste incinerators, effluents from pulp and paper mills, long range atmospheric transport from other countries and contaminants in such chemical products as pentachlorophenol and PCBs.

As a result of Canadian regulatory and guidelines initiatives dioxin and furan emissions from municipal solid waste and hazardous waste incinerators have decreased by 80 per cent in the last four years.

Between 1989 and 1994 dioxin and furan emissions from bleached kraft pulp mill effluents have decreased by 82 per cent. Some dioxin contaminated pesticides are either strictly regulated or banned.

In addition, the levels of dioxin and furans in the Canadian environment have declined significantly. Annual releases from pulp and paper mills have dropped from more than 350 grams of dioxins and furans to less than 9 grams. Less than 50 grams of dioxins and furans are released from municipal solid waste incinerators in Canada per year. I am sure the member would agree these are good news stories.

A federal–provincial task force has been established by Environment Canada to identify and characterize additional sources of releases of dioxins and furans in Canada. This group will prepare and analysis of sectors and areas requiring further action to eliminate measurable releases of dioxins and furans and will recommend time lines for their virtual elimination from the environment. This task force may recommend further regulations under CEPA or modifications to existing guidelines.

Furthermore, federal guidelines relating to contaminants are constantly under review as new scientific findings are reported. Health Canada is currently looking at federal guidelines for human exposure to dioxins set in 1990 to determine whether it is necessary to revise them.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11.37 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 15, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions.

* * *

NIGERIA

Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Madam Speaker, because of the proceedings in the House earlier this week I was unable to give the statement I am giving today. Nonetheless, our government regards it as very important.

Two years ago on June 12, 1993 Nigeria held a presidential election. It was the largest vote ever in Africa and the first chance for Nigerians to choose their president. It was also the climax of an extended transition to democracy which had seen the adoption of a constitution and local state and legislative elections over four years. Most important, it was in the view of international observers including Canada the fairest and most peaceful election in Nigeria's history.

After preliminary results showed Chief Moshood Abiola winning a convincing majority of both votes and states, the military regime simply annulled the election. Protests at home and abroad led to leadership changes and months of confusion which ended with General Sani Abacha taking power in November 1993.

Since then his regime has disbanded all elected bodies, jailed Abiola and many other democratic leaders, closed newspapers, repressed labour unions and minorities, given itself absolute legal power and immunity, ended the right of habeas corpus and carried out public executions. The January 1996 date set by the regime's own constitutional conference for return to democracy was recently dropped, enabling General Abacha to stay on indefinitely.

What happens in Nigeria matters to Canada. Our countries have had a broad relationship based on Commonwealth ties, human çontacts in both directions and a shared commitment to federalism.

Nigeria is our largest export market between South Africa and Maghreb and our largest source of imports in all Africa. Its population and resources should make it a natural leader on the continent. Instead, its entrenched military regime has a chilling influence on democratic neighbours and has been imitated in Commonwealth west Africa and elsewhere. It remains a potentially destabilizing factor in the region.

Canada has responded to the situation in Nigeria. We have condemned abuses as they have occurred and at the United Nations. We have ended high level visits, military training assistance and military capable exports.

• (1005)

Our limited diplomatic relations have included many representations on behalf of Chief Abiola, Ken Saro–Wiwa and other repressed human rights leaders.

We have assisted the democratic movement with modest aid funds and have invited several prominent Nigerians on visits to give Canadians a firsthand impression of the situation.

Democracy delayed is democracy denied. Nigerians have been under military rule for 12 years and have already demonstrated their readiness and enthusiasm for the democratic process. General Abacha's regime must now act decisively to restore democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights. In particular the release of Chief Abiola and ex–president Obasanjo would be a step in the right direction; so would debanning the media, freeing or charging detainees or setting a firm date for the end of military rule.

In the absence of visible measurable progress toward these objectives Nigeria's Commonwealth partners will be obliged to draw their own conclusions. Today we recognize the efforts of Nigerian democrats and ensure them they are not forgotten nor do they work in vain.

Dr. Wole Soyinka, a democratic leader and Nigeria's only Nobel prize winner, was recognized by the Speaker on Monday and met with me. As in South Africa, the struggle may be long but there can be no doubt about the outcome, Nigerians will enjoy the rights South Africans do today.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois, I am pleased today to pay tribute to all Nigerian democrats.

Barely two years ago, the people of Nigeria believed they had acquired a democratic process worthy of the name. Their leader, Moshood Abiola, had won a resounding, eminently democratic victory. Unfortunately, as we know, the military regime did not accept the outcome, cancelled the election and ultimately, appointed General Sani Abacha as head of state.

In light of the special commercial and political ties between Canada and Nigeria, the Canadian government has a duty to condemn loud and clear the basic human rights violations that many Nigerians have suffered.

In our opinion, the Canadian government is not doing everything that it can to intervene. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs publicly announced only a few weeks ago, Canada is preparing to promote trade without taking into account the human rights record of certain countries.

The Liberal government's new foreign policy is questionable. When the Canadian section of Amnesty International gathered for its annual meeting last week, the director of the English section rightly stated that to remain silent on the human rights issue constitutes a serious abdication of our responsibilities, bordering on complicity.

As we have said, the Canadian government's policy on human rights is based on double talk. The policy of the Liberal government is to answer only to the economic imperatives of Canada's relations with its major trading partners, such as China or Mexico. However, it takes a hard line approach to small countries with which we have few or non–existent trade relations.

The Bloc Quebecois believes that the Liberal government should not hesitate to proclaim and publicly defend the fact that democracy and human rights are the cornerstones of Canadian foreign policy, and that all of our trading partners should be expected to have a similar stand, regardless of how much trade Canada does with them.

By taking such a position, the government will be sending a clear message to the people and heads of state or government of countries that have trade ties with or receive aid from Canada, as is the case with Nigeria. Canada must not pass up this opportunity to profess in a vigorous way its democratic faith in an international community where the temptation to remain indifferent, detached or self–interested is omnipresent. We must move quickly to prove wrong the dictators who interpret the collusive silence of countries that claim to embrace democratic ideals as support for their actions.

Instead of turning a blind eye to anti–democratic regimes and human rights violations, whether in China or elsewhere, instead of discussing the issue of human rights only behind the scenes to spare the feelings of countries with markets that are interesting to Canada, the government must adopt a coherent, clearly worded policy, one that is entrenched in legislative and regulatory texts and that ensures that decisions are based on three established criteria, namely human rights, development assistance and international trade.

• (1010)

Otherwise, the only clear message that the government will be sending is that governments of the south need only become good trading partners if they want to rule by dictatorship, free of any pressure.

In closing, I want to express once again my support for all Nigerian democrats. I know how difficult it can be to fight for human rights and democracy. Sometimes people have the feeling that their hard work produces only mediocre results. Yet, we are hopeful that their efforts to achieve democracy will prove successful. Until then, the official opposition will support their actions and join with them in condemning the human rights violations that many Nigerians have suffered.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I share the sentiments of the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa who spoke well on the need for the restoration of democracy in Nigeria.

It is certainly true the people of that country deserve a far better government than they currently have. When they went peacefully to the polls two years ago they had a genuine hope that for the first time they would be able to choose their own president, but their hopes were dashed. Not only was their democratically elected president Chief Moshood Abiola arrested in jail by the army, but almost every personal freedom was taken away from the people of Nigeria. This unfortunate set of circumstances was described in detail by the secretary of state.

In response to this robbery of democracy the Canadian government has been quite right to condemn the illegitimate government which has taken over. It was similarly correct in taking certain punitive actions against that government. In the future the Reform Party hopes the Canadian government will vigorously promote democracy and improve human rights in Nigeria and throughout the world.

In general Reform supports positive measures to improve human rights such as support for the strengthening of democratic and legal institutions in the developing world through our international aid program. Canadian aid should support human rights promotion, democratic change and institution building. Reform also supports working with non–governmental organizations and the private sector to build up a civil society and middle class in developing countries. As civil society expands and the middle class grows, human rights issues will improve.

In severe cases such as Nigeria where the government is responsible for massive human rights abuses and with which a co–operative approach is not likely to be successful, we would support the multilateral use of certain penalties.

I pass on a message to the people of Nigeria that Canada does care and we will continue in our commitment to assisting democratization and human rights in that country and in others. With hard work and persistence they can overcome tyranny and Canadians look forward to the day when we will welcome their democratically elected leaders to our country.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present today to the House the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts concerning the Correctional Service of Canada.

At the conclusion of the report, the committee recommends that the auditor general monitor the efforts of the Correctional Service of Canada to improve its accommodation planning and supervision of released offenders, and that he report his findings when he considers it appropriate.

The committee believes that the recommendations contained in this report should be actively implemented. It also recommends that unless it is directed to do otherwise, the Correctional Service of Canada report on the progress made in implementing the report's recommendations by April 1996 at the latest.

Appended to this report is the official opposition's dissenting opinion on the policy of double bunking. In closing, I would like to quote two recommendations contained in this dissenting opinion: one, that the Correctional Service of Canada assess the short, medium and long term impact of the policy of double bunking on inmates, particularly its effect on inmate rehabilitation and that the results of the study be published by January 1996; and two, that the Correctional Service of Canada await the results of this study before making the double bunking policy part of its accommodation standards.

• (1015)

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

Mr. Paul Zed (Fundy—Royal, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Industry relating to Bill C–91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name the Business Development Bank of Canada, with amendments.

The main change will be in the suggestion that the name of the bank be changed to the Small Business Bank of Canada.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): A point of order, Madam Speaker. In view of the tremendous co–operation of all members I wonder if there would not be unanimous consent for this motion.

I seek unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That notwithstanding any special order, this House shall continue to sit after 11.30 p.m. this day in order to consider Government Orders and it shall not adjourn except pursuant to a motion proposed by the minister of the crown.

I seek unanimous consent for that motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent to accept the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 56.1, I move:

That notwithstanding any standing order or special order, this House shall continue to sit after 11.30 p.m. this day in order to consider Government Orders and it shall not adjourn except pursuant to a motion proposed by a minister of the crown.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Those members who object to the motion will please rise in their places.

And fewer than 25 members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 56.1(3) the motion is adopted.

(Motion agreed to.)

Routine Proceedings

PETITIONS

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House to present a petition sent to me by Mrs. Margaret Wiens of Quesnel, British Columbia, and signed by over 1,000 constituents from many areas of my riding of Cariboo—Chilcotin.

The petitioners call for the government to enact immediate legislation for freedom of choice in health care that is full integration of alternate practitioners, homoeopathic, herbal, naturopathic, et cetera, into the Canadian health care system with full equal coverage of visits and necessary remedies.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I also present eight petitions signed by over 200 constituents from Quesnel, Williams Lake and Lillooet in the riding of Cariboo—Chilcotin.

My constituents request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

• (1020)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I wish to present four petitions on behalf of the citizens of Simcoe Centre. The first petition deals with the subject of state imposed bilingualism.

Given that the large majority of Canadians are opposed to the official languages policy imposed on them by the former Liberal government, the petitioners request that a referendum be held to either accept or reject this flawed policy.

JUSTICE

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on the subject of the drunkenness defence. It concerns the use of a legal defence that has become known as the drunkenness defence.

The petitioners believe that in committing the act of choosing to consume alcohol the individual must accept all responsibility for his or her actions while under the influence.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition involves section 718.2 of Bill C–41. The petitioners are concerned that naming some groups in legislation will exclude other groups from protection and that sentencing based on the concept of hatred is very subjective and will undermine our justice system.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the final group of petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners are concerned about including the undefined phrase sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act. Refusing to define the statement leaves interpretation open to the courts, a very dangerous precedent to set.

Parliament has a responsibility to Canadians to ensure that legislation cannot be misinterpreted.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of a number of my constituents organized by Suzanne MacDonell.

The petitioners request that Parliament urge the government to recognize the unborn fetus from fertilization onward as an individual in its own right with access to article 15(1) of the charter of rights.

Furthermore, the petitioners request that Parliament recognize and exercise its right to define in law the meaning of the unborn child as a judicial person and cause to cease by the most expedient means available the public funding of and the practice of abortion, thereby honouring Parliament's and the government's obligation under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Not only am I pleased to present this petition but I endorse it as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I believe the member is well aware that we do not enter into debate when presenting petitions.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present the following petition from constituents in my riding of Comox—Alberni.

The petition containing 163 signatures calls on Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, today the following questions will be answered: Nos. 186, 187 and 188.

[*Text*]

Question No. 186—**Mr. Duncan:**

With regard to Indians making purchases on reserve or having purchases delivered to the reserve, what was the amount of GST exemption for eligible Indians for the fiscal years 1991–92, 1992–93 and 1993–94?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Although Revenue Canada gathers information to administer the Excise Tax Act on the goods and services tax return including the amount of the GST collected and input tax credits claimed by each registrant, information is not collected on exemptions for particular groups. Consequently, it is not possible to provide the data requested.

Question No. 187—**Mr. Duncan:**

With regard to Indians making purchases off reserve at designated remote stores, (*a*) what was the amount of GST exemption for eligible Indians for the fiscal years 1991–92, 1992–93 and 1993–94, and (*b*) what are the designated remote stores off reserve by province?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Remote stores are not required to accumulate or report on the total dollar value of their sales to Indians. There is no requirement in law for reporting this information to Revenue Canada. Moreover, accumulating such information would significantly increase the vendor's reporting requirements.

Off reserve vendors qualifying as remote stores are entitled to waive the delivery requirement on tax relieved sales to Indians. The department does not maintain a comprehensive list of qualifying remote store vendors. The individual vendors are responsible for determining their eligibility as a remote store and are accountable for the GST receivable if they did not meet the requirements. Their eligibility is later verified by a deparmental audit.

Question No. 188—**Mr. Duncan:**

What was the amount of GST credit paid to eligible on reserve status Indians for the fiscal years 1991–92, 1992–93 and 1993–94?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): The information requested is not available as Revenue Canada does not keep statistics on the number of goods and services tax, GST, credit payments issued to status Indians. In addition, the department does not categorize individuals by status or residence and is therefore unable to extrapolate the requested information from its data banks.

[*English*]

Mr. Gagliano: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House resumed from June 14 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries; and of the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Prior to resuming debate, due to the statement by the minister, Government Orders will be extended by 12 minutes.

I would inform the hon. member for North Vancouver that he has 14 minutes left in the debate.

• (1025)

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Madam Speaker, when my speech was interrupted last night, I was speaking on Bill C–69. At the time when I began my speech I mentioned the continuing growth of the debt and deficit.

I would like to mention that in the 11 hours since I have stopped speaking and have started again, the debt has increased by approximately $50 million. Overnight while we were out of this place the government overspent by $50 million. That gets added on with interest to the debt burden already being carried by our children and our grandchildren.

I also mentioned earlier in my speech last night and I would like to reiterate that the issue of constituency representation is a very important aspect of many of the bills we are considering. Free votes were never an issue in past Parliaments because the three worn out, dictatorial, arrogant old line parties all played the same game of agenda politics.

They never wanted to and still do not want to govern the country according to the wishes of the Canadian voters. They are not interested in conducting business in accordance with the wishes of taxpayers. There was a very good example of that less than 15 minutes ago when the government created a situation where the House has to stay open well after midnight, debating bills and motions that could have been debated adequately many months ago when there was plenty of time to have public input, to do these things properly. Those bills and motions do not have to be rammed through the way it is being done, all jammed into a few days at the end of the session when the public and the media do not get an adequate opportunity to look at things.

If the government had been truly interested in carrying out the wishes of Canadian voters and taxpayers, it would not engage in this type of activity. It would admit that many of its bills are badly flawed and would simply allow them to die or withdraw them.

At the moment, with the exception of the Reform MPs and a few independently minded Liberals, most of the MPs are nothing more than voting machines. All we do is keep busy between votes. Apart from the group I just mentioned, MPs are simply not interested in reflecting their constituents' wishes in the House.

All of the debates, the questions, the committee meetings, the hearings, the witness testimony and the travel junkets are nothing more than make work projects to keep MPs busy between votes, votes for which the outcome is already known because the Prime Minister knows what he wants to happen before the first words of debate are uttered.

As I finished last night, I mentioned that last year the government introduced approximately 60 bills. By the end of the year, approximately 60 bills had been passed. Members could have come here for one day, for one hour last year, stacked the whole 60 bills this high on the Clerk's table, voted once and the outcome would have been pretty much the same.

For all of the debates and discussions that went on, the outcome would have been pretty much the same. That is because the outcome is already known before debate begins. It makes a mockery of attempts by people to properly represent the taxpayers, the constituents of this country.

Instead of having a reasonable approach to the bill before us, members end up debating a bill that resulted from partisan interference in the non–partisan electoral boundaries redistribution process.

When is the bill being debated? Right at the end of the session. Members have to go through the process of speaking right into the small hours of the morning. The government does not particularly care about input or debate any more than it cares for input or debate on any other bill.

The Liberals know it will pass because the Prime Minister has already issued his instruction. It will pass. Yesterday maybe half a dozen Liberal MPs were brave enough to defy the orders of the Prime Minister and to vote against the gun control bill in order to represent their constituents. Congratulations to those members who felt strongly enough to stand up for the principles that were important to them.

We heard that the Prime Minister gave a speech during the Liberal caucus meeting yesterday morning in which he told Liberal MPs that if they vote against a government bill twice, then they are out. If that is true, then I hope the hon. ladies and gentlemen on the government side think very carefully over the next few days about whether they can tolerate such an ultimatum.

Can they maintain their dignity? Can they continue to claim to have ethics? Can they look their families and their constituents in the eye? And can they continue to support their party if they would accept such a dictatorial ultimatum? Are they grown adult Canadians with a sense of morality, or are they prepared to be pawns in a giant political machine?

• (1030)

Clearly, we have a little way to go before free and representative votes are a normal part of the operations of this place, but I truly believe we are on the verge of a revolution in the way Parliament functions. If there are dinosaurs on the other side of the House who refuse to accept the inevitable change, they will soon be sent into retirement by the voters. Then there will be no more Bill C–18s and no more Bill C–69s, because the people of Canada will be represented here instead of the political parties of Canada being represented here.

Mrs. Terrana: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am disturbed to hear that our hon. colleague is saying that the Prime Minister yesterday threatened the caucus that they would be out of caucus if they did not vote for our legislation. That is not correct, and I would like to say that I oppose it.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, but that is an item for debate.

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Madam Speaker, as I was saying, once we get to a point where the representatives in this place are clearly representing their constituents, there will be no more need for Bill C–18s or Bill C–69s, Bill C–41s, because the people of Canada will be represented here rather than the political parties of Canada being represented here. The legislation passed will be meaningful because it will be legislation wanted by the voters and taxpayers who are building the country and supplying the funds we need to run this place. The debates will be real debates. The committee meetings will actually mean something. Questions during question period will actually be answered, and members of Parliament will regain the respect of the people of Canada.

In closing, I would like to mention two things. Our debt has increased by almost a million dollars during the time it took me to give the speech, the total time of the speech. The second point is that the Deputy Prime Minister promised to resign if the GST had not gone within a year of the election. She still has not done it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette–Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am astonished by our colleague's comments. Perhaps he would care to tell the members of this House how many of the votes taken by Reform Party members since they were first elected to this House have in fact been free votes.

[*English*]

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her question.

I am astonished that she is astonished. Having had the opportunity to be in this House for some time since the last election, I would have hoped that the hon. member would have noticed that every vote that has been taken in this House by Reform has been a free vote.

We think very carefully about the details of the bills before us. We all consult with our constituents on an ongoing basis. For the most part we have been elected by voters who have similar beliefs and feelings, so it is not uncommon for us to be able to vote the same way on a bill. On routine bills, that is the way it happens. On controversial issues or issues where there are regional differences, it quite clearly can be witnessed that Reform has been able to demonstrate that freedom of voting quite regularly. There is never any punishment. There is never any animosity between the members because that is the understanding. The constitution of the Reform Party requires Reform MPs to reflect the wishes of their constituencies whenever that desire can be clearly demonstrated, and it is compulsory in the case of moral issues.

I do thank the hon. member for permitting me to elaborate on that and to clarify that point.

• (1035)

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, with respect to what the member refers to as new style politics and the wishes of his constituents, could he explain the activities of the Reform last evening, when for about three hours during the votes I noticed the members were deliberately standing up and sitting down very slowly? Instead of standing up so that the clerks could do the count very quickly, they were standing up and sitting down very slowly. With respect to this new style of politics, is this a new tactic the Reform Party has developed? Was it requested by their constituents?

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Madam Speaker, that is an interesting question from the member. The member asked why some of the members on the Reform side were getting up rather slowly during the votes on C–41 last night. I would like to mention that I think they were emulating and mimicking the member for Burin—St. George's, who makes a habit of carrying on that activity.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is very interesting that this bill would come back from the Senate. They have already expressed displeasure with the kinds of bills the Liberals put through and are expressing it once again. Maybe this time the government will get the message.

One of the reasons we had this bill in the first place was the fact that many Liberal members did not like the way the boundaries were changed. This did not suit the demographics that they thought were in their best interests, and without any thought to whether it was in the best interests of their constituents or the taxpayers of this country they set about to basically eradicate $8 million worth of work by the boundary commissions.

In my riding and in all the ridings that are pretty well interconnected with mine we went through the public hearing process in British Columbia, as I am sure all the other provinces did as well. The initial boundaries that were set were not liked there. It is not important whether they were liked by the MPs or not; they were not liked by the constituents of those ridings.

The public hearings were held, which is the process that is in place, and they did their job. The boundary commission came out to the various towns where these were advertised and were absolutely deluged with letters, briefs, and with people coming before the commission at the public hearings to testify. The people who were not happy with those first boundaries explained in detail what it was they did not like about them, what they thought the alternatives were, why theirs were better and how things could work with the new plan they had.

The people from the boundary commission who came out on these public hearings accepted this information. They went to subsequent hearings until they had heard from the entire area. They then went back and considered all the information and input that took place. That is the way the process is supposed to work. If there is something wrong, it is up to the people it affects, not the MPs. It is up to the constituents, the voters. It is up to them to tell the people who have the authority to set these boundaries what is wrong with this in the first place. That is the process that took place. The people involved in setting the new boundaries took this information and decided that obviously it was what the people wanted. So they redrew the boundaries and changed the program based on the input of the people of the affected ridings.

What they came out with for my riding and for those interconnected with my riding was not absolute perfection as we would like to see it, but it was something that was much better than originally brought up. It was something that reflected the wishes of the people in the various ridings and it was something we could all live with. Unfortunately, it was not something, even at that point, members of the Liberal government could live with. They decided that they had to have changes. Well from time to time these things do need to be upgraded and changed, but that does not mean you should spend millions and millions of wasted dollars to make those changes. There is a time and a place for everything.

• (1040)

Simple changes to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act can always be brought in, but they should not be brought in at the eleventh hour, scrapping all the work that had been just about completed before this started.

One of the problems with what the government is doing is that the cost of boundary examination and modification runs about $8 million. As I said, most of that work had been completed. There is only the final step left to take place. Yet the government would have us scrap that so we can bring in a change of rules and have this work done all over again.

The public has already had an opportunity to talk about the boundaries and what was proposed. One of two things is going to happen if this bill goes through and they scrap all the work that has gone before and start back at square one: either the government is going to listen to the people, the voters of Canada, and do what they want, which has already been done; or it is going to ignore the voters of Canada, which is often its style, and do whatever it wants in order to get the boundary ridings that best reflects its members' ability to be elected. The latter is unacceptable.

If we are going to change the act there are a lot of things that should be in there. Some of those things have been addressed by the Senate amendments and some have not. One thing we proposed was a cap or even a reduction in the total number of MPs in this House.

We see the kinds of high jinks and antics exhibited by one side evoking a response from the other side and causing further retaliation. Do we need more people to do that? It costs a lot of money to have an MP here. Are people going to be better represented because we stuff more people into this place, increase the operating budget of Parliament, revamp this whole Chamber so we can squeeze extra seats in, and not only that but leave it in a formula that will see it continue to expand year after year? Is that in the best interest of the Canadian public? I do not think so.

We need elected representatives who are going to listen to the people. It does not matter if there are a thousand people in here, if they do not listen to what the people say it will do absolutely no good. That is what is happening in Bill C–69.

The government is not listening to the people who have already had input to the boundary commissions and said this is what they want. It is prepared to scrap that. There are not enough changes in these amendments or in the legislation proposed by the government, sent once already to the other place and returned to be sent back again, to justify spending $6 million to $8 million all over again. As I said, the end result is going to be the same thing or the total ignoring of the wishes of the public.

I am here to represent my constituents. My constituents can best be represented by the style of boundary changes we already have in place. If this bill goes through, with or without the Senate amendments as they have been proposed, then the wishes of my constituents are going to be ignored. Consequently, I do not support the government's legislation dealing with C–69 one way or another, with or without the amendments from the other place. It is still an unacceptable piece of legislation and I will never support it.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I was interested to hear my colleague talk about the bill coming in at this time.

I am interested in his experience in the transportation portfolio he is working on. I wonder whether he has made any observations in that area with respect to the kinds of representation people are talking about. I know he has travelled quite a bit and he has talked to a number of people who may be looking for the kind of representation he is talking about. Is he basing his concept of representation on the remarks and the comments he hears from people as he travels? If so, what is he hearing?

• (1045)

Mr. Gouk: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her inquiry. I have travelled a great deal and I have talked with people on a number of issues not only in the transportation area but in many other areas as well, including representation and how that would be affected by the make–up of a riding.

For example, one of the problems we will have if the bill passes is that we will not know what the boundaries are. When we talk about representation we have no idea whatsoever who will be representing what area. The hon. member from Calgary could have her boundaries changed substantially. In my own riding I could look at the original model of boundary changes. It was changed immensely from the initial proposal by the boundary commission after listening to input from people who would be affected.

As I said, we either represent the will of the people or we ram something down their throats. In this case we do not know which way government members will go because once in a while they listen. I do not know if it is because we are getting to them or the people are getting to them but every now and then they listen. It catches us off guard when it happens. More often they do not listen to the people. We are seeing all kinds of legislation being rammed through the House right now and they are certainly not listening to the people on those matters.

That is one of the problems we have, and I am hearing about it as I travel from riding to riding across Canada. I have had meetings in places like Mississauga. The problem is that if the bill goes through the way the government proposes it, with or without the amendments now before us, we are looking at an unknown future for all ridings and for all boundaries. We have absolutely no idea who will be representing which portion of which riding.

In the case of my riding of Kootenay West—Revelstoke, a portion of the north would be cut off under the current proposal and massive areas would be added to the west. On the previous proposal I would go east all the way through the next member's riding and lose a portion of the compact area of my own. It is very important that we consider not only our own ridings but those of all MPs across the country.

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I noticed the hon. member was concerned about the cost of Parliament and the cost of members of Parliament, and I think rightly so. It is very important that taxpayers' money be well spent and be seen to be well spent.

However I noticed last evening the member sitting down and standing up very slowly during the votes. I have heard that one of the costs of Parliament is the cost of running the House and I have been told that it is roughly $48,000 an hour. It seems to me last evening the standing up and sitting down very slowly perhaps cost us an extra three hours, which would be roughly $150,000 or roughly the salary and associated costs of an MP for a whole year.

I noticed the hon. member was standing up particularly slowly and sitting down particularly slowly. I wonder what he thought about spending the equivalent of the annual salary and benefits of one member of Parliament in one wasted period of three hours last evening.

Mr. Gouk: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased the hon. member on the other side noticed anything at all.

With respect to the cost of running Parliament last night and getting around his stopwatch timing of how fast or slow I do my callisthenics from here, I would suggest to him that he should talk to his party leaders. We inquired if they were interested in moving things quickly last night. We were prepared to do that. We offered to have the whole House close down and we could have been well on our way long before he ever envisioned. However they chose not to go that way.

If we want to talk about wasting money and wasting time, let us examine why we were here last night in the first place. The reason we were here is that all last spring and all last fall the government had all kinds of opportunity to bring the bills forward that we are now ramming through with time allocation and late night sittings. Let us talk about things like Bill C–7, an absolute piece of garbage. That legislation has sat for an entire year with absolutely nothing being done, and the government is talking about bringing it forward next week and ramming it through.

If there is waste in the House it is not on this side; it sits firmly with the member and the Liberal Party on that side.

• (1050)

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have been travelling with my hon. colleague on the transport committee so I know what his principles are. We shared a good relationship on the committee.

The riding of Vancouver East that I represent includes a portion of the former Vancouver—Kingsway riding that will be re–established. In 1988 I made a presentation to the travelling committee on the Kingsway riding. I remember at the time I suggested that Vancouver—Kingsway should be kept where it was because the population would grow and we would need it again. Most of the constituents of the riding asked for Kingsway to remain. As we can see seven years later we are trying to re–establish Kingsway and at the time, as I said, the constituents wanted Kingsway to remain.

Does my colleague think that we should have some kind of order in a bill that helps us make better choices on the process of redistribution?

By the way, the part of my riding that will go is one of the best parts of my riding. However I am not speaking to that effect because whatever will come will come. I am not trying to change things. I am just thinking that there is a need for some order in the redistribution of the electoral boundaries and we need a bill to that effect.

Mr. Gouk: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question. She is right. We have had many good times on committee together and I do appreciate her point of view from time to time.

However I find interesting one of the comments she made when she said: "that helps us make better choices". I did not think we were here to make choices. I thought we were here to represent the choices made by our constituents.

In my riding what was proposed was a great problem. However the people of my riding had input and as a result the riding boundary was changed from the original proposal, not in a minor manner but in a major way.

The consideration is not what we in Parliament will do but rather making sure the people in the riding have the democratic input into electoral boundary commissions. I know for sure it happened in the B.C. interior. I can only assume the member and her riding, being I am sure she would suggest well represented, would ensure that the democratic process took place in the electoral boundary commission.

As far as changes are concerned I said in my speech that changes were needed. Changes should be brought in as a routine matter between electoral boundary revisions, not at the eleventh hour when it is all but completed, which would scrap the entire process and we would start all over again at great cost and with great uncertainty to the constituents of the various ridings.

Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette–Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I heard right, but I thought the hon. member would come back with different comments and maybe undo what he said in the first place. He said that the cost of sending MPs here was very high, with which I agree, and that we did not need to increase the cost and increase the number of MPs in the House.

I am surprised because the thrust of the bill will permit western Canadians to have adequate representation here as far as numbers are concerned. I do not agree with the member from western Canada who wants to eliminate the possibility of westerners having more MPs and more representation in the House.

Mr. Gouk: Madam Speaker, I can see where this is a very complicated matter for the hon. member, particularly when the Minister of Justice says that he does not like mathematics. I guess it has affected the whole party.

The answer is that we do not always have to adjust upward. We can also adjust downward. We are not saying there should not be regional balance. We are saying we should adjust the numbers from province to province so that there is always equal representation, but it does not have to be done by adding to the cost.

• (1055)

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I begin my speech today on Bill C–69 by issuing a challenge to Liberal members opposite to go back to their ridings this weekend, grab a piece of paper, a pen and a clipboard, and walk down the street asking their constituents if they think we need more politicians in Ottawa. They should not be surprised if they hear responses like are you joking, absolutely not, no way, get real, and a few expletives that I cannot say in the House.

The issue that we are debating today is quite simple: the need for more politicians in the House of Commons or the lack of need for more politicians in the House of Commons. The Liberal government wants to increase the size of the House of Commons from 295 members to 301 by the next election. Reformers would like to see the House reduced from 295 members and the rate of future growth reduced to 265 or less.

This is the direction Canadians want Ottawa to take: less government, less regulation, less bureaucracy and fewer politicians. We only have to look at how successful the Harris campaign was in Ontario to prove our point. One of his campaign promises was to reduce the number of members at Queen's Park by 25 per cent. The provincial Liberals were opposed to that, and we all know what happened to them once the smoke had cleared.

The cost of six new members is a factor that I highlight for Liberals. They constantly rise in the House in the name of effectiveness, efficiency, lowering the cost of the MP pension plan, and how they are keeping all their promises when they are really breaking them all. I ask them to justify a contradiction. They will increase the overhead of running the country by millions and millions of dollars by adding more politicians full of hot air trying to do their jobs, which they do not get done because that select group over there, the cabinet, runs the country; the rest of us are window dressing.

The current compensation or remuneration for one member of Parliament—

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): They are like mayors.

Mr. Silye: Exactly. I refer to the cost or the overhead for six new members. I am glad to see the President of the Treasury Board is here because he has his favourite pet project, the Cadillac pension plan.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sure the member is well aware that we do not refer to the presence or absence of anyone in the House.

Mr. Silye: I thought it might have been appreciated but I bow to the Chair.

The current compensation or remuneration for one member of Parliament is: a taxable salary of $64,400; a tax free expense allowance of $21,300, which is equivalent to a pre–tax value of $42,000; a tax free travel status allowance of $6,000; and tax free benefits as follows: free VIA Rail pass, free personal long distance telephone calls, free health and dental package, free parking at office and airports, free air travel for families, free life insurance policy which includes spouse and dependent children, free second language lessons, a severance of $32,000 when defeated or retired, a re–entry or reallocation payment of $9,000 when defeated or retired, plus the lucrative double standard obscene MP pension plan for a six–year member worth between $500,000 to $4.5 million depending upon the years of service and valued at $28,400 per year by the independent consulting group Sobeco, Ernst & Young in February 1994. These benefits do not take into consideration the cost of householders, ten percenters, stationery, copying mail, and the list goes on.

It works out to at least $1 million a year for each member of the House based on the overhead and everything else charged to the taxpayers. Multiply this by six and we have a cost of $6 million.

We should not forget to kick in the cost of increased elections and redistributing the ridings, which the Liberals have estimated at $5.6 million. The bill is in the $12 million ballpark. It is a $12 billion bill and the MP pension plan is supposed to save the country $3 million. Now they are going to blow $12 million. What is the net difference? They will increase the overhead of the country by $9 million.

• (1100)

We are $550 billion in debt and the government continues to spend money like it grows on trees. How can the Liberal government possibly defend the House of Commons' growing to 301 members? We all know we do not need more members in the House. There is not enough room to put in six more chairs.

Was it not the greatest classic Liberal of all, Thomas Jefferson, who said government governs best that governs least? It now appears the principle has been lost by the Liberals.

Let me compare Canada with the state of California which has roughly 30 million people. Canada has 29 million people. California is run on a federal level by 52 congressmen, two senators, one governor and one president; 56 federal officials to govern that state.

In Canada we have 295 members and we want to go to 301. We have 104 senators and it could go to 112. We have over 400 federal elected officials running the country. Are American politicians smarter than Canadian politicians? Do the Americans have a better system than the Canadian system?

We each represent on average between 80,000 and 100,000 people. One American congressman represents 570,000 and yet the Liberals cry and complain about the huge ridings they have when they contain 120,000 people. I do not understand that. What is so special about American politicians? I believe we are as competent. I believe we can represent more people. I believe the key is naturally we would have to hire more staff.

However, I will guarantee one thing, staff will cost the country and the taxpayers a heck of a lot less money in salaries than an MP costs and it would create more jobs at the $30,000, $40,000 and $50,000 levels than the half a million dollar level for MPs.

Do we not have the intelligence to do what the Americans have done? Do we not have the technology to have representation by population with a higher population base?

In defence of his gun control registry system which he introduced yesterday, the justice minister used the new technology argument. Why can we not use the new technology argument for democracy, for Parliament for the size and the number of politicians?

If the United States used the same proportion of representation as in Canada there would be 2,900 congressmen, 2,900 members of Parliament. That is embarrassing. That is how disproportionate we are. I believe we are ten times worse off politically than the United States because we will not stick to the principle that a government governs best that governs least.

The Liberal Party pretends to be fiscally conscientious but when confronted with an opportunity to show leadership to lower the overhead and the cost of running the country it chooses instead to increase the size of government.

The finance minister has waxed eloquent numerous times, I think his next career is that of a stand up comic, about downsizing and reducing the cost of government. In Ottawa Canadians still have a big, fat, high spending government. Why not downsize the House of Commons?

The government talks out of one side of its mouth about laying off over 40,000 civil servants in the name of restraint, in the name of fiscal responsibility. Out of the other side of its mouth it talks about the need to bring in six more MPs to help achieve that fiscal restraint. Is that not a contradiction? Is that not an oxymoron? I cannot believe it; increase the size of the Commons, make it big, keep the backbenchers happy.

I hear some heckling from the other side. That person is so far from the centre of power in his own party that last night while we were voting he was told not to vote because they had enough people to beat the Reform votes. That is democracy at its best. It shows we need fewer people in the House. These backbenchers are willing to let cabinet control things.

The Liberals refuse to consider more effective approaches proposed by Reform to accommodate shifting, growing populations. Should the House be downsized from 295 to 265 members we would have a reasonably sized House. We would have members of Parliament who would represent larger groups of people and therefore have some leverage. The backbencher who keeps heckling me would have more power, more impact in the House if there were only 200 people here, not 301. These members would truly have some value and some input into what is happening, some power to check and balance cabinet's dictating.

• (1105)

Someone says why not quit. I would. I do not agree with career politicians. I do not believe what these people do here. They come back just to qualify for their gold plated fat cat pension plan instead of governing the country. That is what is wrong with this place.

The reality in this fish bowl is all those red little fish swimming around with the yellow little fish and the blue little fish, all these people, except for the 20 people who sit around the Prime Minister, are just biding their time. All they are doing is costing the country a heck of a lot of money and they are just a mouthpiece for the centre of power which is a freely elected dictatorship.

Reformers believe the time has come to reduce the House and set a fixed number. If the size is continually expanded to match population increases the House eventually will reach unmatchable proportions with unsustainable overhead costs. We will have to cap it eventually. Why not now? I do not mean cap in the sense of a fixed number that has to be there because I understand the Constitution and I know the commitments that have been made to provinces vis–à–vis senators, the senator clause, the Senate clause. We cannot have fewer MPs in a province than senators. Therefore

we need a clause that allows us to expand. I understand and accept that.

The answer to population growth is not to increase the numbers of representatives in the House of Commons but to periodically redraw the boundaries and redistribute seats according to the population shifts, reapportionment.

That is representation by population and that is a very important principle. The principle that one MP can represent only 100,000 people versus 150,000, 120,000 or 200,000 is the principle I am asking the House to accept. I am challenging the House to accept more people to represent and hire more staff. Overall that would be less of a cost to the country than adding more MPs. That is representation by population. We cannot have that because the urban centres would control and rule the country. We need the balance between urban and rural areas and 10 provinces across the country with another body, with another House. It is called a Senate.

The concentration and the thrust should be a triple E Senate, an elected Senate so it has some empowerment, so it can be held accountable; an equal Senate whether in terms of so many for each province or we look at five regions, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, the prairies and British Columbia, and have an equal number of senators on that basis. The country sadly and dearly needs regional representation.

The gun control bill was born and bred and brought to the House from the heart of Toronto by the justice minister, not reflecting the true wishes of all of Canada and all Canadians. It was pitting the rurals and urbans against each other. If we had an elected, equal and effective Senate with some powers it could send it back and say it might be good for the little heartland of Toronto and the Ontario little area there but it is not what the rest of Canada wants. Fix this bill, change it. It is not acceptable in this form.

It could not overturn money bills but on other bills in terms of effectiveness it could improve things because it would be in touch with its constituents. It would be paid to listen to those people. Why would it be accountable? It would be elected by those people and if it did not represent them its members would be kicked out. That is why an elected Senate would be effective. That is why giving the Senate some powers would be good for the country. That is why equality is important so we are fair and treat each other with respect across this land from sea to sea.

Only a triple E Senate can balance the interests of less populous provinces with those of more populous provinces in Parliament. Reformers believe the time has come to bring financial responsibility to government, not to make government bigger.

• (1110)

I plead with my fellow colleagues in the House to apply their common sense and represent the common sense of the common people and do what is in their best interest.

If we had to go from 301 to 200 or if we reduced the size of the House of Commons the people who would be here representing the country would be more effective. They would have more power. It would be more beneficial for Canadians.

Politicians have to be accountable to the people of Canada and trusted to handle their money. More faces and more people in the House sucking more money out of the purse strings will not improve the system. It will detract from the system. It will cost the country more and more money.

We all know what it is like in committees. We all know what it is like when we want to make decisions. When we want to rule by committee or draft a document by committee we all know how hard it is. We all know how hard it is to build consensus. We all know how hard it is even within our parties to get everybody to agree. Why increase the number of people we want to include in that decision making process when we know the number we have already is hard enough? Why increase the problem? Why add to the problem?

Why not fix the problem by having fewer people to make those decisions? The decisions will be better. There would be more time for debate instead of the silly games that have been played for this past week and last night starting with the government's time allocation on important bills that affect the country, basically attacking the principles of democracy by limiting the freedom of speech. We would not have to do the things we do to give ourselves the opportunity to stand up on the floor of the House to talk to the Canadian people whether they are physically here or watching on television or reading it in the paper. It would give us the opportunity to explain things. We would not have to play these games.

We all know how the structure is in here. One has to be government. Therefore the minority of the House is already neutralized. If one is not in cabinet one gets a parliamentary secretary position. If one does not get that then one gets a chairmanship of a standing committee. After that everybody else is just fill him in, do him in. The reward for attending committee work is interparliamentary travel, one of those great eight associations that will really help the country and really does the country a lot of good because we are learning, giving and establishing contacts. The people who go out there to make those contacts, those backbenchers who are meeting these people in Europe, Asia, China and France come back here and the cabinet ministers do not even talk to them. They do not even ask them what was said. There is no authority there.

Why do we not smarten up in the House and get ourselves doing things better and differently? This system has to change. While the Liberals are politically selling a lean, mean government, their rhetoric I guess, they are trying to increase the size of the House of Commons, which will cost a lot of money.

The cutbacks we are talking about do not affect the people in the ivory towers. With Bill C–68 the ivory tower is still hiring. The ivory tower is the government. The cabinet and the Prime Minister have the opportunity to fix what is wrong in the country but party discipline is the same old way.

There was a newspaper article today about what was said in caucus. Whether it is true or not there has to be some smoke and fire because these journalists received from one of the backbenchers what was told to them by the Prime Minister. It is pretty bad when a Prime Minister has been alleged to have said to his caucus members that if they do not toe the party line their nomination papers will not be renewed. If they do not toe the party line they will not be back in the House. If they do not vote the party line they will be kicked off the committees and will not be allowed to travel. That is not leadership, that is dictatorship.

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Madam Speaker The comparison between California and Canada is really unnecessary. It does not apply. Canada is a much larger country, the second largest country in the world, whereas California is a state and is not as large.

My riding is in an urban area and I represent a great diversity of wants and needs of over 110,000 constituents. They want me to speak on their behalf. I imagine that a member who comes from a rural area has a much tougher time serving constituents because they live far away from each other.

• (1115)

I also find my colleague's tone offensive. We are not here doing nothing. I work very hard and I hope he does too. I know that most of my colleagues work very hard. Apart from the travelling which we have to do from the west, there is a large amount of work to do both here and in our ridings.

I am a backbencher. I have no post nor am I a parliamentary secretary. I do not want to be any more than an effective, efficient member representing the constituents of my riding. I have as much voice in all of this as anyone else. The ministers are here for a purpose and have the experience.

I have done a lot of volunteer work in the last 20 years. I have my integrity and my reputation and I feel offended when I am told that I am not doing anything in this job except keeping the seat warm. I do much more than that, as do my colleagues.

I also want to comment on the gun bill. There are rural areas where the bill is not acceptable but the majority of people live in urban areas. There are two big boxes of letters in support of the gun bill in my office. Those letters came from my constituents. I received very few letters against the bill. I received letters in support of the bill. We all know how much more vocal people are when they are against something, but the surveys showed support for the gun bill.

I also want to remind my hon. colleague that we have a democratic system. Again, I say that the Prime Minister has been misquoted, unfortunately. It is not what he said. It is not up to me to tell my hon. colleague what to say. They are in caucus and know that caucus is the place where we can discuss our differences and our opinions. I want to set the record straight that the Prime Minister never said that. The Prime Minister is a very credible person and a great leader.

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, it is too bad the hon. member feels offended. I must have struck a nerve. I sense a lot of guilt, as if she were trying to justify the fact that the way she works as an MP is doing a lot of good in her constituency.

I know we all work hard. I do not question whether she works hard. That is not the question. The question is: What are the results she is achieving? What has she accomplished? That can be a matter of opinion. She works hard. At what? What impact has she had in her constituency? What has she done better than the person she replaced or is she just doing the same old thing?

I know what I do in my riding. I know the job I have to do administratively. I know what we have to do to help constituents solve their problems. However, there must be other reasons for being here.

She cannot understand my point about the fact that we freely elected a dictatorship over there. She chooses to kowtow to it and praise it and deny that the Prime Minister said something, when everyone in Canada knows he did. Everyone in Canada knows that the party discipline which is represented by a 30–year politician like the Prime Minister is a habit that cannot be broken. The situation is that they are trying to defend something which is not in the best interests of the country.

If she had her ear to the ground in her constituency she would know that there are differences of opinion between rural and urban ridings. She knows that not everyone in this room, even if we are in the same party, can vote the same way on every issue.

• (1120)

Also on a non–partisan basis she should be willing to discuss an issue like free votes in the House of Commons. On what basis could she vote against the so–called party line? That is not even being considered by this government, whereas this party made that an election campaign promise.

I ran because the member of Parliament for Calgary Centre while in government never once in any of his householders asked me as a constituent what I thought about the GST, what I thought about free trade, what I thought about any of the issues being discussed. He never asked me once but he kept sending me householders, photo opportunities: Have a nice Christmas; we are doing a great job; this is what we are doing in Ottawa for you; this is how things are going to get better for you; this is why it is important to send me to Ottawa because this is all the stuff I am doing for you.

I vowed to people door to door that I would represent Calgary in Ottawa, not Ottawa to Calgary. Within this Reform Party I have been able to do that. We have a mechanism where we do toe the party line, where we do discuss in caucus all bills and motions and what our position should be. We match it against our blue book policy. We match it against our election platform, what we promised the Canadian people in order to get elected. We stay true to those two. For any bills and motions that come to our caucus that are covered under those two areas, we then vote the way we promised.

The Liberals promised gun control but they never ever promised a national registration system. They brought it in. It was not in our platform or blue book policy. Therefore, we were obligated to make a decision for ourselves and to find out what our constituents might want. We did that in various ways and forms. The position of our caucus was to be against it. It is a bad bill. It is a terrible bill. I am against it personally.

I distributed a householder in January in Calgary Centre telling constituents about the good and bad aspects of this bill and about my position. I did a poll in which 53 per cent said to vote in favour of it, but the government poll said 70 per cent of Canadians wanted it. I knew there was a difference of opinion.

I said on talk shows and working with constituents as I am sure the member who asked me the question did as well that during that time I received some more input and feedback. After we knew what the amendments would be and what the justice minister was prepared to change in this bill knowing there were some flaws I did a scientific poll. The results were balanced with 50:50 male to female, with 21 per cent gun owners in the urban heart of Calgary, Calgary Centre with high density population.

I was able to do something members in that party could not. There were quite a few who voted against the bill, nine of them, and they are going to be disciplined. That is why the finger was pointing at caucus on Wednesday by the Prime Minister. That is why the lecture was given, notwithstanding whether the quotes are right or wrong.

What is wrong is that the democratic system is not working when a party muzzles its own duly, freely elected representatives that are paid to be here to expressly represent their constituents and they are told not to vote. They are not even allowed to get up to vote if enough members have voted already to beat what is in the House. That is shameful and unacceptable. That is what I am fighting against. That may be offensive to the hon. member and she may feel indignation at my comments but I firmly believe I am on the right side of the issue.

Mr. Fewchuk: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the hon. member across the way is speaking about something that has nothing to do with electoral boundaries.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am afraid the hon. member's time has expired in any event.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be participating in this debate today on Bill C–69. Here we are talking about adding politicians to this place.

• (1125)

My colleague from Calgary Centre said it so well. If we went down the street and asked 10 voters if they would support having more politicians in this place, I am sure we would get 10 very resounding noes with comments like what planet are we living on or where have we been. Here we are and in fact we are debating exactly that which flies in the face of everything we have been hearing from the Canadian voter.

I wonder where our priorities are when we are spending time talking about legislation that is so self–serving. This legislation is all about: What are my chances of being re–elected? This is the we–me syndrome, what is in it for me. That is what this is all about: I want to protect my kingdom; how does it affect my riding; how does it affect my chances of being re–elected?

It does not have the concern about what is best for the hard-pressed taxpayers of this country. It does not take into consideration what the taxpayers of this country indeed want. It is the we–me syndrome: I have got to look after myself, never mind what the voters of Canada want.

We are ignoring the deficit and the debt which was the number one issue when we campaigned. In the Ontario election the polls indicated it is still the number one issue. Instead of that, here we are debating adding more MPs. In fact, there is a good case to be made for the fact that more is not better because the deficit and the debt have been increasing. In the last year the debt has gone up by $100 million. Here we are debating this issue and we are looking at $550 billion of debt. We are going into the hole $1,036 per second and we sit here fiddling about boundary lines and adding more people which I suggest will add to this debt.

What about employment? What about creating jobs, the jobs which are so desperately needed? What about the criminal justice system, the system that is not working and a system which Canadians are demanding to be overhauled? What about our social

programs? The threat to those social programs is the deficit and debt and the interest payments on that debt.

What never ceases to amaze me is that bill after bill, debate after debate from the other side reinforces the fact that government members are just not listening to the Canadian people. Whether they are not listening or it is selective hearing, they are absolutely not responding to what Canadians are asking for and in fact are demanding. They do not understand the change which has taken place over the years. The politics of 30 years ago, which unfortunately is still directing the group across the aisle, do not work any more.

Canadians are going to have no part of it any more. The Canadian voters have said very loudly and very clearly: "We want politicians in Ottawa who are representing us. We want to have a voice in Ottawa because obviously what you people have been doing over the years has not worked. We are deeper in debt than we have ever been and we are getting fewer services for more dollars than ever before". The old style politics of we know best, we know what is best for the mindless masses just is not working any longer.

I want to congratulate those government members who have stood up and represented the people in their ridings. That was courageous. I was absolutely appalled when I heard what was supposedly said by the Prime Minister. I do not know his exact words. He complimented the ones who changed their position and stayed with the party. He said that it took courage not to buck him. What about the courage it took to buck the leader and vote with the people who sent them here to Ottawa? That is where the real courage was. Those people should have been complimented. They should understand that.

That is the message from the voters. They want politicians to represent them in Ottawa, not to listen to the party line. That is the curse of this place: Do what you are told. We saw that last night. I could not believe the display in this House. Members were being told not to vote: Party over people, do not stand up and vote, we have got the numbers. Those members are not going to be recorded in some of those votes. They were here but they did not stand up to vote yea or nay.

How can they justify that in their conscience? We are taking the salary. We are sent here to do a job. Here we are ignoring the voters and responding to one person, the whip. Do as you are told, fall into line or else.

There is a double standard here that I am sure has not escaped members on the other side. They are being disciplined and whipped into shape for doing what is right, for representing their voters. Then we have the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who violates this trust. He invites a group to a dinner and there are political pay–offs, but there is no reprimand, that is all right. It does not matter about the appearance of a possible conflict here. It is okay.

• (1130)

The double standard has to be very confusing to the other members of the government, and it certainly is confusing to the public and to the staff in the minister's department.

What we had here last night was a charade. As a member of the Reform Party, I was appalled at what I saw. With 205 new members elected to this place, the message was: "We want change". You can look at it as either 205 new members were voted in or 205 old members were thrown out. Either way, the message remains the same: "We want change".

Perhaps part of the problem over there is that the government thinks it won the election. Its members actually think they won the election. I would suggest that they did not win the election; the Conservatives lost the election. And the Canadian voters are still looking for a party that will represent them. Day after day they are not getting it. I suggest that the day of reckoning is coming in 1997, because those members who are not listening will be replaced with members who will.

What the voters have asked us to do is look at the old ways. "We do not care if that is the way you have been doing it for years. It has not worked. We want some change. We want some fresh thinking in this place. Do not kowtow to the party line. Listen to us. Listen to the common sense of the common people. The message is we want less government, we want more efficient government". That is not what this bill gives them, or even addresses.

The Reform Party on the other hand has a vision. We are looking ahead. We are listening to voters. We are going to question the old ways. I am very proud that we are. The windows and doors need to be opened. Let us look at the way we have been doing things. There has to be a better way because what we have been doing has not worked. The country has never been further apart as a complete country and we have never been deeper in debt. Very obviously, something is wrong. It is broke. It needs to be fixed. Let us get that message across.

There is a good argument to be made for quality, not quantity. There is absolutely no basis or justification for increasing the size of this House. Reform proposed a 10 per cent reduction in members. We said we can do this job with fewer people, and there is no doubt that we can. In our proposal, Ontario would lose some seats. I would suggest that Ontario is prepared to accept that, because the voters in Ontario know that we have too much government. We are overgoverned. They are quite prepared for less.

In going from 301 to 273 we could reduce the number of members by 28. I heard a figure of approximately $1 million to keep a member in this House. If that is right, we are looking at a saving of $28 million a year, a significant amount of money. And it works two ways: We will reduce the cost to the taxpayer, and I would suggest we will do a better job in running the business here.

More does not mean better. That has just been proved by the statistics that came out from StatsCanada today. Those stats have proved that more taxes mean fewer dollars in the pockets of the average family. In 1989 the average family income was $46,000, and because of this increased government and the increased taxes that has now dropped to $43,000. So the average family income has declined by $3,000. There is a very clear example that more means less and does not improve the situation. We are overgoverned.

You can look at Australia. It was mentioned earlier that Australia would double the number of voters per member for Canada. Germany has about two and a half times the voters per member, and just south of the border the United States has five times the voters per member. So you can certainly justify reducing the number of members we have in this House.

• (1135)

We just had an Ontario election in which one item in the common sense revolution was to reduce the size of the legislature. They wanted to take a 25 per cent reduction. That common sense revolution was overwhelmingly supported by the majority of people in Ontario based on that: less government, more efficient government. More does not mean better. We can do a better job.

In talking about the Ontario election, the common sense revolution would do away with MP pensions and let members look after their own pensions and get out of the taxpayers' pockets. We have not got that message here in Ottawa. We just changed the gold plated pension plan to a platinum. We did a little bit of scraping. But I suggest it is not going to sit well with the Canadian voter and it will be a major issue in the next federal election.

Reference was made to the gun control legislation that has been rammed through. You have to vote the party line and never mind what the people in your riding say. They say that in the red book they said they would do this. There is nothing in the red book about registration. The red book did talk about getting tough with the criminal use of firearms, but there is nothing in there about registration.

The voters in Ontario sent a very strong message, but it will be missed. All others have. I am sure this one will go right over the heads of the Liberals and they will continue to miss it. The voters of Ontario said they want a government that will listen, they want less government. But it has been ignored, and the Liberals will pay dearly for it in the next election.

There are some members opposite who have been listening to the voters. I would just like to quote some from the earlier debate. I will go back to Bill C–18, the debate we had in March 1994. I believe it was the solicitor general who said: "Since Confederation the number of seats in the House of Commons has increased steadily, from 181 in 1867 to the current level of 295. If new rules had not been adopted some years ago the number of members by now would be more than 340. This is something we should be considering". Amen. I think that is right on.

There was the member for Halton—Peel, and I quote from the debate: "If one looks at Australia, for example, there are about twice as many voters per member in that country. We are at the point where we have to make some changes. Either that or we are going to have to knock out one of the walls". Right on. This House is full. There is no more room.

The parliamentary secretary to the minister of public works: "In the 34th Parliament I had suggested that perhaps this Parliament should look at the possibility of significantly reducing the number of MPs. Would this not be an opportunity to see whether we could do with one–quarter or perhaps one–third fewer MPs?" What fresh thinking. Right on. There is some hope over there. There is a germ of common sense.

The Liberal member for Carleton—Gloucester, and I quote: "Is this room not getting a little crowded, and has our national and public debt not grown so much that we should act to curb their growth?" Right on again. At a saving of possibly $28 million a year, there could be substantial improvement in reducing our debt and deficit and at the same time doing a better job for the Canadian taxpayer.

Just to go back to the bill and looking at some of the amendments that have been proposed by the Senate, there are some that we can support, like the one that will reduce the allowable deviation from the provincial electoral quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. We proposed that and we can support it. It will help equalize the voting power between constituencies within a province.

We can support the requirement that the two non–judicial commission members be resident in the province for which the commission is established. That makes good, common sense.

There are some amendments in there that have been proposed by the Senate that we can support. However, in what we are debating here today, unfortunately we are wasting a lot of time and failing to deal with the real issues and the real problems the country is facing.

• (1140)

In closing, I heard the other day that the number of people who are watching this parliamentary channel has tripled in this 35th Parliament. I was really encouraged by that, because what it says is that the Canadian people are watching what is going on here. They are watching and they are listening. That is good news, because they are not just taking what is necessarily recorded in the press as being the gospel but they are watching what is being said and done here. They are watching those votes. They are watching those members who had the courage to stand up and represent the people in their ridings. They know the ones who were told to sit down and

do as they were told. I will tell you that is exactly not what the Canadian voters want from their elected members at this time.

I am encouraged when I discover that the viewing audience has tripled. I think the viewing audience is going to triple again as we get closer to the election and the Canadian voters realize what has been going on in this place.

The arrogance toward the voters perhaps can be partly explained by this leading in the polls. That is pretty heady stuff: We can do no wrong; look where we are in the polls.

I would suggest that is a very artificial number to base their popularity on. They should look to Ontario, because it was a very good indication of how wrong that can be. It was their own party that was leading in the polls in that province, in Ontario. When the rubber hit the road, when they got down to talking about the issues, it was just blown away. That is what it is all about today: it is the issues and who is best addressing those issues and who is listening to the voters.

I suggest to you that day after day we are seeing that this government is not listening. It is still the same old: "We know best. Listen to your leader. Do not worry about the voters". That is the tragedy for them. It is our salvation, because it is going to ensure a government that will be elected in 1997 that is truly listening to the people. I suggest that is going to be the Reform government.

Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was in my office watching the TV and shouting at it and decided I might as well come over here and ask the members opposite the questions I was shouting at my television set.

I am rather amazed at their lack of knowledge of the bill, since they are here to save the country money and they are here to be representing the people and they are here to be efficient.

The old boundary system was cobbled together by a bunch of dinosaurs called Tories, who are now sitting in the Senate trying to block legislation. They have another set of dinosaurs who are helping them in the process.

There are three things in this bill that I would like the hon. member opposite to respond to on a very practical basis. When we have these public meetings to look at the electoral boundary drawings, people go to these meetings and they have absolutely no knowledge of what happens when they change part of the boundary in the current system.

I was on the committee that designed the new system. I come from a riding with 250,000 people and it has not been changed in 10 years. Ten years ago it had 88,000 people. When these people go in and they are supposed to give intelligent responses to the way the boundaries are drawn, they have no idea what happens to the population within those boundaries when they move them to take in a community of interest.

This bill gives three alternatives with the numbers of people in each of those three alternatives and it gives the rationale for picking the one the riding commission picked. This is representation in an intelligent way, rather than some sort of chaotic magical way.

The other thing it does is that it says it will be redistributed every five years instead of every ten. So you will not have a member standing here who yells at television sets because she is overworked with 250,000 people. And it will be 300,000 before the next election. How do the members opposite respond to that?

In this bill, it says there will be no redistribution in provinces that have not had a remarkable change in population. This is really a cost saver, because the old system had a commission appointed, it had all kinds of bureaucrats appointed, and they had all kinds of wheels turning when it was not necessary.

I would like the member opposite to specifically respond to those three questions and not give me great long speeches about the way we are running the government.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, I am really pleased that the hon. member opposite stopped shouting at her TV set and came down to face the real world. I wish more members would face the real world and stop sitting there yelling at TV sets. Those members are not listening and getting involved in the process.

• (1145)

The member's first question dealt with the ignorance of the public, that the public came to the meetings and did not know anything. That is a major mistake. The member is underestimating just how smart the voters are. The member does them a disservice when she makes remarks like that. She thinks that most people came to those meetings without knowing anything; the voters are mindless out there and need our direction, that we have to get into the system and help explain life to them. I suggest to the member opposite that they are a lot smarter than she ever gives them credit for being.

The system was not changed because of any hue and cry from the public. The system was changed because some self–serving politicians on that side of the House said: "It is going to hurt my chances of getting re–elected". That is what we are talking about here. The voters did not ask for this. The backbenchers on the government side did. Their kingdom was threatened. The member may not have said this but many did say: "This is a threat to my kingdom and I have to do something about it. Let us scrap this $5 million that we have wasted of the taxpayers' money and let us redo it all so that I can be looked after here and have a chance of getting re–elected".

I suggest to the House that regardless of where the boundaries are drawn, the member will not get re–elected because she is not listening to the Canadian voter.

Members talk about the number of voters and how they can represent only a certain number of voters. The boundaries can be adjusted to reduce the members of Parliament. I am not saying we have to stay with the same boundary lines. Changes can be made to accommodate shifts in the population. I used the example of Australia where it has double the voters. The United States has five times what we have here and it is not having any real problems. The argument for quantity just does not wash. Quality is what we need here, not quantity. More is not better.

Mrs. Ablonczy: More people for the Prime Minister to threaten.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): More people for the Prime Minister to whip into line, to do as they are told, to not represent the people in their ridings.

Let us get away from this charade. We are talking about doing something that is demanded by the voters and not something that is going to ensure the re–election of the people on the other side.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will give you a perfect example that backbenchers are still allowed to speak in the House.

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Simcoe Centre. When I listen to the Reform Party I come to one conclusion: simple solutions for complex problems. I too have some concern about this bill. When I went back and studied it, I discovered that there was an agreement with the provinces in 1985 which would have to be broken to address the concerns of some, mine included. I had an idea that we could freeze the numbers in the House.

However, it really requires addressing the constitutional agreement that existed at that time. The member has not talked about how he is going to address that problem, how he is going to go to the provinces and get an agreement with the provinces to reduce the numbers.

The formula would require major changes to address the concept of representation by population. It would require major reductions in both the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Manitoba. If my memory serves me correctly, the province of Saskatchewan would lose about four seats.

I do not hear members of the Reform Party from Saskatchewan standing up saying they are prepared to sustain a loss of four seats in the province of Saskatchewan. Let us be honest and clear about these things. They should tell us how they are going to reduce those numbers of seats and if they are prepared to lose four seats in the province of Saskatchewan. They should also tell us the magic solution they have to go back to the provinces and retrench that agreement that existed in 1985.

• (1150)

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the questions from the member. I want to start out with his first comment, simple solutions.

I suggest that the solutions are simple. What is lacking on the part of the government is the guts to do what is right.

There is nothing complex about the problems in the country today. What is desperately lacking is the courage and the guts it is going to take to do what is right and bring some fiscal sanity to the country.

I should take a moment to applaud the member. He is one of the few who had the courage to stand up and buck the party line last night. He had the courage to stand up and represent the people in his riding and I applaud him for that.

I will take him to task though for not watching his TV set and knowing that last night the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster said he has no problem with the reduction in the seats in Saskatchewan. It is not all about what is in it for me. He is looking at what is good for the country as a whole. We did put our money where our mouth is. Nobody hedged on that. The member stood up in the House last night and said yes, we will have to share the hurt right across the country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Madam Speaker, as I listen to the member for Simcoe Centre, I see that we are talking about the electoral map as opposed to a reduction in the number of seats. I see that the words or comments used approximate those of the Bloc. There are too many members and too much government. The country is over–governed and on the verge of bankruptcy. Running the country has become too costly and the government should be more efficient and less cumbersome. The number of seats should be trimmed by 10 per cent.

For our part, we are merely offering to eliminate 75 seats in one fell swoop. Could it be that they are finally beginning to understand our position and that they will soon be supporting us?

[*English*]

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, the question from the hon. member suggested there may be 75 here who want to leave this place but I do not for a minute think that they represent the majority of the voters of the province of Quebec.

I suggest the majority of the voters in that province do not want to leave Canada. They want to be represented in this place by politicians who are going to keep Canada together, not tear it apart and that will be corrected in the next election.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, Bill C–69 is a very significant piece of legislation. It is an honour for me to follow the member for Simcoe Centre. I am enjoying the kind of debate that has been generated around this particular topic.

I wish to look at this bill from three points of view. I want to look at it from the point of view of democracy, the point of view of fiscal responsibility and the point of view of leadership.

Let me first speak on the first point with regard to democracy. The whole democratic system in Canada is represented through the election of representatives on the basis of the particular party they represent. It makes the representation a rather difficult one because there are three things we have to look at when we are that kind of a representative. We have the mandate that our party has given us. It represents the policies and principles which that party has developed in its election platform and its approach to government.

The Reform Party has a tripod that supports the representation that we as Reformers will give to the House and to the people of our constituencies. First, we will reform the democratic system in Canada as it exists today. The first requirement is to represent the people according to their wishes and represent them to this House, not this House to the people.

The second principle is that Reformers will manage the affairs of the country in a fiscally responsible manner. We will have a balanced budget. We will not spend money that we do not have. We will treat the money that is given to us by the taxpayers as money kept in trust. It ought to be treated at least as well as any personal money we would spend. In some cases we should treat it more significantly and with greater respect than if it is our own.

• (1155)

The third principle of the mandate the Reform Party has given us is that we want our streets to be safe. We want the property and lives of individuals to be secure. Men, women and children should be able to walk down the streets with impugnity, not in fear of being attacked. To that end, we want to reform the criminal justice system.

That is the first duty of a Reform representative. It is the mandate. We told the people that we would represent them, be fiscally responsible and reform the justice system.

A second part in the representation is this. The people have trusted us to represent the Reform Party because of certain talents, abilities and their confidence in us. They expect us to exercise our best judgment concerning the problems and issues that will face this country at any given time. We will act in the best interests of the people we represent as we understand them and not in our personal interests. That is significant.

There is a third area in which we want to represent the people. It is on certain moral issues such as capital punishment. We would conduct a referendum in which we want them to cast their ballot on an issue, yes or no.

There are three very distinct aspects to the business of representation and Reformers want to be true to all three of them. It does not make the task easy. It makes it a very responsible one, an accountable one where we can stand before the people and say: "This is what we stand for. This is the judgment we will apply and we want you to have a voice on the issues that affect you directly and significantly on a day to day basis". In a democratic system it is the first thing we will do.

It also means we listen to the people. The people told us one thing about the size of the government. They told us it is too big. It is too big in numbers of representatives and too big in the way it intrudes into the lives of the people, whether in business, families, our communities. No matter where it is, government is all pervasive. The people told us they wanted less government.

The bill flies in the face of that observation. The bill says more MPs, there should be 301 MPs, not 295. The hon. member across the way suggests this is a sermon. This is the most accurate position in terms of democracy. If the member does not understand that, he had better learn to listen to the difference between fact and simple statements.

That is the problem the Liberals have. They make all kinds of statements but where is the action on those statements?

Mr. Forseth: What do the people want?

Mr. Schmidt: We only need one member on that side of the House, the Prime Minister. All they do over there is listen to what the Prime Minister says. He tells them what they will do, when they will do it, how they will do it and sometimes he explains why they should do it: "Because I said so". That is not democracy. On that basis we could reduce the size of the House rather dramatically.

One other point has to be recognized. If the government is going to start listening to the people and if it is going to demonstrate what is said in the bill, that it is actually going to consult with the people, I ask the government with whom will it consult?

I want to read from the bill that is currently before us. It talks about a community of interest.

Mr. Forseth: You are making the Liberals squirm now.

Mr. Schmidt: I quote clause 19(5) of the bill:

> For the purposes of paragraph 2(b), "community of interest" includes such factors as the economy, existing or traditional boundaries of electoral districts, the urban or rural characteristics of a territory, the boundaries of municipalities and Indian reserves, natural boundaries and access to means of communication and transport.

• (1200)

That is a good phrase. That is a good section. That means the interests of the people should be paramount.

However, there are other provisions in the bill which make us wonder whether they really mean that. When it gets into the business of consulting with people there seems almost to be a blockage. The boundaries commissions which are asked to do the redrawing of the boundaries are required to hold at least one hearing per province.

That is an insult to the large provinces like Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. One hearing will actually determine the boundaries of the municipalities, look at the economic interests, look at the differences between rural and urban ridings? Somebody in downtown Vancouver will say what the characteristics are of Vermilion in Alberta, in Kamloops or in Prince George? It is ludicrous.

There have to be some real directions given to the commissions which will mean they will actually consult with the people.

There are some interesting technicalities in the bill. In section 21(6) there is the provision as to how one goes about making a presentation to the commission. This is for ordinary people, people who apparently do not understand anything about boundaries, people who do not know how they will be affected. That is an insult of the first order.

There is a greater insult in here which says a commission shall, before completing a report, hold at least one hearing in the province for which the commission is established for representation by interested persons. Notice of that commission hearing must be given 60 days before the actual hearing is to take place and the application to appear before the commission must be in writing. The application must be not more than 57 days before the hearing. Let us examine that. The notice must be given 60 days before the hearing and the person may make application up to 57 days before that date.

Let us look at another section to see what happens. Section 22(6) states:

> No representation by an interested person shall be heard by a commission at a hearing held under this section unless notice in writing is received by the commission not later than seven days before the hearing is held,

Which section will apply? In one instance it can be three days before the hearing but in the other it cannot happen unless it has been at least seven days. That is an inconsistency.

We have a person who wants to make a representation and he reads one of those sections of the bill. He has to read more than one section to find out how he goes about actually notifying the commission that he wants to make a presentation.

Another principle of democracy has been violated. There were amendments to the bill presented by the Senate. The Senate is not an elected body. It is an appointed body by none other than the Prime Minister. The Senate in this case has stopped the legislation. It has made some amendments to legislation which was created by people who were elected to represent the people. This is wrong in principle. It is a violation of what I have learned democracy should be. Our tradition and our Constitution says the Senate has this kind of power. Does that make it right? Does that make it just? I submit it does not.

• (1205)

The Reform Party wants to reform the democratic system. One of those reformations is to have an elected Senate, to make sure those persons in the second Chamber do represent the people.

There is a very valuable service and function for the second Chamber to perform in this House, to provide sober second thought which it did in this case. It did make some amendments that were very useful and that we can support. That is good and shows the upper house can be an important part of the democratic process but it ought to be elected, just like the House of Commons. I certainly hope it will be.

The upper house ought to balance the representation that exists in this House. It ought to make sure the very highly and densely populated centres of the country are balanced against those not as well populated and therefore the interests of both parties can be served in a balanced fashion. A major reformation needs to take place here.

People have said they want smaller government and also less intrusion in their lives. A bill will be coming before the House very shortly, Bill C–88. It provides in section 9 for the cabinet to suspend, modify or extend the application of a federal law or provincial law. The House and provincial legislators have the right to make laws. It is their responsibility. The people have elected them to do that.

Within a bill coming before the House that power on certain issues will be taken away from the House, and deposited with the cabinet. That is a miscarriage of misrepresentation, a miscarriage of responsibility, a miscarriage of anything that I believe and understand about a democratic system.

On the matter of fiscal responsibility, a point was made here recently about tradition. It seems that practice has developed a certain kind of tradition in the House over a number of years. We have had an increase in the number of MPs in the House and parallel with it has been an increase in the debt of the country.

That kind of tradition must be broken. Other people have said we are a lean and mean government. I suggest they understand what most of those words mean. Lean, no; mean, yes but not fiscally.

What does it mean to have a balanced budget? I came here to find out how we got into this deep debt. I want for the benefit of everybody in the House to recognize the reason we are in debt is we spend more than we take in. That is why we have a debt. Let us not have any doubt that if we are to get our fiscal house in order we have to get to the point of cutting and controlling our spending.

To increase the number of representatives in the House will not reduce our costs. It will increase them. We can talk about the physical things, the everyday things like salaries, personnel, office space and so on but we need to look at MP pensions. This is in the craw of virtually every Canadian.

We need to illustrate exactly what happens with the C twins, Charest and Copps, the member for Sherbrooke and the Deputy Prime Minister. Between these two alone—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sure the hon. member is well aware we do not use members' names. Rather, we use their title or district.

Mr. Schmidt: The C twins, the member for Sherbrooke and the Deputy Prime Minister, between these two alone there will be a payout of more than $6 million if they retire and live to age 75, with an inflation rate of approximately 5 per cent.

There is nothing in this bill that will in any way come to grips with these things. We have seen the opposite. We have seen debate on certain bills stopped. There is another way this new bill negates the work of fiscal responsibility. It will do away with the work that has already been done if it is passed, and the $6 million already spent will be gone.

• (1210)

Fiscally the attitude seems to be to spend, don't worry, be happy. We have seen how democracy works in the country with closure on Bill C–41, closure on Bill C–85 concerning MP pensions, closure on Bill C–68, the firearms legislation. In each case the government has stopped the debate. In each case the government has ignored the wishes of a large proportion of our country. Worst of all, MPs are being warned that not toeing the line could put their opportunity to stand for election on the line and it definitely puts into jeopardy advancement in their political careers.

The people have told them what to stand for and they have been told to stand for what the Prime Minister says. In my opinion that is completely backward and is not the way it ought to go.

Probably the most difficult thing for me to stomach is the message this is sending to our young people. The message that seems to be coming from the House as exhibited by a bill like Bill C–41 is families are old–fashioned. I know as do many members in the House that families are the social institution best suited for the transmission of values from one generation to another. They are where we learn such things as accountability, that freedom has a price and that we must be responsible for our actions, that there is such a thing as common decency, that there is such a thing as respect for another person without fear.

It is necessary to develop courage, to have the guts to stand up to say what we believe and to be honest and true representatives of the people who have elected us to stand in their stead in this place to govern the affairs of the nation in a manner best suited to their interests, to look after their interests and not our interests.

The government did—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired. Questions and comments, the hon. member for Waterloo.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I heard the hon. member talk about deficit, pensions, an elected Senate, et cetera. He spoke very little on the bill before us. I feel compelled to make a few comments.

I will say this often because I feel voters have a right to be reminded. Members of the third party mentioned they were to do politics differently and instead of mindlessly opposing all government legislation they would actually contribute to make it better. We in the Liberal Party, both new and veteran members, really appreciated those promises. Instead we have the sanctimony of previous parties replaced by the Reform Party which reminds me of the rise of the right wing parties in the United States.

We have a virtual attack on every institution in the country as well as on every bill we put forth. I still recall the hypocrisy of the leader of the third party who turns in a government car and then we find out he has—

Mr. Morrison: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, has the word hypocrisy when applied to an individual in the House become parliamentary language when I was not looking?

• (1215)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): This took place during the debate. I agree the comment could be on the iffy side. I would request that the member be a little more careful and that all members be more careful in the future.

Mr. Telegdi: Madam Speaker, I was not referring to a member with that word. I was referring to an action.

Let me expand on it a bit. The Reform leader promises to do things differently. He makes a great show by taking the keys to a five–year government car and turning them back in. Then we find out about the situation where that party is providing the individual with a $30,000 suit allowance.

We are told that on this side we are ruled by a dictatorial Prime Minister. Let us not forget the code of ethics the leader of the Reform Party was going to impose upon members of the Reform Party dealing with how many drinks they could have, whom they could have dinner with—of course not with members of the opposite sex—and on and on.

Let me say that the Reform has shown itself to be a warmed up version of the social credit which has a long illustrious history. Let the Reformers say, when they attack appointments by prime ministers to the Senate, that the father of the present leader of the third party was appointed to the Senate. I have not heard criticisms on that.

Be that as it may, let us look at the policies. Gun registration was mentioned. The fact of the matter is that this party supported gun registration because the people of Canada wanted it and it was good public policy. We are not captives of the religious right in the country.

Mr. Morrison: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would classify a non–believer as I am as being part of the religious right.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry but that is a matter for debate.

Mr. Telegdi: Madam Speaker, much was made about doing what our constituents want us to do. Members of the third party repeat that as their mantra. That is what they are going to do. They are going to represent their constituents. They have 1–900 numbers where they encourage the public to call in to voice their views so they can be represented.

Then we had some members of the Reform Party standing during the gun debate and saying that they did not believe in polls. The leader of the Reform Party said that he would not take a poll on the issue because it was too difficult for the public to understand. He made references to how support was changing but he was not going to listen to the constituents.

Another bill we dealt with mentioned by the member was Bill C–41. It deals with trying to make sure that hate crimes are dealt with harshly. Of course there was no support on that.

Let me just relate a very small incident regarding the present bill before us.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the time for questions and comments has almost expired. Perhaps he would like to give the member time to respond.

Mr. Telegdi: The hon. member of the Reform Party who took my seat on Waterloo council moved a motion that the proposed redistribution debate should not stand. Not only did that person do it, the former Reform candidate, but every municipal councillor of every political stripe in the regional municipality of Waterloo unanimously said that. That community unanimously opposed the proposal. That is what the bill is all about. I am glad it is addressing that.

• (1220)

How can the Reform argue against listening to communities representing all political stripes and being unanimous in their stance?

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Speaker, there are three responses. First, it would be very beneficial for the member who has just spoken to read the code of ethics of Reform Party MPs. He would be rather severely chastised by the content of that ethics statement for the words he used. He needs to examine very carefully his facts before he makes statements such as the ones he made.

Second, with regard to representing the people of Okanagan Centre, I stand here as I stand there to represent all of them whether or not they voted for me. The issue is not one of representing Reform Party members only. It never was. It is not now and it will not be. I was elected by the community. The member ought to be very careful about the kinds of statements he is making.

With regard to the third aspect of being captive of the religious right, there has not been a more irresponsible statement than that one in the House since I was elected as a member. No religious right has the dominant power within or without or in support of the Reform Party of Canada. It represents all people to the degree that they identify with the principles the Reform Party stands for.

It is for virtue and truth that the House ought to stand. That is what the Reform Party stands for and that is where we need to put our mark.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, we are debating today the amendments that have been made by the Senate to the boundaries redistribution bill.

Boundaries redistribution is a way of redrawing the federal ridings or constituencies that we belong to as voters and in which we vote. We elect representatives from these ridings to the Canadian Parliament to represent our wishes, our interests and our concerns and to be our liaison with what is happening in the federal government. Because population shifts and growth take place from time to time, the boundaries of our constituencies from which we democratically elect representatives to govern us have to change.

Politicians, especially those in government, seem to be very nervous about the process. The previous government delayed the process more than once because it did not want to put its members at any disadvantage by having shifts in the boundaries, different voters from time and time, and perhaps even a loss of seats if the boundaries showed there should not be as many seats in a province as there were. Governments have shown themselves to be quite reluctant to let the process go forward. The last redistribution was about 10 years ago, even though populations had grown and shifted considerably during that time.

What happened when this government was elected? There was a process to redistribute the boundaries that had been ongoing for some considerable period of time. It had reached the point where the new boundaries had actually been pretty well drawn up by the commissions in each province.

Lo and behold, government members found to their horror and dismay that they were disadvantaged by this democratic process. Their boundaries were to change. In some cases a lot of their ridings would disappear. The support basis they had built up would be interfered with. A nervous hue and cry arose from government members about the process that had been put into place.

Even though the process had already consumed over five million tax dollars, had been properly carried out, and had pretty well been finished for public hearings on the recommendations, the government decided to do it all over again. Therefore it introduced Bill C–69 to start the process all over again. The process is not substantially different from the one that it interfered with. Independent commissions looked at various factors to redraw the riding boundaries. They will have to do that all over again if the bill passes. We are not quite sure why because the result will be about the same.

• (1225)

There are four problems with the bill that Canadians should know about and they are the reasons we are not supporting the bill.

The first problem and the biggest problem is that the bill and the process that it endorses would increase the number of members of Parliament by six. Instead of the 295 members that we have today there would be 301. The growth under the bill would continue so that for every Parliament there would be more and more parliamentarians. We will be putting people in the galleries who are supposed to be representing constituents because there is not enough room down here.

This is simply nonsense. It shows a shocking lack of sensible leadership by the government. It had a perfect opportunity to cap or diminish the number of members of Parliament. A number of my colleagues have spoken at length about the fact that the country is overgoverned and has far more representatives per capita than almost any other democracy. Yet somehow the Liberals are telling Canadian people, with straight faces, that they need more MPs.

For goodness' sake, why? Already government members have been told by the Prime Minister how they are to vote on pain of being expelled from the party and not being allowed to do their job as a representative next time around. Why do we need more members to be whipped into line and to stand like trained seals to do as they are told? How will that benefit the people of the country?

The Reform Party put forward a very sensible proposal to modestly reduce the number of MPs from 295 to 273. This would be done on a very fair and equitable basis. I am willing to bet any province that loses MPs will not have a great revolt and say: "Give us more MPs; we must have more MPs". That simply will not happen. The country is tired of being overgoverned. It is looking for a little leadership, a little sensibility in the way we put together the House of Commons.

As other members of my party have done, I point out that every member of Parliament costs at least $500,000 and probably more per year, not to mention the pension that is in place for these individuals which they collect after only six years of service until the date of their death.

When seniors' pensions are being cut back, when health care services are being lost daily, and when unemployment insurance benefits are being cut back by a minimum of 10 per cent in the last budget, why on earth would we spend scarce dollars on more representatives in the House, if the 295 members we have now cannot get their act together and get the country into good shape?

It simply does not make sense. I am ashamed to be part of a House of Commons—and I would certainly be ashamed to be part of a government; thank goodness I am not—that cannot do better than that for the people of Canada. On that basis alone this is a bad bill.

The government lost a tremendous opportunity to get some sense and some balance back into the number of representatives and to spend money wisely. We need enough people to do the job but not ever increasing or ever expanding numbers.

The second problem with the bill is the Liberal insistence that there can be a variance between the number of people in each riding of up to 25 per cent.

• (1230)

Even the Senate was aghast at this kind of variance. That means some ridings will have fewer people represented than other ridings, up to 25 per cent. If there were twice as many people in one riding as another, every voter in that riding would have twice the democratic clout as people in the next riding which only had half that number of members. Here we have it almost as bad. It can be 25 per cent more members.

The basic principle of democracy is representation by population, a basic tenet of democracy.

I ask for unanimous consent to delete Standing Orders 56 and 78.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Question and comments.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Madam Speaker, I do not believe you were listening to what I said.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I do not think it is necessary to accuse the Chair. I was being consulted on another issue.

Mrs. Ablonczy: I am very sorry, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Would you please repeat what you said.

Mrs. Ablonczy: I asked for unanimous consent to delete Standing Orders 56 and 78.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Resuming debate.

Mrs. Ablonczy: The third reason this bill is not a good bill and why we oppose it is the appointments on the commissions that redraw the boundaries are now not being made accountable to Parliament. Commissions are appointed in each province to draw up new boundaries as population shifts happen in each of the provinces. This is a very good process, one which has pretty well stopped the old and odious practice of gerrymandering, a problem in the past in a number of countries. This was even in the 1800s a difficulty in our democracy.

In the 1960s the electoral boundaries redistribution commission was set up. It is independent of government so that the self–interested fingers of politicians cannot be making decisions about how the boundaries of our ridings and constituencies are put together. Since that time the political interference in the process has been pretty well looked after.

The appointments to these commissions are made by the Speaker of the House. They can be challenged by members of Parliament if it is felt those appointments are not objective, if they include people who lack independence from government. That is a healthy check and balance.

There is a real difficulty in ensuring the process is fair and objective and that it is seen to be fair and objective. We want to keep that accountability to Parliament. We have every respect for the Speaker of the House of Commons but there needs to be a certainty the appointments can be scrutinized and challenged if necessary. We would like the process to be totally above board and accountable to Parliament. There is a move in the bill to diminish and remove that accountability, which is the third reason we oppose it.

The fourth reason Canadians should be concerned about the bill is that if it goes forward the whole process of redrawing boundaries will have to start all over again. Canadians will not know what riding they are in until six months before the election. Many Canadians who are becoming more involved in the democratic process will have to get ready for an election and nominate representatives they feel will do the job properly in the next election, and they will be guessing. How are constituency associations supposed to nominate candidates for an election when they will not even know the area from which they might be drawing voters? They will be trying to sell memberships and get people involved in the democratic process but the people will not know what street or what avenue the candidate will represent.

• (1235)

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, there does not appear to be a quorum in the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I do not see a quorum in the House. Call in the members.

And the bells having rung and the count having been taken:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There is a quorum.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Madam Speaker, it is an honour to see so many members opposite coming in to listen to the words of wisdom I am adding to the debate.

We now have a bill before us which is very badly flawed, which does not serve the interests of Canadians appropriately for four reasons. It increases and will continue to increase the number of members in every Parliament. It allows a very wide variance in the number of voters in each riding, thereby violating the basic democratic principle of representation by population since some voters will have greater weight than others depending on how many voters are in the riding.

The appointments of the commissions which will draw up the boundaries of our ridings will have an important check and balance to their objectivity removed. There will be real uncertainty, unnecessary disruptive uncertainty, because new boundaries would not be finalized until a few weeks before an election would take place, very much interfering with the ability of Canadians to participate properly and freely and effectively in the democratic process.

For those reasons which are substantial and very clear I urge members of the House to reconsider support for the bill, which is not serving the interests of Canadians as it ought to and has not been put together with appropriate measures.

I move:

That the amendment be amended by deleting the numbers 1, 4(a), 6(a) and 6(b)(i) and substituting the following:

"1, 4(a) and 6(a)".

• (1240)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The amendment is in order. Resuming debate.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I was wondering whether there were questions and comments following my presentation.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There were two minutes remaining. That is why I did not call questions and comments. Questions and comments.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Madam Speaker, since the reapportionment commission was holding hearings quite actively at the time the government heavy handedly intervened, and since in my riding there were no complaints about the way the redistribution had been planned nobody went to a hearing, including me.

I would like a little information. I would like to be informed as to how these things work. I wonder if the hon. member did have hearings in her riding and if she did if she would enlighten those of us who were not involved in that.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Madam Speaker, there was some confusion about the hearings relating to the redistribution process that as I said was nearly finished when the government interrupted it.

Because of the government's decision to introduce legislation to start the process all over again, some of the commissions were not sure whether they ought to hold hearings. Some held them and some delayed them.

The notice of those hearings was in come cases very short. There were hearings held in my area and there were representations made. In some cases there were some recommendations for a better redrawing or a less disruptive redrawing of the boundaries in Calgary, where my riding is.

I also had feedback from other hearings that there was no substantial concern with the way the commissions had been proposing to redraw. It did vary across the country.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciated the comments from my colleague.

On this legislation, one of the major concerns I have, and I will speak to it in a moment or two as the seconder of this amendment, is that the government is behind in a time line. This legislation will impose a lot of restrictions on the commission in terms of its fulfilling its function in a very proper way. Would the member comment on the government's ability to deal with this circumstance under the current legislation?

Mrs. Ablonczy: Madam Speaker, there will be a substantial difficulty put in the way of all of the players in this new drama that has been launched on us as far as redistribution is concerned.

• (1245)

All of the steps in this process need to be done thoughtfully and with good administration, good recording, good consultation. There is going to be tremendous pressure on all of the people involved to get the documents together and make the studies and findings. It is not going to be a process done with as much time and thoughtfulness as could be done because there will be tremendous stress on the process to get it done in time for the next election. It is particularly unfortunate that is going to be done in light of the fact that it had already been done at some length two years previously. There was really no reason to have this thing started up again in a hurry.

I do think the hon. member has pinpointed another difficulty with this whole process.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is certainly my pleasure to second the amendment that was moved by my colleague. We have done that for a very important reason.

The amendment that is before the House at the present time on clause 6 indicates that the commission will only recommend changes to the existing electoral district boundaries where the factors set out are significant enough for changes. That clause put a rather rigid parameter for the commission to follow. When one examines the motives behind that kind of a directive to the commission, what it really does is tell the commission not to touch the existing boundaries unless they really have to. In a sense, it is a partisan intervention that controls what the commission can and cannot do. It does not allow for an objective look at the boundaries as such, which is wrong. Therefore, the Reform Party has moved this amendment to deal with that issue and try in every way possible to allow the commission to have flexibility in boundary determinations.

We have also added, in support of this, a substitute amendment, clause 4.(a), which adds the requirement for the two non–judicial commission members to be residents in the province for which the commission is established.

Mr. Morrison: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My hon. colleague for Lethbridge has some very important remarks to make. Could we not have some Liberals in the House to listen to them?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, the hon. member is well aware that we never refer to the presence or absence of anyone in the House. I am sure he will withdraw his comments.

Mr. Morrison: Madam Speaker, I do withdraw my pejorative comment. However, I would again request that we have quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The member has called for a quorum. I do not see one.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We have quorum. Resuming debate.

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to this amendment that is before us and as well to Bill C–69 and the recommendations that come from the Senate.

• (1250)

I want to say something about the process this bill has gone through between the fall of 1993, when this Parliament began, and today. One of the most disappointing things I have found about this Liberal government is it came to this assembly ill–prepared. This bill is another item that demonstrates the ill–prepared way in which they took on the responsibilities.

The Liberal Party spent 10 years in opposition. One of the basic functions and purposes of the loyal opposition is to be a government in waiting. That is the basic purpose, to prepare itself for government. The Liberals were to know what kind of a budget they would bring to Canadians. They were to know what kind of a social program they would bring to Canadians. They had to know what kind of a redistribution bill would be brought before this House of Commons in 1993.

When this government came here it was not prepared in any way. We spent one year with nothing but procrastination, with studies, with no answers to questions. It was not a government in waiting.

What did the Liberals do in opposition? What did they do on this side of the House? They are doing about the same thing today.

Mr. Volpe: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I realize we are all here to debate the truth so the public will be informed on everything. But I think it is important that when a member stands up he knows that of which he proposes to speak.

There is no way an opposition party under the old system could possibly have intervened in the system; it is an arm's length system—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais): Please continue.

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Madam Speaker, I appreciate your ruling that is not a point of order but a sensitivity of the hon. member to the irresponsibility that went on in this House for 10 years where the Liberal Party members sat on this side of the House and did nothing but play politics and attempt to get into the powerful position of being government. But they did not know why they really wanted to get into government, other than getting the perks, being ministers and having powers. Supposedly they were going to run the country with those terms of reference. There was no preparation at all.

Since coming to this House in the fall of 1993 I have observed what has gone on over and over again, whether the budget, the social policy, the health policy, which is delayed until this fall. The government still does not know what kind of a health policy Canadians are going to have or what kind of a—

Mrs. Terrana: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are here to discuss Bill C–69 and not the performance of one party or another.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais): Resuming debate.

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Madam Speaker, I am discussing the process relative to Bill C–69. I prefaced my remarks to that. My preface was that Bill C–69 is in a process that was ill conceived, that was based on a lack of preparation by this government, and was basically incompetent.

At this time we are faced with trying to design the ground rules by which a commission is going to establish the constituency boundaries across this nation. We are going to put them under a terrible time constraint to do a good, competent job.

There are a couple of other arguments with regard to Bill C–69. My colleague from Calgary Centre outlined very clearly to us a concern that we are going to expand the number of seats in this House from the current 295 to 301. The Reform Party has taken a very clear position, saying we are prepared to reduce the number of seats in this House, which is responsible. It is a response to the Canadian public at the present time, who recognize that we must be frugal and respond to their direction at this time. The Reform Party is prepared to do just that.

• (1255)

We have to ask a question, which relates to my first comments: Why does the government not do that? My colleagues have said very clearly in their debate that the government does not listen and has not listened to the Canadian people and what it is they want.

Another point I want to make, which I feel is different, is the reason the government is not doing it is because it does not have the political will. It is playing the old political games of the 1970s and the early 1980s, when government had more money and was not afraid to go into debt and the public was not holding it accountable. The object was to not get into any political problems, not make any difficult decisions. Just expand the House of Commons and no one will know the difference. Just add on and play the old political game.

The Liberals have not changed. They do not realize that society has changed, the political system has changed. The demand on the public purse and the leadership of the country and the leadership in the provinces is saying be more frugal and adjust your cloth according to the budget of the country. That means we have to start here.

I give the Minister of Finance some marks for bringing about approximately an $8 billion expenditure reduction in the budget. He has brought about reductions, which his Liberal friends resisted for a long time. It took months before the cabinet could turn it around and say they were going to support the Minister of Finance in these expenditure reductions. They just said they would not do it. Finally somebody told them the public wanted expenditure reductions and it was done in the last budget. That took some political will. As Liberals they are still afraid to make some major decisions for the country, and that concerns me very much.

Mr. Volpe: We are making this one.

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): In Bill C–69, again we see a lack of political will to make a major important decision.

I think I should leave it at that, because the government wants to defend its position, which is indefensible and unacceptable at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1300)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred, and I will get back to you after consulting the parties to inform you of the time agreed upon.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would urge the Chair to consider scheduling the vote for 1.30 p.m. for the following reason. If this bill is not passed by the House of Commons later today in its final version, it may well die as, under one of its provisions, the bill must be passed by the other House and receive royal assent no later than the 20th day of the current month. This means that if the bill with all its provisions is not passed today at the latest, we will be unable to deal with this matter, and the bill will die.

I suggest that, when considering the submissions of the two political parties in this House allowed to present proposals to the Chair regarding the timing of the vote, the Chair should keep in mind that the bill must be voted on not only at the amendment stage but also at final reading later today. Otherwise, this would be an academic exercise.

This concludes my submission to the Chair. I hope that this bill, which was drafted by a parliamentary committee after the committee reached a consensus, will clear all stages. I think that the loss of this bill would be very unfortunate and prejudicial to all.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Madam Speaker, our Standing Orders are very clear on this issue, and I am going to take the liberty of reading you an excerpt to refresh everyone's memory.

Our Standing Orders very clearly state that the Chief Government Whip or the Chief Opposition Whip may approach the Speaker, while the bells to call in the members are being sounded, to request that the division be deferred. The Speaker can defer the division until a specified time, but, in any case, no later than the normal time of adjournment for the following day, etc.

But, it has been the custom and actually the practice in this House, certainly since this Standing Order was put in place, that in cases where the request to defer the vote is presented for the following sitting day, only one request is made and it is made immediately, the Speaker automatically grants the request. Even if, subsequently, a second request is made by another political party, never has it been decided to grant the second request.

• (1305)

The standing order is clear: the first request takes precedence. Therefore, I ask you to grant my colleague's request.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I concur with the previous speaker. I support that decision. Those are the rules of the House. They are well established. They are clear. They are meant to benefit all the members of the House. I believe whoever is first should be recognized.

Second, the government whip has put extra pressure on you to consider it, a 30 second consideration. However, the extra pressure that was placed on you by the government whip failed to outline and acknowledge the fact that the other place has all of next week to do its work as well. It is sufficient time for its members to get the job done and, therefore, I would support the opposition's request.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I have already said that I will take it under consideration. We will come back to the House within a few moments.

In the meantime we will continue with Government Orders.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

Hon. Sergio Marchi (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 298)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Arseneault	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blondin–Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gallaway
Godfrey	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint–Paul)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Mifflin	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pillitteri	Reed
Rideout	Ringuette–Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Wood—127	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazer	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guay
Hanrahan	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jacob
Jennings	Johnston
Kerpan	Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne	Williams—76

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Brien	Calder
Canuel	Copps
Crawford	Deshaies
Dupuy	Easter
Gagnon (Québec)	Guimond
Harper (Churchill)	Hickey
Knutson	Lalonde
Laurin	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mercier	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Plamondon

• (1345)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read a third time? Now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. David Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again rise in support of speedy passage of Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

As the House is aware, the bill will implement a number of measures relating to taxation that were introduced in the 1994 budget, along with certain others announced by the government over the last year.

In moving to third reading, it is again appropriate to remind ourselves of the context of this legislation. The fiscal challenge facing the country is familiar to us all. Few dispute the need for tough action and that difficult choices face us all. Surely we will all agree that fairness and effectiveness must be essential guiding principles of the steps we have to overcome in our challenge in dealing with the deficit.

These principles have guided the government as we have worked to restrain spending. They have guided the minister in crafting the budgets of 1994 and again in 1995. In both cases, spending cuts alone could not deliver the deficit reductions that Canada needs. Rigorous government restraint needed to be complemented with some measures on the tax side.

Doing so for us was simply a question of fairness. It was our vision of fairness that guided us as we looked at the tax system, addressing unsustainable tax preferences instead of imposing general tax hikes on Canadian taxpayers.

In looking at the corporate tax regime we sought to ensure that corporations paid their fair share of the tax revenues needed to fund government programs and to prevent certain businesses or sectors from taking undue advantage of certain tax provisions.

With this in mind, the 1994 budget proposed a number of measures to the rules governing the taxation of business income. Our goal, and let me stress this, was not to penalize the business sector or to impede the competitiveness of Canadian corporations. In fact, we believe that it is essential to maintain a competitive tax system in today's global economy.

I would like to now outline some of the specific measures from the 1994 budget which have been reflected in Bill C–70.

One fairness issue this legislation addresses is the tax rules dealing with debt forgiveness and foreclosures. Under the old provisions of the Income Tax Act many transactions involving the settlement of debt were not recognized in any meaningful way for income tax purposes.

The new rules provide a comprehensive basis to deal with debt settlement. In general, they provide that forgiven debt amounts will be applied to a loss carried forward and expenses are partially included in the debtor's income. I should point out, however, there are special relieving rules to minimize undue hardship from these new rules.

Let me now turn to the tax treatment of securities held by financial institutions. Until now the Income Tax Act has not provided specific rules regarding the tax treatment of such securities. The measures under Bill C–70 seek to reduce uncertainty in this regard and also to ensure that the income derived from such securities is measured appropriately. The amendments provide that certain securities will be marked to market, meaning that the

appreciation or depreciation in their value each year must be recognized in that year.

In keeping with our goal of fairness, the amendments include a transitional rule that allow increases in income resulting from the new rules to be spread over five years. These new measures have been generally effective after February 21, 1994.

• (1355)

In addition, new rules are provided for debt securities that are not required to be marked to market. These rules deal with the measurement of income while the securities are—

The Speaker: The hon. member will have the floor when we return to debate.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House resumed consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries; and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Earlier today the Chair had a request for the deferral on the division of the amendment to the amendment relating to Bill C–69.

[*Translation*]

I would ask the whips to consult with each other and I hope they manage to agree or at least produce a recommendation for the Chair.

[*English*]

I hope the whips would consult with each other. If the whips have not reached a decision, I will return to the House at 4 p.m. and I will set a time for the vote at that time.

There was a request for a vote at 1.30 p.m. That is a moot point. We are past 1.30 p.m. and now I would like the whips to discuss it and if they cannot arrive at a decision I will decide at 4 p.m.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Roberval, on a point of order.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which concerns the procedure in this House. When a whip asks for a division to be deferred—and I looked up a number of precedents—the Chair always defers the division at the request of the whip who rises in the House, when there is just one.

Perhaps you could tell us why you are now asking the whips to consult with each other, since there is only one valid request before the Chair and, in our opinion, the Chair must consider that request?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I asked for a little more time, since question period will start in a few minutes, to review what happened. I would like some time to do that.

Furthermore, I would ask the whips to consult with each other. If they are willing, perhaps it would be unnecessary to have a decision from the Chair.

However, should it be necessary, I will announce my decision at 4 p.m.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, Standing Order 45(5)(a)(ii) clearly states:

> During the sounding of the bells, either the Chief Government Whip or the Chief Opposition Whip may ask the Speaker to defer the division.

That is what happened.

> The Speaker then defers it to a specific time, which must be no later than the ordinary hour of daily adjournment on the next sitting day that is not a Friday.

That occurred. The opposition whip asked for a deferral. Five minutes later the government whip stood up and gave a speech asking not to defer it. He asked for a time of 1.30. Two different times were asked: deferral of the vote until the next sitting day which would be tomorrow and subsequently would have to wait until Monday or 1.30 p.m. today. The 1.30 p.m. today has expired so there has been no valid request by the government whip. The request of the opposition whip must be respected and accepted.

The Speaker: I thank the whip of the Reform Party for his opinions. I will surely take them under advisement when I make my decision at 4.00 p.m.

It being 2.00 p.m., the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CO–OPERATIVE EDUCATION

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a group of co–op students from the University of New Brunswick are visiting the capital today. They are here to encourage development of new and exciting co–operative education programs in Canada. These programs are made up of six work terms for two years in total of valuable work experience for every participant.

Students, especially those who work away from school and home, develop personal skills such as independence and time management. Co–op students are also given the opportunity to acquire vital contacts with employers. Out of 37 co–ops graduating from UNB this year, only five are still searching for a job.

Most non co–op students only begin the job hunt on graduation. The most immediate and tangible benefit from the co–op program is financial. The program funds the students' educations with little or no assistance required. The students of UNB ask our government to encourage the development of co–op programs.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PATENTED DRUGS

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' insistence at the beginning of this session on amending the legislation on patented drugs is hard to explain from an economic point of view. In fact, the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board announced this week that patented drug prices fell by nearly 0.5 per cent in 1994.

Since 1987, when the legislation came into force, patented drug prices have risen an average of only 2.1 per cent, below the rate of inflation, while drug prices generally rose an average of 7.5 per cent. In other words, generic drugs were the ones to increase significantly in price.

In addition to containing their prices, manufacturers of patented drugs invested $561 million in research and development last year, which is more than they are committed to do. The Liberals should stop harassing a major industry that has a considerable impact on the economies of Quebec and Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

FREE VOTES

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after the 1993 election, my party asked if I would take on the responsibility of dealing with the issue of parliamentary reform. I quickly came to the conclusion that the main issue was freer voting. It is not just the situation where the leaders of the government side would declare a particular bill the subject of a free vote, but the situation where parties allow dissent to occur, true dissent on particular government bills, bills that form part of the government program.

It was the opinion of those involved in the writing of the McGrath report in 1985 and those who sat on the House management committee in 1993 that dissent should be allowed to be expressed without fear of retaliation by the leadership of the political party concerned. Both groups believe the expression of dissent would make the House a healthier place.

I am pleased to see that members on both sides of this House are beginning to express themselves in dissent. However, in order for freer voting to occur, the fear of reprisals by party leadership must disappear. I hope the leadership on the government side will respect the dissent that has been expressed as a healthy part of our democratic system and that no reprisals will come to those expressing dissent.

* * *

PROFESSIONAL HOCKEY

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the government to the fact that a ruling from Revenue Canada is being sought with respect to the deal that has been arranged to save the Winnipeg Jets.

What has been sought from Revenue Canada and which may not have been received yet is a ruling which would have the effect of making the millions of dollars that are being donated toward the purchase and the saving of the team for Winnipeg as a charitable donation.

It seems to me given all the other things that are happening in this country that hockey, particularly professional NHL hockey, is not a charity. I would like to see the team stay in Winnipeg, but I do not want to see a precedent set whereby professional hockey is regarded as a charity for tax purposes. I think that would be an awful precedent and an awful injustice.

* * *

FEDERAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since its inception 50 years ago, the Federal Business Development Bank has addressed the needs of Canada's small and medium sized businesses. This institution has continually adapted its operations to meet constantly changing political, social and economic climates. However, once again the time for significant change has come.

• (1405)

That is why the business leaders of London—Middlesex are applauding the business development bank of Canada act which was recently tabled. The proposed act would not only allow the present bank to change its name, it would also allow it to evolve and to expand its programs and services to meet today's requirements.

At present, we must adapt to the realities of the new global economy, an economy which in large part sees entrepreneurs along with small and medium sized businesses charged with the responsibility of promoting economic growth and job creation.

I believe that this initiative demonstrates yet again our government's commitment to the people of Canada. I look forward to its implementation.

* * *

FORGING THE LINK

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 8 and 9, Acadia University, Chrysler Canada, the Nova Scotia Department of Education and the Department of Economic Development hosted "Forging the Link", an international symposium on education and the economy. This conference as a preamble to the Halifax summit brought business leaders, educators and youth together to discuss new partnerships between education and the economy.

For young Canadians the chances of finding that first job in a chosen field are a lot better with relevant training and work experience. Whether it is post–secondary education or an internship that helps get a foot in the door, available jobs are going more than ever before to people with more schooling and more skills.

It is crucial therefore that we as a government forge closer links between educators and business. Through important forums such as this, more young Canadians will gain an understanding of the ties between good education and good jobs.

* * *

ELDERS AND TRADITIONAL PEOPLES GATHERING

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the 12th annual Elders and Traditional Peoples Gathering was held at Trent University in Peterborough. Three thousand aboriginal people and others met to address the theme: family growth through our elders.

There were ceremonies, plays, concerts and workshops. Workshop topics included oral traditions, immersion schools, being Indian today, Inuit life, the spirit of healing, native women's issues, traditional language and medicinal herbs. A highlight was the play "Earth Rhythms" about young people creating change in their own environment. This was performed by people from the First Nations of Curve Lake and Hiawatha.

The annual elders conference is aboriginal Canadians helping themselves and others to make Canada an even better place.

I am delighted to add that Trent University will be appointing a new chancellor this fall. She will be Mary Simon, former president of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and currently Canada's ambassador for circumpolar affairs.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this morning's *Globe and Mail* reported staff cuts at the CBC which are the start of further major cuts that could well change the role, nature and even the mandate of the corporation entirely.

As a result of the latest budget, the SRC and the CBC will have to cut 1,000 employees. However, Tony Manera, the former president had indicated that between 3,000 and 4,000 jobs would have to be cut in the next three years. In this context, it is therefore surprising that the Minister of Cultural Heritage continues to refuse to reveal the budget cuts he has imposed on the corporation.

We should not be surprised to discover more American television programs in CBC programming in the near future or to find ourselves witnessing the long slow demise of what was once the jewel of Quebec and Canadian culture.

* * *

[*English*]

DEMOCRACY IN CANADA

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that the past few days have ended democracy for the people of Canada.

It was not so long ago we had a Prime Minister promising fair representation for all Canadians who elected Liberal members of Parliament. Not only has it become blatantly obvious that he has reneged on one of his iron clad red book promises, he has taken it a step further by threatening his caucus members to toe the party line or he will use the ultimate weapon of refusing to sign nomination papers for those members prior to the next election. This in turn could deny access to their beloved gold plated pension plan which is the worst possible catastrophe for a Liberal to experience.

I want to inform members opposite that our constituents have their wishes followed on a day to day basis. They have the power to nominate their own representatives. As well, our leader will sign nomination papers based on constituents' wishes. With these three policies alone, our constituents know that we are the only truly democratic party left in Canada.

* * *

• (1410)

YOUTH SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian youth have a wealth of fresh insight, energy and intellect

to offer our national institutions, our workplaces, our society. What they require in return is opportunity. It is therefore laudable that this government is helping young people who are both out of school and out of work receive the training and experience they need for future success.

Through Youth Service Canada 850 young people nationwide are taking part in 63 projects which will help them gain invaluable work experience while making significant contributions to their communities.

In my riding of Winnipeg North the Maples Youth Justice Committee will target as a project racism, gang violence and fraud with crime awareness programs.

Indeed Canadians have much reason to take pride in Youth Service Canada. We take pride in the renewal, the hope and the vision our young Canadians offer our great nation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

2002 WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Quebec Liberal caucus, I want to join with all Quebecers and Canadians in wishing good luck to Quebec City, which might be chosen tomorrow as the host city for the 2002 Winter Games. The decision will in fact be made in a few hours, and we will finally find out whether Quebec City is the lucky winner.

It goes without saying that we are keen to hear the outcome of the decision and that we will be delighted to have the 2002 Winter Games here. Quebec has a worldwide reputation because of its athletes, whose remarkable performances have made them provincial ambassadors, and because of the warm welcome it reserves for visitors.

The fact that Quebec City is among the top contenders is confirmation that we are a strong candidate for the next Winter Games. I offer my thanks to all those who have had a part in this important bid, and I extend my best wishes for good luck to Quebec City.

* * *

JOB CREATION

Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Quebec's Minister Responsible for Restructuring released the 8th report on Quebec's sovereignty. One of the first conclusions drawn by the author is that the Outaouais region would lose at least 3,500 jobs if Quebec declared its independence. These 3,500 well paid jobs coupled with the 5,000 others the minister says will also disappear in the head offices of big companies in Montreal already puts the separatist's balance sheet for job creation in a debit position of 8,500.

Quebec's Minister Responsible for Restructuring should devote his efforts without delay to putting an end to these reports and start using the funds at his disposal to create jobs instead of to announce they are going to disappear. This is what Quebecers want and this is the goal towards which the Government of Canada is working.

* * *

FAMILY INCOME

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a study done by Statistics Canada which was released yesterday revealed that the after–tax income of families dropped 2.1 per cent in 1993. Compared to 1989, Quebec and Canadian families have on the average $3,025 less money to spend per year. All levels of society have been hit by this drop which started in 1989 and which has carried us back to income levels we have not been seeing since the early 1970s. Even the poorest families have seen their after–tax income drop since 1989.

Economists predict that this decline could very well continue over the next few years, all the more so because the federal government's unemployment insurance reforms are having a negative impact on workers at the lower end of the pay scale. The dignity of working is above all the dignity of being able to earn a living at it. That is what the government should have realized before it started blindly cutting its support to those in need.

* * *

[*English*]

FREE VOTES

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, page 94 of the Liberal red book states that if elected, Liberals would give more power to individual MPs by providing more free votes. Yesterday the Prime Minister broke this promise by warning his own MPs that if any one of them vote against the party line more than once, he will not sign their nomination papers for the next federal election.

Breaking campaign promises to free voting backbenchers, kicking them off committees, killing their travelling privileges, threatening to pull their nomination papers and last night the government whip ordering them not to vote is not leadership. It is dictatorship, duly elected and duly followed by sheep like members on the other side.

• (1415)

If it looks like a Mulroney caucus and baas like a Mulroney caucus then I guess it is a Mulroney caucus and can be led to the slaughter in the next election just like a Mulroney caucus.

Oral Questions

ILIQQUSIVUT

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, today at 4 p.m. the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada will be holding a news conference on Parliament Hill to unveil Iliqqusivut, the Inuit Spirit of the Arctic Pavilion which will be showcased at this year's Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto.

For 18 days in August the Inuit will bring a piece of the Arctic to Toronto's CNE. The pavilion will feature Inuit businesses, artists and cultural performers. Visitors will be able to hear and see the famous Inuit throat singers and drum dancers, participate in traditional Inuit Arctic games, enjoy northern food of char and caribou, and purchase Inuit carvings, prints, jewellery and clothing.

I encourage all members of Parliament, their staff and all other Canadians to experience the Inuit way of life at the CNE this summer and, for a foretaste, to join us on the front lawn of Parliament Hill later this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Group of Seven summit opened this morning in Halifax, while 12 Canadian peacekeepers and observers are still being held hostage by the Serb forces. They are literally being used as a shield, as Bosnian government troops launch an offensive on the outskirts of Sarajevo to break the Serb siege of the Bosnian capital.

Could the Minister of National Defence tell us what specific steps have been taken to provide a safer environment for some 850 Canadian peacekeepers deployed in Visoko who are now caught between the two sides in a confrontation between Bosnian government troops and Serb troops north of Sarajevo?

Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's question. I can inform him that at the base in Visoko, because of the build–up of Muslim forces, certain precautions have been taken to be ready in the event of an attack. The situation is very disturbing but, so far, our troops are in good shape and not in any immediate danger.

As for the 11 members of the Canadian forces in Ilijas, this is a real problem because of the start of hostilities in this region. So far, they are in good shape and are not in danger.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during a previous question period, the Minister of National Defence said they were in a very delicate situation.

I wish the Minister of National Defence would explain what he meant by this very delicate situation and why these peacekeepers still have not been released? Could he be a little more specific?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned that our people have not been released. Yesterday I called in the chargé d'affaires of the Yugoslavian government to lodge a formal protest with the authorities in Belgrade.

Although we appreciate very much the efforts of President Milosevic and the Yugoslavian government in Belgrade so far in getting the release of the hostages and working with the Bosnian Serbs, we have demanded they intercede immediately to release the 11 Canadians at Ilijas and Captain Rechner who is still in Pale, the Bosnian Serb headquarters.

There is no reason for these people to be detained other than the fact that perhaps these forces are being held as some kind of a shield to try to prevent the Bosnian Muslims who are amassing for an attack apparently to liberate Sarajevo from Serb control in the suburbs.

• (1420)

It is totally unacceptable to have United Nations personnel, especially Canadians, used as pawns in the middle of a conflict between those two parties.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister is now at the G–7 summit, together with some very important players in this unfortunate series of events, could the Minister of National Defence tell us whether today, the Prime Minister intended to make it clear to the G–7 heads of state that quick action is urgently needed to save our troops, to save Canadian soldiers who are now in the worst possible situation in that part of the world?

Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure our Prime Minister intends to raise the matter in Halifax with his G–7 colleagues, because he knows perfectly well this is a bad situation and everyone wants to see the liberation of all hostages and prisoners.

[*English*]

I am sure the Prime Minister will be talking about this with his colleagues in Halifax. All members of the G–7 are as concerned as everyone about the deteriorating situation in the former Yugoslavia.

As to whether or not Canada will take part in the rapid reaction force, again that will be the Prime Minister's decision. He will announce that in due course.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

As the minister mentioned, the heads of state at the G–7 Summit will be discussing the situation in Bosnia. However, yesterday in Washington, French President Jacques Chirac expressed his regret at the length of time it was taking to set up the rapid reaction force in Bosnia. Here, on the other hand, we still do not know whether Canada will be part of the force or not.

Would the Minister of National Defence tell us whether or not Canada will participate directly in the establishment of the rapid reaction force as France and Great Britain have proposed?

Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not think either the minister or the Prime Minister have ever answered this question. They have said they will discuss the matter at the G–7 summit, and again we have the same response.

How can the government not commit to participating in the rapid reaction force—because we have still not had an answer—and thus abdicate its responsibility to further protect the safety of the peacekeepers in Bosnia at a time when many members of the large contingent of Canadian peacekeepers are in very precarious situations?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government is certainly not abdicating its responsibilities.

We have taken measures in the last number of months to ensure that our forces take all necessary precautions, as I described in reply to the earlier question, especially increased fortifications at our base in Visoko, especially increased protection for our troops, and a number of other things that will help them do their duties.

The question of the rapid reaction force was an initiative that we support. It is an initiative that will largely be manned by British and French forces. Certainly it is the desire of the NATO allies that Canada participate. We want to make sure before we give our concurrence that we are fully satisfied with the way the force will be deployed. Those answers will be coming shortly.

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government House leader said that he did not accept the premise of our questions about the heritage minister's violation of the federal code of ethics. We are not dealing with assumptions, conjectures and speculation here. We are dealing with the facts.

It is a fact that the heritage minister targeted departmental clients for political donations. It is a fact that everyone who attended that dinner received a government contract or appointment. It is a fact that the minister blatantly broke section 23 of the government's own code of conduct.

What does it take for the Prime Minister to remove a minister guilty of unethical behaviour? A criminal conviction?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental flaw in the hon. member's question because on the public face of information available it is not based on fact. There is no information I am aware of to say that the minister personally invited people to the dinner but rather that he simply attended the dinner. It is quite proper for ministers and members of all parties to attend fundraising dinners. It is part of the normal political process in the country and I am informed that the donations were properly recorded.

• (1425)

I can ask the hon. member a question. Why is she asking questions that do not appear to be based on facts?

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear the minister attended and he is personally responsible for the contracts that go out under his signature.

The government's excuses and its carefully crafted damage control lines are certainly wearing thin. The heritage minister was clearly in the wrong. The government is making matters worse by refusing to release the full list of all the people who were invited to the minister's dinner, the full list of those who actually sent contributions, and the full list of donors who have received heritage contracts or appointments, not just giving donations. Trying to bury this information in Elections Canada documents will not make it go away.

I have a supplementary question. If the government does not have anything to hide, why is it hiding behind these ludicrous answers? When will it make all the list public?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear from public information that this dinner was not organized by the government and the invitations were not sent by the minister or the government. These are not materials within the control of the government, except to the extent that they are

recorded in the Elections Canada returns. To have information disclosed in the Elections Canada returns is not hiding the matter. It is carrying out the requirements of the law.

I again ask the hon. member why she is asking questions like this rather than about matters of real concern to most Canadians.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the red book in the last campaign I thought integrity was a fairly major issue in the country.

The Prime Minister has said that the heritage minister was not at fault because receipts were issued for all donations. Selling access to a minister of the crown cannot be justified by a handful of receipts. The heritage minister has violated the federal code of ethics by placing himself in a conflict of interest, but instead of doing the honourable thing and demanding his resignation the Prime Minister continues to stubbornly defend the indefensible.

The government has put politics ahead of principles and it is making a mockery of the code of ethics. Enough is enough. Will the heritage minister resign now?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made what I consider to be a totally unwarranted accusation by saying that access to the minister of heritage was being sold. Ministers generally come in contact with the public in a whole range of acceptable ways, including attending fundraising dinners.

It is clear if anybody is putting politics ahead of principles it is that member and her party.

* * *

[*Translation*]

G–7 SUMMIT

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago, the Prime Minister stated that the G–7 summit would be held in Halifax rather than Quebec City, because the Canadian flag did not fly above the city hall occupied by the separatist mayor of Quebec City. Now that the G–7 summit has just opened in Halifax, *La Presse* reports that, "those who do not speak English are lost".

How can the Acting Prime Minister, whose government defends a vision of Canada as a supposedly bilingual country "from coast to coast to coast" not be embarrassed by the almost total lack of French on the very site of the G–7 summit in Halifax?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this summit is being attended by spokespersons for the G–7 countries, including France and Canada, it is obvious that both official languages are represented at the summit site.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we see the faces of francophones, but the image being projected is English. How can the federal government explain that Canada continues as always to project a unilingual English image at the G–7 summit, while federal representatives in Quebec seize every opportunity to emphasize the merits of a bilingual Canada?

• (1430)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I totally reject the premise of the hon. member's question. The face we are showing at the summit is that of a bilingual, proud and united country. The hon. member's attempt to tarnish this image of unity is regrettable.

An hon. member: Right.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*English*]

ETHICS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

It has been revealed that both the director general and the director of the public works contracting branch have doled out contracts to close family members without competition. One director hired his wife to do his office work. Mr. Hugues Bureau–St. Pierre has received close to $50,000 from his generous Aunt Lillian since September 1993.

Is the government investigating this matter? If so, will he punish those responsible for unethical conduct?

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election the government made a commitment to govern with integrity. We intend to honour this practice.

We are aware of the situation that the member has brought to our attention. To this end, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services has directed his deputy minister to give instructions that guidelines should be respected.

It is not standard practice to hire family members. This particular group that the member mentioned is now the subject of an internal audit. If the allegations are substantiated as a result of this audit we will direct the department to bring in corrective measures.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged at the government's show of concern for ethics in the public service, but is it not ironic that it will investigate the public service for unethical conduct while the unethical conduct of the heritage minister and the public works minister goes uninvestigated altogether.

It is no wonder that the auditor general says there is confusion in the public service about ethics. It is examples from the top that prove the old adage that the fish is rotting from the head down in this case.

My supplementary question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Since the federal code of conduct does not seem to apply to the cabinet, how does the government expect to enforce ethical standards in the public service?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ethics are very important to the government. We show this in many ways every day when it comes to the cabinet and when it comes to the public service.

Dealing with the hon. member's rather tasteless metaphor about fish, obviously things have stretched quite a way down to the bottom of that party judging by his question.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Health Canada officials revealed today that the synthetic hormone somatotropin can legally be imported and used in Canada. Yet, the Minister of Health has tried to reassure the public by saying repeatedly in this House that the use of somatotropin is illegal in Canada and that cheaters would be punished.

How could the Minister of Health let us believe in the House that Health Canada had the situation under control when she knew that, through a loophole in the Food and Drugs Act, synthetic somatotropin could legally be used in Canada?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in our opinion, the current regulatory framework adequately blocks the use of bovine somatotropin in Canada. The example mentioned by the hon. member is a minor exception.

I am aware of the hon. member's concerns, but, up to now, they have been unfounded. We will continue investigating and, if we detect any problems, we will take the appropriate action.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that all of the members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which met this morning, share this concern about this minor exception. If she talks to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, she will realize that he is of exactly the same opinion.

• (1435)

How can the minister explain why, in the past year, she has taken no steps to plug this important legal loophole, now that the voluntary moratorium imposed by her agriculture colleague has expired?

[*English*]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the vast majority of people in Canada other than pharmacists or veterinarians it is illegal to import, to sell, or to distribute rBST.

To date Health Canada has felt that the regulatory framework that was put in place was effective in preventing the use of rBST in the country. If that is not the case we will take appropriate action.

* * *

BOSNIA

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, every report from Bosnia suggests that our peacekeepers can no longer do their job. The Canadian commander says they are "frozen in place".

In response, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said this morning that if our peacekeepers "are no longer able to accomplish their raison d'être then they will have to be evacuated".

Given the minister's statement, is the government now preparing the evacuation of Canadian troops from Bosnia?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): No.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we found out today that the government will be joining the Bosnia strike force. The presence of such a force is not in keeping with the peacekeeping mandate and has only two purposes: one, to join an escalating conflict as a combatant; or two, to facilitate the withdrawal of UN troops from the region.

Since the government is contributing troops to the strike force, does this mean it is abandoning its professed resolve for neutrality or is it preparing for withdrawal as we have proposed for the last six months?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know by reading reports from the NATO meeting a couple of weeks ago that the establishment of the rapid reaction force is a measure designed purely to assist UN personnel in danger. That is why it is being put together.

Whether a country is part of that or not does not lessen the fact that the UN force is there not in a belligerent capacity but as one leading the search of peace. That is Canada's position. We intend to stay and finish the mandate unless it becomes absolutely impossible for us to continue. The Prime Minister has made that clear in the House many times.

While it is true that in the last few weeks there have been some considerable difficulties in helping to discharge the mandate we believe the situation can be resolved.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Seventy five per cent of all consumers are against the hormone somatotropin. The dairy industry is demanding that the moratorium on its use be extended, and, this morning, the Standing Committee on Health passed a resolution for the renewal of the moratorium for at least two years. With 15 days left to go before the end of the moratorium, the Minister of Agriculture is still undecided regarding the issue.

Will the minister admit that we are talking about something bigger than the minor exception that the Minister of Health would have us believe, something which more closely resembles a gaping legal loophole which permits somatotropin to be used in Canada, and will he admit that, in the short term, the only thing that will protect consumers who want to drink milk that was not produced using somatotropin will be an extension of the moratorium?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has referred to the provisions in the Food and Drugs Act and the regulations promulgated under that act which is legislation under her jurisdiction. She has indicated quite clearly what the provisions of the law and the regulations provide. She is quite correct to indicate that the possibilities of importation are exceedingly limited to certain specific individuals and certain specific cases. The answer given by the Minister of Health is completely accurate as to the facts.

She has also indicated that on further review if the legal framework appears in any way to be inadequate to properly deal with the situation, then that legal framework can be strengthened.

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us stop beating around the bush. My question was very clear.

Does the Minister of Agriculture acknowledge, yes or no, the right of citizens to drink natural milk that was not produced using hormones, and if so, what is he waiting for to announce that he will extend the moratorium for as long as is needed to guarantee consumers that they will be able to drink unadulterated milk, in accordance with their wishes?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last year, on the recommendation of the agriculture committee, we undertook in co-operation with all of the interested stakeholders, including many in the private sector, a task force investigation of a variety of facts surrounding rBST. We did that following the advice of the agriculture committee to provide more information, to get all of the details on the table so that everyone could be fully informed on the issue.

The one important piece of data which remains to be concluded and provided is a critical piece, which is the scientific regulatory review of the health aspects with respect to rBST. That is presently being studied by the Department of Health. Until the Department of Health is satisfied with all the health and safety issues, then obviously no notice of compliance will be issued.

* * *

NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today the Correctional Service of Canada released its report on the September 5, 1993 murder of 25-year old Dennis Fichenberg.

Fichenberg was murdered by Paul Butler, a federal inmate who was on day parole at the time of the murder. At the time of sentencing Butler was considered to be a psychopath and at the time of his release he was described as a high risk offender with a high potential for violence. Butler, however, was able to stay on day parole despite committing numerous violations over the six-month period he was on parole.

Is the Solicitor General satisfied with the way the correctional service and the National Parole Board handled Butler's release?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the parole board is an independent

quasi–judicial tribunal, operating at arm's length from the minister, who has no right under the law to interfere in its decisions.

However, I want to say that the investigation report which was released had recommendations for change and a correction in the situation to help prevent it from taking place again. I want to ensure that these changes are put in place because, like the hon. member, I do not want to see this kind of thing happening again.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is some suggestion that Butler was able to maintain his day parole status because he had previously been an informant for the RCMP.

Was Butler's freedom due in part to the intervention of the RCMP and is the minister satisfied that the RCMP acted in an appropriate manner?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the report of the investigation into this matter says that the parole board applied the criterion of the protection of the public as its main guideline.

I am not in a position to comment on the RCMP's involvement or non–involvement in the matter.

At the same time, this happened before the government took office. I want to ensure, in so far as I am able to do so, that the circumstances which led to this tragic occurrence do not happen again. I am glad to have the hon. member's concurrence in this concern of mine.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food.

As the minister knows, for more than a year now the whole farm safety net program has been studied and reviewed. Can the minister tell the House, the hundreds of farmers across Carleton—Charlotte and the thousands of farmers across Canada what the status is of the study and when we can expect to see its results?

• (1445)

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through most of 1994 we were discussing the future shape of agricultural safety nets with farm organizations and with provincial governments.

In December 1994 we achieved unanimous agreement among the federal government and all of the provinces with respect to the principles to underpin the future design of safety programming in Canada.

At the moment our officials are working on the drafting of an omnibus memorandum of understanding hopefully to be signed in due course between the federal government and all of the provinces outlining the basic components of the safety net structure for the future, indicating the necessity for trade compatibility and production and market neutrality.

We want to ensure interprovincial fairness and balance. We want to achieve a cost sharing ratio of about 60 per cent federal, 40 per cent provincial. We want to achieve national consistency across the country with sufficient provincial flexibility to meet local and regional objectives.

We think we will get there. The memorandum of understanding is very well advanced.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEFENCE INDUSTRY CONVERSION

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry has consistently refused to set up a genuine defence conversion program and has cut the few resources remaining in the budget for the defence industry productivity program, which has had serious consequences for Montreal. In fact, Pratt & Whitney, a leader in Canada's aerospace industry, is planning to move its research centre.

Does the Minister of Industry realize that by refusing to set up a genuine defence conversion program, he is denying the Quebec aerospace industry an opportunity to develop its technological capability and thus undermining its ability to compete?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the hon. member on the interest he has shown in the broader issues of technological development here in Canada. I am very much aware of the problem concerning Pratt & Whitney, which has been discussed in the media.

I want to say to the hon. member that in the budget, which of course reduced the funding available for this program, we promised to review it. Cabinet intends to discuss the broader issues of technological development, and I am looking forward to hearing what the hon. member has to say about these programs.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the almost British phrasing of his reply, the minister did not answer my question.

My question is: Since Ottawa funded 18 per cent of Pratt & Whitney's R and D investments over the past ten years, mainly for military applications, why does the minister now refuse to support civilian applications of the company's research? Why does the minister refuse to help a Quebec company? That is the question.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I may remind the hon. member that Pratt & Whitney is not exactly a Quebec company. It is a multinational that also has plants in Halifax and Lethbridge, Alberta. The issue is one that is important to all regions in Canada.

I would also like to point out that during the past decade, Pratt & Whitney Canada received nearly $525 million from the federal government, and we are committed to giving the company another $91.2 million during the next four years. So we did not exactly forget Pratt & Whitney.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the road blockade beside Adams Lake still remains in place today.

Eighty–six days after it was started by the three native bands involved there have been at least two episodes of violence involving criminal charges. Last week a bridge into a provincial park was burned.

Does the minister of Indian affairs still insist he must be specifically invited by the parties involved before he will take action?

• (1450)

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated in the House on several occasions both by me and by the solicitor general, policing in the province of B.C. is in the jurisdiction of the RCMP under contract to the province of B.C.

On this specific road there are three scenarios. The best case scenario is that it is a public road to the reserve. The second case is that the owners on the other side have the right of way and then they can sue. The worst case scenario which my hon. friend seems to be moving toward is this land is owned totally by the First Nations. If that is the scenario they are entitled to close off the road on their land like any owner in Canada.

I am hoping we can work out an arrangement with them so people can get to their premises. We are prepared to work with the province of B.C. which fortunately we do in many situations. We will help out in the facilitation. Those are the facts and all the rhetoric in the House will not change those facts.

The problem was it was an archaeological dig. The person who did it was supposed to comply with the mandate from the province. That person did not. That person has been written to and still has not complied.

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the problem goes beyond that. The federal government was supposed to have been involved a long time ago on the signing of that road, as the minister knows.

He has also been contacted by the B.C. aboriginal affairs minister, Mr. Cashore. He was informed on April 13 this should be treated as a top priority by this minister. He has also had that request from aboriginals and from the property owners.

I know nothing comes easy to this minister. Unfortunately that is the only thing he is good at. When will he acknowledge his responsibility under the Indian act and get involved?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all that happens is I get the same question and I give the same response. I will respond again.

The province is negotiating with the band. Hopefully a deal will be made but enforcement is a provincial responsibility. Does the hon. member want us to take the RCMP back and go into B.C. and enforce that?

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

This week has been designated as national public service week, a time to recognize and celebrate the contribution federal public service employees make to the country.

At the same time, however, the government is in the process of cutting 45,000 jobs in the federal public service. How can the government justify having a week to celebrate the accomplishment of its employees while at the same time taking away their jobs?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these are challenging times for the public service as we carry out a downsizing brought about by the need to cut government spending in order to meet our deficit reduction promises.

Our employees are dedicated, committed people and I think they deserve recognition. They have carried out a great many innovations. There are many examples of excellence in the work they do and I do not think there is any better time to celebrate the fine work done by the public service.

The public service of Canada is among the best in the world.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SINGER EMPLOYEES

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

Former employees of Singer in St. John say that the federal government failed to meet its contractual obligations toward them by paying the surplus that is part of their pension fund to the employer rather than the workers.

Further to the question by the Bloc on June 1, which has yet to be answered, will the Minister of Labour once and for all correct the federal government's error in connection with the Singer employees?

• (1455)

[*English*]

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter and report to the hon. member as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the question was asked over three weeks ago.

My supplementary is also for the Minister of Labour, who was elected to answer questions in this House. How can the Minister of Labour, by refusing to intervene quickly in the matter, allow herself to be an accomplice in this injustice to the former employees of Singer, whose average age is 80 and who are hoping to finally achieve justice after so many years of struggle?

[*English*]

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely irresponsible on the part of the hon. member to use occasions like this to play cheap politics.

If the hon. member would review the responsibilities of the Minister of Human Resources Development he would find it is the responsibility of that minister. To attack the Minister of Labour, and I know exactly where you are coming from on this issue—

The Speaker: I ask hon. members to please address the Chair.

* * *

FAMILY INCOME

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian families are right; Statistics Canada has made it official. Family incomes after taxes have fallen 6.5 per cent in real terms since 1989; 2.1 per cent in the last year surveyed. Canadians are fed up with the performance of the economy and rightly blame the federal government.

Will the minister accept the blame for the decline in family income and change the policies responsible?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

The statistics he refers to ended in 1993. There was an election that year and since that time there have been some half million new jobs created in the country. The statistics for 1994, the first year of our mandate, will show a substantial rise in family incomes in Canada.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, since 1981 tax freedom day, the day when people's annual incomes go into their pockets, has advanced 73 days. The Fraser Institute announced that this year it is on July 5. The tragedy is that the ever higher taxes we all pay do not get us more services, they pay interest on our staggering debt.

When will the government close the bottomless hole for our tax dollars by cutting the debt and getting Canadian families once more to enjoy increases in after tax incomes as they had for decades before the deficit became out of control?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate that question because that is exactly what the government is doing. It is reducing the deficit, bringing it to 3 per cent of GDP in the third year of our mandate, on the way to a balanced budget. That means a falling debtload and lower taxes will follow when the time comes.

* * *

CUBA

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the acting Prime Minister.

Canada has maintained broken diplomatic relations with Cuba for 50 years and has established very important trade and investment links. In contrast, the United States has maintained an inhumane embargo that has had disastrous implications for the people of Cuba.

Today American politicians are once again threatening Canadian companies with trade links to Cuba with blacklisting. I ask the acting Prime Minister if he can tell this House whether the Prime Minister will be raising this issue at the G–7 meeting this week and condemning the U.S. blockade of Cuba and condemning the bullying of Canadians and Canadian business by the United States.

• (1500)

Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to this question.

One part deals with the Helms bill. The minister and the government are on the record as being opposed to this bill. We are encouraged that the U.S. administration so far has clearly indicated that they also have some concerns about that piece of legislation.

On the second part of the hon. member's question, which deals with action that might be taken against Canadian companies doing business in Cuba, we have not received anything officially on this matter. As soon as we receive anything we will take appropriate action in the interest of Canadians and Canadian businesses.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. John Loney (Edmonton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence, the minister responsible for the Emergency Preparedness Canada agency.

Southern Alberta has recently suffered the most devastating flood damage in decades. The cost of restoring this part of my home province to a pre–disaster condition will be considerable. Has the Province of Alberta asked the minister for assistance? If so, has the minister directed Emergency Preparedness Canada to offer its help as Alberta tries to recover from this disaster?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government does provide assistance through a program called financial assistance arrangements. The province of Alberta this morning did apply for assistance with respect to the very serious problems it has had in that province in the last few days. That application will be considered in the normal way according to the normal formula. I do not anticipate any problems in complying with the government's request.

The financial assistance is usually directed toward the cost of replacing public infrastructure, but also does have application for individuals, farms, and businesses for the essential parts of their homes or businesses that have been destroyed by floods in this particular case.

The Speaker: My colleagues, that would bring to a conclusion the question period.

I have a question of privilege, which will be raised by the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED MEDIA MISREPORTING

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege dealing with newspaper articles that affect my longtime good relations with and my respect for all colleagues in this House of Commons.

In my nearly 30 years in Parliament I have never met with anything as vicious and low as what I am about to quote to this House from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* and the Toronto *Star*. These statements undermine my good relations with all members of this Chamber.

In today's Toronto *Star* the following quote appeared: "When Hopkins sat down at lunch at the Liberal table in the parliamentary restaurant yesterday following the caucus meeting, the other MPs sitting there left within minutes".

Secondly, from the *Globe and Mail* is the following quote: "The bitterness among Liberals could be seen even at the parliamentary restaurant when Liberal MPs started moving away from a table after gun–control dissident Leonard Hopkins sat among them".

The truth is that I did not have lunch in the parliamentary restaurant at all yesterday. I did not sit in a single chair in the parliamentary restaurant yesterday morning, noon, or night. Obviously the Toronto *Star* and the *Globe and Mail* did not either.

These articles are completely inaccurate and are nothing but fabricated stories with no truth or foundation whatsoever. Not even *Frank* magazine has treated me like this. These kinds of fabricated stories originating from whatever cheap source are obviously designed for despicable undermining purposes.

I would respectfully request that you review these items, and if you find that I do have a prima facie point of privilege I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion.

• (1505)

I want to thank all members of the House for their attention during my remarks.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: My colleagues, our colleague for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke has made his point. I do not know that it needs any elaboration. His reputation in this House has been impeccable for some 30 years. It has not been affected.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it being Thursday I would ask the government leader to kindly give us an idea of the business of the House for the week to come.

[*English*]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide the weekly business statement.

The first bill we will deal with this afternoon is Bill C–41, the sentencing legislation. After six hours of debate, pursuant to an order of this House we will vote on the motion for third reading of this bill.

Our next priorities are completion of the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C–69, concerning redistribution; completion of report stage of Bill C–85, the pension legislation; and the report stage of Bill C–89, the CNR bill.

We are also eager to make progress on Bill C–87, regarding chemical weapons; Bill C–86, concerning the Canadian Dairy Commission; Bill C–82, regarding the mint; Bill C–91, concerning business development loans; Bill C–88, regarding internal trade; and a number of other bills that have been placed on the public record several times over the past week.

I hope this will help hon. members to plan their time between now and tomorrow. Actually I should say between now and June 23. We will be happy to continue our consultations with the opposition parties on the arrangement of House business and the making of progress on legislation in a way the public expects from us.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

The Speaker: My colleagues, I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received, which is as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable John Sopinka, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 15th day of June, 1995 at 5.15 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: My colleagues, I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C–81, an act to amend an act respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.

* * *

• (1510)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I apologize for being a little slow in getting to my feet after the question was asked of the government House leader.

I wonder if the House leader might expand on the government's intentions as to how many bills it plans to deal with tonight before the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that a motion for extended hours was approved by the House. Therefore, we intend to use the time as fully and as fruitfully as possible to achieve as much progress as possible on important legislation in the public interest.

If my hon. friend would like to discuss this further, I am sure I or the deputy House leader or the chief government whip would be happy to carry on consultations behind the curtains.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C–41, which we debate today at third reading, represents a culmination of 14 years of effort to achieve comprehensive reform in the sentencing process as part of Canadian criminal law.

Since 1983 we have had recommendations for substantial reform in the area of sentencing from a royal commission, from the Law Reform Commission of Canada, from the Canadian Sentencing Commission, and from an all party committee of this House, which as long ago as 1988 unanimously recommended many of the measures that are reflected in the bill that is before Parliament today.

At long last, in Bill C–41 we have action to implement practical changes to reflect the recommendations of such long standing from broad areas of Canadian society, meaningful reform, meaningful improvement in the process of sentencing in the criminal law.

[*Translation*]

The bill states, for the first time, the purpose and principles of sentencing to be used by the courts in sentencing an offender.

Its statement includes the fundamental purposes of sentencing and the principles the courts are to apply in setting the sentence of adult offenders.

The bill provides for a number of changes to procedure and evidence at the time of sentencing. These changes will make it possible to include in the Criminal Code the practices sought by courts of appeal, proposals set out in previous legislation and the suggestions by the Law Reform Commission.

The bill includes provisions that allow the provinces to establish programs of alternative measures for individuals charged with an offence. Included in the bill at the express request of the provinces, these provisions are based on similar provisions in the Young Offenders Act and are intended to draw on the provinces' experience in developing and administering programs of this type.

[*English*]

Among the fundamental purposes of this bill is to codify and legislate for the first time in Canadian law a statement of the purposes and principles of sentencing.

• (1515)

Until now, as hon. members know, the sentencing process has been guided and determined by principles developed only by the courts. While the common law system has produced cogent statements of those principles by judges across the country, the commissions, the committees and the authorities to which I referred at the outset have all recommended for years that those purposes be legislated by Parliament for the purpose of uniformity.

In this bill Parliament is given the opportunity to declare the key purposes of sentencing, to put before judges a list of factors to be taken into account, to provide direction to encourage uniformity so that the purpose of the process can be properly understood and so that it might be rendered more predictable than it is at present.

What are those purposes and principles? They are spelled out clearly and in plain language in the statute. The sentence would reflect the seriousness of the offence. There would be similar sentences for comparable crimes. Those who contravene the criminal law must face punishment. They should be separated from society where appropriate. Rehabilitation should be one of the objectives to be achieved. Similarly in passing sentence the court should take into account factors that either aggravate or mitigate the sentence such that they are fairly considered in the process.

Let me touch briefly on some of the main elements of Bill C–41 as I believe it improves the sentencing process in place at present.

First of all, let me touch upon the perspective of the victims of crime. In relation to victims, I refer to the changes to section 745 of the code, a section which has achieved some fame in this Chamber as a result of challenges to its continued existence.

That section provides that where someone is serving a sentence with a period of parole ineligibility longer than 15 years, after that period they can ask a court to permit them to apply for parole notwithstanding the extended parole ineligibility. The change in that section contemplated by C–41 would obligate the court on such an application to hear from the family of the victim so that they have an opportunity to have an impact on that process.

Bill C–41 also broadens considerably the rights to restitution in the criminal law so that victims and the rights of victims to compensation become a regular part of the sentencing process. Compensation for victims will now be dealt with as part of the normal process of sentencing rather than requiring special application.

The restitution provisions in Bill C–41 would allow the enforcement of a restitution order for the benefit of the victim in the regular civil courts. The making of a restitution order would in no way limit the right of the victim to sue for damages.

Bill C–41 also improves the present process with respect to the payment of fines when fines are imposed as a penalty in the criminal process. The fact is that today there are too many people taking up space in jails and prisons because of the non–payment of fines. It simply does not make sense to spend more to keep them there than the state would have gained upon the payment of the fine imposed.

This bill ensures that the court will determine in advance of imposing a fine the ability of the offender to pay. It provides that if the person cannot pay, alternatives such as requirements to perform community service will be considered and imposed. It also provides for the use by the provinces of their own mechanisms, since each of them have them in place, to collect fines that the court assesses. It provides that instead of jailing someone for not paying a fine. Provinces may exercise powers to withhold licences or privileges to encourage or require the person to pay what the court has ordered. As a result of all of the measures which I have just summarized, prison will be a last resort for the non–payment of a fine.

• (1520)

Another of the areas in which Bill C–41 achieves improvement has to do with probation as a sentence, a very common sentence in Canadian criminal law. Bill C–41 lays out a process to ensure that the courts have access to more and better information at the time when they are imposing that sentence, information by way of pre–sentence reports which will tell the judges and the courts more about the offender.

Bill C–41 provides for an increase in the penalties for breach of a probation order. It provides for greater clarity and cogency in the conditions which apply to probation.

Another innovation in the bill is the introduction for the first time in the context of adult sentencing of alternative measures. By providing for this instrument, the federal government is responding to requests made by the provinces themselves. Each province will have the right to set up and administer its own process of alternative measures.

For offenders who are before the court for the first time, never before having committed an offence and are facing charges of a

less serious, non–violent nature, the system will provide for taking that person out of the court stream. As long as they acknowledge their wrongdoing, alternative ways of ensuring that they learn the lesson will be established. These measures will free up scarce and valuable court time for the more serious offences where the need is greater.

A separate and different innovation which Bill C–41 introduces is the concept of the conditional sentence. It is a new form of sanction available where the court imposes a jail term of less than two years. It permits the jail term in effect to be served in the community rather than in a prison. This would be done under strict conditions which the court can impose and under close supervision if necessary. In a manner which is less costly to the state and more likely to result in a positive outcome, the court can impose strict conditions. Breach of these will require the offender to show cause and effect why the offender should not then be brought to prison to serve the balance of the sentence in custody.

Finally, Bill C–41 provides for a comprehensive and cogent statement of the rules of evidence and procedure for the sentencing hearing itself. It collects for the first time in one place in a readable and usable fashion, the rules of the sentencing hearing: the burden of proof; the powers of the court to obtain additional information pertinent to the sentencing process; a requirement that judges give reasons for their sentence. In every case society will know what logic or rationale lay behind the penalty imposed. There is also a provision so that we know plainly and clearly what the rules are governing the sentencing process to add greater fairness and greater consistency in the way courts go about doing their business.

Bill C–41 is a broad and comprehensive measure to introduce progressive, sensible and sound changes to the criminal law, to act upon longstanding recommendations made for many years by independent bodies and by a committee of the House, effecting real improvement to this vital part of the criminal justice system.

I commend the House committee for its careful work on the bill. The committee heard from many witnesses. It worked very hard clause by clause examining the bill and all of its measures. I believe the bill was improved considerably as a result of the effort and the care which was taken by the committee.

• (1525)

Just as was the case when I appeared before the committee and as was the case when I spoke in the House at second reading, there is one feature of the bill which dwarfs the others in terms of the attention it has received and the controversy it has created. It is section 718.2 of the bill which deals with aggravating circumstances that the court should take into account in determining the appropriate sentence.

Section 718.2 of the Criminal Code as contemplated by Bill C–41 would provide that one of the principles that govern the sentencing process in the criminal courts should be that a court that imposes a sentence shall also take into consideration the principle that the sentence should be increased or reduced to account for relevant aggravating or mitigating circumstances. Those circumstances may relate to the offence or to the offender. For example, if someone was a first time offender or if someone was a repeat offender, those circumstances would respectively either mitigate or aggravate the sentence the court gives.

The section goes on from that general statement upon which I just elaborated to provide more specifically. It says, without limiting the generality of the statement to which I have just referred, that certain factors shall be deemed to be aggravating circumstances and the court therefore shall take them into consideration. The section provides that evidence that the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based upon the race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or any other similar factor shall be deemed to be an aggravating circumstance.

Of course this is the section that has attracted the attention of those who criticize the approach. It is important for us first of all to bear in mind just what the section does and how it operates. This has nothing to do with policing or punishing the way people think or the views they hold. It has nothing to do with the freedom of thought or the creation of thought police to govern the attitudes of individuals.

The section is part of a sentencing bill in the Criminal Code to assist the court in determining what the punishment should be when it has already been established in the court that a crime has been committed. All it says is that after it has been proven that a crime has been committed the court should consider aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Where it is proven that the person was motivated in committing the crime by hatred, bias or prejudice, then that shall be taken into account as an aggravating factor.

Among other things the inclusion of this provision in the bill complies with a commitment made by the Liberal Party during the 1993 election campaign. On page 84 of the red book, in a promise that was elaborated upon in specific statements made by the Prime Minister to equality seeking groups, the Liberal Party undertook to amend the criminal law to provide this kind of protection to vulnerable groups who are typically the victims of hate motivated crime.

Beyond that, if one needs further justification for the statement of what one would have thought was simply a sensible proposition, one need only look to the increased incidents of crimes of this type. Every major group among identifiable minorities reports in recent years a troubling and significant increase in hate motivated crime, among them B'nai Brith which has told the Department of Justice that there are now over 40 organized hate groups in Canada. Religious groups and minorities are clearly worried, as well they

might be, that the existence and the activities of these hate groups are undermining the social fabric of Canadian society.

• (1530)

There is further evidence of the rise in such crimes. Police departments across the country have established hate crime units devoted exclusively to investigating and acting on crimes of this nature.

In testimony before the Quebec Human Rights Commission one group referred to the American experience where one in five gay men and one in ten lesbians reported being the victim of aggression and one–third of all respondents said that they had received threats of violence.

Police forces in Toronto and in Ottawa have recently reported that hate crimes based on sexual orientation represent the third largest category of hate related offences.

I suggest to the House that the need for this legislative intervention is clear. We have drafted the section to provide for specific reference to characteristics that are commonly targeted in crimes of this type, specifically referring to race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, and sexual orientation.

Why do we include the list? It has been alleged by some that we have selected certain groups or certain characteristics in order to give special treatment or special protection, that we are conferring special status upon specific groups. It is not the government that has selected these groups for special status. It is not this Minister of Justice who has identified these groups for special treatment. It is the hoodlums and the thugs who have identified them for special treatment. It is the criminals and the punks who go out to find them to beat them up who have selected them for special treatment. It is this Parliament that has the opportunity today to respond to those hoodlums and those thugs by showing maturity and by showing a preparedness to be logical and to do what is required.

The rigour of logic leads us to this approach. The evidence in front of us compels us to act. Common decency requires that we furnish through the criminal law a means of dealing with this thuggery.

If we are speaking of special status perhaps we should remember that if gays and lesbians, for example, have a special status they have a special status to be targeted, to be beaten up. If there are members who care to share that special status I am sure it could be discussed. The only special status that is on that list is vulnerability. The only special rights we are talking about here are the rights to be targeted. The very purpose of this legalisation is to redress that unfairness.

As long ago as 1977 in the Ingram case in the Ontario Court of Appeal the senior appellant courts of the country recognized that targeting someone, attacking them, victimizing them in crime based on a characteristic such as sexual orientation was an aggravating factor to be taken into account in the determination of sentence. This provision merely codifies that altogether sensible rationale and introduces it into the Criminal Code that we might achieve uniformity across the country.

When criminals target another and commit a crime against a person or a person's property based upon race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation, they have committed a crime not only against the individual. They have committed a crime that has an effect on the entire group.

• (1535)

American laws in states of the United States where such laws exist are commonly called laws against crimes of intimidation because the offender knows that the effect of the act is not only to harm, to frighten or to affect the person who is at the end of the punch or the kick. It is to intimidate every member of that group who is intended to feel more vulnerable the next time they walk down the street. That feature of such a crime distinguishes it and justifies the approach contained in Bill C–41.

We have referred to sexual orientation. We have not found it necessary to define the term because its meaning is clear. Since 1977 the term has been included in human rights legislation in eight provinces and territories in Canada. There has never been any difficulty in interpreting or defining or applying that term as it is found in those provincial and territorial statutes. No question has ever been raised about what it means.

In the gay bashing crimes about which we have heard too much in recent years, the offenders, the thugs and the hoodlums who target people because of their sexual orientation, have no difficulty knowing what they are looking for when they drive downtown on Saturday night hunting for someone to beat up because they think they are gay or they are lesbian.

It should be stressed that the responsibility of parliamentarians in dealing with legislation is to use logic and reason in assessing the legislation's merit. I earnestly hope that we will be spared the observations that Bill C–41 is a gay rights bill, that Bill C–41 has to do with traditional family values in Canada, and that Bill C–41 confers special status for purposes of benefits or any other purpose.

Bill C–41 is a criminal law bill which amends the Criminal Code. It deals not at all with human rights, access to benefits, the right to marry or adopt. It has to do with the sentencing of people who have been proven to have committed crimes. It has to do with determining the nature and extent of the sentence having regard to the societal value of discouraging hate motivated attacks. It

provides an opportunity for Parliament to make a statement that that kind of attack will not be tolerated and that we stand together in condemning hate motivated crime.

I commend the bill to my colleagues and ask them to support it. In the last several days we have received expressions of support for this exact provision from the United Church of Canada, B'nai Brith Canada, the Canadian Jewish Congress, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the chief of the Ottawa police force, the chair of the Ottawa–Carleton Regional Police Services Board, the Centre for Research Action on Race Relations, the Urban Alliance on Race Relations, the chief of the metropolitan Toronto police force, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the mayor of the city of Toronto, and on and on.

These responsible participants in Canadian society perceive the problem that the bill is intended to address and agree on the efficacy of the approach taken in section 718.2. I urge my colleagues to see past the smoke and the disguise of false characterizations, to look at what the bill does and at what the section achieves, and to support the government in these meaningful and important measures to deal with a rising social problem in the country.

As we approach third reading let reason prevail. I ask members of the House in all parties to join with the government in doing something to improve the criminal law in general and in particular to demonstrate a resolve no longer to tolerate hate motivated crime in the country.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, talk about sentencing reform is nothing new. The consultation process that started 10 years ago has finally led to today's third reading debate on Bill C–41, which deals with sentencing. This outcome was preceded by acrimonious debate.

The statement of principle underlying the bill is a step in the right direction. The maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing just sanctions, together with other crime prevention and law enforcement initiatives, fully deserves my support. In addition, innovative measures aimed at decriminalizing some minor infractions, alternatives to incarceration, and suspended conditional sentences will reduce prison overcrowding and focus sentencing on rehabilitation rather than incarceration.

That said, I think it is essential to stress that the bill will have a major impact not only on the accused before the court but also on the general public.

Sentencing is one of the most important steps in the criminal justice process. Contrary to what many people believe, most people charged with crimes do not go on trial. The vast majority of them plead guilty as charged. Their only experience of our criminal system is often limited to a brief appearance before the court for sentencing. Most charges laid are settled out of court as a result of plea bargaining. Without this process, the judicial system would clog up to such an extent that, the way things currently stand, it would cease to function to all practical purposes.

As a result, the accused pleads guilty, hoping that his lawyer will negotiate a reasonable sentence with the Crown. Any agreement reached between both parties is submitted to the judge. The judge is then free to approve or reject the suggestion made jointly by the defence and the Crown. The defense may also ask for a presentence report that the judge will take into consideration before handing down his sentence.

The public pays attention to two things: the verdict and the sentence. The majority are not concerned about the technical side of what lawyers do. They want to know whether or not an individual is guilty, and what the sentence is. The sentence does not just involve the accused, but the public in general. The appearance of justice, the setting of an example, clemency and the dissuasive effect of the sentence are all important aspects in the determination of the sentence.

Despite the importance of sentencing, the Criminal Code has never given any exhaustive direction to judges. They exercise complete discretion and have full powers as to the nature and the severity of a sentence. The applicable law in sentencing is written by judges and not by the legislator. This is the classic example of the judge–made law that is part of our Anglo–Saxon heritage.

Through their interpretation of the law and the moral authority they wield, judges help to shape and develop the fundamental values underpinning society. Unfortunately, and I will go on condemning it, women are chronically under–represented in the judiciary. Lynn Smith, the dean of the University of British Columbia's faculty of law laid out the problem clearly in an article entitled "A system that is changing".

• (1545)

It contains the following eloquent passage, and I quote: "The roots of the legal system were put down by men. They were developed in an era when women were not allowed to vote, to stand for office, to be lawyers or to sit on juries. The law was there to protect interests that men held important, that were consistent with the realities of their lives as men. Although the law may be said to take the situation of women into account, nonetheless an entirely masculine perspective underlies our legislation".

The majority of the approximately 1,400 judges handing out sentences are men. The overwhelming majority of federally appointed judges, those sitting in the provincial higher courts or in the Federal Court, are men. Of a total of 950 federal judges, only 134 are women. All come from a privileged socio–economic background. The accused appearing before them are rarely as well connected: they are not always men.

The majority of women who find themselves before the bench are unemployed, on welfare, or possibly working part time. Most judges are unfamiliar with the conditions in which the women appearing before them live. Ninety per cent of women serving a prison sentence have been found guilty of minor property offences, such as shoplifting. They are also sent to jail for non–payment of fines.

It is clear that women in the prison system are a particular clientele. They are not usually there for violent crimes, which brings me to one of the great weaknesses in this bill. Clause 718 identifies one of the main purposes of sentencing as the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society. This is a very worthy goal but may be difficult to achieve. And in order to achieve it, we will have to get rid of the gender and class bias of some of our judges. Our magistrates will need some very clear guidelines.

It is surprising that those who drafted the bill did not bother to consider the characteristics of the accused at the time of sentencing. In fact, except in the case of aggravating circumstances associated with crimes motivated by hate or involving abuse of trust, nowhere does Bill C–41 oblige the judge to consider the degree of indigence or the gender of the accused.

Women who come before the courts tend to be different as a group from male offenders, one factor being the type of offences women commit. Their behaviour is not the same and their goals are different as well.

If, at the time of sentencing, the judge makes no allowance for these differences, his decision will inevitably be unfair. Equity does not mean equal treatment. Two identical sentences for the same offences do not carry the same stigma for men and women.

Many women who have been in trouble with the police have already experienced very serious problems as a result of poverty, spousal abuse, family breakup and the fact that in most cases, women end up with the responsibility for a family.

Judges must be made aware of these factors. This problem will be solved when we have as many women as men on the benches of our courts of justice. It is up to the Minister of Justice to administer the remedy.

• (1550)

One of the cornerstones of the bill is the alternative measures for adult offenders. If the province provides for a system of alternative measures, instead of being prosecuted, the adult offender would be ordered to participate in a training program or authorized community services. The conditions and restrictions that apply to the alternative measures program proposed in the bill are almost identical to those in section 4 of the Young Offenders Act.

For instance, offenders will have to accept responsibility for the act or omission and fully and freely consent to participate in such a program. The Crown has full discretion to proceed with prosecution of the offence if it feels there is sufficient evidence and the interests of society so justify.

However, and as usual in the case of federal legislation, it will be up to the provinces to implement these alternative measures. In fact, it will be up to the attorney general of the province to set up a system of alternative measures. Provincial legislation from coast to coast does not necessarily guarantee uniform implementation across the country.

There is no provision for implementation in this bill. Because the federal government conveniently chooses to ignore the need for mechanisms to implement its own legislation, the onus will be on the provinces to implement the system, and they will have to deal with all the start up problems.

This kind of implementation will create provincial and territorial disparities which may cause other provisions of the bill as well as the bill's philosophy to be ignored. In fact, how can we expect to have sentencing parity across the country, if some regions have no alternative sentencing system or are unable to put one in place? Someone who commits an offence in a region where there is no alternative sentencing will not be able to use it, and this part of the bill then becomes ineffective.

Offenders who happen to be in the wrong province will have different sentences. For similar offences committed in similar circumstances, some people will get different sentences, which goes against the principle set forth in clause 718.2.

The range of sentencing available to the judge includes the suspended sentence. Under this system, it is possible to grant individuals a stay of sentence and to allow them to do their time within the community, provided they respect the conditions imposed by the court. Such a stay will only be available to individuals declared guilty of a crime for which no minimum prison sentence is set and sentenced to less than two years.

Suspended sentences only confuse matters more. Judges already have the discretion to suspend the passing of a sentence and to put someone on probation for a specific period. A suspended sentence will have the same effect as suspending the passing of a sentence and putting someone on probation. Same difference. The Minister of Justice would have been better advised not to waste his time reinventing the wheel.

Bill C–41 does, however, innovate in the area of victims' rights. Under clause 722, the judge is obligated to take into account the victim impact statement at the sentencing hearing stage. Hearsay will be acceptable under oath, and, if the victim is deceased or is unable to make a declaration, his or her spouse, relative or anyone who has taken responsibility for the person, may make a statement for the victim.

This important development has made up for all the times that I denounced the minor role that the victim played in legal proceedings until I was blue in the face. But, this should only be the beginning.

• (1555)

Victims must take their rightful place in the courts and not just be regarded as crown witnesses. The Daviault case is a sad example of the foibles of our system. Henri Daviault was recently acquitted, for lack of evidence. The case made quite a stir and prompted the Minister of Justice to table his bill on drunk defence. But the victim died in 1993. Despite the order for a retrial, the crown no longer had a witness and the judge was obliged to acquit Daviault.

Was justice served? The victim cannot give testimony from the grave and the victim's statement cannot be used as evidence now. Daviault is now a free man and we will never know what really happened. The victims of criminal acts must be included in the criminal court proceedings. They should no longer simply be crown witnesses. They should be entitled to representation by counsel and be able to cross–examine the accused, if the individual decides to testify. Victims should be able to call their own witnesses.

The rules on hearsay evidence in a trial should be relaxed in favour of the victim. In short, the system should not further traumatize the victim, who has already been subjected to the violence. Twenty years after the first shelters were opened in Quebec, violence continues to be perpetrated against women. Our society's biggest challenge is to put an end to this scourge.

This violence is not only physical; it can be psychological, emotional, economic and social as well. Spousal abuse is another scourge that must absolutely be stopped. Although the reason is obvious, the problem remains. Most of the members of this House continue to turn a deaf ear, unfortunately. They simply reflect the attitude of a society that indulges spousal violence.

Obviously, most say they are sensitive to violence and do not approve of deviant behaviour. A number also say that spousal violence is reprehensible, but look for an excuse for the disturbing attitude of the aggressor. He was drunk, for example. This approach fosters social acceptance of spousal violence. There are always two sides to the coin in our mind. We try to understand the aggressor and we blame the victim. The implication is, generally, that a man has reasons for abusing his wife, and that the victim's reaction does not meet our expectations.

In criminal law, when the courts have to deal with spousal violence, the sentence is too often lenient when the aggressor is found guilty. And for good reason. The pre–sentence report, which significantly affects the judge's decision, contains a distorted analysis of the problem. The report is limited primarily to analyzing the personality or the history of the aggressor. With this sort of analysis, the system is playing the aggressor's game.

The individual is relieved of responsibility, and the sentences such behaviour deserves are avoided. I contend, therefore, that, in all cases of spousal violence, however serious, the fact that the victim is a spouse or a former spouse should be considered an aggravating circumstance thus requiring a stiffer sentence. Former spouses are all too often the victim of both physical and psychological aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I realize you must intervene at 4.00 p.m. I will therefore turn the floor over to you and perhaps continue afterward.

* * *

• (1600)

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House resumed consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries; and of the amendment.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: My colleagues, I asked a little earlier if the whips would confer on the deferral of this vote. The Chair would always prefer that these decisions be made in harmony after consultation. To my knowledge no decision has been made by the whips of any of the parties.

I saw the video tapes earlier today of exactly what took place. I have satisfied myself that the acting whip of the Bloc Quebecois proceeded in the normal and accepted fashion. I have reviewed what the government whip had to say with regard to this point and I have taken into consideration what the whip of the Reform Party said in the House.

I want to make one thing clear to all hon. members. It is the purview of the Speaker to make this decision. I will tell you how I am not making it. I am not making it on first past the post. It would be unseemly, in my view, to have the whips running up to the table and knocking each other down. This is, after all, the House of Commons and we should have some decorum. Because the decision has been placed on my plate, I have decided and I order that the vote on this particular amendment take place at 11.30 p.m., Monday, June 19.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the former spouse is too often the victim of both physical and psychological abuse. When couples break up, the built–up tension too often degenerates into violence. The former spouse is a special case, because the abuser often blames his victim for the failure of the relationship.

With respect to spousal homicide, which is an extreme form of violence, the probability that a woman will be killed by her husband is nine times higher than the probability that she will be killed by a stranger. Separated spouses, however, are much more at risk.

In the case of couples living together at the time of the murder, four times more women than men are killed. This 4:1 ratio goes up to more than 10:1 for separated couples. These statistics are inescapable and alarming: for every man killed by his ex–wife, 10 times as many women are killed by their ex–husbands.

The results of this Canada–wide survey on spousal abuse, in which over 12,300 women participated, were published in March 1994. This survey gives a picture of spousal violence that is troubling, to say the least. Because violence against current or former wives is disturbing, we prefer to ignore it instead of facing reality. It is high time that this House sent a clear message to violent spouses, the vast majority of whom are men. The message to the judges looking at the circumstances surrounding violent crimes against spouses must be just as clear.

I am talking not only about physical abuse but also about psychological abuse, which produces lasting, detrimental effects. Put–downs and insults are as devastating a weapon as slaps and punches. They inflict deep wounds that never completely heal.

• (1605)

The national survey published last year was aimed at testing theories on the links between physical and psychological abuse. About a third of the women who were or had been married at the time of the survey said that their spouses or former spouses had been psychologically abusive. Fifty–nine per cent of former partners were considered psychologically abusive, compared with 17 per cent of current partners.

Although physical abuse does not necessarily go hand in hand with psychological abuse, both types were used in most cases. Three quarters of the women who described themselves as victims of physical or sexual abuse said that they were also victims of psychological abuse. Eighteen per cent of women not experiencing physical violence at the hands of their spouses said they were the victims of psychological violence.

The principle forms of violence described by the women surveyed were pushing, grabbing, shoving, followed by threats to hit, slapping, having objects thrown at them, being kicked, bitten and punched. A good number of women were also battered, sexually assaulted, strangled, hit with an object and threatened with a gun or a knife. Rarely was only one form of violence reported.

The Bloc Quebecois proposed an amendment that covered all these forms of violence. In fact, by defining assault as it is defined in section 265 of the Criminal Code, we have included the application of force against a spouse, the attempt and the threat to apply force. The definition applies to all forms of assault, including sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party, causing bodily harm and aggravated sexual assault. Unfortunately, our amendment was not accepted.

Almost half of women victims of violence have been injured. The most frequent injuries were bruises, in 90 per cent of cases, followed by cuts, scratches, burns, and various degrees of fracture. Almost 10 per cent of injured women said they had suffered internal injuries and miscarried.

I would like to quote Mr. Justice Jean–Guy Boilard of the Superior Court of Quebec. When sentencing the accused Fouad Ghazal last Thursday in the district of Hull, the judge, speaking to the accused who had murdered his wife, said the following, and I quote: "Spousal violence is a repugnant crime that has become one of the major concerns of our society. It would be utopian to think we can eradicate it. However, the sentence must reflect society's reprobation of this crime".

I hope all members of the bench agree with Mr. Justice Boilard.

To get back to the sentencing bill, the debate, as I pointed out the day before yesterday, was distorted from the outset. Most speakers zeroed in on the expression "sexual orientation" which appears in clause 718.2 of the bill. This clause deals only with the circumstances the judge should consider at the time of sentencing. As I said before, this is not a new charter of rights.

There is no justification for the concern expressed by some members that an individual will be punished more severely. All forms of violence must be punished. If the victim is attacked as a member of an easily identifiable group or as an apparent member of such a group, this is clearly an aggravating circumstance and the punishment should be severe.

• (1610)

At the insistence of the Bloc Quebecois, clause 718.2 now contains two additional factors, so that national or ethnic origin as well as language are now part of the list.

We felt it was imperative to send a clear message to the courts to punish crimes motivated by prejudice based on language. A person has no right to abuse a francophone because he speaks French, and this applies to all language minorities in Canada. I hate violence in any form, and I particularly hate violence motivated by prejudice, the most damaging of all.

Violence against women is the most obvious example. I therefore support unreservedly a bill that identifies the gender–based bias of the aggressor as an extreme example of a morally reprehensible attitude. We have every right to disagree with some of the provisions of the bill, and we have the right to express our opinions. However, some opinions make me fear the worst.

Not so long ago, the debate centred on discrimination against Blacks and visible minorities in general. Bill C–41 is an indication that our society is moving in the right direction, towards civic responsibility and tolerance. Violence in any form must be condemned. The consequences of crimes motivated by hate are profound. There is not just one victim. There are many. Every member of these groups becomes a victim.

This is a situation that cannot be tolerated. We each have to choose the kind of society we want. And I have chosen to live in a society that condemns violence.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before resuming debate, I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C–44, an Act to amend the Immigration Act and the Citizenship Act and to make a consequential amendment to the Customs Act.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr Speaker, I am glad to speak for the last time on this bill in the House. No doubt I will be speaking about it in many places across the country as people contact me by phone, letter and fax to express their concerns and ask questions about the form it has taken as it leaves the House on its way to the Senate for final approval or amendment.

I would like to touch on three areas in Bill C–41. I want to look at the alternative measures. I want to look at that part which deals with section 745. And of course I want to touch briefly on section 718.2. Perhaps I could start there.

The justice minister took considerable time to dwell on what has been known as the hate category. It is unfortunate that many parts of the bill have been overshadowed by concern for what is in this particular part. We have to examine the bill from the viewpoint of whether it is a good bill or whether it is a bad bill, whether it is good legislation or whether it is bad legislation.

I submit with respect that this is not a good bill and that it is bad legislation. I will attempt to justify my concerns in my address and intervention this afternoon.

• (1615)

The bill does not deal with the cause of hatred. It does not deal with the cause of prejudice or with the cause of bias. It does not deal with those issues which give rise to frustration, anger, stress and fear which I submit humbly is the mother of hatred.

We see the government passing legislation that creates anger, fear and frustration. All we have to do is read the letters we receive on Bill C–68, on Bill C–41 and on the MP pension bill. That is all we have to do to see what the government is doing to contribute to the degree of anger and frustration across the country.

The bill is not attacking the cause. It is not alleviating those fundamental feelings that result in bias, prejudice, hatred which eventually express themselves in human acts, one human against another.

When I was growing up and going to school in Saskatchewan in our community there were people from all ethnic groups. There were ethnic jokes, Ukrainian jokes and jokes against the English and the Scottish and the French. Almost every one of those jokes was a putdown. Although they were humourous they were still putdowns and yet they did not bother any of us because we all knew we stood equal before the law.

After all was said and done we all stood equal before the law and that is what is being destroyed. At least the sense of that is being destroyed; that the government is introducing legislation creating special rights for special status for some citizens. That is what will create a bias. If one grants special rights and special privileges to individuals, one will see other individuals resenting that. They will see the bias and the prejudice occur.

I go back to the example that comes out of the United States where a school teacher went into her classroom Monday morning and said to her students that all the brown eyed children in her class are special, they have a higher IQ and they are smarter. She saw the result. She saw the friendships drop off between the blue eyed children, the brown eyed children and the others. A week later she came in and said she made a mistake. It is not the brown eyed children who are the smart ones, it is the blue eyed children. She sat back and watched what happened.

She saw the prejudice. She saw feelings that produce bias, prejudice, anger and frustration develop within that classroom. I am saying this bill is not eliminating those feelings. It is aiding and abetting those feelings.

If it is creating the impression in the minds of people across the country that people are being granted a special category or a special right, we must all feel we stand equal before the law regardless of our race, our colour, our language and regardless of our chosen style. We must all feel we have the protection of the law and we stand equal before that law, that those who administer the law, and the political forces will recognize that and never deviate from that principle.

When we look at the alternative measures, what do we have? What do they mean? Alternative measures in the bill suggest we will segregate violent offenders and non–violent offenders from the court system and from the penal system. That gives me great concern. There are many cases which ought to be handled outside the criminal justice industry, as I refer to it, and the penal system. I was a peace officer for 14 years and most of the minor incidents which I came in contact with never reached the courtroom because I considered the court to be the last resort.

• (1620)

I am not unmindful of the principle contained here and the power and the strength of it which is expressed in what we call alternative measures. However, it should be directed. There should be a division between non–violent and violent offenders.

The bill does not create that division. One of our hon. colleagues from across the way discussed during report stage that this will allow violent offenders to receive the treatment provided for under the alternative measures. We will see the state, those who administer the law, given the right to allow violent offenders, those who have attacked others, not to be subjected to the court system or to the penal system.

When it comes to non–violent offences such as theft of property or wilful damage of private property or public property where there is no threat to the life or safety of individuals, I can understand looking at the possibility of dealing with that individual, particularly a youth, in a manner as outlined under alternative measures.

When we entered an amendment at committee stage to segregate violent offenders from this alternative, of course there was no consideration given to our amendment and it was defeated by the Liberal side. That is wrong.

This is a bad bill, poorly drafted. I do not think it will achieve the results and provide for a safer society. To me, with respect, it is more of a political statement, a politically correct statement, than an effective piece of legislation.

When the Canadian Police Association appeared before the standing committee this is what it said about the bill:

> Bill C–41, with few exceptions, is unwieldy, complicated, internally self–contradictory, duplicitous and, what is worse, in almost all of it completely unnecessary for anyone with any knowledge of it or use for the common law heritage of Canada.
>
> While it would attempt to codify basic sentencing principles, eliminating this most basic judicial discretion, at the same time it would bestow huge new discretionary powers to a whole range of persons within the justice system. The common thread in those new powers is that all are to the benefit of the offender in the sense of non–custodial consequence for criminal actions.
>
> While sentencing reform calls for protection, this bill offers platitudes. Where it calls for clarity it offers confusion and outright hypocrisy. It will almost certainly cause the already skyrocketing criminal justice budget to expand further still.

To continue with this theme, I received a letter from the executive director of the Canadian Police Association, Mr. Newark, dated June 13, 1995. In part, Mr. Newark wrote:

> I have taken the liberty of writing to you in the last hope that practicality might intrude on what appears to be a predetermined decision to see this legislation passed. I should add, at the outset as some of you may know, that the perspective of this letter comes from rank and file police officers who work in our nation's courtrooms on a daily basis, and my own personal experience as a trial prosecutor for 12 years.
>
> This bill attempts to codify some, and I emphasize only some, of the basic principles of sentencing which evolved in our courts over the last hundred years or so. It is a classic example of bureaucratic arrogance which assumes that using a particular phrase or sentence will somehow make everything constant and in accordance with "principles" determined as valid within the federal Department of Justice.
>
> When I first saw this bill, which was in 1992 as Bill C–90 from the Tory regime, I was convinced that it must have been drafted by people who had never seen the inside of a court room other than as an academic observer. My subsequent investigation has proved that to be correct which is far from comforting. No matter what one's view of how sentencing should occur, this bill's approach of attempting to redefine principles will result in endless litigation which will add millions of wasted dollars of expense to a system that is now struggling to make more efficient use of existing resources.
>
> Even the much publicized sexual orientation clause is an example of how unnecessary this bill is. Section 718.2 merely directs that an offence motivated by any of the listed factors, including sexual orientation, shall be viewed as an aggravating factor by the sentencing court. Has anyone, ever, cited a case where a court said it was not an aggravating factor? Any such judicial position would be an error of law and it is so obvious that in my time in court I never encountered or heard of such a suggestion

and indeed, to the contrary, all sentencing texts or digests dealing with current practice recognize such motivation as an aggravating factor.

In short this controversial section is completely unnecessary. It has always been my observation that while unnecessary legislation is generally unwise, it is especially so when dealing in criminal law—I would ask that you keep in mind that both our association and the chiefs of police (and, by the way, every crown attorney I've spoken with) opposed the passage of this bill.

Bill C–41 is a badly drafted, inconsistent, self–contradictory bill which is truly the creation of a bureaucracy which unlike elected representatives has no constituency or ultimate accountability.

• (1625)

This letter was written by the executive director of the Canadian Police Association and those are his comments and opinions about the bill.

Also within the letter he indicates this viewpoint is shared by the chiefs of police and the crown attorneys he knows and has talked to and also the peace officers. I find it very strange the justice minister embraces the opinion of the chiefs of police and the Canadian Police Association with regard to Bill C–68, the gun control bill.

The minister has regularly and repeatedly used them as support for pushing through the gun control legislation. However, when it comes to Bill C–41 their opinion is no good. Why is their opinion fine and sound and wise on support of Bill C–68 or portions of it and unwise and unacceptable on Bill C–41? There is an inconsistency here that escapes me. It simply escapes me that the justice minister would use these organizations, their opinions and their support to justify one bill but would completely ignore their scathing denunciation of Bill C–41. I would like to place that on the record.

• (1630)

This bill also relates to section 745 of the Criminal Code. Section 745 of the Criminal Code allows first degree murderers or those who have been sentenced to over 15 years imprisonment the opportunity for early parole or at least to apply for a reduction of their parole ineligibility after serving 15 years. Of course it applies mostly to first degree murderers.

I ask: What is a human life worth? What is a fair and just penalty for someone who has premeditated and deliberately taken the life of an innocent person? What is a fair and just penalty for that?

When the government removed the death penalty from the Criminal Code we received the assurance that society would be protected by a term of life imprisonment for those convicted of first degree murder and that they would have no eligibility for parole for 25 years. However, at the time I suggest 99 per cent of Canadians were unaware that section 745 was created and placed in the Criminal Code.

Yes, hon. members can say that it was debated here in the House but it was debated before the proceedings were televised. I suggest that very few people were aware that section 745 was placed in the Criminal Code and what it meant. I suggest it was a betrayal if not a deception on the part of the government of the day against the people of this country. My office has received calls and letters from people indicating clearly they were not aware of what the government intended when it introduced section 745 into the Criminal Code.

We introduced an amendment to this bill that would strike section 745 from the Criminal Code entirely so that a life sentence would mean a life sentence. At least that would place a greater sense of worth on a human life and when someone deliberately with premeditation and intent took a human life there would be a penalty to pay. Regardless of whether there is rehabilitation, regardless of whether there is remorse of any sort, the penalty must be paid. We are saying it ought to be exactly what the government promised in the seventies when this change was being considered. We moved to strike that. I oppose Bill C–41 on that basis as well.

In summing up I would like to go back to the business of violence in society which has led to a categorizing of individuals. This bill would have the courts impose a greater penalty for certain crimes. If I am assaulted because someone hates me and if I fit within the categorization in this bill, my attacker will receive a greater penalty. If I do not fit within that category, then my attacker may not receive a greater penalty. That is the crux of this whole concern as far as I am concerned. It is creating status by categorizing groups of people. I think it is wrong.

• (1635)

As I said before, what will create bias and prejudice quicker than anything else is for example by my telling you, Mr. Speaker, that because you have brown eyes you are not as good as I am because I have blue eyes and I do have blue eyes. We must avoid that at all cost. This bill does not avoid that. We are moving to the edge of a slippery slope when we begin by statute to create special rights for groups of people.

If we want to reduce the degree of hate crimes within our country, this bill does not contain the power to do it. How do we eliminate those emotions that give rise to hate and to hate crimes? In all of my lifetime the only way I have found to do that is by understanding and love. Only one thing will replace hate in the mind and heart of an individual from my experience.

I grew up in my family of seven brothers, my mother and my father. I have raised a family of four with my wife. We have gone through the gamut of feelings and emotions, including frustration, anger, bitterness, all of those negative feelings every human being is subjected to. I know that if I do not sit by a warm heater when I am cold I am not going to get warm. If I do not open my mind and heart to the feelings of love from my family, my neighbours and my colleagues, the bitterness even of this place that comes to me from time to time will get the better of me. I see traces of this.

The hon. member from the Bloc spoke about psychological violence. I hope I am not out of place, but I have to ask what kind of psychological violence occurred in the Liberal caucus when their leader, the Prime Minister of this country, used words to say: "You must do as I say and if you do not this is what is going to happen to you". This was said to grown men and women who were freely elected in a democratic election by the people of this country. What happens?

There are two types of violence. There is the physical violence, which this bill attempts to address and I think fails miserably, and there is the mental violence. I often think the mental violence is far worse because it precedes the physical violence. Unless we look as a Parliament at the causative factors that lead to bias, prejudice and hatred, we as elected officials are not going to be successful in dealing with the problem. If we begin to create those things that will frustrate me and frustrate my children by saying that they are not equal in the law with all other Canadians, we are on a slippery slope.

I go back to my childhood days when yes, the ethnic jokes were there and the put downs were there, but we did not mind. Why? Because we knew we stood equal before the law. As soon as that changes—and we can look at countries that do not have laws which allow people to stand equal before the law, where there is special status and special rights and privileges—we will see the anger, the frustration and the hate.

With respect this bill does not address those factors. If the justice minister feels that by introducing a category of groups of people who will receive special treatment at the hands of the court over people who are not categorized within those groups, I think it is wrong. I am also absolutely amazed that the justice minister, who portrays a great degree of intelligence, could bring forward this kind of a document. I cannot support it.

• (1640)

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering, with unanimous consent, whether I could put a question to the hon. member with respect to his speech. I know that for his speech there is no provision for questions, but I am wondering if we could have unanimous agreement to put a question to him.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the request from the hon. member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the hon. member who worked very hard in the committee. In his speech he suggested that there were provisions in the bill that would give priority to people with brown eyes and blue eyes. He said that the bill might favour people with blue eyes as opposed to those with brown eyes or brown eyes as opposed to blue eyes, that one would be in a more favoured position than the other. That is not correct. I would ask the member to look at this once again.

The bill states, for example, hate based on race. It does not state that any one race would have precedence over another. They are all equal. In other words, if the violence was committed against whites it would be subject to the provisions of this bill, as would violence committed against blacks or against people with yellow skin. No group is given priority over the other.

With respect to nationalities, it states nationality. It does not state English over French or English over Polish. It states religion. It does not state Jewish before Catholics or Catholics before Presbyterians. In other words, there is no prioritizing of any of the groups. They are all equal.

All races, all nationalities, all colours, all religions, all sexes, all ages, all mental or physical disabilities are equal and all sexual orientations are equal. If people were to attack heterosexuals they would be protected by the provisions of this bill as would gays and lesbians.

The member was in the committee when the Canadian Bar Association and the Barreau du Québec, very eminent lawyers, made that very exact submission. How can he say that the bill favours one group over another when it obviously does not? It is in very general terms and no one group is favoured over another. That was the evidence presented to us by the eminent lawyers who appeared before the committee.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the intervention from the hon. member is appreciated but he misses the point.

My point is that there are categories. He has mentioned the categories. Inasmuch as I fit into that category, then I am protected. What happens if I do not fit into that category and I am assaulted? The member for Wild Rose asked that if he is attacked by someone who hates fat people, what category does he fit into? That category is not there. If I am attacked and assaulted because I am a member of a particular political party, which I am, where in the bill am I protected? I am not because that is an excluded category.

I understand what the hon. member is saying but that was not the point I was making. The point I am making is that as soon as we start to make categories we had better not stop because there is an unlimited number of reasons that people are angry and hate other people. Whether they are fat, or ugly or just simply irritable for some reason or another—

An hon. member: Or rich.

Mr. Ramsay: Yes, rich or poor perhaps. That is the point I am making. I thought my point was clear, but if it was not then I hope that the intervention made by my hon. colleague will help clarify it.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On this important debate, I just wanted to ask the Speaker to check and determine whether quorum is present in the House.

• (1645)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I see a quorum. We will resume debate. We will go to the next stage of debate where members will have 20 minutes for their interventions subject to 10 minutes of questions or comments.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time. I am glad of the opportunity to speak to this bill. I am excited about what Bill C–41 means and seeks to accomplish for all Canadians.

This follows years of law reform commissions that have spoken clearly on the need to find a purpose and principle for sentencing. This justice minister and this government is finally doing something about it.

I do not understand why it is that third party members of the House oppose the bill with such vitriol and emotion. What do they disagree with? That is what I would like to know. Do they disagree that sentences should denounce unlawful conduct and deter others? Do they disagree that sentencing where appropriate should separate the offender and safeguard society? Do they disagree with rehabilitation and accepting responsibility for one's crime?

Surely they must agree that reparation to the victim as a first priority is important. What is there to disagree with? Is it that the punishment must be proportional to the severity of the crime and to the degree of responsibility of the offender? Would the third party have us give generic sentencing regardless of age of offender or gravity of crime?

Should a nine–year old be as culpable as a 25–year old? Should traffic violations be punished in the same way as second degree murder?

Excuse me if I wax sarcastic here but the purpose and principle of sentencing in the bill are so logical, so common sense, that I have a hard time understanding what the opposition is about.

There are three other provisions of the bill that I would like to address today: first, the section of the bill which provides for measures that are alternative to incarceration; second, those aspects that address victim's rights in the sentencing process; and third and most important, I will speak to section 718 of the bill that lists among other things aggravating factors that would lead to an increase in the severity of the sentence.

Alternative to incarceration is logical. It is sensible and it says in a nutshell in language that even I, who am not a lawyer, can understand that one ties sentencing to the severity of the crime.

It simply says that people who present no threat to society should not be incarcerated and should be offered an option for conditional sentencing, that they should pay their dues within the community with due supervision, to do community and victim restitution.

If a fine is involved—one–third of people in provincial jails are there purely because they could not afford to pay their fines—and they cannot pay, the provinces can revoke licences or permits or they can set up a formula for repaying the fine in hours of restitution to the community.

If third party members do not believe in the common sense and fairness of this, surely they must agree with the economic logic. It saves the taxpayer the expense of incarceration.

The second part of the bill that I want to talk about, section 745, deals with the victim and sentencing. The impact of crime on the victim, the family and the caregiver is going to be important and it is going to be held and taken into consideration in sentencing.

It helps the offender to see the real effects that the impact of the crime had on real people. Surely that fulfils the principle of responsibility of the offender because it makes an offender directly responsible to the victim, to pay restitution to the victim or family. It places this as a priority above all else.

I do not understand what it is that a third party whose members sit in the House and tout themselves as the advocates of the victim over and over could disagree with this part of the bill.

Finally, I want to speak to section 718.2 of the bill. It is the most controversial part and the third party members really oppose it if we want to get down to brass tacks. It takes into account the aggravating factors in sentencing. These are simple and clear. They are: crimes of abuse, of position, of trust or authority. These would be seen as an aggravating factor. I will read this. "Evidence of the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or any other similar factor".

• (1650)

I want to pick up on two terms: evidence, and any other similar factor. I have heard it said in the House by third party members that we are on a witch hunt. We are paranoid. We are going to charge anyone who beats up on anyone because we are going to think it is done because of hate. However there has to be evidence after the person has been found guilty that it was done because of hate. That is clear.

We just heard the previous speaker mention the fact that he felt we were setting up separate lists of people and giving certain people special status over others. He mentioned fat people. There is a part of section 718.2 which says similar factor. Similar factor takes into consideration anything which is missing from the list. The hon. member should really wonder about the whole thing. I wonder if he has read the complete bill.

I want to talk about why the members of the third party are concerned about this. If we want to take away the red herring of whether we include everybody or whether we do not include everybody, the clear fact is that what hon. members opposite oppose is the inclusion of sexual orientation. That is what they oppose. I want them to know that I applaud the inclusion of that term.

When I was a physician I saw many young men come into the emergency room with injuries from beatings inflicted because they were gay. Gay bashing in my riding is a favourite Friday and Saturday night sport when brave, macho males drive into town and identify men who are gay, or even worse, who they think are gay, and in bullying, frightened, drunken bravado afflict brutal harm on these people.

My son, when he was 17 years old, was coming home one night with a friend. He was waiting at a bus stop. Because he was with a male colleague who was in his class they were beaten badly. They were called faggots. Were it not for the fact that six people came down the street and stopped it, my son and his friend would have probably been brought into the emergency room dead. That is what I talk about when I talk about crimes inflicted on people because of hate. When a person commits a crime on another because of who they think they are, they inflict it on all the people who fit into that group.

I am sorry if I am getting a little emotional. This stuff happens. It is real. We can talk in the House about what the law says, about the fine points, about dotting the *i*'s and crossing the *t*'s and fiddling around with every word. But in real life, in the real world, that is happening every single day.

It is not limited to men in my riding. Lesbians have been the target of these night time cruises purely because of their sexual orientation, purely for that reason and for no other.

Have we learned nothing from history? In the very beginning the crusades were religious wars. More recently in Nazi Germany people were targeted and beaten because they were Jews. Those acts of violence, which were sanctioned by governments, did not begin as a war; they began as individual acts of violence, which escalated to group violence, which finally reached genocide.

Have we learned absolutely nothing from the past? Do we sit here in these seats in the House of Commons confident that because we are living in a diverse and tolerant society, because we have people in the House who are of different colours and religions, that we have progressed?

I sat here and I listened to the member who spoke very piously about setting up special status for people and giving them special rights. The gays, the lesbians and the bisexuals in my riding and in Canada have special rights all right. They have the right to be beaten up every Friday and Saturday night, to be denied the right to work, the right to live, the right to walk down a street, to go to a movie and to enjoy the things which members in the House take for granted.

• (1655)

What does the member who spoke so glibly know about hate and prejudice? The member is one person of a majority group in the House. He has status. He does not ever have to know what it is like to be vilified or discriminated against. I know what it is like. Just because my group is now accepted does not mean that I cannot speak for the groups that are not accepted.

Every day members of the third party get up in the House and bleat about how they are advocates for victims across Canada and how they speak for the rights of victims. Well shame on them for not supporting the bill. In doing so, they have abandoned the gays and lesbians of the country who are the daily victims of violence.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I come from a city in central British Columbia where we have a tremendous problem right now. Some young people that hang around together think it is fun to walk down the street and beat people. They do not take time to discriminate and find out what colour the person is. They do not take time to determine if the person happens to be a homosexual or take the time to check out the religion of their victim. They just beat people up.

Members of the Reform Party have been trying to say that the assaults they are committing are of no less severity than if they take the time to find out what religion their victims are, whether it is a homosexual or some other little group the government wants to put people into.

The member is trying to tell us that indiscriminate beating on someone just for the sake of beating, because they happen to like beating someone up, is not as severe an action if it had been someone who fits conveniently into some Liberal category. This is absolute nonsense.

I am led to believe that the member is apparently an intelligent person. How on earth can the member stand and tell us because a victim fits into some category the Liberal government wants to dream up because special interest groups got to it, that an assault in that category can be any more severe than an assault on any other category?

The problem is, when the Liberals were on their so–called fact finding mission, they took the time to invite every special interest group they could possibly think of to come and talk to them about the criminal justice system. They forgot one thing. They forgot to talk about Canadians as a whole. I use the word Canadian proudly. Everyone who lives in this country is a Canadian and is entitled to equal justice under the law no matter what colour or religion, whether they are homosexual, a Protestant or a Catholic.

For the government to suggest that because of a person's preference or religion or whatever, that a crime committed against them should be more severe than a crime committed against someone who is an ordinary Canadian is absolutely ludicrous and serves only to garner favour with special interest groups that put the government in power. Average Canadians are going to throw the government out in the next election.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Colleagues, I would like to take a moment to make an observation at this point. We are very early in a debate that has a maximum six hour limit. Usually there is an indication to the Chair when members are going to split their time. I do not have any indication yet of what the other parties might be doing, only that a large number of members want to participate in the debate.

• (1700)

When members are splitting their time they only get five minutes for questions or comments. To facilitate the participation of as many members as possible the Chair will try to maintain those time slots. If a member takes four minutes, ultimately the answer will be very brief. It is certainly up to each and every member. If he or she wishes to use the entire five minutes for questions or comments, so be it.

In this instance regrettably I will set the tone. I will ask the parliamentary secretary to use no more than one minute in her response because ultimately I should go on to the next speaker.

Ms. Fry: Mr. Speaker, I wondered for a while whether it was a question or a speech. The member asked how would I know it was an indiscriminate beating. My son has gone with girlfriends down those same streets at that same time in the city of Vancouver and has never been touched. He was called a faggot. That was the word used. That is a term used by the people who cruise. Its called going into town to gay bash. That is hate directed at a group.

I do not know if the member knows what he means by special interest groups. The bill deals with women, children, elders and victims. Now we are being told by members of the third party that women are a special interest group. Actually they have said that already. Now children are special interests and victims are special interests. Everyone is a special interest as far as members of the third party are concerned. They do not speak for Canadians. I do not know who they speak for.

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to speak on the important piece of legislation before the House today.

We have heard a lot about the legislation. I asked myself three questions when I looked at the nature of the legislation. First, what does the legislation do? Second, is it necessary? Third, are there any unintended or unfortunate consequences arising out of the legislation? We have heard a lot of talk about some unfortunate things that might arise out of the legislation.

What does the legislation do? It is a comprehensive revision of the nature of sentencing, something that has been advocated by law reform commissions, jurists and criminologists for the last 20 years. We have called out for a comprehensive, important revision of the standard under which sentencing will be conducted. This is an omnibus bill that addresses those issues. It is an extremely important bill that results from studies to grasp the nature of punishment that will prevent crime and at the same time rehabilitate. The bill is directed to that.

It is most unfortunate that discussion in the House has turned around section 718.2 which requires the court to take into consideration whether a crime was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on national origin, language, colour, race, religion, physical disabilities, sexual orientation or any other similar factor. Since third party members have spent their whole time talking about nothing but this and accenting it, let me turn to that question and deal with it.

Is there a need for this provision? Yes, there is. We have heard the parliamentary secretary speak. We live in the century of World War II and of the Holocaust. We can look at the former Yugoslavia about which we have debated in the House. What is taking place in Bosnia today is based on years of hatred brought on by sectarian strife, by people hating one another and holding one another in contempt. In the foreign affairs committee we heard from the B'nai Brith that knows something about this matter. You might listen to this, over there in the third party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I caution members that this debate has a great deal of sensitivity. It is a debate where there are some very strongly held views, and I know we want to conduct it in a respectful fashion. All interventions must be made through the Chair, through the Speaker, and not directly from one member across the floor to another.

• (1705)

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, our committee received a report from the B'nai Brith called "The Extreme Right: International Peace and Security at Risk". The report of some 350 pages shows that there are still virulent strains of anti–Semitism and racism present in the world which need attention. The report also draws a link between racism, anti–Semitism and homophobia. They are in accordance with the report one and the same thing. The report makes clear that they are the same voices that call for the elimination of people who are different.

When speaking of extremism in respect of the United States, the report indicated:

> A major focus of extremism is on homosexuality. Believers have every right to maintain that homosexuality is inconsistent with their theology, but when anti–homosexual campaigns move outside the church and in the public arena characterize gays as sick, disease ridden, perverted by choice, and unfit comrades for clean living solider boys then this is clear extremism. Gay Americans have become the major new scapegoat in their country, perhaps to an extent unknown in other democratic nations, and just as surely as Julius Steicher's *Der Sturmer* was a direct contributor to Nazi anti–Semitism with all that it led to, so arguably the homophobic outpouring from religious extremists leads to gay bashing and murder.

When I hear comments from members of the House about relativism and about characterizing one group as being outside the bounds of protection afforded by civilized society and refer to natural law, I think of that quote and I shudder. My natural law is found in the Supreme Court of Canada in Egan v. Nesbitt which holds that discrimination is outlawed in the country.

When members on the other side of the House talk about extremism and the problem of violent incidents, I could cite dozens of violent incidents in urban ridings in the country. In my own riding of Rosedale, like the member for Vancouver Centre, I know of people walking down Church Street and having had cars pull up and people jump out who have beaten them up, crying that they were gay.

In August 1989 Alain Brosseau, a young man who was perceived to be gay, was thrown to his death from the Interprovincial Bridge between Ottawa and Hull, which we can see from this building. His attackers testified in court that they were just out to roll a queer. One of the attackers stated that he had put an imitation gun "to the gay's head and he freaked out—I started laughing". Another of the youths dangled him upside down from the bridge, said: "Oh, I like your shoes", and then let go.

In this same city two strangers approached a man returning to Ottawa from Hull and asked him where he had been. When he gave the name of a local gay bar they remarked: "Oh, you are a fag" and beat him so badly that he was in the hospital for two days.

I heard cries from across the House as the former speaker was saying: "Give me a break". Nobody gave those people a break. One of the reasons they did not get a break was the sense that they were fair game as put out in speeches such as we have heard here that allow people to be attacked for their comportment, their religion or their race because they fall outside a tolerated group by certain groups in our society.

This is no longer tolerable conduct in a civilized society. We must not allow it to continue. We must address it in the criminal law. We must frame a criminal law that has as its source a notion of what civilized behaviour is about, which tells our citizens that if they go down this road they will be going into the dark hole that led Nazi Germany into the wars of the past that have ruined Europe. We live in a tolerant society. We live in a pluralistic society. Let us not be fooled by the suggestions put forward that the bill will somehow lead to unintended consequences like condoning pedophilia and other crimes.

The minister has agreed to an amendment which was legally not necessary but one which addressed the issue by saying that it would not make lawful any previously unlawful conduct. This was never a real suggestion. How could it conceivably be said when a judge is considering the appropriate sentence to hand down on a given case, the weight to be given to the surrounding circumstances to prevent further like crimes, that it is relevant? We must not forget that the bill deals with sentencing and how to prevent anti–social conduct. The judge takes these circumstances into account.

• (1710)

How could that conceivably ever lead to an increase in pedophilia, which is a criminal offence known to every judge? It is a total red herring. It has been raised by those who want to discredit the notion of a modern, compassionate, intelligent criminal law that seeks to root out or extirpate evils in society: hatred, racism, homophobia and other forms of intolerable civil behaviour.

We live in a land in which we have had the privilege of peaceful enjoyment as citizens of the country. We are fortunate. We can walk down every street generally free from fear. That is not to say, as members opposite have said, that if we walk around in the middle of the night we too might never be the subject of an attack. I do not deny that. It is a possibility.

However, I am asking members opposite and other members of the House to think of what the bill is doing for people who walk, every day of their lives, down the city streets and are targets of attacks that go to the nature of their humanity and the nature of their being. It is not because they happen to be a haphazard article of attack. The member for Wild Rose said he might be attacked because he was fat.

The member is quite right. I have been accused of looking too English and might one day be attacked for that. However that is not a risk that the member for Wild Rose or I take every day of our waking lives, knowing that we could be the specific targets of people's abuse just because of our human nature, our race or our religion.

This comprehensive sentencing bill was the result of years of study. Sociologists, criminologists and the most learned jurists of the country are trying to come to grips with how we can have a modern Criminal Code that will ensure that all Canadians will be able to live in this blessed land and be able to move into the 21st century in a pluralistic and tolerant society, one in which all of us can be proud to live with as much ease and security as possible in the modern, civilized society of today.

That is the reason I am proud to speak on the bill and I am proud to be a member of the government that has introduced it.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions I should like to put to the hon. member who is known to be an eminent lawyer.

Members of the Reform Party have suggested that in section 718.2 certain groups are favoured over others. For example, if people are attacked or a crime is committed against them because of their race, national ethnic origin, language, et cetera, they are favoured in sentencing over people who do not belong to the groups listed. In committee we amended that section to add the words "or any other similar factor" so that there would now be no limitation on the groups to be considered under the hate crime provisions.

Now, with that amendment made in committee, if people were attacked because they were bald, fat, Liberals, or Reformers, they would be taken up in the new wording added in committee "or any other similar factor". I would ask the hon. member to comment on that.

Second, it has been suggested that even if we were to include all other groups, why should we have a harsher sentence for a hate crime against a group than for a hate crime against an individual. Is it not true that if in the Criminal Code the maximum penalty for a crime is 10 years, 15 years or life—and I give the example of the Reform Party member of people in his town going down the street and beating up people because they are hateful, not because they are hateful against the group—the judge can give the maximum sentence? If it is 10 years he can give 10 years.

This clause states that if he was to give five years rather than the maximum he might give two more years; he might give seven years. If it is a crime against an individual, could the judge not give the full maximum sentence even though no hate under this section was allowed?

I will put those two questions to the hon. member.

• (1715)

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I think those are two very good questions from the learned chairman of the justice committee.

We are struggling here trying to understand our role as parliamentarians with respect to giving instructions to courts and judges on how to review these cases. The hypothetical case the member has put illustrates clearly that what the judge is being called upon to do is weigh this in his or her mind to determine the social evil there and be able to add to the sentence that would otherwise be handed down. There is no question that if the assault is particularly vicious and if the assault calls for the maximum penalty, the judge is perfectly at liberty to give that penalty to anyone who commits an assault.

We are seeking to give our judiciary the opportunity to send a signal to society. The purpose of sentencing is to send signals to society; it is not just retributive justice. The purpose of sentencing is to send signals to society as to what conduct is tolerable in a civilized society and to enable the court to give extra time for such behaviour to indicate to people that this type of behaviour will not be tolerated. That is precisely what the member's question illustrates, that we have here an opportunity that will enable our courts to speak to the issues and deal with them. In that sense, it is a very intelligent addition to the rest of the sentencing bill.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the connection I cannot get from the hon. member is when he says that when they do these things we are going to get tough and we are going to do this, and that will deter it. Well, for two years I have been saying that we have to get tough on people who murder or sexually assault people.

My friends from the Bloc say I want to throw everybody in jail, lock them up and throw away the key. My friends from the Liberal Party say no, that is not the answer. And now all of a sudden it is? What has changed? Why is it not applied to everybody when these laws are being made? Why say that this particular situation was motivated by that, therefore we are going to sock it to them, and this situation was motivated by nothing, so we are going to take it easy? One is just as dead as the other. The whole thing has to stop.

When are we going to address the whole picture and quit picking on little areas?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I have some sympathy with the member's position. There is no question that we do not want to tolerate the type of anti–social behaviour he referred to. But the member is totally ignoring the incredible importance in this of being able to deal with other social causes.

Mr. Thompson: They do it now. They already do it.

Mr. Graham: We have provisions in our Criminal Code that make it illegal, for example, to preach hatred against others. These are issues that go to the root causes in society.

Earlier I referred the member to the problems in the former Yugoslavia. We are looking at problems in the world today that he and I lived through as we watched a world war evolve and watched the hatreds in sectarian areas around the globe evolve. This bill is seeking to deal in an intelligent and I would suggest a very well thought out way the root causes of those evils, which extend beyond the consideration of the mere issue of violence to which the member is referring.

Criminal acts can be differentiated as one type of criminal act or another in terms of their anti-social consequences. This bill is telling our judges that is what they should look to. In that sense, I support it. It is intelligent and it is needed in the country at this time. The police in my riding are telling us that these types of crimes are on the rise and that this bill is needed.

Mr. Thompson: The police are telling you this bill is no good.

Mr. Graham: Believe me, the police in Toronto are telling us it is needed. The member is fooling himself if he does not understand that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I understand that, because of what is yet to come, I will not be able to talk for 20 minutes consecutively and that you are going to interrupt me to allow those who so desire to go to the Senate for Royal Assent.

• (1720)

Allow me to begin by saying that no party line or differences in parties could prevent me from thanking the minister in all sincerity today for his show of courage, firstly for having persevered, because we all know that if any bill raised controversy or stirred up heated debate, the bill that is now before us did.

I am very aware that the minister showed great courage, great compassion. Allow me to thank him, despite the fact that we belong to different parties. I thank him on three levels. First, as a parliamentarian, second, as a citizen, and third, as a homosexual.

I believe, and I hope that all of the terms I will use are parliamentary, yes, I believe that one would really have to be obtuse, stubborn or live on another planet to not realize that some people in our society are the victims of violence. Some people in our society are the victims of violence because they are homosexuals.

Some people may turn a blind eye to this fact, but that does not take away from our duty as parliamentarians not to do as they do. Therefore, I simply reiterate my thanks to the Minister of Justice. My sincere thanks for his courage. Obviously, I will not make a habit of it, but this is a case where sincere thanks are due.

I would also like to say, for the benefit of our Reform friends, that—we all must admit that they are actually quite clumsy in their efforts to understand this reality—it would be interesting for them to come spend a day with the gay community. I would also be tempted to say, if it is parliamentary, that they have actually been rather abrasive in their attempts to remodel Quebec's and Canada's democratic institutions.

It would be quite informative for our Reform colleagues to come and spend a day in the company of a number of spokespersons of the gay community, to cross their white picket fences and come to the gay part of town. I am giving them an open invitation.

I am the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, but just beside it, there is the riding of our Bloc Quebecois whip, a nice guy. His riding includes Montreal's gay neighbourhood. I invite them to drop in, if any of them wish to do the utterly logical thing, which is to try to really understand what it is all about.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We will continue this debate after our visit to the Senate.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Honour the Deputy to his Excellency the Governor General in the Senate chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to certain bills:

> Bill C-43, an act to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act and to make related amendments to other acts—Chapter No. 12.
>
> Bill C-44, an act to amend the Immigration Act and the Citizenship Act and to make a consequential amendment to the Customs Act—Chapter No. 15.
>
> Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts—Chapter No. 11
>
> Bill C-75, an act to amend the Farm Improvement and Marketing Co-Operatives Loans Act—Chapter No. 13.
>
> Bill C-81, an act to amend an act respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company—Chapter No. 14.
>
> Bill C-97, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1996—Chapter No. 16.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

I would just like to add that, before going to the Senate, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve had the floor in the debate on Bill C–41 at third reading, and we will return to this debate following Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Bernard St–Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ) moved:

That Bill C–317, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act (scabs and essential services), be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise in this House today to speak on Bill C–317, anti–scab legislation. This bill, which will amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act is aimed at preventing the hiring of scabs to replace employees on strike against or locked out by an employer covered by the Canada Labour Code and employees on strike in the federal public service.

• (1740)

The bill is also aimed at maintaining essential services during a strike or lockout at a crown corporation or in the public service.

As you know, the workers' cause is very important to me. That is why I tabled this bill in this House on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois. This bill would provide adequate protection to workers currently victimized by their employers' disloyal practices.

In Canada, more than 10 per cent of the labour force is subject to the provisions of the Canada Labour Code. This amounts to 217,600 workers in Quebec and over 1,083,000 in Canada.

The debate on the adoption by the federal Parliament of anti–scab legislation that would apply to organizations under its jurisdiction is nothing new. In 1980, the hon. Ed Broadbent, then leader of the NDP, tabled a private member's bill aimed at banning replacement workers. From 1981 to 1992, several unions called one after the other on the federal government to introduce an anti–scab bill.

Finally, in 1990, the Bloc Quebecois tabled, through my colleague, the hon. member for Richelieu, a bill aimed at prohibiting the hiring of persons to replace Crown corporation employees who are on strike or locked out. Unfortunately, this bill was defeated at second reading by only 18 votes.

In 1977, Quebec legislators passed what is commonly referred to as the Quebec anti–scab bill, which went into effect on February 1, 1978.

To understand the reasons behind this bill, we must go back to the early 1960s. In that era of great reforms, relations between the federal government and unions made possible a review of labour laws that led to a sharp rise in union membership. Unions gradually hardened their positions. In the early 1970s, in reaction to the Liberals' election and the imposition of their War Measures Act—as you will recall—, unions openly dissociated themselves from government actions. A strike by the coalition of public sector workers gave rise to a new union solidarity. Within a very short time, this solidarity moved into the private sector.

Afterwards, around the mid–seventies, there were some extremely turbulent strikes. I would point out the Firestone strike, the Canadian Gypsum strike and, particularly, the infamous United Aircraft strike.

It is the Parti Quebecois which introduced the concept of prohibiting the use of scabs.

A significant event happened a week before the bill was passed. During a strike at Robin Hood, a federally regulated company in Montreal, security guards opened fire on strikers and injured eight of them. The person who gave the order to fire was Robert Grynszpan. I am giving his name because, later, he suddenly reappears in the news.

In Quebec, since the anti–scab provisions were adopted, studies have revealed that disputes have indeed been shorter.

It is obvious that the Quebec legislation was not well received by employers. The Conseil du patronat, which was vehemently opposed to this legislation, received in 1991 permission to challenge it before the Supreme Court. However, it later decided to drop proceedings, considering that the climate of labour relations had changed since the provisions of the legislation had been applied. And this last part should really dictate the conduct of the present federal government.

The aim of this bill is not to impose on the rest of Canada legislation that is essentially Quebec's.

• (1745)

In Canada, the tendency seems to be to integrate the principle of prohibition of strikebreakers in labour relations practices.

Recent laws in Ontario, British–Columbia and at the federal level confirm that tendency. These two provinces and Quebec total more de 75 per cent of the population of Canada. Therefore, the majority of workers and employers are regulated by laws which prohibit the use of strikebreakers. Of course, the level of prohibition can vary but the principle remains the same and seems to be accepted by management as well as by labour unions.

In Quebec, a number of unions and employers agree that anti strikebreaker legislation has significantly reduced the number and length of labour disputes. They also recognize it has contributed to lowering the risks of violence on picket lines, which is good for both parties.

Conversely, the use of strikebreakers in recent years has only contributed to extending the duration of labour disputes. Statistics show that the more important labour disputes in terms of the number of workers involved are generally those where strike–breakers are used. It was also noticed that the longer a dispute lasts the higher the proportion of strikebreakers tends to get.

The strike of the Ogilvie flour mill in Montreal, which is still not resolved, is a good example. If I may, I would like to briefly remind my colleagues of a labour dispute that has dragged on and on for over a year now, and which could still last a rather long time if we do not act soon.

In January 1992, the collective agreement between the workers of Ogilvie Mills of Montreal and their employer, Labatt, came to an end.

In June of the same year, the Labatt's Brewery, then the owner of the mill, sold it to ADM Archers–Daniels–Midland Co., a U.S. multinational corporation.

From 1992 to 1993, negotiations to renew the collective agreement were unsuccessful, since the employer was presenting demands based on the working conditions that are common practice in the United States. Can you imagine?

From October 1993 to February 1994, the employer unilaterally imposed working conditions as established in its own proposal.

In February 1994, the union filed a complaint with the Canada Labour Relations Board on grounds that the employer was negotiating in bad faith. In fact, it was simply refusing to negotiate.

On June 6, 1994, a general strike broke out, involving 116 workers—I should add 116 families.

Only four days later, the employer hired scabs to replace these workers. Members should note that it did so through a federal employment centre. Can you imagine that?

I have here in my hands a copy of the ad that was posted in the Employment Centre of Verdun. I will take the time to briefly read some details that were given. It is really unusual.

Date: December 5, 1994, 2.18 p.m., Verdun employment centre. Job offer: forklift operator; $10 an hour; temporary; 40 hours a week, possible overtime. Where? Ogilvie flour mill. They even have the gall to request three to five years experience. But it does not mention whether its is three to five years experience as a fork lift operator or as a scab. There is a hidden anachronism. Further down, it reads: Attention, ongoing labour dispute. One cannot claim ignorance. Then comes the employer's address: Archer–Daniels–Midland Co. (Ogilvie Montreal), 950 Mills, Montreal, Quebec, H3C 1Y4. I will even give a phone number: 514–847–8522, and a contact: Francine Farmer. Attention, company on strike.

Mr. Speaker, this takes the cake. This is blatant proof that the government was in cahoots with a company which was hiring scabs during a labour dispute.

• (1750)

The Ogilvie flour mill is still operating, thanks to scabs, since this is not prohibited under the Canadian Labour Code. It continues to post profits and is using unusual security devices, including surveillance cameras, fences, security guards, to monitor strikers and bring scabs inside the plant.

What is at stake in the negotiations can be summed up as follows: the union's demands are quite simple—there are none. They are not trying to obtain additional jobs, to enhance job security in any way or to obtain any salary increases. The union's demand can be summed up in one sentence: to keep jobs the way they are and salaries at current levels, period.

We could not ask for a better employee attitude in today's climate. They have been very, very understanding. However, here are but a few of management's demands: first, the right to unilaterally modify hours. To put it in simple terms, this means: we will make you work when we want, how we want, how long we want, where we want.

Second, the abolition of seniority as a consideration in promotions and layoffs. In plain and simple language, the better you are at sucking up, the better your job advancement possibilities. I know no other term for it.

Loss of job security still means the same thing, so I will not repeat it. Elimination of notice prior to layoff. That means that when you leave for work in the morning, give your wife and children a big kiss, because when you come home that night, you may no longer be working for the same company and you will have nothing to say about it.

More contracting out: this means that you should not forget to tell your wife that it is possible that some guy from out of the blue will get hired to do the same job as you.

More term employees: this means that the possibility that some guy from out of the blue will come in to do your job is even more likely.

Fewer union rights: go back to my first scenario, which was the more you suck up, the better the chances of keeping your job.

Lastly, the meetings with a conciliator were fruitless. Just to make the discussion even more interesting, I would like to add that the famous name that I mentioned earlier, the current manager of the Ogilvie mill, is none other than Robert Grynszpan, the one who gave the order to shoot in the 1977 conflict in which eight strikers were wounded in Montreal. In 1977, in a democratic country which was not in a state of war, one man gave the order to shoot. Today, that same man is the manager of one of Ogilvie's factories in Montreal. He is free to walk the streets, like you and me.

Because they work in an industry which is covered by the Canada Labour Code, the unionized workers of the mill have been made to pay for the failure to prohibit the use of strikebreakers during a labour conflict under that same code. The mill's employees have often demanded that an anti–strikebreaker law be brought in for companies falling under the federal government's jurisdiction. Despite the promise he made in October 1994, the Minister of Human Resources Development put off tabling such a law in the House of Commons, as you will recall, until spring 1995. Also, the Minister of Labour, when she first took office, stated she would make it a priority.

• (1755)

This must have been left out of the red book. In other words, it is high time the government took steps to stop the kind of labour dispute where workers on the picket lines watch strikebreakers get their wages because the federal government is doing nothing to stop this blatant injustice.

Everyone has a right to be respected, and this applies to workers as well. They are entitled to a decent standard of living and to be respected as individuals who have certain rights. When an employer uses pressure tactics like hiring scabs during a legal strike, this puts an undue stress on the employees, increases the likelihood of violence and undermines the bargaining process.

The use of scabs merely leads to dictatorial and disloyal practices, collective bargaining unworthy of the name and poor labour relations that will have the effect of reducing the quality of service, while probably also adding to the ranks of the unemployed.

The use of scabs during a labour dispute automatically gives the employer an advantage. No wonder that employers who resort to this practice are in no hurry to sit down and bargain in good faith.

The case for introducing anti–scab provisions very similar to those in the Quebec Labour Code is quite straightforward. In Quebec, these provisions, introduced in 1978, have stood the test of time. After 17 years, they still hold true. Legislation in Ontario and British Columbia is in fact based on the provisions in effect in Quebec.

The purpose of this bill is to introduce a number of democratic principles that are now accepted in many countries, including ours, principles that we apply every day and which have repeatedly proved beneficial to the settlement of labour disputes.

The statistics show that since anti–scab legislation was passed in Quebec, the duration of labour disputes has decreased by 35 per cent, on average. That is something to consider.

The Canada Labour Code is certainly not perfectly equipped to settle disputes under its jurisdiction. One only has to remember the 1986–87 Voyageur bus strike; the postal strike a few years ago; the strike at the Port of Montreal, which is still fresh in our minds; the three month strike at QNS&L in Sept–îles last year; and, must I remind you, the infamous strike that has been going on for a year at Ogilvie Mills in Montreal.

Today, we are at the second reading stage. The members participating in the debate, who will have to vote later, must tell us whether or not they agree in principle with making social relations, labour relations in Canada more civilized. Then, if they want to make amendments, they can appear before the legislative committee and suggest all kinds of amendments they deem relevant or necessary. But, for the time being, we must look at the principle—I repeat, principle—of the bill.

We must wonder if Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia were justified in introducing a civilized labour relations system, which restored the real balance of power in negotiations resulting from labour disputes.

A strike broken by scabs is no strike but a right to strike hypocritically denied. Either we are for the right to strike, a basic right won by workers after many years of fighting, or we are against. If we are in favour, we will not undermine, either directly or indirectly, the workers' sacred right to strike, with which Canadian employers have learned to live.

Employers learned a long time ago about strikes, lockouts and the bargaining process. In Quebec, we have lived for 17 years with anti–scab provisions, and I submit to you that it would be a shame if this House refused to move with the times and bring its labour legislation into the 20th century, on the eve of the third millennium.

The Canada Labour Code must be updated and improved to meet today's needs and realities.

• (1800)

And the reality today is that there still are honest workers out there who, after having worked 15, 20 or more years for the same company, find themselves hitting the pavement on the strike lines simply to protect the benefits they have acquired over the years for themselves, it goes without saying, and for their families, or quite simply to protect their jobs. Every day, they see strikebreakers, scabs, take their place and take home their pay. This is unacceptable.

I would like to conclude by saying that this problem has already been resolved in three provinces which together represent 70 per cent of Canada's population. As this bill targets a small portion of this country's labour force, it is obvious, in my opinion, that the federal legislation must take into consideration provincial legislation and fill in the gaps between the existing laws. It is high time, in my opinion, that federal legislation take a step forward and restore pride in work and dignity to workers.

[*English*]

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the debate on Bill C–317, a bill to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act which, if enacted, would prohibit the hiring of replacement workers by employers during a legal strike. The bill also contains provisions which are intended to ensure that essential services are maintained in the event of a strike or a lockout in a crown corporation and in the public service.

While this bill proposes changes to both the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act, my comments on this bill are confined to those changes which would affect the Canada Labour Code.

The two specific proposals advanced by the hon. member pertain to the institution of collective bargaining. If I may, I would like to spend a few moments outlining my views on this institution. In a nutshell, I believe in collective bargaining because it works and because it is an institution that promotes democratic decision making.

If one were to go through a copy of the Canada Labour Code, one would find at the beginning a preamble to part I, the section that deals with labour management relations. In my view, this preamble articulates in a very eloquent way why we need and why we have a system of free collective bargaining in this country.

The preamble refers to the promotion of the common well–being through the encouragement of free collective bargaining. It speaks of the freedom of association and of free collective bargaining as constituting the way to determine good working conditions and to promote sound labour management relations. It expresses the desire of the Parliament of Canada to extend its support to labour and management in their efforts to develop constructive collective bargaining practices. In other words, the preamble to part I of the Canada Labour Code conveys in no uncertain terms the federal government's commitment to the preservation and encouragement of collective bargaining.

Political parties of all stripes adhere to this belief in collective bargaining. Not surprisingly, labour unions also support free collective bargaining. Indeed, over the years they have resisted with all the resources at their command any effort to restrict worker access to free collective bargaining or to replace it with government regulations or other mechanisms.

Maintaining that integrity of the collective bargaining process is probably the most important concern of the majority of trade unionists. For many employers collective bargaining provides an efficient way of promoting stability in the workplace, for securing the consent of the workforce and for obtaining innovative solutions to a variety of workplace issues. Employers who value partnerships with labour realize that they can lead to a competitive advantage.

Paul Weiler, distinguished Canadian labour lawyer, author and Harvard professor, describes it best. He states that collective bargaining is a mode of employee representation which serves two vital social functions. First, it obtains for workers a measure of protection from the employer and the vicissitudes of the labour market, protection from substandard wages and benefits and from arbitrary and unfair treatment on the job. Second, it affords workers a degree of participation in an organization's decision making. It requires employees to take responsibility for defining, asserting and if necessary, compromising their concerns.

• (1805)

As Professor Weiler has written: "Collective bargaining is as intrinsically valuable as an experience in self–government. If one believes as I do that self–determination and self–discipline are inherently worthwhile, indeed, that they are the mark of a truly human community, then it is difficult to see how the law can be neutral about whether that type of economic democracy is to emerge in the workplace".

As I mentioned, I support our system of collective bargaining not only because of its democratic nature, but also because of its effectiveness. Something like 95 per cent of all collective bargaining disputes in federal jurisdiction governed by the Canada Labour Code are resolved without resort to a work stoppage.

When a third party is needed and the mediation and conciliation service provides assistance, about 90 per cent of disputes are settled without work stoppage. Time lost due to strikes and lockouts is but a fraction of a per cent, far less than the time lost due to workplace accidents.

The system works because it places the responsibility for the settlement of workplace conflict on the shoulders of those directly involved. It acknowledges that labour and management know best what their needs are and it calls upon them to take ownership of the terms and conditions that govern their employment setting.

By looking south of the border we can get some idea as to what would happen in this country if our system of collective bargaining were allowed to deteriorate. In the U.S. trade unions and collective bargaining are on the ropes and the consequences are starting to be noticed. According to the Commission on the Future of Worker–Management Relations, the decline of unions has contributed to the rise in inequality.

The commission reported among other things that the U.S. earnings distribution among workers is the most unequal among developed countries. Lower paid workers in the U.S. earn markedly less than comparable workers in western Europe. U.S. workers work about 200 hours more during the year than workers in Europe. While occupational accident rates in the U.S. showed little improvement over the past decade, they declined significantly in Canada over the same period. So distressed were the commissioners by what they found that they were moved to declare: "A healthy society cannot long continue along the path the U.S. is moving with rising bifurcation of the labour market".

Of course, our industrial relations system is not noiseless. Work stoppages do occur and people are inconvenienced. But in the vast majority of cases, both labour unions and employers recognize that a work stoppage is far more costly than a peaceful settlement. It is in the interests of both parties to resolve their differences through negotiation rather than through the display of raw power.

It should be emphasized that collective bargaining works for business as well as labour. The majority of respondents in a survey of large employers reported that they are successful in reaching their bargaining goals, that they are able to work together with the union during the life of a collective agreement and that they have the ability to adjust to changes in technology.

It seems to me that what employers and managers value above all else is stability. Generally speaking, stability is what they get through the collective bargaining process.

• (1810)

The private member's bill the hon. member has put forward for discussion would significantly change collective bargaining for enterprises regulated by the Canada Labour Code. It seems to me therefore that such reforms ought to be considered within the context of a comprehensive review of part I of the Canada Labour Code.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate today on the bill sponsored by the hon. member for Manicouagan.

The summary of the bill found on page 1a states that the purpose of the bill is to prohibit hiring of persons to replace employees of an employer under the Canada Labour Code or of the public service who are on strike or locked out.

In fact this bill goes much further than just prohibiting hiring of new workers. Modelled after labour legislation in Quebec, this bill proposes that government prohibit anyone from performing the work of a person who is on strike or locked out by companies falling under federal jurisdiction, crown corporations and the public service. It also includes provisions for the maintenance of essential services in the event of a strike or lockout in the public service or a crown corporation if public health and safety are at risk and it gives increased powers to the Governor in Council.

The Public Service Staff Relations Act contains a mechanism for providing essential services in strike situations. To replace the designated employee category of the act with these provisions cannot be viewed as a progressive step.

We know that one of the reasons the member is sponsoring this bill is that he is concerned over the effects of the year long labour dispute at the Ogilvie flour mills in Montreal. Members from all sides of this House have expressed concern over the Ogilvie situation and we are all anxious to see a speedy resolution. I was pleased to hear that progress was made at the mediation meetings held on May 25 and 26. There was an agreement to reconvene the talks on June 20 and 21.

If the hon. member for Manicouagan really wanted to help settle that dispute, he should have supported Bill C–262 authored by my colleague, the member for Lethbridge. If the government and the hon. member and his colleagues were really concerned about the workers at Ogilvie Mills and other workers under federal jurisdiction, they could have got on the ball and voted for Bill C–262 on March 20 and supported the hon. member for Lethbridge on his final offer arbitration bill.

If the hon. member and his colleagues wanted to protect both sides of labour disputes they would advocate final offer arbitration as a sure fire solution to settling labour strife.

When workers at the west coast ports were legislated back to work last year, the Minister of Human Resources Development endorsed the use of final offer arbitration as the settlement mechanism. The transport committee in its recently released national marine strategy recommended a final offer selection mechanism for settlement of all disputes between pilots and their customers.

As I stated in this House on previous occasions there seems to be a growing popularity for final offer arbitration. The transport committee also recommended that the new Marine Transportation Act would provide for final offer selection for the settlement of all disputes between the new not for profit seaway corporation and its employees.

I would like to confirm once again that the Reform Party believes in the bargaining process and we do not want to interfere in the course of two parties coming to an agreement. We see final offer arbitration as a tool that is useful to both sides, labour and management.

There are three provinces in Canada that ban the use of replacement workers in strike or lockout situations: Quebec, British Columbia and Ontario. Just last week voters elected a Progressive Conservative government whose leader promised to repeal Bill 40, the NDP's labour legislation and put an end to the ban on replacement workers in Ontario. Perhaps my hon. colleague would do well to find out if there is public support for anti–worker legislation.

• (1815)

We in the Reform Party are concerned about the impact that strikes and lockouts have on workers, employers, and Canadians, who most often have to bear the brunt of the cost and inconvenience of services withdrawn by monopolistic industries.

The recent strikes in the railway emphasize the weakness in the Canada Labour Code for preventing a shutdown of essential services. I commend the member for attempting to deal with the contentious issue of maintaining essential services. However, this bill does not contain any provision for the continuation of essential services in the private sector.

We would all agree the federal government has a responsibility to act in the best interest of Canadians, but I am surprised the hon. member would increase the powers of the governor in council.

In an interdependent world, economic security is threatened by major strikes involving services that provide linkage on an interprovincial and an international basis. Transportation and communication services, for example, are essential to the daily movement of people, goods, and services. A shutdown for any duration always has significant economic impacts.

Canada's competitive advantage is determined by the efficiency and reliability of the transportation and communication network it relies upon. We simply cannot afford any major shutdowns in the networks that link the country together.

The Canadian economy was hard hit by the $3 billion railway strike in March. The effects of this strike are now seen as contributing factors in the lower than predicted gross domestic product and the fall of the leading economic indicators. This was a hit the Canadian economy could not afford to take.

I believe that if final offer arbitration had been in place it could have defused the problems that faced the parties in this dispute. It is by far the most effective and impartial means of obtaining a solution to the concerns of labour and management where an impasse occurs that inflicts significant damage on Canadians.

There is nothing to prevent both sides from achieving a deal, providing they are being fair and open with each other. In fact, the presence of an arbitrator who is in a position to adopt either side's proposal in entirety exerts a tremendous pressure on both sides to reach an agreement. I believe this would preserve and strengthen the process by which the parties negotiate a contract.

In cases where fundamental issues are at stake, such as employment security, an agreement might never occur through collective bargaining, and a strike or lockout may only make matters worse. The best solution is for someone respected by both sides to make a decision on the fairness of one proposal and for the process to be viewed as legitimate by both sides. Section 57 of the Canada Labour Code which contains provisions for final offer settlement by an arbitrator for disputes that occur during the life of a collective agreement should be amended to include final offer selection in disputes where collective agreements have expired.

I want to assure the House that I believe in the collective agreement process, but in the area of essential services the Canadian people should be protected from costly and disruptive work stoppages. Part I of the Canada Labour Code is under review at the moment. I urge the Minister of Labour to bring the code into line with today's economic realities by expanding the definition of essential services and by providing for final offer arbitration in work stoppages in essential services when the agreements expire.

The end result of a strike or lockout is that the side that is able to withstand the damage longest is considered to be the winner. In reality, we know that neither side wins. Both parties sustain significant losses in relationships and dollars. In the long run, no one benefits from a strike, not the workers, not the employers, and not the Canadian people. I believe this legislation would inflame already strained relations and drive a deeper wedge between labour and management.

• (1820)

The Canada Labour Code is out of date. As legislators, we must find and implement solutions that will best serve the needs of all involved.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak to Bill C–317 whose purpose is to add

anti–scab provisions to the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

I want to commend my Bloc Quebecois colleague, the hon. member for Manicouagan, on his worthy initiative which I support with vigour and enthusiasm, and especially on the excellent speech he just made.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure there is no undue advantage to either party during negotiations, in order to reduce the duration of strikes and lockouts. Its objective is also to prevent violence during labour disputes.

The gist of this bill is as follows: To prohibit the hiring of persons to replace the employees of a federally–regulated employer who are on strike or locked out and employees of the Public Service who are on strike; and to ensure that essential services are maintained in the event of a strike or lockout in a Crown corporation and in the Public Service.

This bill takes its cue from similar provisions introduced in 1977 by the Parti Quebecois government at the time to amend the Quebec Labour Code. Since then, Ontario and British Columbia have also passed anti–scab legislation. Today, 75 per cent of Canadian workers are covered by these provisions.

The legislation passed by the Quebec National Assembly on December 22, 1977, prohibiting the use of strike breakers during a labour dispute, was the first legislation of its kind in Canada. It was passed following some very violent strikes in the seventies, including the strike at Firestone and Canadian Gypsum and especially the long and difficult dispute at United Aircraft, now Pratt & Whitney. The strikers were members of my former union, the CAW, the Canadian Auto Workers.

Strikes are based on the principle that a work stoppage should be an incentive for the employer to agree to and offer better working conditions. If the employer can hire replacements for the strikers, the strike becomes useless, a costly burden to those who exercise this right recognized by the Canada Labour Code, the International Labour Organization and all democratic countries.

When workers involved in a labour dispute see they are replaced by other people who are often escorted by security guards, they become exasperated, frustrated and may even resort to violence. They are reacting to provocation, and the consequences are disastrous.

Quebec's adoption of anti–scab legislation was in response to strong pressure from the labour movement, and in particular from the FTQ. However, the unions criticized the weakness of the measures approved in 1977 and demanded the use of personnel to replace an employee locked out or on strike be absolutely prohibited.

In fact, the text of the legislation contained errors, which moved the Government of Quebec to propose new amendments to the Labour Code in 1983 in order to correct the discrepancies that appeared through its use and legal interpretation by the labour court, the superior court and the court of appeal.

Approximately 114,000 Quebec bank, federal public service, federal ports, telecommunications and transportation workers come under the Canada Labour Code.

• (1825)

This number includes the 116 employees of the Ogilvie–ADM mills in Montreal, who are members of the CNTU and for whom June 6 marked the anniversary of their first year on strike. This dispute has gone on for over a year because of this American employer's use of scabs. These workers along with the entire labour movement in Quebec and Canada have long called for anti–scab legislation federally.

This afternoon, I met a group of strikers on Parliament Hill, who are currently in the gallery. I would like to salute them and all the workers of Ogilvie–ADM, show them my support and express the hope that a reasonable solution may be found quickly.

I understand their frustrations, because I worked for 19 years at the FTQ, where I witnessed and experienced similar disputes. This dispute is deteriorating because of a skewed balance of power. I also support the campaign waged by the CNTU and the FTQ for the inclusion of anti–scab provisions in the Canada Labour Code.

On September 18, 1992, an explosion at the Giant Gold mine in Yellowknife killed nine miners during a strike in which the employer had hired scabs. This tragedy could have been avoided with anti–scab legislation. This conflict lasted 18 months, ending only in December 1993. Last January, an individual was convicted of causing that explosion.

An anti–scab law would, of course, significantly reduce the risks of violence on picket lines. Under the previous, Tory government, the Liberals supported such legislation. Since they came to power in 1993, they have moved to the right and changed their position. The Minister of Human Resources Development had promised to table an anti–scab bill in December 1994. He did not keep his word.

The new Minister of Labour now uses the excuse that she intends to propose a more extensive reform of the Canada Labour Code, arguing that this legislation has not been amended in 20 years. The Minister of Labour, who is the hon. member for the wealthy riding of Westmount, is even more insensitive than her predecessor in this regard.

She is probably afraid of hurting the interests of her wealthy constituents. Yet, the Ogilvie workers, whose plant is located at the boundary of the minister's riding, are still waiting for her to help resolve this dispute as she promised.

Once again, I ask the government to be consistent with the positions defended by its members when they were in opposition and to table an anti–scab bill to prevent labour disputes from deteriorating and dragging on needlessly. We already know that the

bill tabled by my colleague from Manicouagan will probably not pass without government support, but we will not give up.

The government must share the three largest provinces' positive experiences and realize that anti–scab measures are needed to reduce the risks of sometimes violent confrontation during a strike or lockout.

In Quebec, as my colleague from Manicouagan said, studies point to a significant reduction in the duration of labour disputes since these provisions went into effect. The same phenomenon occurred in Ontario and British Columbia.

We must correct the inequities suffered by the 680,000 workers subject to Part I of the Canada Labour Code. Sometimes, a strike is the workers' only recourse. Adopting legislation in this area would eliminate the inequities suffered by unionized federal workers as opposed to their provincial colleagues, who are protected by an anti–scab law.

• (1830)

In conclusion, I call on the Minister of Labour not to hide behind the comprehensive review of the Canada Labour Code and to immediately table a bill to this effect. I am asking her to act as quickly as she did last March to trample the rights of workers by tabling a special back–to–work bill aimed at rail workers.

For all these reasons, I strongly support Bill C–317.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address the House on an issue of concern to the government, essential services.

There has been much debate on this topic in other jurisdictions as it applies to their labour environment. I am sure that everyone here appreciates that the federal government is a unique employer, one which has a trusted mandate to ensure that Canadians can be confident in the delivery of government services.

The Public Service Staff Relations Act is a balanced piece of legislation, one which has assisted the parties involved in complex labour disputes for over one–quarter of a century. It should be remembered that it was due to the leadership of a Liberal government that federal workers gained the right to collective bargaining.

However, it was also recognized at that time, and still holds true today, that the right to collective bargaining in the federal public service cannot be to the detriment of the health, safety and security of the Canadian public.

Over the years most labour disputes have been resolved satisfactorily without the need for back to work legislation. It should be noted that the government, as a matter of practice, discourages the hiring of outside workers to do the work of striking employees. In fact, the current policy of the employer on this matter is to rely on managers and staff excluded from the bargaining unit.

It is also important to recognize that the government has never denied the right of individual employees to voluntarily come to work during a strike.

As I have already indicated, the federal government cannot be compared to employers in other sectors. The business of providing government services to Canadian citizens can never be considered in a similar context to the private sector company, one which provides shoes or soap or flour.

There are many services provided by the federal government for which there is no viable alternative. There is a wide range of services which many of us take for granted until that moment when they become delayed or are not forthcoming. For example, we depend on and have confidence in our meat inspectors and officers involved in numerous other federally inspected consumer goods. Moreover, we rely on the transportation systems, the patrolling of offshore and coastal fisheries and the vigilance of officers at border crossings. Individuals on fixed incomes, the unemployed and senior citizens depend on the uninterrupted delivery of social programs.

Without the careful analysis of the effects of new drugs and medications being produced for human and animal use, the health of Canadians could be at risk. I am sure that each of you here could add other areas that I have not mentioned.

As members can see, government services are vital to the health and security of the public. The present language of the Public Service Staff Relations Act ensures that areas essential to the health and safety of Canadians are safeguarded by designating positions which by law cannot strike before any legal strike activity begins.

What this means is that the employer must identify the positions that are essential to the health and safety of the public three months prior to the notice to bargain and three months prior to the expiration of the collective agreement. Therefore, there is at least a six month advance notice as to the positions that are to be designated.

The current process has worked since 1967. As recently as 1993, when reviewing proposed changes to the Public Service Staff Relations Act, the House in its wisdom saw fit to allow this process to continue.

All of this reinforces the fact that the federal government requires a unique legislated labour framework that is different from

other employers in order to ensure delivery of services regardless of labour difficulties that must eventually be overcome.

In addition, it should be realized by all concerned members of the House that the legislation must be reviewed in its totality. It is not advisable to tinker piecemeal with individual sections of an act. Many portions of the Public Service Staff Relations Act were drafted for a specific purpose and for special reasons and must be viewed in balance with each other.

• (1835)

The designation of essential services, for example, which is at issue here, was specifically developed to permit the notion of the right for federal government employees to strike. It also served to allow the government as the employer to cede the right to lock out employees.

In closing, I must caution my colleagues on the wisdom of proceeding with the bill as it relates to the Public Service Staff Relations Act without fully appreciating the history and the experience behind this important existing legislation.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my apologies. I was in committee and I thank you for your patience. Before being interrupted to go up to the other Chamber, I was extending a friendly invitation to members of the Reform Party that would help them understand how terribly important this bill is for the gay community.

With courage and conviction, I am going to be daring and stand by the invitation. Therefore, I turn to the Reform Party, with your permission, and I say to them that if, as parliamentarians, they are interested in expanding on their knowledge of the reality of the gay experience and the potential ill treatment to which gays are exposed, I am available to introduce them to spokespersons and leaders of these groups, because if their positions and statements are any indication, I venture to think that although the members of the Reform Party are very knowledgeable in certain areas, they are somewhat less so in this particular area.

I think that, here as elsewhere, a closer look at reality would undoubtedly help them to modify their behaviour and certainly to improve their understanding. I therefore cordially extend to each member of the Reform Party an invitation to come and spend a day with me in the gay village, so that they can meet with the spokespersons and be in—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I remind my colleagues that they must always address the Chair, particularly when rather diverging views are being expressed. We are dealing with very emotional and sensitive issues. Consequently, we must show a great deal of respect in order to carry on the debate in the usual parliamentary fashion. Again, I remind hon. members that they must address the Chair, and not each other directly.

Mr. Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I always try to abide by that principle, but I thank you for this reminder. So, through the good offices of the Chair, I reiterate my invitation to Reform members.

It may be in order to remind the House of a number of facts. On several occasions during the debate, some members claimed that it might be detrimental to the public interest to recognize, in clause 718.2, the principle and the concept of sexual orientation. What is rather surprising with this position is that it implies that the concept of sexual orientation is something new and that it sets a precedent.

Yet, if you look at the Canadian case law, you will see that the administrative courts, as well as the ordinary courts of law, have had to deal with the concept of sexual orientation on a number of instances. In fact, the whole issue started exactly 18 years ago, with the Quebec charter of rights. Quebec, ever the leader in the social sector, was the first province to legislate and provide, in its human rights code, specific protection based on sexual orientation.

• (1845)

If you were to ask every opponent of the legislation to mention one case where an ordinary court of law, or an administrative tribunal, established a link between the concept of sexual orientation, which the legislator seeks to protect by including it as a ground for illicit discrimination, and any of the perversions to which some members of this House referred, you would not find any such example. This is why such an attitude is so deplorable.

Let it not be forgotten that what the Minister of Justice and his government wish to offer is very explicit protection, so that when the courts are faced with the situation where a person has been the victim of violence because of sexual orientation, whether homosexual or heterosexual, they shall, in determining the sentence for homicide, cruelty or assault, take into consideration any aggravating circumstances, based on legislative principles that are very, very clear.

In other words, a person found guilty of such offences will receive a stiffer sentence. That is the main focus of Bill C–41.

This has led to all sorts of comments which, out of respect for you, I will not dignify with a response. People said, yes, but there is a problem. There is a problem of a legal nature. Members of the Reform Party in particular kept saying that sexual orientation had not been defined. They said that there was a danger that the courts would not be able to properly enforce the law without a definition of sexual orientation.

And yet, none of the detractors of the bill has stopped to wonder why it also does not define freedom of worship or religious freedom. And what about national origin? Somehow we have managed. After all, we live in a society where, in the past, people have set themselves ablaze in the name of religious freedom, in the name of freedom of conscience. There are also people who have committed acts of cruelty, as well you know, in the name of religious freedom.

If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, there are even colleagues who have made remarks that, in my opinion, are certainly pushing the limits of politeness, as well as the limits of democracy, in this House, in the name of religious freedom. None of the bill's detractors rose and asked that religious freedom, or national origin be defined.

Why this unhealthy obsession with one of the explicit motives of discrimination, as if it could open the door to recognition of what is obviously in the realm of perversion? Some not so great minds even went so far as to make a connection with paedophilia. You really have to be pretty ignorant and pretty far removed from any understanding of the term sexual orientation to make that kind of connection.

Anyone who has some concept of psychology or psychiatry knows perfectly well that homosexuality has no connection with paedophilia. Homosexuality has no connection at all with paedophilia, and it is comparisons like these that tarnish reputations and they are also most unfortunate from a legislative point of view.

Let me quote a few facts that truly demonstrate that the decision of the Minister of Justice to introduce this legislation was, without a doubt, a most fortunate, responsible and democratic decision.

• (1850)

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in the United States says that according to a study they carried out three years ago, so this is a relatively recent study, one gay out of five—one gay out of five, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I may glance briefly towards the other side, one gay out of five, and one lesbian out of ten were physically assaulted. We are not talking about empirical research. This is a study conducted by an authorized group in the United States, often used as a point of reference by our Reform Party colleagues, and they have information that has helped us understand statements made by people belonging to the gay community.

We are told that one gay out of five, so this means we are talking about 20 per cent, one gay out of five, and one lesbian out of ten say they were physically assaulted.

We also have information on the situation in Canada. The study was made in New Brunswick, and if I am not mistaken, New Brunswick is not very far from Nova Scotia, and in Nova Scotia there are a number of parliamentarians who are very concerned about the gay community. I will not name names.

In any case, in this study, which was carried in New Brunswick, which is not very far from Nova Scotia, we read the following: 82 per cent of gays and lesbians who responded to this study were at some time in their lives victims of physical violence.

At 82 per cent, we should start to be alarmed. There is absolutely no way anyone could call that a fringe movement or an isolated incident. I do not know whether our Reform colleagues are aware of this study. I do know that it would behoove them to take a gander at it. Then maybe they would even understand why there is a need for this legislation. Once again I ask what is the basic principle? The basic principle is that we are still living in a society that does not accept these realities, in Quebec and in Canada, but I must say more so in English Canada. Permit me to demonstrate how we, in Quebec, have a real head start on the rest of Canada when it comes to this issue.

The crux of the matter—and I would have hoped that my Reform colleagues would have been more concerned with this issue—the crux of the matter is that the very fact of being gay or recognized as such by a certain number of people in society makes people the targets of violence. If one makes the effort to read the studies which have been done, it is obvious that this is not a mere coincidence; it is not a figment of imagination; it is not an oddball occurrence.

You all know as well as I do that there is no doubt that this law will be passed; the official opposition is going to help it along. I would even say that we are going to contribute to its passage—I am choosing my words carefully—, I believe every last one of us will be behind it. However I do not want to go too far.

It still remains that a lawmaker is sending a very clear message to the Canadian public with such a law. What it is saying to the Canadian and Quebec public is that we will not tolerate that any people in our society are molested or attacked, because we are a democratic society, a society which believes in the equality of individuals. Our belief in the equality of individuals goes so far that we even accept that this equality encompasses the expression of different sexual orientations. We believe in this so strongly as a society that we will not tolerate that some people are attacked or molested because of this difference.

Whenever this happens, we will take deterrent measures. To deter people from doing this, the lawmakers must demand that the courts impose much more severe sanctions against those who do promote repression. Do you have to be a genius to understand that? Is this beyond comprehension? Does one need a Ph.D. to understand this kind of thing? I do not think so, but it takes two things some members of this House may lack. The first is an open mind, a simple and solid openness to difference. Unfortunately, this is too much to ask of some parliamentarians.

The second is tolerance, tolerance permitting the understanding that there are people, who—for all sorts of reasons, something innate or something in their personality— nevertheless differ in the way they experience their sexuality. We are asking parliamentarians, who are legislators and who must set the tone, to be open to this. Unfortunately, it is asking too much of certain colleagues, and, I imagine, that they would have to justify their position to their electors.

• (1855)

I said earlier that I thought there was an openmindedness in Quebec that is not always found elsewhere. If I had to explain it, I would say there are two reasons for it. The first is that, on the whole, as a society, we condemn violence. I think that, on the whole, as a society in Quebec, we recognize that there are gays and that they continue to be victims of violence. There is no attempt to beat about the bush or to hide behind this reality, which means acknowledging the facts.

Why then can Quebec claim, take pride in, a certain openmindedness not to be found throughout English Canada, although I know very well that parts of the country are very open to this. The reasons are twofold. The first is that members from Quebec, in dealing with this issue, do not ask their electors to take a moral stand. When Quebecers deal with these questions, they see that violence is committed against members of a certain group, known among other things as gays, they take a stand on rights. They take a civic stand.

They do not ask a majority or a minority to impose morals. As you know, the foul–ups that occurred during debate on this issue in this House came from members who, in my opinion, rose in this House to talk about moral values, as though there was only one set of universal moral values that must be instilled in everyone.

We as parliamentarians know, from travelling a little here and abroad, reading a little, watching television and taking the trouble of talking with people, that there is no single set of moral values, no single religion. There are numerous sets of moral and ethical values guiding individuals. This is a good thing, and not only in Quebec and Canada.

If we as parliamentarians want to successfully navigate this debate without questioning anyone's motives and with a minimum of good faith, we must stay away from moral judgments. We must restrict ourselves to legal matters, because our first duty is to make laws, to legislate. Mr. Speaker, since you are indicating to me that my time is up, I will conclude by asking all members to make a highly democratic and tolerant gesture by supporting this government and the Minister of Justice, whose courage I commend, and voting unanimously in favour of Bill C–41.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member for very clearly stating that we are not debating morality in the House. We are debating criminal law and how we want our sentencing bills to be now and for the future.

He has clearly expressed the views that have been a consensus across the country. It is not just the gay, lesbian and bisexual groups that are in favour of this legislation. It is the United Church of Canada, B'nai Brith, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Jewish Congress, the Centre for Research–Action on Race Relations and the Urban Alliance on Race Relations.

I know the member is from Quebec so I will rely on some of the material that has been forwarded by Quebec. I specifically rely on the Quebec human rights commission, November 1993, which convened the first public inquiry into discrimination on violence against gays and lesbians. The hearings received a fair profile in that province and across the country. They acquired that profile because 15 homosexual men in Montreal between 1989 and 1993 were murdered. That was the trigger which started the debate in that province.

Other debates went on in Vancouver, Toronto and across the country with the police forces.

• (1900)

We have the Ottawa police chief saying he is in favour of this legislation, we have the metropolitan police force. We need this legislation everywhere. What I want to know from this member is what other experiences does he know about that go on every day in the lives of gays and lesbians for the hate motivated section of this bill to be necessary for all of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her question and, more importantly, for actively supporting this bill. I know that she sits on the committee which reviewed this legislation. The hon. member very appropriately mentioned that, two years ago, the Quebec government appointed, through the Quebec human rights commission, a travelling commission of inquiry which came to the following conclusions.

First, it found that some 20 people had been killed because of their sexual orientation. Moreover, about one hundred of those people who testified before the commission had been victims of physical abuse.

The hon. member is also right when she says that, ultimately, all this takes place in everyday life. As a member of Parliament, I often meet people who are homosexuals and who tell me that they were intimidated.

These cases do not all involved physical abuse or death, but the hon. member is quite right when she says that there is still this widespread idea that you can bash people who are gay, because they may look effeminate, or because they openly show their orientation.

The only reasonable way to change that attitude is to provide some deterrent, through bills such as this one.

Again, as parliamentarians, we should ask ourselves this question, which I direct in particular to our Reform Party friends, through the good offices of the Chair, of course: What is so upsetting about our Canadian society saying that it will not tolerate reprisals against homosexuals, against the expression of one difference, among others?

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that when a person is comfortable with his or her own identity, with his or her own sexuality, that person will accept the fact that there may be differences. With all due respect, I think that we must question the well–being—and I choose my words carefully—of some members of this House who show no tolerance toward the expression of that difference.

If I were in the shoes of some Reform members, I would ask myself some questions.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin in my comments to the member by simply stating that as an individual person, as a member of Parliament, as a member of the population of Quebec, and as a Canadian, I have more than ample respect for him. I wish him no ill. I honestly do.

I am going to make a statement that is going to sound as though it is very ridiculous. I am going to say—and I am with my friend from Wild Rose on this—that I want to have fat people included in that list. I really do. I could tell members experiences of how when I was a youngster I was attacked and beat up because I was fat. I have been like this all my life. So I want to be on that list. I want to make sure that people cannot attack me because they have this prejudice against fat people.

Of course members are going to say no, that is not necessary. Then I am going to ask why they hate me so and why they are so fatophobic. Now I have just said something that everyone in this House recognizes as being quite a ludicrous statement simply because it is not based on fact.

Number one, yes, I did get beat up. That does not mean that my being beat up was any more important than another kid who was beat up because he had an even funnier face than mine.

• (1905)

I remember another time being quite vilified because I was a farm kid and I attended a city school. We have differences, and sometimes kids can be cruel. That does not mean that we now have to start specifying this person, this group; that person, that group. What we need to do in order to reduce those differences is to start treating everyone the same.

When I say to my hon. colleague opposite that I have respect for him as an individual, I certainly have no intention of checking out what he does after he leaves this place. That is his choice. I neither fear him nor do I wish him any harm. However, I want to say that not one member of the Reform Party in the country will say that because of the choice he made he is now fair game for being beaten up. I am totally opposed to that. When I hear of individuals being beaten up because they are homosexuals I decry that as loudly and as vigorously as I would when anyone else is beaten up, for whatever reason.

It is time that we as Canadians started applying the rules of justice and the protection of law equally to everyone across the board. I want to assure the hon. member that I do not dislike him. I am not picking on him. I am simply saying that he stands together with all of us on an equal ground.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague that among all of my Reform colleagues, he is by far my favourite. However, I do not know whether I should be jumping for joy or crying after what he just said because, with all due respect, my colleague rose in this House and said: "I do not dislike the hon. member", all the better. However, he also said: "What we need to do is to start treating everyone the same".

You will understand that at face value, such a statement betrays a lack of sensitivity, because, if we acknowledge that in Canadian and Quebec society people are being molested solely on the basis of their sexual orientation, there is no way we can agree with our colleague's conclusion that we have to treat everyone the same.

This is like the kind of reasoning that used to be widespread a few years back, and I am choosing my words carefully. You will nonetheless understand to what point this example, regardless of how absurd it was, is worth calling to mind. I remember very clearly the debate that was raging in our society a few years back in which some people used to say: "Whenever a person, in general a woman, is raped, we must take into consideration whether she provoked the attack". And they said, some very sensible people included, even men of law, that the punishment for raping a woman

should vary, depending on how provocative she was, for example, if she was wearing a short skirt.

I never subscribed to this point of view. What our colleague is saying, is: "I am ready to accept homosexuality only if these people are treated the same as everybody else and only if we do not acknowledge, at this moment in time, that they are being systematically discriminated against and are being targeted for violence". This is contradictory, this is a paradox, this is illogical and cannot be. That is why we have a bill before us like the one that is before us today.

[*English*]

Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sharing my time with the hon. member for St. Catharines.

• (1910)

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the debate at third reading of Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code, sentencing, and other acts in consequence thereof. It is a criminal law bill directed at hate motivated crime.

First, I want to commend the work of the Minister of Justice, who has responded to the call of Canadians for the need to reform our sentencing process by establishing a clear framework of provisions to guide the courts in our country.

We have before us a criminal law bill directed at hate motivated crime. We have before us comprehensive legislation that for the very first time gives Canadians a say in the purpose and principles of criminal sentencing.

In these very challenging times, it is now necessary to provide clear guidelines for the courts to protect society to assist in rehabilitating offenders, to promote their sense of responsibility, and to provide reparation for sometimes irreparable damage, both physical and emotional, done to victims and the community.

Rules of evidence and procedure have now been set out in this bill, along with alternative measures to prisons and conditional sentences to be served in the community under strict compliance with conditions ordered by the court.

This bill works in partnership with the community to rehabilitate offenders while at the same time protecting the public from those criminals who have committed serious and violent crimes.

The strength of this bill is clearly evident from the support it has garnered across the country, despite what we might hear in the House.

I represent an urban riding in the greater Toronto area where people want only to live in peace and safety. In Etobicoke—Lakeshore we are firm believers in crime prevention measures as a method of improving safety in our community. As a community we are working very hard to eliminate crime. I give as an example the hard work of the Etobicoke Crime Prevention Association, which has succeeded in making our community more aware of crime prevention. I would like to read to the House the tip of the month published in its May 1995 newsletter. It reads: "A key element in preventing crime is public education through a variety of means. Let the public know that prevention is possible. They are capable and it is worth their while".

The sentencing reforms contained within Bill C–41 will indeed make the efforts of all Canadian communities worth their while. Our government is committed to restoring safety to our homes, our streets, and our communities. Bill C–41 is a clear indication of this commitment. We want to give Canadians back their sense of security by working hard to implement policies that will reduce and help to prevent crime in Canadian communities.

Canadians have asked for changes to the criminal justice system and we have responded with reforms that enhance the rights of victims and encourage respect for the law.

When we talk about public education we want to make sure that people have all the facts. What has been happening across the way today has not been all the facts.

I will now proceed to give what I perceive to be the clear facts in this legislation and emphasize the benefits these reforms will mean to the protection of all Canadians.

With the passage of this bill judges will henceforth be required to give clear reasons for sentencing in all cases. This clarity will benefit the public and will assist later in potential appeals trials.

The bill also gives consideration to offences committed in breach of trust, usually against children and increasingly in cases of violence against women. These vulnerable individuals who lost this essential and assumed protection in society will now find it in the courts.

This legislation will also benefit and consider the victims of crime, whose suffering and anxieties for so long have been pushed aside.

• (1915)

The statement of purpose and principles will allow for reparation to the victim or the community while at the same time forcing the offenders to take responsibility for their actions.

This means first of all that financial restitution can now be audited to compensate for loss of property or damage inflicted on an individual. I know that many seniors in my community who have been victimized by theft will be very pleased with the introduction of this provision.

Financial compensation by the offender in the case of less serious crimes often encourages rehabilitation of the offender. In the legislation, amendments to section 745 of the Criminal Code will give victims of violence the chance to voice the effects the offender's crime has had on their lives during their hearing for early parole.

It is about time the victim's experience is given greater emphasis. The statement will play a key role in the determination of the release of violent offenders back into society. Fines will now be officially recognized as part of the sentencing process. The fact is that many offenders are in prison for non–violent crimes simply because they are not able to pay the fine levelled on them.

Consideration will now be given to these individuals and fines will be imposed based on the offender's ability to pay. Inability to repay will result in other penalties such as probation or community service.

For those who have the ability to pay, fines will be strictly enforced. The system of fines will result in decreased costs of running our institutions. The community plays an important role in this bill, especially under the provision that allows for alternative incarceration.

Under strict supervision, a less serious non–violent offender who has been determined to pose no danger to society could serve the sentence within the community in some way. Counselling, probation, fines and community service will be part of a more effective rehabilitative approach to minor and first time offenders.

Limited funds could be spent protecting the public from more serious and violent offenders. Prison will be reserved for their rehabilitation. This legislation will prove beneficial to communities because it contains measures that will ensure the culture of hate is not permitted to flourish in this country.

Hate crimes are an unfortunate and insufferable reality in our society. The fact that people are specifically targeted because of their race, their religion, their ethnicity, their sexual orientation cannot be ignored or purposely be swept under the carpet.

Police bias crime units have reported that crimes motivated by hate are on the increase. We must also keep in mind that this probably does not include the many hate crimes that go unreported because of an individual's fear or historic mistrust of authorities.

Have you ever stopped to think, Mr. Speaker, about how traumatizing it is to victims, knowing that they have been specifically attacked because of who they are and what they look like? This is a very personal attack because you cannot change these aspects of yourself.

Canadians have expressed their alarm at the intolerable increase in this type of violence. The government has responded by introducing these amendments that will allow judges to impose stiffer sentences on those who have been convicted of a crime motivated by hate based on race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation.

Working with the community to improve education in combination with stiffer sentencing measures will result in a better co–ordinating response to hate. Section 718 which got much discussion across the way specifically comes into play after a person is convicted of a crime motivated by hate toward a specific group.

The government recognizes the need to replace the vagueness that currently exists in the sentencing process to protect the groups that are being senselessly and violently targeted.

History has taught us that we will only suffer as a society if violence, intimidation and fearmongering toward any group is tolerated. Ours is a society of equality and Bill C–41 will offer a solid deterrence to all people who threaten human life.

Sentencing practices should be a reflection of Canadian values and this legislation mirrors the values of equality and democracy quite clearly.

• (1920)

There is great support for this bill because the people of Canada know that in combination with other elements of our crime prevention package, change will come and the risk toward safety will lessen.

Sentencing reform, amendments to the Young Offenders Act, parole and corrections reform, the creation of a crime prevention council, greater control of firearms will go a long way toward making our communities safer places to live.

In addition to all this we will continue our efforts to reform the social programs, implementing more effective measures to combat poverty, lack of education, unemployment, illiteracy. We are making progress toward a safer, less violent and more progressive society.

Bill C–41 will guide us in that direction. Let us show tolerance and support this bill.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that the hon. parliamentary secretary had a wide ranging look at this bill in her speech.

There are some comparisons that I might make to the comments she has made. I have in my hand a report from the Canadian Police Association, a group that was lauded by the justice minister for its support of Bill C–68.

In the introduction to the report, the association says this:

> Bill C–41 with a few exceptions is unwieldly, complicated, internally self–contradictory, duplicitous and what is worse, almost all of it completely unnecessary for anyone with any knowledge of or use for the common law heritage of Canada. While it would attempt to codify basic sentencing principles, eliminating this most basic judicial discretion, at the same time it would bestow huge new discretionary powers to a whole range of persons within the justice system.

The common thread in these new powers is that all are to the benefit of the offender in the sense of non–custodial consequence for criminal actions.

Where sentencing reform calls for protection, this bill offers platitudes. Where it calls for clarity, it offers confusion and outright hypocrisy. Given its previous life as Bill C–90, [from the Tory administration] it is in no way a creature of this government yet if passed, it will certainly be identified as just that. It will almost certainly cause the already skyrocketing criminal justice budget to expand further still, in particular, the fastest growing component of that, namely legal aid.

When all is said and done and when one considers the truly great challenges the justice system faces in real crime prevention and protection of the public, it is tragic that this bill occupies debate while other legitimate issues are ignored. This, too, will be the legacy for the government should this bill be passed into law.

In concluding this report, the Canadian Police Association says that:

Bill C–41 is confused, contradictory and in large part wholly unnecessary. It is a blatant example of what a former Liberal member of the justice committee described as smoke and mirrors legislation. It is put forward as meaningful sentence reform but it is only that in the sense that it will generate endless litigation with huge attendant costs for little or no purpose. It is a blatant example of our worst tendencies in criminal law amendment in that it is impractical, badly drafted and will produce results wholly inconsistent with the overwhelming majority of Canadian sense of what needs to be done.

It is a bill that was not created or refined in any sense by the political response of elected members of the government who will be responsible to their constituents once its results are made clear as they will be.

In these days when so much needs to be done to prevent crime from occurring in the first place and to provide protection to society from those chronic violent offenders, Bill C–41 is and will be an embarrassment.

As I think about why the government is putting forward Bill C–41, I am compelled to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister what is the justification for this bill. I can only assume that it is to assuage the interests and the demands of the politically correct movement that you so capably represent.

• (1925)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. Once again I remind the House not to refer to one another as you. Interventions should be made through the Chair.

I also remind the House that the hon. parliamentary secretary has only one minute left to respond.

Mr. Mayfield: I do apologize.

Ms. Augustine: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I accept his apology because that is the kind of person I am and this is the kind of debate that brings out the worst in members as we address those issues that face society.

We are talking about the kind of society where there is respect for diversity, where there is respect for the individual. We are talking about measures that have within them preventive, rehabilitative and other measures.

The bill before us would ensure the function of our communities, as I said in my remarks, and would ensure the safety of every individual within society regardless of race, colour, creed, nationality, age, sex or sexual orientation.

I think the member has difficulty with this. I can quote from other sources that speak in very positive terms to the bill.

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C–41, first because I believe this bill is very important in protecting and promoting the rights of victims and second, because there are many misconceptions about this bill. Yes, the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the bill has caused some people concern. Some of my constituents are concerned. They fear this may somehow promote a homosexual lifestyle or it may result in restrictions on religious speech or change the Criminal Code to make things such as pedophelia acceptable.

First I would like to address those questions. Bill C–41 is a sentencing bill. Its aim is to deal harshly with offenders who commit serious crimes and to provide educational or community service programs for non–violent offenders.

Section 718 of the bill proposes that aggravating circumstances should be taken into account in sentencing. The bill outlines that if the crime is committed because of hatred or where an offender abuses a position of trust, this hate or abuse of power shall be considered an aggravating circumstance and therefore will be dealt with more harshly.

The bill outlines that hate crimes can be committed based on hatred for someone's race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation.

I want to state clearly that I believe hate crime is intolerable in any form and we must take proactive measures to remove hate from our society. I strongly support measures which will send a clear message that crimes based on hatred will not be tolerated but will be punished harshly.

However I am a strong believer in the family and I am also concerned about the potential erosion of family values through the use of the term of sexual orientation. Based on these concerns and those of some of my constituents I wrote to the Minister of Justice and asked these questions very clearly: Does the bill have any effect on the issue of same sex benefits or adoptions? Could the courts interpret sexual orientation to include pedophelia or other deviant forms of sexuality? In regard to same sex benefits and adoption the minister has clearly stated the bill is not relevant to those items. Cases have recently been before the courts on these issues but Bill C–41 has no affect on same sex benefits.

There is also concern over setting a precedent by using the term sexual orientation in legislation and opening the door to future extension of many other items, those promoted by some of the members opposite.

I want to reassure my constituents that the use of the term of sexual orientation is not new in our justice system. In fact it has been around since 1977 and presently is included in the human rights legislation of eight provinces.

• (1930)

The second question I addressed to the minister was whether pedophilia and other sexual behaviour could be defined as sexual orientation. Again the minister replied in the negative. The Criminal Code clearly describes and provides for offenders.

The minister pointed out this is not new legislation; it is not ambiguous and does not include criminal acts such as pedophilia. I heard some of my church congregations in St. Catharines expressing some fear that freedom of speech might be removed. Again I was assured by the minister, quoting from his letter: "The provisions of the bill do not and cannot prohibit people from holding beliefs or from talking about them within their churches, congregations or communities. The bill deals with people who act on certain bias or hatred to commit crimes. It will not affect freedom of expression".

Recently one of the congregations wrote to the minister to express its concern and support concerning Bill C–41. I am reminded the church believes it is obligated to struggle against injustice. Its letter to the minister:

> Our mandate is to support the church in God's mission of bringing about an inclusive and participatory church and society, striving to protect the rights and meet the needs of all, including those who are marginalized on grounds of race, culture, sex, family and economic status, age, belief, sexual orientation, and disability.

The focus of Bill C–41 is to improve our sentencing laws and define their purpose. The bill deals with victims, crimes motivated by hate, other rehabilitative provisions for some offenders like community service, and probation, fines and updating the rules of evidence and procedure.

Bill C–41 is particularly important to me because it deals with the rights of victims of violence. It is unfortunate but our justice system often seems to protect the offender while ignoring the victim. The bill takes important steps to outline the importance of respecting and protecting victims, one small step forward.

The bill deals with the protection and promotion of the rights of victims. The bill contains a statement of sentencing purposes. The present Criminal Code does not contain a statement outlining the purpose and principles behind sentencing. The new bill would fill this void by including a statement providing direction to the courts on the fundamental purpose of sentencing.

The statement would include as part of the objectives of sentencing providing restitution to victims or the community. In addition, sentences should promote a sense of responsibility for offenders and include encouraging acknowledgement by offenders of the harm done to victims or to the community. The statement would outline the importance of maintaining a peaceful, safe society.

The second way the bill provides for the victims of violence is through victim impact statements. The bill allows victims the opportunity to speak of the harm done to them or the loss they have suffered because of the offender. These statements will impact the sentencing of offenders and in deciding whether an offender should be discharged in a section 745 parole hearing.

In the past the parole board has refused to allow victims to put forward information. This is important to me because as I am sure all will agree the information on harm done to a victim by the offender is relevant to the offender's parole. The victim's experience will be taken into account and they will have a chance to speak, which will have an important impact.

The third way the bill deals with the protection and promotion of the rights of victims is in the area of restitution. The bill helps to provide compensation in cases where there is family abuse. Costs for moving, temporary housing or child support may be awarded when the victim is a wife or family which must move from their place, for example when the father is the offender.

• (1935)

I would be remiss if I did not speak on this bill today. I understand and have experience with hate and discrimination and what it can do to an individual. It is a devastating, destructive force that must be dealt with very harshly. I have seen and lived through periods when a name like mine was something excluded, something different and dealt with differently. I understand what can happen in society as a result of having a name like mine.

We must start making the rights of victims a priority. I hope in the future the justice minister brings additional bills to the House to improve the consequences of what victims have to suffer in society as a result of violence taken.

I have noted that the chief of police in Ottawa–Carleton, this area, strongly supports it. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities have written in support of the bill.

A vote for this bill is a vote against discrimination and hate toward individuals and groups. Expressions of hate should have no place in Canadian society and the bill sets out a commitment to fighting hate motivated crimes.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is very simple. If a woman is sexually assaulted that is a terrible crime. If she is violated because she is a lesbian why should that crime be treated more seriously? That is the key question here which we have not had answered by any of the debate from that side of the House. That has to be answered. If that is not answered this legislation should not be put in place.

Mr. Lastewka: Mr. Speaker, the bill talks about sex and the various areas the judges can rule on. Too often I have seen in court cases in which the law is not defined. There is a wide discrepancy from one coast to the other in Canada.

The bill puts more into the system so judges can make the decisions. When there is a sentence they will be guided as to whether it was hate motivated, yes or no. That is what is important. We are trying to get the message out to people that the government will put in stiffer laws whenever there is hate motivated crime. That should be pretty clear.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, he has not answered my question. Why is the one crime more serious than the other?

What I can see happening in our court cases is that this will simply be another make work program for lawyers. It will add a dimension to trials. They will be able to argue a crime was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate. Rather than focusing on the facts of the case, that a crime was committed and that the behaviour was not acceptable, they will have another dimension added to all of these court cases. What drives this legislation? Was it possibly designed by lawyers? Was it designed by people like that who may benefit?

• (1940)

Our court trials are already expensive enough. We do not need another dimension added which this legislation will add.

The question that needs to be answered is if a woman is sexually assaulted is that not as serious as if she is violated because she belongs to some category?

Mr. Lastewka: Mr. Speaker, anywhere there is discrimination or motivated or planned hatred it does not underscore what the member opposite has put in as an example. If it is a motivated hate crime, sentencing should be dealt accordingly.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again I find myself debating a bill restricted by time allocation brought in by the government and its cohorts in the Bloc Quebecois.

When time allocation was introduced for Bill C–41, Bill C–68 and Bill C–85, the Secretary of State for Parliamentary Affairs said the government was forced to do so because the Reform Party had introduced hundreds of amendments aimed solely at stalling the passage of the bill.

When we look at the amendments introduced at report stage on Bill C–41, we see there are a total of 25. Of those 25 amendments only five were Reform Party amendments. How can the secretary of state possibly claim that by submitting five of the 25 amendments the Reform Party was trying to stall Bill C–41?

How can the government possibly claim time allocation was necessary to get the bill passed when it was tabled at report stage on March 22? The government has had almost three months to get the legislation passed.

It is not the Reform Party causing problems for the government on the bill, it is a few Liberal backbenchers causing the government so much anxiety it had to invoke time allocation to get the bill passed with as little debate as possible.

On the quality of debate, I raise some comments made by the member for Vancouver Centre. I am glad to see she has rejoined us so she can hear me. I am bothered that the member for Vancouver Centre had the audacity to question the member for Crowfoot whether he had read the entire bill. I do not recall seeing the member for Vancouver Centre sitting in the justice committee for months and months listening to witnesses or going through the bill clause by clause, trying to make it into something better.

The member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore said this bill is a law of hate motivated crime and that was the sole intent and purpose of it. Maybe these individuals should take a few minutes off and actually read the bill and find out it is about a lot more than hate motivated crime. The member from the Bloc who spoke should do so as well. This bill is about sentencing. It is about alternative measures. It is about breach of trust by public officials and section 745, so much more than hate motivated crime. Having sat through months of testimony on Bill C–41 in the justice committee, it is a shame that many of the aspects of the bill about which I have spoken have been overlooked because of the words sexual orientation being brought into section 718.2 of the Criminal Code and of having an enumerated list of qualifiers.

• (1945)

The hon. member for Rosedale and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre raised the fact that the police were fully behind the bill. As other members have said, the police association is not behind the bill. When the justice minister was promoting his infamous Bill C–68, the gun control legislation, he held up the chiefs of police and the Canadian Police Association as institutions that supported the gun legislation and asked how Canadians could not support it. I will tell government members that the chiefs of police and the Canadian Police Association do not support Bill C–41. I quote the Canadian Police Association which stated:

> Our criminal justice system is based on both a defining statute (the Criminal Code) and the case law which has been built up over years in its interpretation and application. Both aspects are cornerstones of our system.
>
> This bill attempts to codify some, and I emphasize only some, of the basic principles of sentencing which evolved in our courts over the last hundred years or so—This bill's approach of attempting to redefine principles will result in endless litigation which will add millions of wasted dollars of expense to a system that is now struggling to make more efficient use of existing resources.

The Canadian Police Association represents police across the country, not just in Ottawa. It went on to say that it was compelled to articulate just how ill advised the bill was and to say:

> The sentencing is far too important to be saddled with as poor an effort as this and it should be sent back to the drafting table with instructions to start again. At this late date we urge you to do the same thing and do whatever is necessary to not proceed any further on this bill.

Those are pretty strong statements from the police community that was so important to the government's support of Bill C–68 but is being totally ignored on Bill C–41. Why is its support so important on one bill and totally ignored on the other?

When Parliament passes amendments to current legislation it is usually done because it wishes to change the direction of the legislation or to make up for some deficiency in law. As was pointed out by the Canadian Police Association, the bill falls far short of that.

The amendment about which everyone has been talking this evening with respect to section 718.2 does not do it either. The amendment calls for crimes motivated by bias, prejudice or hate to be deemed aggravating circumstances. Therefore a greater sentence would be applied. We have heard impassioned speeches from the government benches about the personal injustices and experiences they have had with respect to discrimination. I do not doubt that. I do not doubt there are many Canadians who have been faced with that.

The justice committee heard extensive evidence about what the courts have been doing for years. Before passing sentence the courts take into consideration all the aggravating and mitigating circumstances. The courts are already giving stronger sentences when they are based on hate or prejudice.

The motivation of the offender has always been an issue. Courts today frequently hand out more severe penalties for crimes committed on the basis of hate, prejudice or bias. If that is already the case, why do we need this section in Bill C–41? Are we in effect telling the courts that we are passing new legislation because we want them to maintain the status quo? There is one difference, which is that section 718.2 lists nine issues to be considered.

The justice committee attempted to determine if the list was exclusionary, that is if the basis for hate crime is not listed in the section can the court consider it to be an aggravating factor?

• (1950)

The hon. member across the way brought forward the fact that an amendment was made to it. Yes, there was an amendment made to it that added the similar factor. As is usual, in cases where lawyers appeared as witnesses some said that the list would not be exclusionary and others said that the list would be considered exclusionary. If it was not meant to be exclusive why would the government include a list?

It is obvious that people charged under this section will be arguing as to whether or not the list is exclusive. It is equally likely that in leaving the section as it is we as parliamentarians are leaving it up to the courts to decide whether something belongs to the similar factor. That is why the section should be deleted in its entirety. I have not heard one individual state that the courts as a whole have not been effective in taking aggravating factors into consideration for crimes based on hate, prejudice or bias.

As I said earlier, section 718.2 received the most attention but other areas deserve further scrutiny. One such issue is alternative measures. The concept of alternative measures is valid. I do not think there is anyone in the Reform Party who does not support the concept of alternative measures.

However the bill has left far too many unanswered questions. What is an alternative measure? We cannot answer that question because there is no definition. There are not even guidelines on what the provinces can decide is an alternative measure. Who qualifies for alternative measures? That is another question that we cannot answer. The bill just states that the person who makes the decision must consider it appropriate. Who is this person who is to decide if the penalty is appropriate or not? Again we do not have an answer. The bill does not stipulate who should be making these decisions. In fact the bill does not even state what type of crimes are appropriate for alternative measures.

One would think that the alternative measures would not be available to people who have previously been dealt with by alternative measures. The bill does not say that. It may be extremely difficult to determine if an offender was previously dealt with by way of alternative measures because there is no need for mandatory reporting of alternative measures. Nor is there a central repository to determine if alternative measures have been previously used. The sections dealing with alternative measures are just too vague to support.

Another serious issue that Bill C–41 fails to address is that of individuals in public positions losing their positions if convicted and sentenced to a term of incarceration. Previously a member of Parliament who was convicted of a criminal offence could only lose his or her position if sentenced to a term in excess of five years.

The justice committee accepted a Liberal amendment to this clause that reduces the necessary term of incarceration from five years to two years. However the committee rejected a Reform amendment that elected officials should be removed from their positions if they are sentenced to any period of incarceration. Perhaps it was a little too severe for the Liberals' liking but the zero tolerance was based on reality. Members of the RCMP who are convicted of a criminal offence lose their jobs if they spend even one day in jail. How could Parliament permit such a double standard?

We expect members of the national police force to have such a high standard of conduct that any incarceration would automatically result in the loss of their jobs. Yet when it comes to the standard of conduct of our own, the lawmakers of the country, we say that only incarceration in a federal institution for two years or more will disqualify an elected official. How can the government justify this contradiction?

However the biggest problem with Bill C–41 is not necessarily what is there but rather what is not there. Bill C–41 is tinkering when what is really needed is a major overhaul.

• (1955)

I go back to the CPA letter which says that it should be sent back to the drafting table with instructions to start again. It is not just Reformers who feel that it needs to be scrapped; that is also supported by the CPA.

We need a sentencing bill that will lock up violent high risk offenders and keep them incarcerated until they are no longer a threat to the public. We need a sentencing bill that will provide offenders with a sentence that is a specific deterrent to them and a general deterrent to others. We need a sentencing bill that provides sentences that are commensurate with the severity of the crime, sentences that are applied consistently and with a high degree of certainty.

The justice system is suffering from a major lack of public support. If we are ever to regain the public's faith in the justice system, we must provide Canadians with laws that will really keep our streets and communities safe.

Bill C–41 is not the answer. I ask my colleagues on the opposition side and on the government side how they could possibly support such a poorly written document that will infringe on justice in Canada.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member personally addressed me in her speech I think I should not only respond but ask her a question.

The hon. member said that I was not present at all the hours and hours of committee meetings and I did not listen to the witnesses. One does not have to be there to comprehend, to be able to read the bill from cover to cover. That is very simple to do. It is also quite easy to get transcripts of the committees and understand them.

I did not only deal with them to get my knowledge. As a family practitioner for 23 years I have knowledge of what hate crimes do to people. I worked in emergency rooms and know about people who had come in beaten up because of their sexual orientation or because of their race in the city of Vancouver. I have a very valid reason for speaking the way I did.

If you discuss the abstracts of the bill, look at the fine points of clause by clause consideration and dot the *i*'s and cross the *t*'s but fail to understand the principles behind the bill or the very real part of the bill that will affect Canadians where they live, that will affect their lives in a very real and meaningful way, you have missed the whole issue completely.

Does the member understand the principles?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before I go to the next member, by and large debate has been conducted in a very parliamentary way, but I remind members that because it is an issue about which there are some very strong feelings it is important for the interventions to be made through the Chair.

Ms. Fry: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. Does she fully understand why hate crimes should have aggravating factors? Hate crimes do not only hurt physically. Nor do they only hurt psychologically. Hate crimes leave a lasting effect on the individual. Hate crimes cause the continuing erosion of the self–esteem of a group that feels rejected by society. Members of that group have no sense of self–worth. It haunts them throughout the rest of their lives.

Does the hon. member fully understand that aspect of hate crime?

Ms. Meredith: Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that I fully understand the intent of the bill and the impact that hate crime can have on an individual. That is why I am pleased that the courts already take that into consideration.

• (2000)

I appreciate the fact that the hon. member is a medical doctor and not a lawyer, but perhaps if she looked through transcripts of trials and sentencing she would find that the courts now take that into consideration in sentencing. They already take into consideration that a beating might have been because a person was homosexual or because they were of another race. They already give more severe sentences based on that aggravating factor.

I appreciate that, but I recognize that this is already happening now and we do not need to codify it so there is more debate as to whether or not another group should belong to that list, that enumeration. And that will happen.

We had a case in Vancouver, which she is very much aware of, where it was the profession of an individual that caused him to be the victim of a shooting. He may or may not fall into this list. We will have lawyers debating back and forth and wasting court time when right now the courts would take that into consideration because there is not an exclusionary list.

I would suggest to the hon. member that already the courts take it into consideration, the judges take it into consideration. There is absolutely no need to put a law together to specify a list. I repeat that it is only one part of this legislation.

In case the hon. members in this House missed the point, this is also about alternative measures that are not defined, that are not specified as to who makes decisions, that are not specified on what crimes or what offenders qualify or whether they get alternative measures one, two, three, ten, or fifteen times. I think those things have to be addressed. We cannot pass a law for one clause; we have to look at the entirety. If the entirety of it is bad, we as legislators have a moral obligation to see it does not become law.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief comment.

The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley complained in her opening remarks about time allocation, saying that it is not her party that is stalling and delaying.

I believe the hon. member was here yesterday when Canadians saw the Reform Party members wasting time deliberately with the way they were voting in slow motion and making a mockery of this Parliament. I call that a contempt of this Parliament. This is why we have to bring in time allocation. We have not brought in closure. They can complain about closure.

When we are dealing with members like this, I call time allocation good time management.

Ms. Meredith: Mr. Speaker, in response to the allegations from across the floor, it is interesting that an individual on the government side could comment about needing time allocation when this particular legislation has been at report stage since March 22. If the government moves so slowly that it takes it over three months to get something from report stage to dealing with it, from introduction to dealing with it, I do not take any responsibility for that.

What we went through last night was giving every single individual in this House the opportunity to make their recorded vote, which is the parliamentary right of every member in this House. I will not apologize to the House or to anybody else for forcing the situation last night so that every member had the ability to be registered as voting for or against the amendments on this important legislation.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out that in the statement of the hon. member she did point out that right now the criminal law is composed of the Criminal Code and the common law. All that is sought to be done by this amendment is to simply codify the existing common law—it is not changing the law—so the judges and lawyers will all be aware of exactly what the law is in a very succinct form so that—

The Deputy Speaker: The member has the same amount of time to reply.

• (2005)

Ms. Meredith: Mr. Speaker, I will be very quick.

They already have the flexibility, not looking just at a list but looking at all factors, whether they fall under a list of enumeration or not. The list of six or seven items is not just bias, hate, and prejudice. There are far more areas. This is an exclusionary list that is being put into law that will give lawyers more and more opportunities to suck money out of the economy.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C–41. In particular, I would like to address the proposed change to section 718.2 of the revised Criminal Code, which deals with crimes that are motivated by hate, hate being deemed an aggravating factor for the purpose of sentencing.

More specifically, this section of the Criminal Code looks to criminalize those who commit an offence that was motivated by bias, prejudice, or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation.

This section takes into consideration that there are crimes against individuals and then there are crimes against a group. The latter crimes have the potential to hurt and hurt deeply and injure a collective group of people. Hate crimes put a group at psychological unease, deteriorating their psychological quality of life and inducing mental injury. As we all know, mental injuries and traumas can lead to physical illnesses, commonly referred to as psychosomatic illnesses. However, everyone within the designated group will be affected to some degree, some more than others. Above all, practically every single one will feel a deterioration of self–concept and eventually feel themselves second class citizens.

It is important to take note of the fact that all of the groups specified in the proposed legislation are afforded equal protection. I reiterate: equal protection. For example, hate crimes against males are treated in the same manner as hate crimes against females. Caucasians are afforded the same protection as Orientals; Christians the same as Muslims; anglophones the same as francophones; heterosexuals the same as homosexuals; and Ukrainian Canadians the same as Iranian Canadians and native Canadians.

Each of these mentioned groups at some time or other can be potential victims of hate crimes. All of them have been singled out for excessive negative treatment by someone for some reason. Why? It is ignorance, pure and simple. Ignorance is the foundation of this negative form of behaviour. It is nurtured by someone for someone's advantage, whether it is for control of a group, greed, or to keep people in a state of ignorance so that they will never know there is something better around the corner.

Fear is another controlling factor. This points out to me and to everyone else that there is a desperate need for education, education that will enhance the image of every single Canadian to the point where they will feel secure in the decision making and the choices they make and someone else who is trying to manipulate them for some unknown reason will not degrade them, debase them, and humiliate them to the point where their self–concept is practically destroyed.

Remember that most people who attack other people and hate other people have very poor self–concepts. Because of the poor self–concept they have, they are trying their very best to knock someone else down to a much lower level of esteem.

• (2010)

Given the above realities, one is astounded as to how opponents of the bill can possibly come to the conclusion that any particular group is being granted special protection. The above clearly indicates that in fact everyone is treated equally. Yes, every hate crime as well is treated equally.

Bill C–41 does not give special rights to anyone. It protects all Canadians. Every Canadian has a nationality, a race, an age, a gender, a sexual orientation, and a religious belief. If there is a member in the House who believes he or she is an exception to this rule, please let them stand and be counted.

Since no one has risen, I will assume I was correct in my assumption.

Another misguided criticism regards that claim that inclusion of the term sexual orientation would somehow serve to promote homosexuality. This allegation hardly deserves a response. I cannot for one moment think of a way in which this bill would serve to promote a certain sexual orientation, or any other group protected by Bill C–41 for that matter.

Some opponents of this bill have been misled into believing that Bill C–41 involves changes that would include the recognition of same sex marriages and even same sex benefits. This is absolutely ludicrous. This bill deals with crimes in the Criminal Code, not with same sex issues.

The civil and political rights of gays and lesbians will be debated in a completely different context, that being within the context of national and international human rights. Those civil and political rights are completely unrelated to the bill that is being discussed today. Some members in the House have been able to make the distinction. In fact, judging from the debate I heard today and yesterday in the House, some members have been having a terribly difficult time in doing so.

Furthermore, I fear that some have utilized this debate as an opportunity to voice their dislike for certain lifestyles. Although I do agree that they are privy to their own opinions in this respect, I most certainly believe that today's debate is not the forum for them to voice these opinions. We must deal with this area of concern in a rational manner and not emotionally.

Today's debate is concerned with the pressing need to prevent offences of hate motivated violence in Canada. This distinction we must keep in mind.

It is quite apparent that the allegations and criticisms aimed at Bill C–41 are entirely unfounded and misleading. These criticisms are based upon half–truths and misconceptions as well as misperceptions.

For those who are opposed to the listing of the various characteristics of the individual in this clause, please remember that the hate crime section is meaningless without the list. In several rulings the Supreme Court of Canada has warned that any hate related legislation must be very, very precise and identify target groups it intends to protect.

I urge all members in the House to objectively analyse the debate surrounding this bill and make a decision based upon the principles of justice, equity, and fairness.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan for lowering the tensions in the room and debating on a somewhat lighter level than we have been getting. Of course I think that is only just, because we are dealing with a very frivolous bill.

All the members opposite who have spoken seemed to zero in on one section of the bill. No one remembers that the bill is thick and includes a great number of clauses many of which are as equally bad as the one all of them seem to want to debate.

• (2015)

However, the gauntlet has been thrown down on that one issue which lists and categorizes people and says that only they and no others are entitled to protection against hate. It was a bit frivolous when he started saying everybody has a race, a religion and so on. The hon. member knows it goes much deeper than that. In any event I will play on his turf and by his rules.

This is not a very hypothetical question, but if a man who happens to be Jewish goes into the bad section of town and is beaten half to death by somebody who wants to take his wallet, does that man suffer any less than he would have suffered had his assailant known he was Jewish when he was beating him? I would like a straight answer to that question.

Mr. Dromisky: Mr. Speaker, the victim in this case has been robbed and in the process has received a physical form of abuse that could be very devastating. In both cases we have laws to cover them. I do not think the attack was perpetrated by the attacker knowing the gentleman was a Jew. Therefore I think the law covers it and states very clearly exactly what type of treatment the criminal must receive in this case.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the police commission has written a letter. It opposes this bill very strongly. If the hon. member has not seen the letter, I suggest he get a copy. It is stated loud and clear in the letter that in the courts today there are numerous texts, illustrations and periodicals and case law. All of that has been put together and they have been using it for a number of years to address hate crimes. They have been doing it very effectively I might add.

If the Liberal government thinks this is not being done, then someone should talk to one of the Liberal members on the justice committee who stated statistics from court trials where it was shown that the homosexual community is third on the list behind racial and possibly religious hate crimes. There are records of all these things that are happening. It is presently being done. That is why the police commission opposes this section. It is simple duplication and is unnecessary. They know what they are doing and they are doing a good job.

What is the real reason for section 718.2 if it is already being done?

Mr. Dromisky: Mr. Speaker, the arguments and challenge being presented right now are the very kind of questions that were probably asked in the 1930s in this Chamber. In the 1930s the very same principles were being advocated by opponents to changes in our laws.

We have identified various groups in our society in the history of this country who have been victimized by hate. Various individuals have been attacking specific groups. The need arose. The need was identified and a responsible Parliament of the day made a change in the Criminal Code to make sure that we could protect that segment of Canadian society from various ignorant people, as I would like to call them.

We have reached a point in the history of this country where for some reason or other a group of individuals is being attacked, hatred being the main motivating factor. As a result we are taking into consideration the need to protect this segment of our society. That is why a change has taken place in that section.

• (2020)

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the member seems so convinced that logically the bill is defensible. Why then is it necessary to tell all of the members on the government side how to vote on it? Why can they not figure it out for themselves if it is so convincingly logical?

Mr. Dromisky: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to convince anybody on the government side as to how they should vote on this bill. I know that members of the government are extremely rational individuals who are very very concerned about the safety of their compatriots, their constituents and the citizens of this country.

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The hon. member for York—Simcoe. Perhaps it could be put on the record that by an understanding the hon. member for York—Simcoe is sharing the slot with the hon. member who just spoke on debate.

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in the House to debate an issue that is of importance to all Canadians. I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for Bill C–41.

In particular, I would like to address the sentencing provisions of crimes motivated by hate. There has been an incredible amount of misinformation surrounding these amendments. I appreciate this opportunity to relay the facts and clarify any misconceptions that may have arisen over the course of this debate.

Bill C–41 is a general bill that proposes amendments to the sentencing provisions of the Criminal Code. One of these amendments proposes harsher sentences for those already convicted of crimes motivated by hate on a number of grounds, including race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation of the victim.

Currently there are certain hate crimes that are not covered by Canada's anti–hate laws. These include Criminal Code offences motivated by hatred against a targeted group which do not involve hate propaganda such as physical attacks or murder. In the past the law has viewed synagogue desecration as simple mischief without acknowledging the intense pain and fear suffered by members of the entire targeted community. Therefore, it is imperative that hate motivated crimes be included in this bill.

Unfortunately hate crimes have become alarmingly prevalent in our society. Expressions of hate are numerous and range from attacks by skinheads on gays to the desecration of synagogues to the killing of a native Cree. These attacks target virtually all minority groups and most of the time are violent and malicious. This can no longer be tolerated.

Statistics have made it apparent that hate motivated crimes are drastically increasing in our country. B'nai Brith has identified over 40 hate groups in Canada. Crimes targeting specific populations are on the rise. Hate crimes make many Canadians feel vulnerable and afraid. We must not tolerate this any longer in Canadian society. It is time that Canada recognized hate crimes as a particularly serious category of crime which attacks our diverse society. Bill C–41 sends a clear message that these hate motivated offences will not be acceptable.

This rise in hate motivated crimes has also been recognized across the country by police. As a result hate crime units have been established to address the changing nature of crime. The Ottawa–Carleton Regional Police bias crime unit has already had an effect on hate motivated crimes in the national capital region. It has been credited with contributing to a significant decrease in all hate motivated crimes in Ottawa. As a first of its kind it will act as a model for other cities seeking to address this problem.

Canadian authorities have had their hands full trying to monitor and contain the hate movement. Bill C–41 is an important measure to help them protect innocent Canadians from persecution and harm. Section 718, 718.1 and 718.2 of Bill C–41 reform the sentencing provisions for hate crimes. These amendments are welcomed and endorsed by police units across the country.

In the past, court rulings have recognized the underlying principle that hate motivation should be taken into consideration in sentencing. These sections will ensure through legislative means this principle is applied uniformly across the country.

I firmly believe that specific legislation is required to address hate motivated crimes in Canada. These crimes are more serious than those committed against individuals and therefore should be treated more harshly under the Criminal Code.

• (2025)

For example, it is horrible that a young man walking home would be attacked because he was targeted as a member and therefore a representative of a specific group. This indicates that the crime is premeditated and committed with the specific intention of bringing deliberate harm and persecution to a targeted group.

Not only do hate motivated crimes make all members of a targeted group feel vulnerable or afraid, but unfortunately by their very nature they are often repeated crimes. Therefore, it is imperative that we punish these crimes more harshly.

Those committing the crimes must realize that their prejudice and hatred must not be tolerated by Canadian society and their sentence must reflect Canadians' collective condemnation of the crime. Only by recognizing the seriousness of these acts of aggression and punishing them accordingly under the Criminal Code can Canada combat this wave of hate propaganda.

Many of us assume that Canada is an open, tolerant and inclusive society. We must not take that for granted any longer. Canada has been changing over the past few decades. Unfortunately, some people do not like the changes and stubbornly resist them. That in turn creates more problems. People begin to scapegoat certain groups as instigating the problem. This is not right.

We must not blame groups for our problems in society. It is much easier to blame others than to seek solutions for our complex problems. We must not fall prey to this. We must work together to build consensus and effectively manage changes occurring in our society. However, we must also feel that it is crucial to protect individuals and groups from hate motivated crimes.

Hate crimes are almost invariably based upon these characteristics: race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation. Therefore, it is necessary to spell out these characteristics in order to ensure sentencing provisions in the legislation are upheld in court.

I have received letters from constituents regarding Bill C–41. In particular, they are concerned with the inclusion of the term sexual orientation. First, the bill does not confer any special rights, but rather protects all Canadians. Every Canadian has a nationality, a race, an age, a gender and a sexual orientation.

The bill will not grant special rights to homosexuals, nor will it in any way affect the traditional family. I have assured my constituents of these facts, but I will also take advantage of the chance to reiterate that this is a sentencing and crime bill which will protect all victims of hate crimes. It has absolutely nothing to do with the recognition of same sex marriages, nor will it destroy the traditional family.

I firmly believe that all Canadians should be protected from vicious, targeted acts of aggression. I certainly support the inclusion of sexual orientation as a ground for hate motivation in the legislation. The inclusion of sexual orientation as a ground for hate motivation recognizes the fact that criminal acts which are intended to terrorize the gay and lesbian community are on the rise and unfortunately have become a problem in Canadian society.

The term sexual orientation has been adequately defined. In fact, it has been used in a number of statutes in Canada, including the human rights legislation of eight Canadian provinces. This term has been consistently interpreted by the courts to include heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual. It does not include pedophilia. As a matter of fact, pedophilia is an offence under the Criminal Code of Canada.

I have also heard concerns from constituents that Bill C–41 will endanger freedom of speech. This legislation is applicable to offences indictable only under the Criminal Code. Bill C–41 is a sentencing bill and will be applicable once a person is found guilty of a crime. Church sermons are not crimes, nor is moral opposition to homosexuality. However, gay bashing is a crime. No one, regardless of their beliefs, will be affected by the legislation unless they commit and are convicted of an offence which is indictable under the Criminal Code. In addition, freedom of religious expression is guaranteed in the charter of rights.

We cannot ignore the fact that hate crimes are on the rise. We must not tolerate hate crimes in our society any longer. The Liberal commitment has been very clear from the beginning. Bill C–41 merely fulfils yet another of our promises outlined in the red book. I have always been opposed to hate crimes of any kind. I campaigned on this election promise and I fully support the bill at final reading.

I firmly believe that Bill C–41 is a crucial measure to send the strong message that hate crimes will not be tolerated in Canadian society. I strongly urge all parliamentarians to support the bill so that we may work together to protect all Canadians.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly noticed the strong emotion of the previous speaker. She is committed to ensuring that hate crimes, as she talked about them, are vigorously punished by the courts.

• (2030)

You and I, Mr. Speaker, both represent ridings in Edmonton. There is a problem in Edmonton and other cities with the Vietnamese gangs who have assaulted other people, white people, because they are of a different origin. If white people were to set upon the Vietnamese section 718.2 would certainly suggest because of their national ethnic origin the court should look on that quite seriously.

However, when the shoe is on the other foot and the Vietnamese gangs are pillaging and terrorizing the neighbourhoods I wonder if the member can explain how the bill will show the same respect and have the courts apply the same type of punishment.

Mrs. Kraft Sloan: Mr. Speaker, as parliamentarians we come into the House and operate under certain parliamentary rules and procedures. One of the rules of the House is that we leave bigotry and narrow mindedness at the door before we come in.

I suggest to you that your—

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. Kraft Sloan: To Canadians watching tonight, this is another example of bogus, reverse discrimination consistently used by members of the third party.

This legislation refers to sentencing based on race and ethnicity. It does not specify the race of the ethnicity of the individual. If an individual is convicted of a crime motivated by hate based on race or ethnicity it has nothing to do with whether they are black, white, red, yellow, green or purple.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke pointed out one of the problems with this legislation.

When my colleague asked about different treatments that might be in place when Vietnamese committed crimes against whites because of race and when whites committed crimes against Vietnamese, she did not consider both to be discrimination. She considered one to be reverse discrimination.

I ask the member why that is. If one is discrimination, why is the other one not pure and simple discrimination?

Mrs. Kraft Sloan: Mr. Speaker, what I said was this is a typical example members on the other side use to illustrate what they refer to as reverse discrimination. I do not refer to reverse discrimination. I refer only to discrimination. I am referring to the things members opposite have used particularly in debates on employment equity when they are constantly screaming about reverse discrimination.

What I said, if the member opposite had been listening, was if a person is convicted of a hate crime based on race or ethnicity it does not matter about skin colour.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York—Simcoe seems to suffer from the same misapprehension as her colleagues in that she believes Bill C–41 is a bill with only one clause. We hear nothing except the so–called hate clause over and over again.

• (2035)

The member from Thunder Bay—Atikokan wants to play on that field. I will join her there.

My mythical Jewish gentleman wanders into a bad section of town and is beaten half to death by someone who does not know he is Jewish in order to steal his wallet. On another occasion he suffers the same type of treatment from someone who knows he is Jewish and decides that for his daily kicks he will beat up on Jews. As an afterthought he steals the wallet. The gentleman in both circumstances is equally damaged and ends up in the hospital. Why in the name of justice and common sense should one thug get a stiffer sentence than the other one?

Mrs. Kraft Sloan: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues on this side spoke about different aspects, about victim impact and other aspects of the legislation. Other members on this side have spoken about many different aspects of the legislation. However, some of us have been choosing to speak to the hate crime aspect of it simply because members opposite are not getting the point. We thought we would like to do it again and again until perhaps—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Resuming debate with the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, one of the things that becomes abundantly clear in this whole debate is the Liberal Party appears to be very uncomfortable with section 718.2.

We on this side know the bill is some 75 pages long. Some of the Liberal members have pointed out the bill is some 75 pages long. However, invariably every one of the Liberal speakers tonight has zeroed in on 718.2. Why is that? The reason is they are uncomfortable with it. They are finding themselves being put into a position of having to defend it over and over again and their case is getting weaker and weaker.

Now we find in this debate, which has been happening since the bill was first introduced, the speakers becoming proactive in jumping into 718.2 in order to fend off some questions from the other side. If I were not comfortable with 718.2 had I presented it as part of the government I would probably be doing the same thing.

Tens of thousands of letters, cards and names on petitions have come into Parliament, to members, by people who have taken the time to read Bill C–41. They have taken the time to get an understanding of what section 718.2 really means, what kind of precedent it can set and what it may lead to in the future when we come to defining some of the categories mentioned in it.

Let us not forget if this legislation passes, the term sexual orientation will appear for the first time in any Canadian legislation ever passed in the House. People are very concerned about that.

I understand the Liberals' current proactiveness in zeroing in on 718.2 because they want to deflect some of the questions over here.

• (2040)

They are uncomfortable with it. They know it is flawed. They know there has been a huge uprising of concern from the Canadian people, not from the special interest groups they have been talking to, but from rank and file Canadians across the country concerned about this clause in the bill as well.

They all have the letters. They have the cards. They have seen the petitions. Our Criminal Code tries to demonstrate the things we hold dear and what penalties should be dealt should these things be violated.

The government of the day and parliamentarians have an obligation to listen to the Canadian people, to a broad range of Canadian people to get the feel of the average person so when amendments are made to the Criminal Code they will best represent society's perception or views on what direction we should be going in when we deal with changes to the Criminal Code.

Bill C–41 does not reflect the views of the average Canadian because the Liberals did not pursue a broad sampling of the views of average Canadians. That is not their style. Instead they selected people to attend the committees, to submit briefs from groups and organizations, not individual views, so they could mould them into the real Liberal agenda in the bill, something politically expedient for that party.

This is one of the many bills the Liberals have introduced this session that do not address the real views of the Canadian people. I want to talk about criminal justice for a moment and tell members about a survey so there is no mistake on some of the things I may say tonight as to whether I am representing the views of my constituents. Above all, unlike the views of the leader of the Liberal Party, I am here to represent the constituents who voted and sent me here to represent them.

I did a survey on criminal justice and I wanted to get a broad range of views from right across my constituency. I asked 30,000 households about their views on the death penalty. Eighty–eight per cent of the people who returned the questionnaire said they wanted to have the death penalty returned for first degree murder. Of those 88 per cent affirming the return of the death penalty, 58 per cent suggested it should be extended to child molesters. Fifty–four per cent said it should be extended to rapists. Forty–five per cent said it should be extended to drug dealers. I think members are getting an idea of the views of the people I represent. They are my views as well.

The point is we have a Criminal Code which our courts are obligated to operate under. In the sentencing provisions judges are given sentencing latitudes. The penalties, quite frankly, with the exception of capital punishment which is not in there, thanks to the member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce a few years ago, are in the criminal justice system already. It is not the problem of the penalties. It is a problem with the administration of the penalties by the judges. It is the sentencing that is the problem. The judges have latitude and they are not giving out the penalties.

• (2045)

An assault is an assault is an assault, whether it is against one person or another person, regardless of what people's differences may be. A physical assault is a vicious crime. A sexual assault is a more vicious crime. An assault that causes a lifetime injury, a disability, is a very vicious crime. There are penalties on the books to deal with these crimes. But a government like this one does not have the guts to encourage the judges to deal with them in a manner that rationalizes the sentences they should be giving. That is the

problem. We do not need changes to sentencing provisions. They are already there but they are not being used. This is frustrating Canadians all across the country.

A section in the bill deals with the treatment of offenders of aboriginal descent. About two weeks ago a native Indian was convicted of sexual assault. At the same time he issued a death threat against his victim. The fellow went to court and was found guilty. That is a very serious crime in my book and would be considered so by most Canadians.

Even some of the bleeding heart Liberals across the way would agree with me that sexual assault is a very serious crime. Saying: "If you do not co–operate, I am going to kill you", is a very serious offence as well.

The person was found guilty. The evidence in court showed that the person had prior arrest and convictions for armed robbery. However, the judge with his creative thinking or because of political pressure or the influencing forces to make politically correct decisions, decided that instead of dealing with the crime as one that has a specified punishment in the Criminal Code, to have a sentencing circle. That is something new that is coming into the country when dealing with aboriginals.

The sentencing circle of elders determined that this man who was convicted of sexual assault and while assaulting his victim said: "If you do not co–operate with me, I will kill you", who had previous sentences for armed robberies which is a serious crime, whether your gun is registered or not, was given a sentence of one year banishment.

Mr. Thompson: Shame. Shame.

Mr. Harris: He was given one year banishment. He was to go out into a remote area for a year and be counselled by some elders.

I saw an article on that in a Halifax newspaper while going home. By the time I reached Prince George, B.C. it had hit the Prince George *Citizen* the next day. My phone started ringing off the hook and people were asking me: "Is everyone crazy out there?" I said to them: "No, just the Liberals".

• (2050)

This is the type of justice that Liberals seem to embrace. An individual is responsible for a crime which he or she commits. But Liberals do not believe in placing the responsibility on the individual who commits the crime. No. The Liberal philosophy says that it is society which is to blame. Let us penalize society. Society turned this person that way. They are not to blame.

The fact is there are provisions in the Criminal Code to deal with serious crimes, even the hate crimes which are pointed out in section 718.2. We have penalties on the books now.

I want to get back to sentencing. Section 718.2(c) states:

> where consecutive sentences are imposed, the combined sentence should not be unduly long or harsh;

When I read that I see Pierre Elliott Trudeau and I see his former justice minister, the one responsible for section 745. It is the rallying cry of bleeding heart liberalism personified in the bill. Far be it for the courts to suggest that criminals should be punished for a crime.

Many Canadians are wondering about the existence of concurrent sentences. Why should a criminal convicted of several crimes serve his sentences concurrently so that he ends up serving a sentence for only one of the crimes?

This fashion of sentencing, consecutive and concurrent, is the number one contributor to plea bargaining, to deal making outside the courts. The lawyers get together, have a cup of coffee and say: "If you want to play golf this afternoon let's cop a plea and we will get this thing over with".

People read in the paper about someone who has been convicted of a serious crime and got a slap on the wrist. Most times the judge takes a bad rap for that because the lawyers had made the deal outside the courtroom before it even got to the judge. I have a decent enough regard for lawyers. They have to make a living too. We took the bounty off them in our party, Mr. Speaker.

The Liberals have it all wrong in Bill C–41. They are simply reacting to pressure from the interest groups which supported them during the election. The Liberals are famous for that. Mr. Trudeau probably did the best job at gathering together people from different categories and from different groups so that when the election came along they did not have to start talking to people individually, they just talked to the leaders and the rest of the people followed behind.

Our country is on a dangerous path. We would be negligent as parliamentarians if we dared to forget that the people of Canada have a right to decide what kind of society they want to live in. As long as the government refuses to listen to a broad spectrum of the Canadian people to hear their ideas and concerns, then anything it attempts to do with the criminal justice system is going to serve only the people who support it.

• (2055)

This is the underlying purpose of the bill. It is not to try to address crime in a meaningful way, but rather to placate the special interest groups that are giving the government a lot of problems right now.

I cannot in any way support a bill like this. I have had probably in excess of 15,000 pieces of mail from my riding all saying: "You are our member of Parliament for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. We implore you to vote against Bill C–41 particularly against section 718.2" which attempts to categorize certain types of crime based on the categories that the Liberal Party wants there.

In response to the people who sent me here to represent them I will most assuredly vote against Bill C–41 and comply with the wishes of my constituents, something that the party opposite is not able to do.

Let me rephrase that. In all fairness there are members of the party opposite, and I apologize to them publicly now, who have had the guts to stand up and say, I am going to represent my constituency. That is what I was sent here to do. That is what I am going to do. I congratulate them and I condemn the whip. I condemn the Prime Minister for the things he has said about the people who have had the guts to stand up and vote in a democratic fashion representing their constituents.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a lawyer. They may have taken the bounty off lawyers in the Reform Party but I have to rise to debate the comments that my hon. friend has made. I want to make three or four comments. I ask my friend to have a pen and paper handy to copy down some sections. Then perhaps he would make a comment or two.

I have a great interest in this bill, having studied it in the justice committee. I have been watching the debate. I note that the debate is going back and forth. Where is Her Majesty's loyal opposition in this debate?

The last person I saw speak was from the Reform Party, then back to my own party, then back over to the Reform Party and back to my own party. I do not see the Bloc Quebecois members standing up and talking about what they think is right, whether they are supporting this bill or whether they are not.

The justice critic stood up and said a few words. One Bloc member addressed one of the many sections of this bill. I say shame on a party that does not take its responsibility seriously as Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

I want to say something about the witnesses that appeared before the justice committee. I was a member of the justice committee that studied this bill. It is very true that what we would call the ordinary citizen, in other words, the person who might live on Grenoble Street in my riding did not have an opportunity to come.

The groups that appeared before the justice committee and gave evidence were in my view representative of all of the interests that were concerned with this bill and in my judgment at least put forward the arguments for and against various sections of the bill.

I do not think the Canadian people were deprived because each and every one of the members on that committee of all the parties took a certain approach at the justice committee and were able to ask the questions they felt were required based on how they want to represent their constituents.

• (2100)

I know a lot of the debate has centred on section 718.2. However, this bill has a lot of interesting principles in it and it deals with a number of things. We have had history lessons about Prime Minister Trudeau and who was the justice minister here and there. Let us find out a little bit about the Reform Party.

Section 730 deals with absolute and conditional discharges, which may be granted by the courts in certain circumstances. Does the Reform Party support absolute and conditional discharges, yes or no?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Wappel: Section 731 deals with probation. Does the Reform Party support section 731 and the concept of probation?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Wappel: Section 734 deals with fines. Does the Reform Party support the concept of fines as outlined in section 734?

What about section 738, dealing with restitution to victims of crime and in particular a proposal made that people who abuse their spouses should be ordered to make restitution?

I would like to know what the Reform Party's policies are in response to the very things that are in this bill on these points.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the hon. member. The answer to his last questions are yes, yes, yes, and yes.

However, here we have a bill that has a lot of similarities to Bill C–68 where it has some perfectly good legislation in it. At the same time, because of the way the Liberals operate, it has some terribly bad legislation in it.

This is just like Bill C–68, when we said: "Listen, why do you not split the bill. We will be glad to support you on the part dealing with stiffer penalties, but we cannot support you on the registration". We made amendments to this bill to try to delete some of the bad legislation that we thought was going to cause a lot of problems. It is interesting that so did some of the members over here. The government whip and the justice minister said no, it has to go through.

What is happening is that we are permitted to try to take out bad legislation here, which we have done. The member for Crowfoot made a ton of amendments to try to get this thing so it was acceptable by leaving the good parts and getting rid of the bad parts. I know the hon. member made a lot of amendments himself trying to do exactly the same thing.

However, the fact is that the justice minister, cheered on by the Prime Minister, had an agenda and just tried to ram this thing through and God help anyone in this party who votes against it, because they are going to answer to the whip over the summer.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when I hear Reform members call the bill frivolous and say we are giving people with a different sexual orientation unnecessary powers when there is already flexibility, I say yes, judges have some flexibility, but they are under no obligation to consider the sexual orientation, race or gender of the victim. This flexibility applies to all human beings. There is no obligation.

In Quebec, we have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms and we have been using it for 17 years. We never had a problem. People never said we were giving more power to some people on the basis of their sexual orientation, race or gender. On the contrary. I believe this is a very democratic exercise.

Reform members today are trying to appear holier than thou. Today they are calling for the death sentence, and maybe tomorrow they will call for corporal punishment for children to make them more obedient. I think this bill is nothing out of the ordinary. It is a good bill. I think it should be supported, and we will do that. In Quebec, we have operated this way for a long time.

• (2105)

I would ask Reform members to stop playing holier than thou in this House. I would ask them to be logical and look at the bill as it is, and especially to read it, because they did not read it. I have a feeling they do not understand it very well. Maybe we should translate it for them. I would also ask them to try to understand and further the cause of democracy.

[*English*]

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of talk there.

I want to address the first thing the member said. She said that the judges do not have an obligation. Judges are put in a position to preside over criminal cases. They are in fact entrusted with the responsibility and with the obligation to deal in the sentencing of people who are found guilty of committing crimes in this country. They do have the obligation. They clearly have an obligation. The problem is when we get politicians who do not allow them to do their job and want to try to influence them for politically correct reasons or for politically expedient reasons. They interfere with the justice system.

If judges were left alone to do their job without the outside influence from politicians and political parties who believe that people who commit crimes should not be convicted, we would have a safer society.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I have to say that I do not think this debate is good for the Canadian public. This is the highest court in the land. Quite frankly, I am fed up with members of the Reform Party getting up and either intentionally or unintentionally in their debates on their points—they have every right to debate points here, but it seems that each and every time they use an example about what is wrong they use the example of a native Canadian, an Indian, as he just said, to show that the whole sentencing structure in Canada is wrong.

Did he use the example of an adult white male from Alberta? No. He used the example of a native. It is the same thing when there is a crisis in the fisheries on the west coast: they get up and talk about native poaching.

Every single thing I have heard from this bunch opposite since they got elected smacks of racism. It smacks of the very type of thing I fought most of my adult life to stamp out. To hear it repeated over and over again in the highest court in the land I think is condemnable.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, was that a question?

I would like to make a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This hon. member appears to be under the understanding that I created this story. I did not. It happened. I read it in the newspaper. I read the report. I did not create the idea that—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Dartmouth very clearly called the other member stupid. I do not think it contributes to the demeanour of this House one bit to have one member calling another in a loud voice stupid.

There are very few of us who were in the last Parliament here, and I can assure colleagues that the Canadian people thought we behaved abominably in the last Parliament.

I would ask the hon. member for Dartmouth whether he wishes to reconsider that comment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I was a member in the last Parliament, and I do not often use language that strong. I am sorry, but the member's comments incited me to strong language. If it is the wish of the Chair, I will withdraw it.

I will speak later in this debate and I will clarify my comments so that anybody who is listening will fully understand the intent of what I just said to the hon. member.

The Deputy Speaker: I would thank the hon. member for Dartmouth very much for that. Resuming debate, the hon. member for Wild Rose.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43(2), our members are to be dividing their time from this time on.

When I go to a store and buy a box of apples, if they are half rotten I am not going to buy the whole box. That is why I cannot buy this bill. There are some good points in it, but it is too bad that the merits are plumb spoiled by a number of items that are absolutely wrong.

• (2110)

I want to quickly mention alternative measures. Maybe it will help my lawyer friend across the way to know that I agree with the lawyers in their issue of the *Law Times* when they ask a question I asked. An editorial in the *Law Times* asks the question: Is the minister dispensing justice, or are his attempts at change another failed attempt at social engineering? I could not agree more with that law book. The minister has spent two years here trying to be a social engineer, not a Minister of Justice. I think he needs to straighten up his act.

I object to the alternative measures for the reasons I have mentioned. I object to the idea that we have come up with C–37, the tough legislation that is supposed to deal with young offenders, and then turn around and come out with a sentencing bill that puts in a clause that says 16 and 17 year olds who go to adult court are still going to be treated at sentencing as if they were juveniles. If they are going into adult court, they should be prepared to take adult sentencing. Even children in schools have told me that is the way it ought to be.

I want to make another quick comment with regard to something I read in *Hansard*. The hon. government whip dared to say that I am painting all teenagers with the same brush because I mentioned 16 and 17 year old hooligans. I did mention that, but I resent that comment. Thirty years of working in a school certainly ought to command a little respect for what I have done and how I treated students.

I can assure the government that 95 per cent of the time I spent with about 5 per cent of the youth, about 4 per cent of them were disciplined and about 1 per cent were serious problems. I do not paint them with the same brush. I reject that kind of thing.

I swear to goodness that if I were walking down the street and there were two people beating up on another person, had him down and were really working him over, I for one guarantee that I would make an effort to stop it. I would not stop to ask if the victim was gay or see if he was black or what. It would not make any difference. I would stop it, because that is the way it ought to be. You do not allow it to go on.

To hear these people talk, you would think I would lift him up and say: "Oh, you are gay, well then carry on". How stupid can you get? I resent those kinds of remarks and the implications.

I would like to say that I have a brother–in–law who is black. I love that man just as much as I do any brother–in–law. His children are also very black. I love every one of them, my nieces and nephews. I do. I happen to know a little bit about what it is to be involved with prejudice, because I have seen it happen to them. I know it can happen, and it should not happen. If we think for one moment that this kind of legislation is going to deal with it, we have to think again. It is not.

I want to talk about one other thing that really amazes me. I would like to find out how many employers throughout the country hire their staff and tell them: "You work for me, and if you go out and break the law make sure you do not go to jail for more than two years and I will keep you on the payroll". That sounds pretty stupid to me. Good grief, we are telling the taxpayers of the country that it is okay if we go out and break the law as long as it does not cost more than two years incarceration and they have to keep paying us and keep us on the payroll, so we had better make sure that if we get sentenced it is for only 18 months. Good heavens. We are pretty good, though; we got it changed from five years to two years.

The last thing I want to talk about is section 718.2. I did not even really want to address it. I firmly believe the courts are doing an excellent job of handling hate crimes now. I have seen numerous reports coming from the courts that verify that they are dealing with it effectively. They are doing a great job in that respect.

I only wish they would do that much for every crime, so we would not have to have caveat and other groups joining up all over the nation crying for justice and not getting it.

• (2115)

In the nearly two years I have been in the House I have not seen one piece of legislation that will make one person in the country any safer, not one.

Ms. Augustine: Bill C–68.

Mr. Thompson: That one most of all. Let me consider section 718.2. If they are doing their job then why are we including sexual orientation? That is a good question.

My, my. I heard my colleague say a minute ago that if we included it in this legislation it would be the first time it has ever been included. I have heard comments from the commissioner of human rights who says that if this is put into legislation it will get into the human rights act; it will get into the charter; and it will get into many more things.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: That is what they want and they are making it very clear. That is why they are cheering. That is what they want.

I am speaking for myself; I am not speaking Reform policy. I want the whole world to know that I do not condone homosexuals. I do not condone their activity. I do not condemn homosexuals. I do not like what they do. I think it is wrong. I think it is unnatural and I

think it is totally immoral. I think that is the opinion of 85 per cent to 90 per cent of Canadians.

Members of the House should take the time to find out how their people feel, wherever they are. They should read the petitions with the table with the names of people who are against that kind of legislation. They should read the letters they get in their offices about the legislation. Then they would have no choice but to stand up for the people of Canada and say: "No, it is not going to be part of any legislation in the country as it condones immorality". That is what it does.

I will object to it forever whenever they attack the good, traditional Canadian family unit that built the country. I do not want any changes to that family unit, including this kind of legislation.

I am very certain the reason that section 718.2 has been included is so that they can do it in the future. I know for a fact, having talked to a number of Liberal backbenchers, that they feel the same way. I know they do. I have talked to them personally.

An hon. member: They do?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, they do. I encourage them to stand for morality and not stand for immorality when the vote comes tonight. Listen to what the people have told you, read your mail and look at those petitions, one to ten or better. You must vote against this kind of legislation. Do not allow it to happen in this country. I beg of you, do not let it happen. Stand up for your convictions. Stand up for Canadians. I ask you to do that.

An hon. member: I have never seen a bigger bigot in my life.

Mr. Thompson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like the gentleman who just called me a bigot to come back in here and withdraw. Hamilton West, the member for Hamilton West.

The Deputy Speaker: Did the hon. member for Hamilton West call the hon. member a bigot?

Some hon. members: Yes.

The Deputy Speaker: I would like to hear the hon. member for Hamilton West if he will have the decency to come back in the House.

The member for Hamilton West heard the point of order. Perhaps the member for Hamilton West would wish to reply.

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, I will have something to say if the hon. Speaker withdraws the remark that I do not have any decency.

• (2120)

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, I realize this is a very, very controversial matter but there are rules, there are words that are unparliamentary. When one member calls another member a bigot and the member gets up and expresses offence at it, I would think that the member who has done it would be kind enough to withdraw the term. I would ask the hon. member for Hamilton West to withdraw the term.

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat. If Mr. Speaker rises and says will the member for Hamilton West have the decency to come back and apologize, then I have to question the Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. Secretary of State for Parliamentary Affairs wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Gagliano: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think as the Chair you have the right to keep order here, but the way you addressed the issue was as if you agreed and made your judgment but did not give a chance to the member to express himself on whether or not he made that statement. I think as a Speaker of this House you have to hear both sides before you make any judgments.

The Deputy Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the point of order? The hon. House leader of the Reform Party on the point of order.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the hon. member who made the comments has returned. Mr. Speaker, you did say, if I understood correctly, that you thought it would be the decent thing for the member to come back and state his case.

I agree with the Secretary of State for Parliamentary Affairs that the hon. member for Hamilton West should be allowed to state whether or not he in fact used the word. He has been decent and has come back to the House. I would ask that he state whether he would withdraw the remarks he made to my hon. colleague from Wild Rose.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I refer you to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, citations 488, 489, 490 and 492. In none of them is the word bigot listed as a word that is unparliamentary.

Mr. Adams: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I do not know about the member for Hamilton West, but I did call the member opposite a big bigot and I withdraw it as being unparliamentary.

The Deputy Speaker: I would thank the hon. member for Peterborough for the courtesy to other members in the House. Does anyone else wish to speak to the point of order? I will call on the member for Hamilton West one further time.

Mr. Keyes: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, one further time for what? I am not too clear on what you are asking.

The Deputy Speaker: Whether the member would be kind enough to withdraw the word bigot that was used earlier, I understand.

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, in the interests I have of having a respect for this House—is Mr. Speaker paying attention?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Keyes: In the interests I have for the respect of this House and the respect I have for a colleague of this House, I will withdraw the term bigot on the member because I too was in a heated state with the member in debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, to ask for me to have the decency to come into the House, I had a lot of difficulty with your remark, Sir.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for doing that.

Mr. Keyes: Thank you very much for your courtesy.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs on questions or comments.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise so that I can compliment the hon. member for Wild Rose who is a former educator like myself. He told the House what he would do if he saw a fight on the street regardless of the colour of the people, the religion, et cetera. I compliment him for it.

He like other speakers from the Reform Party complained that the only section the Liberals were addressing was section 718.2. The reason this side is addressing it is that—

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to clarify whether the hon. member is on debate or on questions or comments.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is on questions or comments.

• (2125)

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, the reason we were hung up on section 718.2 is that it was all the Reform Party was addressing and we were trying to educate the Reform Party to the fact that it was not the only issue in the bill.

I draw the hon. member's attention to section 718. I had trouble with some sections but I welcomed section 718 when I looked at the purpose and the principles of the bill because I also have a constituency where a lot of crime has crept in. Section 718 states:

> The fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute, along with crime prevention initiatives, to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing just sanctions that have one or more of the following objectives:
>
> (a) to denounce unlawful conduct;

Unfortunately there are some Canadians who stoop to unlawful conduct. It continues:

> (b) to deter the offender and other persons from committing offences;
>
> (c) to separate offenders from society, where necessary;

In question period the Reform Party has been pressing this point. Sections 718(e) and (f) are specifically important. They state:

> (e) to provide reparations for harm done to victims or to the community;

The judges in the past have had no direction and now the bill is giving them direction. If there is damage done to a community, hopefully in the sentencing the judge will take that into consideration. The criminal might be able to help the community more by restoring the damage rather than by sitting for two or five years behind bars.

They continue:

> (f) to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders, and acknowledgement of the harm done to victims and to the community.

There is an organization called Parkdale Focus Community Watch in my constituency. That is exactly what it is focusing on. It wants to protect the safety of the streets and the homes of the community.

Would the hon. member agree with what is stated in the purpose and principles in section 718?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I too sat on the justice committee for a number of hours going through the bill. Like I said, there are a number of things which I really liked about it. There are some things in section 718 that I appreciate about the bill. I think there was some good intent.

What I cannot understand is why we had to have an all–inclusive list. When we start making a list regarding hate we are going to leave somebody off of it. I do not see how we can help that. At the same time we did research on this and my hon. colleague provided statistics which said that homosexuals were third on the list of groups being targeted. The first was racism and I forget what the second one was. There are statistics showing that the courts today are dealing very effectively with those issues.

The Minister of Justice has received a letter from the police commissions indicating that is the case. They objected to the entire section 718.2 based on the fact that they have been doing this for years, have built case law and have plenty of literature. They were very effectively doing the job.

If they are doing it effectively, why does the minister not listen to the police commissions as he did on the gun bill and take that section out? I have to assume it is because of the inclusion of sexual orientation. I cannot figure any reason why they would include that if it is not to extend it much more. It bothers me when we get into legalizing adoption and spousal benefits. That is what bothers Canadians.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I have one very simple question for the hon. member for Wild Rose. If a crime such as murder is committed against a person who is a homosexual, or a person is discriminated against because of their homosexuality, does the member condone that?

• (2130)

Mr. Thompson: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not condone that. I thought I had made that perfectly clear. I do not believe that any human being in Canada should be treated in that fashion regardless of anything. I object when people say that a particular crime affected more people than another one.

We have a number of crimes before the court right now. I am thinking of the Mahaffy family and the Fisher family which affected the entire nation, affected every province. Every human being in this country who knows has been affected.

Whether people over there like to believe it or not, any time that happens to any human being, regardless of anything, it affects me. I do not want it to happen in Canada. I do not want my grandchildren to live with that threat. I am here because I want laws that will address those problems. It is not going to be done with Bill C–41 regardless of what the clown from Kingston tries to tell us.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to Bill C–41, an act to amend the Criminal Code with regard to sentencing and other acts in consequence thereof.

There are a number of positive aspects of this bill that I personally find encouraging. For example, it is good to see that victim impact statements will be allowed as testimony, though Reform members have voiced concerns over the decision that only written testimonies will be accepted.

One of the principle concerns I hold though lies in this bill's further entrenching of the divisions between Canadians as outlined in section 718.2. This entrenching does nothing to pull Canadians together and reinforce the principles of fundamental justice. If anything, it stigmatizes Canadians, classifies Canadians, divides Canadians and raises suspicions between Canadians.

In the last century, one of the most controversial thinkers ever proposed a radical view of history and society. Whether or not one agrees with these views and opinions, most people will agree that Karl Marx was one of the great philosophers of his age. The theories he put forward on society's changes and conflicts rested on one basic foundation, that our society is divided into identifiable groups. Changes came in Marx's model when groups polarized and fought against each other, landowners versus peasants, the proletariat versus the bourgeoisie, or the capitalists versus the communists. These groups would clash and fight and in the end, society would undergo dramatic changes, he proposed.

Most Canadians today rightly refuse to have anything to do with Marx's principles of division and conflict. The people of this country want Canada to be a land of opportunity where anyone, rich or poor, man or woman, can reach for their dreams and strive for whatever goals their hearts desire. We strive for a country free of racism and discrimination so that when we look at each other we see nothing but fellow Canadians. Ironically, it is our governments, not the Canadian people, which are striving to retrench and reinforce these very divisions that Canadians are trying to erase.

It was in 1982 that the government of Pierre Trudeau brought forward its controversial charter of rights and freedoms. This charter did not simply declare all individuals as equal under and before the law, it outlined the specific grounds under which people could not be discriminated. In other words, it spelled out the specific grounds under which Canadians could be considered equal or unequal.

In section 15(2), much to the surprise of many Canadians, the charter gives our governments the power and the authority to discriminate. This charter by its language and intentions purposely divided Canadians into identifiable groups both before the courts and before their fellow Canadians.

Since the passage of the charter, Canadians from coast to coast have fought against the entrenchment of these divisions in the quest to simply become Canadians above all else, not hyphenated Canadians, not divided Canadians. For example, Statistics Canada became extremely frustrated during the last census because many Canadians refused to identify their ethnic origin. They saw themselves only as Canadians and told StatsCan this by writing "Canadian" on the form.

• (2135)

The message they were sending is: "We are Canadians, not members of some identifiable group". Despite this opposition StatsCan is continuing to compile these figures. Without a doubt even more questions on ethnic origins will be asked in future censuses.

It is odd that my colleague from Calgary Centre presented a petition just last Monday calling on Statistics Canada to consider adding Canadian to its list of backgrounds and ethnicities. There is a message here. Canadians are tired of the divisions, tired of the classifications. They are seeking parity. They want equality.

This brings me to Bill C–41 and the amendments to the Criminal Code under debate today. A great deal of debate has surrounded section 718.2 of the bill. No doubt each member of the House has received numerous letters asking that we, as members of Parliament, vote against this entire bill because of the section and particularly because of the inclusion of the words sexual orientation.

Last week my counterpart from Port Moody—Coquitlam tried to give the justice minister over 10,000 letters from Canadians who oppose this inclusion. As well, over 70,000 Canadians have signed their names to over 600 petitions against this aspect of the bill. Reports have placed the number of letters to the minister opposing section 718.2 at over 70,000.

The reasons for opposing this section are wide ranging. For some the reasons are based on their religious beliefs or ethical convictions. For others the opposition stems from legal concerns. For me the key concern is that this section once again enhances the notion that there are no real Canadians in this country, just identifiable groups that happen to share a plot of land on the northern part of the continent.

I agree with the basic principle of this section, that those committing a violent act based on hatred or bias should be more severely punished. In Canada, after all, we oppose all forms of violence. We look south of the border and we are shocked at the rampant crime and brutality in many United States cities. Is it not ironic that the capital of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., also has the highest homicide rate in North America? It is a tragedy none of us want to see repeated north of the 49th parallel.

More important though we are a people who from day one of our existence have opposed discrimination. Even before Confederation we willingly became the final stop along the underground railroad. We provided new homes and new opportunities to hundreds of American slaves who wanted nothing more than a taste of freedom. Since then we have welcomed people from every corner of the globe to taste and savour that same freedom enjoyed so many years ago. Many have come not only for our freedom but also to contribute to our society.

My constituents oppose and I oppose how the government is setting aside these principles and using the bill to further entrench these legislated divisions. The bill outlines to Canadians what discrimination is from the federal government's point of view. Included in the list are a person's race, national origin or ethnic origin, someone's language, an individual's colour, sex or age, a person's mental or physical disability, someone's sexual orientation or finally some other similar factor.

As I noted earlier a great deal of debate has surrounded the inclusion of the term sexual orientation. As the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Psychiatric Association and the Quebec Bar Association have noted, the lack of a definition of this term could open the door to the legal acceptance of such practices as pedophelia. These groups, I would like to add, are seeking a clear definition limiting the term sexual orientation to heterosexuality, homosexuality or bisexuality. It is a concern that has not been directly addressed by the government.

I find it ironic that the government refuses to define the term sexual orientation yet insists on defining and limiting the term discrimination. Some characteristics it would appear are more worthy of protection than others. Those singled out for attack based on some characteristic outside of these grounds have no assurance that they will be protected by the full force of the law.

• (2140)

For example, would this section apply to the Canadian counterpart to the so–called unibomber, an individual well known throughout the United States for attacking academics with letter bombs? Would it apply in the case of people singled out for attack because of their size or lack of strength, their accent or any number of characteristics in this legal and legislative grey area? The fact is we do not know.

I am encouraged that a number of members in this Chamber have seen this shortfall. Proposals have been brought forward to simplify this section and make additional measures apply to any instance where bias, prejudice or hate are involved. Sadly though, it appears that the justice minister is fully committed to appeasing the special interests and keeping his list of characteristics in place.

To conclude, Canadians for many years have been trying to move beyond government defined categories in the hope of becoming one people. This bill defies this vision and tries to further entrench these categories to appease special interests.

Canadians have clearly spoken out against these categories and want equal protection under the law. It is my intention therefore to oppose this bill when it comes up for final vote and I encourage other hon. members to do the same.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to comment about what has been said in this debate tonight. I want to compare that with a debate and question and answer session I had which I found extremely informative in two ways. It occurred in my riding and it concerned this bill. It occurred on a Sunday afternoon from four o'clock until around six o'clock at the London Salvation Army Citadel. It was about section 718.2.

What was so interesting was all the misinformation that came into that room that day with those people who came to have a fellowship and information session. They were very concerned about the moral fibre and changing laws in Canada.

The minister of that congregation came to see me in my constituency office. He was very concerned. He said: "I think I cannot go to my pulpit any more and preach what I want to preach in my church and this disturbs me". I asked whether his sermon was a criminal offence to which he replied: "Of course not". I told him not to be concerned because there is no offence created in this bill.

When I asked him what else concerned him, he said: " There is a slippery slope. If you do this we are going to end up over here and all of my beliefs I feel very strongly about will be gone". I said: "If that concerns you and if it concerns other constituents why don't I come to you in your forum?"

That is what I did. We walked through this section step by step telling them what the bill said, outlining the abuses of positions of trust in this section that we are concerned about and the crimes that are going on in our communities across this country. It was a long discussion. I went through the section as it stood before the amendments which in my opinion have actually added to it and have made it even a better section. At the end of the day they were very satisfied that their concerns were addressed.

I have offered that to other churches in my community. They have not accepted my invitation to go to them and explain this section. That concerns me. I think a lot of people think this section does something that it does not do.

I want to comment on one other thing. When I practised law, part of my job was with the psychiatric Criminal Code review board in Ontario. In that part time position on many occasions I had to deal with situations where pedophiles were involved. I want to say very clearly it is my honest belief that pedophilia is not covered in this bill at all. I have had to deal with pedophiles. I have been there.

• (2145)

This is not a bill that sanctions pedophilia. Pedophilia is a crime in Canada, as I explained to the Salvation Army people that day in the church. Pedophilia is actually a mental disorder under DMS–IV. It was III when I was doing that type of work. Heterosexuals often commit the crime of pedophilia. It is more prevalent with heterosexuals.

Mr. Benoit: How do you know that?

Mrs. Barnes: Because the psychiatric evidence tells us that. Because it is common psychiatric evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I will speak through you because it is difficult to educate some members on the other side. It is not so difficult to go to people when they are concerned about the real issue of this bill and explain to them in a calm manner when the decibel levels are not so high and say: "This is what is really happening. We have a Criminal Code statute. We are not addressing morality in this bill".

It is easy to joke. I came here as a lawyer to become a politician. I guess in some people's books I have two strikes against me. I do not know what the third one is. Maybe it is becoming a Reformer.

I think my comments have probably used up five minutes. There is no question to the member of the third party.

Mr. Mayfield: Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Psychiatric Association, the Quebec Bar Association. They speak of their concern for opening the door to legal acceptance of such practices as pedophilia.

While it may not be explicitly included in the legislation it certainly gives an indication, a hint, a clue, a direction to the courts that are already pushing well beyond the legislators. This has been indicated in Ontario where the legislators voted it down and the courts brought it back in. It has opened the door to question in Alberta.

I believe we are setting precedents here that really take away the significance of Parliament being the high court of the land.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am listening with distress as I see this debate drift farther and farther away from what is really relevant. The members opposite are talking about creating divisions, conferring special rights, saying that government is singling people out for special status.

It is not the government or the minister that is singling people out for special status. As I said this afternoon in the House, it is the hoods, it is the thugs, it is the criminals that are out there on the streets singling out gays and lesbians for special status. They are providing them with special status by hunting them down and beating them up. This legislation is an attempt to get the Parliament of Canada to do something about it.

My hon. friends opposite tend to forget this is a bill which has to do with sentencing in the criminal law. The hon. member for Wild Rose would tell us that we are condoning immorality, we are breaking up the family unit. He does not approve of homosexuality. We are not inviting him to approve of homosexuality.

Religion is on the list too. We are not inviting him to approve all the religions held by Canadians from coast to coast. This has nothing to do with social engineering, it is about the criminal law. This is about punishing criminals which is what I thought the Reform liked to do.

The Deputy Speaker: I am reminded by the table the time has expired but I will give the member a chance to very briefly reply.

Mr. Mayfield: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply because the hon. minister raises a valid point that what we are debating here is the legislation. As was said before, a thug is a thug and should be treated the same in every instance.

I want to remind the minister of what the Canadian Police Association has said. It is an organization he lauded in the Bill C–68 debate:

> Bill C–41 is confused, contradictory and in large part wholly unnecessary. It is a blatant example of what a former Liberal member of the justice committee described as smoke and mirrors legislation. It is put forward as meaningful sentencing reform but it is only that in the sense that it will generate endless litigation with huge attendant costs for little or no purpose.

• (2150)

That is the statement of the Canadian Police Association about the legislation without regard to the categories that have been defined in this legislation.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. There have been consultations among members of the House to the effect that a word in the French text of the bill could be improved.

This word has to do with the restitution provisions of the bill under clause 738. Therefore given that consultation, I would like to move:

[*Translation*]

> That Clause 138 of Bill C–41 be amended, in the French version, by replacing lines 40 and 41, on page 33, with the following:
>
> "garde d'enfants, qu'une telle personne a réellement engagé pour demeurer ailleurs—"

I ask the unanimous consent of the House to make this change in the French text, and I want to thank my colleagues from the Bloc, who mentioned the need to improve the text, for proposing this amendment. I welcome this opportunity to present it to the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the request of the government whip. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*English*]

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to address the House on Bill C–41. I would like to extend my thanks to the Minister of Justice for bringing it to the House.

I should also congratulate all members of the justice committee who reviewed the bill with a great deal of public attention focused on them. I would also like to extend congratulations to my colleague from Brant who has made a significant contribution to the bill through an amendment providing restitution to the victims of domestic violence. This amendment will make a good bill a better bill.

My office has received many letters about this bill both for and against. Unfortunately the majority of letters are centred around two words found within one clause. Very few correspondents talk of the need for sentencing reform or the need to include a statement of the purpose and principles of sentencing.

We have heard very few voices acknowledging the broad acceptance the bill has received from the legal community. It is very easy to get caught up in the emotion of an argument. We have seen that several times tonight. To argue fact and common sense takes more skill than courage. I support this bill for many reasons but the best of all is that our justice system and Canada as a whole will be better for it.

Bill C–41 is very similar to Bill C–90 which was introduced during the last Parliament. Bill C–90 died on the Order Paper when then Prime Minister Campbell called the last federal election.

In fact, the entire issue of sentencing reform has been the topic of study for both Liberal and Conservative governments for many years. The bill before us can trace its beginnings to a white paper on sentencing that was published in 1984.

Perhaps what we should do is extend our apologies to our colleagues of the past, our proponents of sentencing reform for allowing it to wait this long.

The Liberal version of sentencing reform contains an important difference from the previous version. This difference which I will discuss in detail later was in the Liberal Party red book during the last federal election and Liberal candidates across the country, myself included, were prepared to defend this policy throughout the election.

I wonder why opposition members who are so vehemently opposed to this now did not lobby their party to make an issue of it during the election campaign.

There are three specific areas of this bill that I would like to address. The first area deals with adding a statement of purpose and principles within the sentencing portion of the Criminal Code. Our role in regard to sentencing has been largely based on setting maximum penalties for offences rather than in dealing with the policy objectives of the sentencing process.

It would seem that we have been putting the cart before the horse. When we create the sentencing procedure, it is right and just for us to put forward principles that represent Parliament's rationale behind sentencing. The statement of purpose and principles put forward in this bill describes the objectives of sentencing as: helping in the rehabilitation of offenders as law–abiding persons; separating offenders from society where necessary; providing restitution to individual victims or the community; promoting a sense of responsibility by offenders, including encouraging acknowledgement by offenders of the harm done to victims or to the

community; denouncing unlawful conduct; and deterring the offender and other people from committing offences.

• (2155)

In the future when the government or a private member for that matter proposes a bill that involves a criminal sentence we will be able to compare it to the guiding principles that have been set out in Bill C–41. As well, criminal courts across Canada will have the same principles to follow rather than a patchwork of sentencing practices and principles that differ from province to province as is prevalent now.

The second section of the bill I want to discuss deals with changes to early parole or section 745 hearings. Currently the Criminal Code allows victim impact statements to be read only at sentencing hearings. The bill would allow the victim's impact statement to be read at section 745 hearings, ensuring that a victim has the opportunity to outline the harm done by the offender.

I should preface my remarks by saying that I was proud to support Bill C–226 proposed by the member for York South—Weston when it came to the House at second reading. It will be interesting to see the recommendations made by the justice committee when the bill comes back to the House in the near future.

I would prefer to see section 745 repealed. If this cannot be accomplished, the amendments within the bill are the next best alternative. Victims should have a say in how the crime has affected and changed their lives. Early parole, if it remains within our criminal justice system, should be a rarity given only to prisoners who show little likelihood of offending again and who have served adequate retribution for their crimes.

I do not want to see a Clifford Olsen walking the streets because of a 745 hearing. I think he would be even more unlikely to be released if the families of those killed were able to give evidence at the hearing. We often speak eloquently about the need to recognize victim's rights. This bill addresses that concern. All members should applaud the government for taking this necessary step.

The third issue I want to address relates to sentencing in crimes motivated by hate. I worry when hatred causes people to commit a crime. Far too often people commit crimes motivated by prejudice and hate. In our country we have seen hatemongers spreading their untruths at our schools, on our streets and in our workplaces. Less than two years ago, white supremacists marched on Parliament Hill to tell the world about the hate they felt for those who were different from them based on race, religion, physical handicap or sexual orientation.

After passage of this bill, a sentencing judge can use the aggravating circumstance of hate to decide what sentence should be handed down. This will only apply after a conviction has already been delivered. It will allow the sentencing judge to provide for a punishment that will make it very clear to groups that propagate hatred and to people who follow a philosophy of hate that their actions will not be tolerated in Canadian society. I applaud the government for including this section. If we can keep those who commit crimes motivated by hate in prison longer then we are all better for it.

Unfortunately discrimination has been a constant throughout Canadian history. We only need to reflect on the inhuman way our native people have been treated or the citizens of Japanese ancestry or origin during the second world war. Only 80 years ago, women in Canada did not have the democratic right to vote because they were not considered persons.

I took the time to look at the suffrage debate that took place in 1918. Members argued that it was against natural law for women to have the right to vote. In this very institution members of Parliament declared that women did not want the vote. Now we know that view was wrong. We all realize the important role women play in our society and the invaluable role they play within this House. For someone to say it was against natural law to allow them to vote seems ludicrous to us today.

• (2200)

There are people who believe it is against natural law to give a segment of our society protection in this bill. It is quite possible that there are members within the House who feel this group should be denied protection. Respectfully, I have to disagree. When it can be proven that a group in our society is facing discrimination the law should move to protect that group. Can any of us say there are no incidents of gay bashing in Canada?

I have heard the argument that one cannot identify someone's sexual orientation just by looking at them. I agree. Are we then to ask people to deny who they are? We could also say you cannot identify a person's religion just by looking at them. We have consistently seen religious groups persecuted throughout history. It would be humiliating and wrong to advise citizens to deny their differences in order to escape persecution. Instead the government should move to assure that all such groups—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I believe he is sharing his time with the hon. member for Burlington. If that is correct, it is questions and comments at this point.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, justice delayed is justice denied. This legislation will result in longer, more complex and more costly trials.

Friends of mine in the RCMP are frustrated because they work very hard yet the courts do not mete out justice, often for some procedural technicality. Why not bring forth legislation that would close some of those loopholes rather than open up more of them, as this legislation does?

The same Liberals that brought us the Young Offenders Act are now bringing us justice in another form. I wonder if we will have rallies about Bill C–41 in a few years.

Does dividing people into groups enhance prejudice or decrease it? If I do not belong to an identifiable group, what if somebody hates my guts for some reason other than the physical, mental or behavioural characteristic that makes me part of a group? Why does hate have to fall into a certain category as defined by a Liberal in order for it to be more serious than some other kind of hate?

Mr. Finlay: Mr. Speaker, I think people divide themselves into groups in a very natural way. They have been doing it for several thousand years. I do not think we will stop it.

The society I want to live in and the society I want my grandchildren to live in is one based on love and understanding and acceptance of people for who and what they are. I want people who extend their hate to crime to be punished severely.

I think all members of the House need to vote in favour of the bill. It is long overdue.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the House it has been said Liberals want this law so there is an obligation on the courts or the judges to sentence in a certain way. We on this side of the House have said judges now have flexibility to apply and sentence. This tells me there is a lack of trust and confidence in judges. Why?

Mr. Finlay: Mr. Speaker, in light of everything I have heard in the House today, the member's question is obviously backward. We do trust the judges but we have heard nothing but how they do not do this or that, or they let people out too soon or do not give sufficient sentences for this, that and the other thing.

• (2205)

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on Bill C–41. This bill is important. It takes the necessary leadership role to set standards of fairness and equality for all Canadians in our criminal justice system.

Perhaps because of the campaign or the crusade by the member for Central Nova we have missed some of the other principles of the bill. We have forgotten that it codifies the principles of sentencing, that it formalizes victim impact statements and that it brings about changes which help to restore the balance in domestic disputes.

Last summer I met with lawyers from my community and over the past year I have met with many people in Burlington about the bill. Their conclusion is that with the increased attention to the law by lay people we need to spell out clearly the goals in sentencing. The bill clearly codifies those principles.

Sentencing should denounce unlawful conduct. It should deter offenders from committing crimes. It should work for rehabilitation. It should promote a sense of responsibility in offenders and it should make reparation to individual victims and families and acknowledge the harm done.

This bill will work to make sure fewer Canadians will be imprisoned for non–payment of fines, fines which in many cases were assessed at a level prohibited to the individual.

Section 718 formalizes the victim impact statement process. Victims groups such as CAVEAT have long supported this section.

An exciting initiative out of the backbench of the government and from a member of the Liberal women's caucus is the change to section 738, the restitution section. I am pleased the amendment moved by the member of Parliament for Brant, which was accepted by the government, will allow for much broader consideration of the impact of domestic disputes when making restitution orders. In tabling her amendment my colleague stated that victims of domestic violence should not have to deal with economic hardship in addition to the obvious physical and emotional trauma that is the result of a violent situation.

The amended section 738 of Bill C–41 will empower judges to order compensation to battered spouses forced to move out of their homes. This would cover costs such as temporary housing, food, child care and transportation as a result of the crime.

On section 718.2, the hatred section, the debate on this has exposed some of the depths of hatred in Canada and I find that unfortunate. I think the support the bill has received from many church organizations and from many individual Canadians says something about the real value of Canadians. Although we like to believe we are a tolerant and moderate society, it is harrowing to find out that in Canada we have active groups whose philosophies are based on hatred of others.

Names of groups which are recognizable to all of us, Aryan Nation, the Heritage Front, Church of the Creator and the Aryan Resistance Movement are actively recruiting today in Canada and they are particularly targeting young Canadians. There are over 40 organized hate groups in Canada. They are using techniques they perfected in the United States and they are accessing Internet in the most evil way.

In 1993 youths were charged in Montreal for beating up a man. They admitted they were engaging in an activity called the game, seeking out homosexuals with the intent of beating them up.

Police across the country are setting up crime units to deal specifically with hate crimes, responding to a concrete reality and need to end this violence. They adopt these units not because they approve of the gay lifestyle or they want to promote homosexuality but because in the exercise of their police functions they recognize there is violence and it is their job to protect and provide security for all in our community, particularly those who are members of groups most vulnerable to hatred.

From B'nai Brith we learned that in 1993, 256 reported incidents of anti–Semitic harassment and vandalism occurred. That represents a 31 per cent increase since 1992, the most incidents ever reported by the league in the 12 years since it has kept statistics.

In Ottawa–Carleton in the last two years there were 387 cases of hate based crime. There were 105 charges laid; 215 of the cases were based on race, 110 on religion and 45 on sexual orientation. We must use education, community action, intercultural coalitions. We must use all of these techniques, where hate crimes need to be addressed and where we can make a difference as well is in our legislation.

• (2210)

This bill has two goals: first, to send a strong message to persecuted communities that violence against any person or group is unacceptable and that our laws will take action in that regard; second, it encourages victims to come forward, allowing the police to get a true handle on the extent of the problem, work on educating people and work against this hatred.

Committee members who were listening learned from B'nai Brith that at its base a hate crime is not like a robbery for the purpose of obtaining goods. Hate crimes target not only the physical victim but the entire group of persons who share the same skin colour, the same language or the same religion. These acts are intended to violate, intimidate or isolate. They are intended not against just the victims but against the entire group.

When a rock comes crashing through someone's house in the middle of the night with a bomb threat simply because that person is a Muslim, other Muslims in the neighbourhood are terrorized. That is the goal of the hate monger, to terrorize whole communities. When survivors of the Holocaust see a swastika painted on a synagogue, and they thought they were safe in their Canadian community, suddenly those community members are fearful.

Reform members need to remember that when hate groups target what they perceive to be minorities their intention is to divide those minorities and separate them from the rest of the community. They isolate them in order to make them easier targets for attack. Once they have targeted one group they never stop with that group. They keep adding to them, to their targets. They never stop with Jews. They never stop with gays. They enlarge their sphere of activity.

To allow hate motivated violence and hate propaganda to go unpunished or uncontrolled through personal or collective indifference on the part of community leaders or public officials is simply to allow hate discrimination and violence to become acceptable norms of behaviour and standards of contact. On page 86 of the red book the Liberals campaigned on equality for all Canadians, including freedom from hatred and harassment.

The list of characteristics in section 718.2 identifies those groups, those people most frequently targeted for hatred as per the information from the justice department. It does not confer special rights to any one group because every person in Canada is covered in this list.

We all have a sex, we all have a race, we all have a nationality, we all have a religion and yes, we all have a sexual orientation. To say including sexual orientation in Bill C–41, particularly in this section, is encouraging a lifestyle is like saying that because we have included religion we are encouraging people to become Catholic or that including gender is to encourage members in the House to become women instead of men.

Remember, Bill C–41 takes effect when a crime has been committed. The proposed section comes into full force only after a criminal conviction has been registered. The bill does not create new crimes. It only requires judges to consider it as an aggravating factor if the crime was motivated by hatred.

I quote from Martin Niemöller, the German theologian: "When Hitler attacked the Jews I was not a Jew and therefore I was not concerned. When Hitler attacked the Catholics, I was not a Catholic and therefore I was not concerned. When Hitler attacked the unions and the industrialists, I was not a member of the unions and I was not concerned. Then Hitler attacked me and the Protestant church, and there was nobody left to be concerned".

For the sake of all Canadians, for the sake of all children in Canada, based on the values of fairness, equity and justice taught to me and my family and in my church I encourage colleagues to enact Bill C–41 as soon as possible.

• (2215)

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I find this a very disturbing discussion. It is implied by the hon. members who were speaking—I heard the last three speakers—that somehow by opposing this bill one is in favour of crime, hate crimes, crimes of passion, whatever. We are not. Reform is not.

The problem we face is that so much of what is being asked of us involves a curtailment of one of the most fundamental rights in a democracy. Some countries have established in their constitutions limits on government to pass legislation that restricts the freedom of speech. It is about the freedom of speech for people to say whatever they want to say. It is not possible to suppress this without going down a very slippery slope in the destruction of democracy.

The problem is that when anyone takes words and transfers them into violent action, that is when we should come down on them with a ton of bricks, not when they are saying what they believe. Where does one draw the line?

There have been Parliaments, there have been legislatures around the world, people with even greater indignity and self–righteousness than the speakers we have heard tonight, who say they have the solution to all the problems of mankind: all we have to do is shut down the ability of that person to speak.

The founding fathers of the United States have said that this is one of the greatest dangers to democracy. Nobody is in favour of those crimes. But what we are talking about and what I have heard being said here is that we must go to thought control, to speech control, and that means the end of our freedom. That is why I will vote against this bill.

Ms. Torsney: Mr. Speaker, it is troubling when we have sat in the House and debated a bill for many hours to find out that my colleagues do not even know what bill we are debating.

Bill C–41 is a sentencing bill. The actions that are in here only come into effect when someone has committed a crime. First you have to assault somebody, and then the judge has to consider a sentence. This is what this bill uses.

This bill specifically targets anti–hate. It is one of many tools we as leaders in our community can use. I call on the member not to be indifferent on hate crimes, to use every tool in his power and to vote for this bill. It is important to all Canadians, who do want freedom of speech. It is not about freedom of speech. It is about when people take action based on their hatred. When they assault somebody, then we look at this.

I am sickened to hear that we have had this much debate and he has just figured out that it is a sentencing bill. Perhaps all of us need to go back to the books and do some reading.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud my hon. colleague who just spoke on her commitment to fairness, equity, and justice.

In a recent issue of the student newspaper in Ottawa's Carleton University there was a cartoon depicting a smiling female carrying a large hunting knife and asking women whether their lives would be helped by the total elimination of penises. Another cartoon showed her holding a dripping axe over the heading "No guilt".

I would like to ask my colleague why she can support a bill that would consider hatred against some groups more serious than hatred against others. The group that was the object of these cartoons is not listed in Bill C–41.

Ms. Torsney: Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is the most important reason why there are not definitions on gender, on sexual orientation, on race and on religion, because men have a gender. They are male.

• (2220)

If one of those women attacked a man on the basis that he was a man, they could use this bill in considering that an aggravating factor.

If a group of homosexuals attacked somebody on the basis they were heterosexual, that person could use this section of the bill to get a tougher sentence against those people.

If you are attacked on the basis you are a Jehovah's Witness—and unfortunately that has happened in Canada on many occasions—if it is perceived you are a Jehovah's Witness because you happen to be wearing a suit and carrying a briefcase, as many of us were during the campaign, the person could use that and the prosecutor could seek a tougher sentence and ask the judge for a tougher sentence because all people with those characteristics are at risk when people commit hate crimes in Canada.

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate as well.

Most of the debate has focused on the sexual orientation aspect of section 718.2. I too have received a strong response from my riding and from various Canadians across the country on this. Their main concern seems to be that the term is not defined and that the consequences of it being in the bill remain unknown.

Arguments against including the phrase have been presented at great length. I would like to focus more on the effect of having greater sentences for some crimes versus others. In this bill it is based on hate, which is an emotional or human response.

Another concern I have is the categorizing of conditions. I do not really think I have to be anything as far as religion or whatever is concerned. If someone assaults me I should have the right under law to extract a sentence on that.

I would also like to look at the reason we are having such difficulty with crime in this country. We all agree that we have a crime problem and that we have various groups that are making life very difficult for us. I would like to try to figure out what has happened. What happened to our justice system that has turned things around?

This brings me to a philosophical concept. Over the past 30–odd years we have seen a gradual erosion of the concept of law. In moral philosophy there are two opposing ways of looking at a situation. One school of thought is represented by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant in his *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Kant argued that actions should be based on the intent of a person doing the action and not the consequences of the action. Kant himself said: "An action done from duty has as its moral worth of that action not in the purpose that is to be attained by it but in the maxim according to which the action is determined". Again that is an implication of intent. He is basically saying that it does not really matter what the result is of what you do; what matters is why you wanted to do it in the first place.

The opposing view is presented by the British philosopher John Stuart Mill in his work *Utilitarianism*, where he argued that actions of individuals should be based on the consequences of the action. He was more concerned with the consequences of an individual's action than he was with the intent behind the action.

• (2225)

An easy way to get a better understanding of that concept would be the example of one person striking another one. Kant would want to know why that person struck another, what motivated him to take that action, whereas Mill would come up with the fact that the person was indeed struck and that in itself is the offence.

One might ask what all this has to do with the bill today. I firmly believe that the intent of the Canadian justice system has changed from addressing the action involved and the result of the action to now trying to address intent and be psychologists and psychiatrists in the court system.

We also have come into other problems that could very well relate to this switch in the philosophical approach to how we view our justice system. We talk about criminals getting more rights than victims, for example. Well that follows my argument that if we are looking at why somebody does something we are not looking at the person who is dead, the victim.

There are a number of things that have happened in our system that bring me to think there has been a definite switch in philosophical views or actions in our society and we have switched from the Mill concept to the Kant concept and are stressing more and more the intent aspect.

This first started to erode when we looked at the state of mind component from the point of view of mental illness and people who were involved in some sort of crime who were mentally ill. We tended to forgive their crime to a certain degree because they knew not what they did. From there it gradually evolved to where we even got into debates involving drug abuse, for example: I take drugs or I drink and because I am in that state from the inducement of drugs I am not responsible for what I do.

I see this intent business getting totally out of hand. The point is that it does not really matter what your emotional state of mind is, when you kill somebody they are dead and that is the end of it.

We have to try to create situations where people who need help and who can be harmful to others or themselves can be treated before they end up in our courts so we do not have those kinds of situations.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 299*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
Daviault	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky

Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Hopkins
Ianno
Jacob
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kraft Sloan
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Regan
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Simmons
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Whelan
Young

Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Hubbard
Jackson
Keyes
Kirkby
Landry
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
Maheu
Manley
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wood
Zed—168

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)

Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Mayfield
McTeague
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Silye
Solberg
Steckle
Strahl
Wappel
Williams—51

Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
Skoke
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Wayne

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Asselin
Bachand
Brien
Canuel
Copps
Debien
Dupuy
Gagnon (Québec)
Harper (Churchill)
Knutson
Laurin
Mercier
Ouellet
Rocheleau

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bethel
Calder
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Crawford
Deshaies
Easter
Guimond
Hickey
Lalonde
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
O'Reilly
Plamondon
Venne

● (2250)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CN COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Order. I want to make a ruling for the groupings on report stage of Bill C-89.

There are 16 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 16 is identical to a motion we considered and rejected in committee. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 76(5), it will not be selected.

[*English*]

The other motions will be grouped for debate as follows: Group No. 1, Motions Nos. 1 to 4.

Group No. 2, Motion No. 5.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 3, Motions Nos. 6 to 11.

[*English*]

Group No. 4, Motions Nos. 12 and 13.

[*Translation*]

Group No. 5, Motion No. 14.

Group No. 6, Motion No. 15.

[*English*]

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the table. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

I shall now propose Motions Nos. 1 to 4 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-89 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-89, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 23, on page 6, the following:

"(8) This section ceases to be in effect five years after the coming into force of this Act."

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-89, in Clause 8, be amended by adding after line 23, on page 6, the following:

"(8) Paragraph (1)(*c*) ceases to be in effect five years after the coming into force of this Act."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-89, in Clause 9, be amended:

(*a*) by replacing line 27, on page 6, with the following: "jurisdiction"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 31, on page 6, with the following: "section 8(1); or (*c*) sell any subsidiary or part of the operations of CN unless CN and the purchaser have given the Minister written undertakings, in terms satisfactory to the Minister, that all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that it will continue for a reasonable period as a viable operation and that the interests of the employees affected by the sale will, so far as is practicable, be maintained after the sale.

9.1 The Minister shall, in respect of every sale mentioned in paragraph 9(*c*), cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament the undertakings given pursuant to that paragraph."

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will say a few words with regard to the amendments I have submitted and then I will defer to my colleagues for debate.

The first two motions deal with the restrictions the government has placed on the sale of CN shares dealing with the requirement for the head office to remain in a particular location. I would like to point out to my colleagues from the Bloc that this is not a Quebec issue. I do not care if it is Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver or some obscure place no one has ever heard of, a company should not be tied down to any location. It should be free to choose.

With regard to the 15 per cent shares, I feel that places restrictions. We heard in committee that it did not solve any problems but it could create some in the long term. Consequently, we have to view this as an unwarranted restriction.

The third motion deals with if the government does not see fit to remove these then perhaps it would at least see fit to put a time limit on how long it requires the company to comply with this. It is an attempt to put in a five year sunset clause.

The only comment I would make with regard to Motion No. 4 by the Bloc is that I understand why the Bloc is doing it but it is a bit overrestrictive in terms of creating more obstructions in the way of the sale. We believe this can be dealt with in other more appropriate ways. Beyond this, I defer to my colleagues for debate on this grouping.

• (2300)

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Motions Nos. 1 to 4 in Group No. 1 on Bill C-89.

Motion No. 1 calls for the deletion of the head office clause which stipulates that CN's headquarters must reside permanently in Montreal and calls for the deletion of the 15 per cent ownership restriction.

In today's marketplace the stipulation of the permanent location of a head office is absurd and makes a mockery of a bill of serious intent. This whole question of permanence reminds me of a story of a fellow who applied for a job with a previous employer. When he was offered the job he asked whether it would be temporary or permanent. The response was in that company there were no permanent jobs. This stipulation would not occur in a free market and no private sector companies face these same restrictions. This is purely for political reasons and should be expunged from the bill.

As well, restricting the percentage of shares any one individual, corporation or association may own is not sound. Where is the incentive for new investors to bring in a new management style to revitalize this dinosaur? To which latest investor advice fad is the government listening?

This clause also restricts the best price CN could fetch in the marketplace. As one investor put it, the 15 per cent restriction circumscribes the deal. This restriction dampens investor confidence and freezes out the type of investor who looks for troubled, debt ridden companies that can be restructured and made profitable, generating dividends and capital gains. I support Motion No. 1.

Under Motions Nos. 2 and 3 of Group No. 1, I support the introduction of a sunset clause of a five year time limit on the headquarters and ownership restrictions should Motion No. 1 not carry.

Motion No. 4 calls for parliamentary approval on each offer made by the private sector for CN assets. This is redundant. If Bill C–89 passes Parliament has already given its approval for the sale of CN. I will not support Motion No. 4.

If the government cannot attract a good offer it will have to answer for that later.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise, despite the late hour, on our fourth amendment, which reads as follows:

That Bill C–89, in Clause 9, be amended;

(b) by replacing line 31, on page 6, with the following: "section 8(1); or (c) sell any subsidiary or part of the operations of CN unless CN and the purchaser have given the Minister written undertakings, in terms satisfactory to the Minister, that all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that it will continue for a reasonable period as a viable operation and that the interests of the employees affected by the sale will, so far as is practicable, be maintained after the sale.

9.1 The Minister shall, in respect of every sale mentioned in paragraph 9(c), cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament the undertakings given pursuant to that paragraph.

• (2305)

You will have noted with the reading of the amendment that our party's principal aim was, despite the Liberal government's decision to privatize CN, to maintain and keep jobs, because behind privatization or the end of business, although economic aspects are certainly sometimes given consideration, the human element, the experiences of the people affected by changes in their working conditions or even the cutting of their position, must be considered.

You will note that the aim of this amendment is to give this House a certain right over the selling of CN assets, not directly related to rail transportation.

Our decision, in the Bloc Quebecois, to table this amendment was based on the statement made several times by the Minister of Transport that he intended to sell off individually the assets of CN not directly related to rail transportation. Being familiar with CN operations, we know that one of the largest CN subsidiaries to be sold is AMF Techno Transport, located in Pointe–St–Charles, in Montreal. We are talking here about 1,300 jobs, 1,300 workers who, unfortunately, saw their company lose some $35 million last year.

When the minister appeared before the Standing Committee on Transport, he told us that, in his opinion, AMF had a very precarious future and he refused, despite our questions, to guarantee its survival. As you can understand, the loss of this company would have disastrous consequences for the greater Montreal area.

One European company, however, showed interest. Alsthom is a French company that can brag about its major contribution to the high speed train in France, in partnership with none other than the pride of the Quebec business community, Bombardier.

Alsthom has no North American subsidiary that makes railway equipment. AMF Techno Transport, which is located in Pointe–St–Charles, could thus easily become its bridgehead in North America, which would have a very positive impact on AMF and the greater Montreal area.

Before closing, I wish to add that perhaps if we gave Alsthom the possibility or the incentive to take over AMF—this is the purpose of our amendment— I am confident that Quebec would be in a very good position when the decision is finally made to build a high speed railway corridor between Quebec City and Windsor.

Let us not forget that Alsthom Bombardier holds an exclusive licence for building a high speed train or HST in North America.

• (2310)

Let us not forget that about seven or eight HST projects are planned for the next 12 years, which would put the new Alsthom AMF consortium in an excellent position to bid on contracts to make railway equipment for future HST projects in the U.S. Or that economic benefits in the order of $200 billion are being mentioned. Again, a Quebec manufacturer could very well succeed on the international market.

In closing, I will say to you that the purpose of the amendment is to ensure that, whoever the buyer is, precautions will be taken to keep AMF viable and to protect the jobs of the Montreal men and women who work there as well as those of the people in the greater Montreal area.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the issue we are discussing today is the privatization of Canadian National rail.

Although Reform supports the government in this endeavour there are still some problems with this legislation that must be addressed. The bill requires the headquarters of CN to be located in Montreal permanently. It includes the restriction that limits the percentage of shares any one individual can own to 15 per cent.

CN Rail currently owes about $2.5 billion. Industry representatives say the debt must be reduced to $1.5 billion to achieve a BBB bond rating and sell. The minister has the power to reduce CN's debt to any amount he chooses, which could mean an amount well below the amount for which taxpayers would see a return.

Let us take a look at crown corporations. In the auditor general's report of 1982 this is what was written: "Crown corporations are like an enormous iceberg floating lazily in the foggy Atlantic, silent, majestic, awesome. The public tends to see only the upper portions consisting of giants like Petro–Canada, the CBC, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The great bulk of the iceberg below the surface is less spectacular, less likely to attract public interest, less likely to receive the attention of Parliament, yet costly to taxpayers".

That was 12 years ago and nothing has changed. In his 1994 annual report to Parliament the president of the Treasury Board gave us a view of this iceberg below the water line when he listed the Government of Canada's holdings: 48 parent crown corporations, 64 wholly owned subsidiaries, 5 mixed enterprises, 3 joint enterprises, 51 other entities, 8 corporations under the terms of the Bankruptcy Act.

Reform Party policy on privatization and corporations indicates we support placing the ownership and control of corporations in the sector that can perform their function most cost effectively with the greatest accountability to owners and the least likelihood of incurring public debt. We believe this would be in most cases the private sector but not necessarily in all cases.

The Liberal position which I had to try hard to read in the red book says that for the past decade the small and medium size business sector has been the engine of the Canadian economy. It says the Liberal government will focus on its growth. While debating Bill C–89 on May 2 the Minister of Transport stated: "This legislation is part of our government's intention to have the private sector operate in areas where it can do the job best".

The Minister of Finance said in the budget last February: "Our view is straightforward. If government does not need to run something it should not and in the future will not".

Let us get to an analysis of what the government's role should be when it comes to privatization and/or crown corporations, some general points. The role of government should be to do what only the government can do, which is to keep peace, order and good government. It should regulate, administer, pass laws and defend borders but it should not enter the marketplace to create jobs. With regional development funds, grants, subsidies and crown corporations, governments distort the private sector, create temporary jobs and promote unfair competition within industry sectors. Governments are, in fact, part of the problem and not the solution.

• (2315)

There is a big difference between the spending of debt capital that is borrowed money and equity capital that does not have to be repaid. The private sector understands the difference and it is time politicians did too. At risk money motivates; government money wastes.

In some concluding comments I would like to state that the government's role in today's world should be to develop an economic atmosphere, an environment and infrastructure that facilitates investment, not make the investment itself directly. The private sector will do that. The Reform Party believes in the principle of Bill C–89 and the privatization of CN Rail.

We would like to see some of the roadblocks removed from the legislation and we hope the government will accept our suggestions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support motion No. 4 amending Bill C–89. That motion, tabled by the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, seeks to give the House a say in the sale of CN's assets which are not directly related to railway transport.

The minister said on several occasions that he intends to sell off one by one those assets which are not directly related to railway transport. One of CN's major subsidiaries, AMF Technotransport, located in Montreal's Pointe–Saint–Charles, will be sold in that fashion. Last year, that company, which employs over 1,300 workers, suffered losses of some $35 million.

When he appeared before the committee, the minister said that AMF's future was precarious, but he refused to pledge to ensure the company's survival. Yet, should AMF close its doors, the consequences would be disastrous for the Montreal region. CN workers fear that privatization may deprive them of their job security and pensions. In fact, the process has already started.

Today, the media announced that the arbitrator just imposed a new collective agreement which, among other setbacks, provides less job security. The CAW union, which represents some 12,500 CN workers, made representations concerning the privatization

process. The workers have already had bad experiences with the privatization of two sections of CN: Route Canada and AMF.

In the case of Route Canada, the new owners bought the company and then shut it down, thus putting over 2,000 workers on the street. AMF, which is now a CN subsidiary, did not recognize the collective agreement. It took the courts over a year to restore the workers' rights. Several unions represent CN workers, particularly, as I just mentioned, the CAW. Overall, the unions are in favour of maintaining CN's Crown corporation status, but they want to be represented on the board of directors.

It should be pointed out that these workers are very productive. Following very tough negotiations and sometimes long strikes, they managed to get acceptable and reasonable salaries and working conditions. However, CN's management obtained, and continues to demand, concessions from the unions, including on the issue of job security. However, job security, which is only one element, was gained in exchange for other concessions.

• (2320)

Therefore, unions are concerned about the future since there have been massive layoffs over the past few years. Moreover, management positions have not been affected to the same degree.

I believe it to be urgent to improve labour relations at CN, a task which should be mainly the responsibility of the company's management. Unions, and the workers they represent, are worried about their jobs. This amendment seeks to maintain some degree of job protection for workers.

The bill contains no provision protecting the CN workers' vested rights or maintaining the present level of employment. This is a very important issue for workers. They do not want to find themselves without a job in the new company. As I said, the problem is the same for the employees of the sister companies such as AMF Technotransport, in Montreal. The vast majority of CN employees have more than 20 years seniority.

I will monitor the new company to make sure it abides scrupulously by the collective agreements in effect in this Crown corporation. I intend to monitor closely the transfer to the new employer of the rights and obligations under these agreements.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the first grouping. I must apologize, I was told by the opposition that they had more than one speaker on the motion. If I could, I would like to deal with Motions Nos. 1 through 4, specifically on clause 8.

Motions Nos. 1 to 3 propose either the removal or sunsetting after five years of the 15 per cent individual ownership restriction and the stipulation that CN's headquarters remain in Montreal.

The government chose to include a 15 per cent individual ownership restriction in the bill for a very specific purpose. Since the public share issue of CN will be the largest in Canadian history and likely could not be absorbed wholly by Canadian investors, access to foreign markets will be essential for the success of this deal. Any form of foreign ownership restriction would be viewed negatively by foreign investors and could result in a significantly reduced demand for CN shares, even jeopardizing the government's ability to sell 100 per cent of the crown corporation.

However, in order to ensure that no individual, Canadian or otherwise, would be able to attain control of CN, the government decided to include a 15 per cent individual ownership restriction. This is a balanced approach which would allow investors to buy a substantial piece of the company and have some influence over its future direction without enabling them to take it over. Since this is not expected to impact on the value of the CN shares, there is no call for either removing or sunsetting the stipulation.

With respect to CN's headquarters, it has always been located in Montreal and there is no reason to expect that to change. Indicating that it will remain there sends a message of stability and consistency with past practice to the workforce and investors. It has absolutely nothing to do with politics but everything to do with good business.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 1 negatived.)

• (2325)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 4. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Because Motion No. 1 was defeated, we now have to put the question on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Gouk: Mr. Speaker, we have just voted on Motion No. 1 which is appropriate. Motions Nos. 2 and 3 could be voted on together. That would work.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: Then I will put the question on Motions Nos. 2 and 3. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: I take it that the House wants to vote on both motions together. Is that correct?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motions will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motions Nos. 2 and 3 negatived.)

The Speaker: My colleagues, we will now proceed to Group No. 2 which is Motion No. 5.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-89 be amended by adding after line 13, on page 7, the following:

"11.1 (1) On continuation day and during the initial period following continuation day, neither the Minister nor CN shall sell or otherwise dispose of shares to persons who are not Canadian persons.

(2) In subsection (1)

"initial period" means ninety days or such longer period as is set by order of the Governor in Council;

"Canadian person" means

(*a*) an individual who is a Canadian citizen or who has the right of permanent residence in Canada, or

(*b*) a corporation registered in Canada the majority of the voting shares of which are held by

(i) individuals mentioned in paragraph (*a*), or

(ii) corporations, the majority of the voting shares of which are held by individuals mentioned in paragraph (*a*)."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why I have put forward this motion. It addresses the very point that the parliamentary secretary addressed when giving his explanation of the 15 per cent under the former grouping.

This will protect and give an opportunity to Canadians to buy shares and address the concerns that could only be dealt with by putting in another restriction. I would defer to my hon. colleague from Lethbridge for debate on this motion.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks. First of all, I would like to express my support for the privatization of CN. This is the proper move at this time.

To put it in economic terms, for example, the Government of Canada at the present time has a $550 billion debt. That is of major concern to Canadians. Canadian National has an accumulated debt of $2.5 billion which is an encumbrance on the people of Canada. It is time to privatize and bring an operation like this one into the private sector so that it works under the rules of the private sector in terms of its financing and its efficiencies.

• (2330)

The amendment we are speaking on tonight, which puts the shares out to Canadians in the first 90 days, is a good one. If the capital is in Canada for individuals or corporations in order to buy Canadian National and to operate it as a Canadian entity, that would be a good thing. It would be divided among Canadians in a variety of ways.

Let us give Canadians the first opportunity. After the 90 days we could open it up so those international people who wish to invest can do so and in a very proper and positive way participate in the economy of Canada.

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 5 proposes that the shares of CN be sold only to Canadian individuals and corporations for the first 90 days that the shares are sold on the stock market. It would negatively affect both the value the government would receive for its shares in CN and its ability to sell 100 per cent of its shares.

Given the size of the CN initial public offering it is unlikely that the Canadian equity markets could absorb the issue alone. Therefore, in order to sell 100 per cent of CN for a value which maximizes the return to Canadian taxpayers, foreign investors will need to participate in the share offering.

Changing this clause, as suggested by the Reform Party in Motion No. 5, would be viewed as foreign ownership restriction. Any restriction on the ability of foreigners to participate in the sale of CN would affect value and the shares would have to be sold at a significant discount in order to sell them all exclusively to Canadians.

Given the likely size of the share issue, all Canadians who so desire will have an opportunity to purchase CN shares, resulting in broad Canadian ownership of CN stock. An amendment such as suggested in Motion No. 5 is therefore unnecessary.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 5 negatived.)

The Speaker: We will now deal with Group No. 3 which contains a number of motions.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-89 be amended by deleting Clause 12.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-89, in Clause 12, be amended:

(*a*) by replacing line 14, on page 7, with the following:

"12. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Minister, with the approval of the"; and

(*b*) adding after line 30, on page 7, the following:

"(2) The aggregate amount of all debts of CN owed to Her Majesty in right of Canada may be reduced only by application of the proceeds of sales referred to in paragraph (1)(c), unless the amount to which it is so reduced exceeds a level that an accredited bond rating agency has certified to the Minister in writing as a level that would ensure for CN a bond rating no lower than BBB, in which case the Minister may make such further payment referred to in paragraph (1)(c) only to the extent necessary to reduce the aggregate amount to the level so certified."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-89, in Clause 12, be amended:

(*a*) by replacing line 14, on page 7, with the following:

"12. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Minister, with the approval of the"; and

(*b*) by adding after line 30, on page 7, the following:

"(2) No agreement or arrangement under paragraph (1)(*a*) or (*b*) or payment under paragraph (*c*), may be entered into or made until

(*a*) the Minister has laid before the House of Commons a proposal that the agreement or arrangement be entered into or the payment be made,

(*b*) the proposal has been referred to such committee as the House may determine,

(*c*) the committee has reported that it approves of the proposal, and

(*d*) the House has concurred in the report."

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-89 be amended by adding after line 36, on page 7, the following new Clause:

"13.1 No transaction that is made by the Minister or CN at any time before the first day that more than fifty percent of the shares in CN are owned by parties other than Her Majesty in right of Canada

(*a*) that would transfer to Her Majesty in right of Canada any part, subsidiary, operation or property of CN with a value exceeding one million dollars, or

(*b*) that would transfer to a party other than Her Majesty in right of Canada any part, subsidiary, operation or property of CN with a value exceeding ten million dollars,

shall be entered into until

(*c*) the Minister has laid before the House of Commons a proposal that the transaction be entered into,

(*d*) the proposal has been referred to such committee as the House may determine,

(*e*) the committee has reported that it approves of the proposal, and

(*f*) the House has concurred in the report of the committee."

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-89 be amended by adding after line 36, on page 7, the following new Clause:

"13.1 (1) No transaction that is made by the Minister or CN at any time before the first day that more than fifty percent of the shares in CN are owned by parties other than Her Majesty in right of Canada

(*a*) that would transfer to Her Majesty in right of Canada any part, subsidiary, operation or property of CN with a value exceeding one million dollars, or

(*b*) that would transfer to a party other than Her Majesty in right of Canada any part, subsidiary, operation or property of CN with a value exceeding ten million dollars, shall be entered into unless

(*c*) the Minister has referred the matter to the Auditor General of Canada, and

(*d*) the Auditor General has reviewed the transaction and prepared and caused to be laid before the House of Commons, a report stating that, in the opinion of the Auditor General, the transaction is in the interest of CN and of Canada.

(2) The Auditor General shall cause the report to be laid before the House of Commons within fifteen days after the date of referral by the Minister."

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-89 be amended by adding after line 36, on page 7, the following new Clause:

"13.1 (1) The pension plan for employees of CN known as the CN Pension Plan shall continue to exist and be funded and be administered by the CN Pension Board in accordance with the rules in existence immediately prior to the coming into force of this Act.

(2) The CN Pension Plan shall not be amended without the agreement of the CN Pension Board."

• (2335)

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, again I would like to say a few words in explanation of my amendments.

During the course of committee investigation the minister came before the committee and stated that it was his intention only to pay off enough debt after taking off the assets and resources of the company to allow the company to reach a BBB credit rating.

I have accepted this but wish to restrict the minister to ensure that he will do no more than what he said. Given that he has made this statement, it is very reasonable to ask him to make that commitment by way of amendment to the legislation. However, if he is not prepared to do this, then I would suggest that we should take away the power for him to arbitrarily pay off any amount of debt he chooses.

With regard to Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 I have looked at them but I have not been able to find my way clear to recommend that we support them. However I think Motion No. 11 by the Bloc Quebecois is a good motion. It deals with a sensitive subject. A lot of people will be reassured without causing any problems, and I recommend we support that motion.

Beyond this I would defer to my colleague from North Island—Powell River on debate.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will not speak to Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10. I am going to listen to the Bloc.

However I rise to support Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 11. Motion No. 6 deletes the possibility of government bailout of any CN debt. Current CN debt stands at $2.5 billion. Financial and industry experts agree that it will never reasonably sell with that debt level and must be reduced to an amount that would achieve an investment grade bond rating of BBB. A $1.5 billion debt would achieve this bond rating. The House should not give the minister the power to reduce CN's debt to any amount he chooses. This is risky and is not prudent.

First, it allows the minister to reduce the debtload well below the amount for which taxpayers can get a return upon sale. This could cause higher share prices which would appear to be a better deal but return a lower yield for taxpayers. I am quite certain this is not the intent of the minister, but this is no excuse for putting it into the legislation or allowing that kind of free board.

Second, excessive reduction of CN's debt would put CP Rail at a disadvantage similar to the disadvantage when Air Canada was privatized. It is not a simple matter of balancing the debt of two companies. CN has purchased many deluxe assets without normal private sector concerns for debt financing. The most recent example is the expensive buyout package for employees to help reduce CN's workforce. If CN is allowed this strategic advantage without any economic costs, it would have a tremendous and unfair market advantage.

Motion No. 7 would limit the government's ability to reduce CN debt to only the amount necessary to achieve BBB bond rating status after first reducing it by utilizing company funds available and from the disposal of real estate assets; in other words utilize cash and start selling off some of the assets. If members agree to this reasonable motion we will not need Motion No. 6 which deletes all authority for government bailout.

I also support Motion No. 11 which would provide for the continued existence of the CN pension plan to be administered by the CN pension board under current government rules. This is prudent and fair.

All too often employees with little control over the situation end up on the short end of the stick just because of a change in ownership. In many respects this is the most important and considered motion of all to pass through the House. If we all dig deeply in our collective memories we can think of living examples of people who have been treated unfairly by the system.

• (2340)

At this time I should like to move an amendment to Motion No. 7. The amendment is to one small section of Motion No. 7 which I believe was in error. We want the motion to read that it should apply to all CN debt, not just the debt owed to the Government of Canada. Therefore I move:

That Motion No. 7 be amended by deleting the words "owed to Her Majesty in right of Canada".

The Speaker: An amendment to Motion No. 7 has been moved. Now I will recognize the hon. member for Blainville—Deux–Montagnes on debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux–Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my comments will deal with Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10. The Bloc Quebecois agrees with the principle underlying Bill C–89 which provides for the transfer of the CN railway system to private interests, and the purchase of the company's remaining assets to dispose of them at a later date.

However, we vigorously oppose the outrageous powers the Minister of Transport wants to assume, under this bill, to carry out these operations. The amendments I am defending here are aimed instead at giving these powers to the House of Commons or the auditor general.

First, under clause 12, the Minister of Transport is assuming nothing less than the power to pay off the CN debts, not only from the proceeds of the sale of shares, but also out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. This operation aimed at making the product more attractive to buyers actually amounts to giving taxpayers' money to buyers, potentially foreigners.

This is untenable. It is strange, to use parliamentary language, that a government could be cynical enough to suggest to the people's representatives giving a minister the power to carry out such an operation.

My amendment is aimed at seeking the approval of the House for any agreement with CN by having the minister lay the proposed agreement before the House which will then refer it to a committee of its choice. It seems to me that it would be totally irresponsible for the government to reject this amendment and accept clause 12 as it is.

Secondly, the transport minister's obsession with power is not limited to asking the House to pay CN's debts with the taxpayers' money. Under clause 6, he goes ahead and gives himself the power to have any CN asset which he would like transferred to him or to a third party in exchange for a consideration in an amount he will determine himself.

• (2345)

In opposition to this outrageous requirement, we offer motions 9 or 10, at the discretion of the House. In Motion No. 9, we propose that no transaction be made by the Minister which would transfer to him a CN asset worth one million dollars or more, or transfer to a third party a CN asset worth ten million or more, before fifty percent of the CN shares are sold and unless the minister tables the plan for such an operation in the House and the House approves of such a plan, upon favourable recommendation from the committee designated by the House.

In Motion No. 10, since I said the House could pick No. 9 or No. 10 at its discretion, we propose instead that the House approval be replaced by the obligation, for the minister, to refer the project to the auditor general, who must report within 15 days. His opinion must be favourable in order for the transaction to be made. Again, it seems unthinkable that members would not accept one or the other of these guarantees.

Finally, the amendments I propose are aimed at preventing the Minister of Transport from acting as if CN were his own personal property and disposing of it the way he wants, buying the company's assets or paying its debts with our money. CN is a public asset, an asset that belongs to the people. We cannot, as the people's representatives, abdicate our responsibilities by conferring to a minister the power to dispose of it as he pleases.

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will speak for a few minutes on Motion No. 11 which deals with the pension plan. If we recall the history of Canada, railroads were supposed to be the catalyst for economic development throughout Canada. However, the problem over the years is that we had a company which was a crown corporation, to be privatized shortly.

The problem is that if CN is privatized, as it will be, it will serve the interests of shareholders rather than those of Canadian communities. Canada is currently going through a difficult period, while some regions are fighting to recover from the recession and to adjust to free trade. We are somewhat concerned that this privatization could add to instability at the very moment where Canada needs a reliable transportation network.

If CN were to be sold for an amount less than its book value, it has been estimated that the loss could be one billion dollars or more. We should ask ourselves if the liberal government across the way will forgive CN's debts or not. On the one hand, a privatized CN will need to be profitable to guarantee its long term growth. On the other hand, considering current fiscal restraints and the fact that this government constantly repeats that Canadians must accept cuts in social programs, one can hardly justify the decision to increase at public expense the value of shares which will be held by private interests.

The privatization of CN will also be costly for another reason. It is almost certain that some workers will lose their jobs in the process. Besides the cost of severance pay, we will also have to take into account the cost of unemployment insurance benefits and various retraining programs. After having made this preamble, I

would like to say that this is the reason why I moved Motion No. 11, which reads as follows:

13.1 (1) The pension plan for employees of CN known as the CN Pension Plan shall continue to exist and be funded and be administered by the CN Pension Board in accordance with the rules in existence immediately prior to the coming into force of this Act.

(2) The CN Pension Plan shall not be amended without the agreement of the CN Pension Board.

• (2350)

You will understand, and I think it is clear, that the aim of this amendment is to protect the pension plan of CN employees.

I would like to digress a little. I have never questioned the Translation and interpretation services of the House, I believe that we have excellent professionals, but I would like the service to look at the French version of my amendment. It seems to me that, instead of saying "régime de pension"—I have already been in contact with linguists from the Office de la langue française, and apparently, "régime de pension" is a literal translation of "pension plan"—we should say "régime de retraite". Not being one of those who know everything, I would like our interpretation services to tell me if my amendment is correctly written in French, as it refers repeatedly to "régime de pension".

I have said it before, but the purpose of this amendment is to protect the CN employees' pension plan. Bill C–89 does not include any measure ensuring that no change will be made to the CN pension plan, after privatization.

Finally, as has become clear to all Canadian workers, not only in railway companies, but all workers in Canada and Quebec, in spite of the NDP's traditional policy of fighting for Canadian workers' rights, the Bloc Quebecois has been the only party in this House speaking for Canadian workers' interests. For someone like me who has always worked on the side of employers, I am particularly proud to propose this amendment.

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, I want to support Motion No. 11.

This motion seeks to preserve the CN employees' pension plan. You will have noticed that Bill C–89 says nothing about the pension plan. I think it is important that provisions be made in the act itself so that the CN employees' pension plan can be preserved.

Why? Because of the recent and also not quite so recent history of Canadian National. We have noticed, over these past few years, that CN has had a certain propensity for shifting the costs for the transformation and modernization of the system to its employees. It has streamlined its operations under the pretext of improving productivity, but it has nevertheless changed the working conditions of its employees.

Especially during the last strike, which was a combination of strike and lockout, we saw that CN developed a strategy to completely change the working conditions of its employees and to urge the Canadian Parliament to pass a special bill under which these conditions would be legislated.

Yesterday, in the report released by the mediation–arbitration board, we saw that the worst concerns we, in the Bloc Quebecois, expressed during the debate on the legislation ordering CN and CP employees back to work, came true and the working conditions were unilaterally changed in favour of the employer.

I think it is vitally important that the Canadian Parliament protect the interests of the CN employees in terms of their pension plan. The motion put forward by my colleague from Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans should be agreed on, because it would be very reasonable to ensure that, after the sale of CN, it would be impossible to change the CN pension plan without the consent of the CN Pension Board.

• (2355)

You know that the rules of the CN Pension Board are such that the employees can have some influence and some input on the way the funds are administered.

I think that if such a motion is adopted—and I noted that my Reform colleague said something similar—, it would be entirely appropriate for the Parliament of Canada to ensure that justice is done for the workers who have given so much of themselves to this company and who, at the age of retirement, are entitled to enjoy the benefits they worked so long for, because people who worked for CN made a career there and were, in a way, employed by the government of Canada, by a crown corporation. I think that the House of Commons should not use privatization as an excuse for shirking its responsibilities.

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of Motion No. 11, which is a very important motion.

The workers and the union are very concerned about the future of their pension fund to which they have been contributing for many years. Unfortunately, Bill C–89 does not contain any provision to protect the pension fund after the company is privatized. It is a serious omission.

This amendment is in response to a request by the unions, who do not trust either the employer or the government in this regard. There have been bad experiences there also. The employer has not always contributed to the fund in the way that was provided for in the agreements. This fund should not be used to buy shares. The risk is too great in a market that is too volatile.

The pension plan is the only source of income for most pensioners. I think workers should have more control over their pension fund since it belongs to them.

No change should be made to the pension plan without the consent of the CN Pension Board and the consent of both the workers and their unions. Workers have contributed a lot to the CN pension plan. For example, in 1989, employees traded a 1 per cent salary increase for a partial indexation of their pension plan. That goes to show the importance of this amendment, which I fully support.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in view of the late hour, I will be brief.

Given the fact that, in my riding, there are 500 CN workers affected by this, I would like to support the proponent of the motion, our critic for transport, the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans. I know, for having spoken with these workers, that people who have worked for CN have worked hard for that company. We are reminded of those who work there now, but that is a long story; for them, this is an historic moment. I think the least I can do is to support this motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: We are on group No. 3.

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of co–operation, with regard to the amendment proposed by the Reform Party to its Motion No. 7, I do not believe we have any objection to that technical amendment but we are opposed to its Motion No. 7 and I will deal with that now.

Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 each propose amendments to clause 12 which provides the minister with the ability to deal with CN's capital structure. In order for CN's share issue to be attractive to investors and for CN to affordably finance its operations into the future, CN's debt needs to achieve an investment grade bond rating prior to the sale. In order to achieve such a rating CN's debt will need to be reduced. The exact magnitude of the debt reduction will not be known until the bond rating agencies begin to familiarize themselves with CN and discourse between the agencies, the government, and CN addresses the issue.

• (2400)

Any debt reduction will have three parts. First, in order to reduce its debt CN has already undertaken to sell several of its non–rail assets, such as CN Exploration. The proceeds from such divestitures will go to debt reduction. Second, in the spirit of selling CN as a core rail operation the government has proposed that CN transfer its non–core real estate assets to the government for fairconsideration prior to the share offering. This will also help to reduce CN's debt.

Any further debt reduction will be carefully considered by the government, taking into account the need to put CN on a level playing field with its competitors and ensure that it will remain viable in the future. However, the minister needs to retain maximum flexibility in making these decisions in consultation with the Minister of Finance. Any requirements to have such actions reviewed and approved by the House of Commons, a committee of the House, or the auditor general would limit the minister's flexibility and could therefore impede the transaction from proceeding in a timely and efficient manner, consequently affecting the value.

Therefore, these motions cannot be supported.

Motions Nos. 9 and 10 and the new clause 13.1 the opposition is proposing would remove from the Minister of Transport the flexibility he requires in dealing with the transfer of assets in the context of CN commercialization.

The commercial nature of the transaction dictates that any transfer be efficient and timely. The requirement to report to the House or have the auditor general review any such transaction before the transfer can proceed would seriously impair the minister's ability to direct that such transfers be undertaken in a timely manner. By impairing the efficiency of the transfer process the value of the transaction may be affected.

Moreover, to the extent that such assets are transferred to another crown corporation, they would be recorded in the crown corporation's corporate plan, a summary of which would be tabled in Parliament on an annual basis. This would allow all members to review the value of the assets in that crown corporation on a regular basis. In addition, the auditor general would have the opportunity to review such transfers in the normal course of events.

In addition, the commercial nature of these assets in some cases calls for confidentiality, which could be jeopardized should the minister be required to report any such transaction to the House.

Therefore, because of the need of timeliness, efficiency, and confidentiality, these amendments cannot be accepted.

I want to take a little more time with respect to Motion No. 11, which deals with the CN employees and pensioners. We also agree that these men and women who have worked and continue to work for a great corporation need to understand and know how they are going to be treated with regard to their CN pension.

The pensions of all CN employees and pensioners are protected in a number of ways, but first under the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985. They will continue to be protected following the commercialization of CN. The Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985, sets out the rules for pensions of all federally regulated companies. It therefore is a means by which to treat all those who are members of such pensions equally, including employees and pensioners of CN.

Following the sale of Canadian National to private investors all the pension promises made under the CN pension plan will continue to be honoured. The CN pension plan will not participate in the share offering. The CN pension plan is a defined benefit, which means that regardless of the vagaries of the marketplace an employee is promised a pension. That pension is calculated according to a fixed formula and the only variables in the formula are average earnings and years of service. The plan is federally registered under the Pension Benefits Standards Act, as I mentioned before, which is administered by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, and under the Income Tax Act, which is overseen by Revenue Canada.

Pension promises are documented in the text of the CN pension plan, which describes the entitlements of the 50,000 pensioners and surviving spouses as well as the approximately 25,000 active members. These pension promises are supported by the assets of the CN pension trust fund, which do not form part of the assets and revenues of CN. Legal title to the assets of the fund is held by the trustee of the fund, the Montreal Trust Company of Canada.

• (2405)

The CN pension plan and fund, in addition to being regulated by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions and Revenue Canada, are audited by the company's internal auditors as well as by external auditors. The financial, actuarial, and administrative aspects of the CN pension plan are also reviewed by the CN pension board, which is composed of five company representatives, five union representatives, five pensioners, and one representative of CN non–scheduled employees. As well, the CN pension plan and fund are subject to periodic actuarial evaluations by the external actuary, whose reports are presented to the CN pension board, submitted to the board of directors, and filed with the regulatory authorities.

The foregoing processes exist to safeguard the accrued pension entitlements of all members of the CN pension plan, pensioners, surviving spouses, and active members. A condensed version of this information was printed out on the April pension statement of all pensioners in answer to their most commonly asked question about the security of CN pensions. The April 1995 issue of "Keeping Track", a monthly newsletter sent out to all active employees and pensioners, featured the chart.

The government is committed to protecting the pensions of CN employees and the new corporation. This is our commitment. The amendments as proposed by the opposition would open it to employees of federally incorporated companies coming forward and seeking their own additional protection. This could potentially lead to a mixed bag of statutes protecting different players with different benefits for each group, rather than the consistent and clear protection currently found in the single piece of legislation. This inconsistency would not serve Canadians as efficiently as keeping all provisions under a single act.

Therefore, since CN employees and pensioners already have protection under the law, which would not be affected by commercialization of CN, the government does not support this amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I want to talk about the pension plans.

I believe it must be pointed out that the CN workers and rail workers everywhere in the country know perfectly well whom they can trust the most in this House.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on the amendment to Motion No. 7. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Fontana: Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to the members on the other side of the House. I think we had made the commitment that the amendment to Motion No. 7 was acceptable to us. If you could return to that particular vote, I am sure we would want to correct that in the spirit of cooperation.

The Speaker: My colleagues, it is a little bit late. Is it agreed that we return?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (2410)

The Speaker: We are going to deal again with the amendment to Motion No. 7. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Amendment agreed to.)

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion as amended will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 7, as amended, negatived.)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 6 negatived.)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 8.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, could we consider a vote on Motions Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11?

[*English*]

Mr. Gouk: Mr. Speaker, we would agree to voting on Motions Nos. 8, 9, and 10 together but would like Motion No. 11 voted on separately.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: We are going to vote on Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motions will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motions stands deferred.

• (2415)

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–89 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–89, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 8, with the following:

"15.(1) The Official Languages Act continues to apply to CN as if it continued to be a federal institution within the meaning of that Act.

(2) Subsection (1) ceases to be in effect five years after the coming into force of this Act."

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be consent for the purpose of debate to putting Groups Nos. 4, 5 and 6 together.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: I agree, Mr. Speaker, provided that we will be able to vote on each of the four motions individually.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is it agreed that we are going to put Groups Nos. 4, 5, and 6 together for debate and we will vote on the motions separately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–89 be amended by adding after line 3, on page 8, the following new Clause:

"15.1 The Minister shall, no later than January 1, 1996 conclude an agreement with CN providing for CN to repair, renovate and maintain the Pont de Québec in Quebec City and to commence work under the agreement no later than May 1, 1996."

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-89, in Clause 16, be amended by adding after line 15, on page 8, the following:

"(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to

(*a*) any activity of CN within a province that operates under an agreement that subjects the activity to the jurisdiction of that province, or

(*b*) any work, subsidiary or corporation owned by CN that is situated or operates only within one province."

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will touch on my own motions by way of introduction. My colleague will deal further with those.

I would just like to point out two things. First of all the Official Languages Act is not the subject of the motion. The subject is a restriction to a private company contrary to what the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for London East said earlier with regard to the headquarters. He suggested that because it is in Montreal and it has always been in Montreal it probably always will be. That may be. If the company follows the official languages policy of the federal government and it works for it, I am sure it will continue to but if it does not work for the company, then it should not have a gun held to its head.

I guess I should not use that expression. That would offend the Minister of Justice who is taking all those away. Instead I would say that we should not twist the company's arm and require it to remain there subject to this policy. Of course even twisting its arm now is a little dangerous because the thought police will first have to determine whether we are twisting its arm because we want it to use a particular language or because of race, religion or sexual orientation. I guess I will have to start to be more careful in the House.

I would like to speak just briefly to Groups Nos. 5 and 6. Group No. 5 deals with the Bloc motion with the Pont de Québec. I listened to the group which came to committee on this matter. They were a very passionate and dedicated group. They obviously feel very strongly about their project to preserve the bridge and have a lot of commitment to this. I am sympathetic to their case. It was their explanation that there is a legal obligation on the part of CN. If that is true, and I have no reason to believe that they would be incorrect given how conscientious they seem to be about this, then it will not matter whether CN is still held by the government or privatized.

• (2420)

That legal obligation, if it exists, will go with the company and should be dealt with and enforced. I have suggested to them that I, among others I am sure, because I know the Bloc is very concerned about this, would be prepared to take this up if they are prepared to bring forward the evidence that this is a legal obligation.

With regard to Group No. 6, in principle I have some support for what the Bloc is talking of. However, this is the wrong forum in which to do this. The government has already put me on notice that it will be introducing legislation next week dealing with regulatory reform for the entire rail industry. It would be inappropriate to take a small segment of that and try to deal with it under privatization when we have the regulatory legislation coming forward that will deal with all of it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, since I am not familiar with the procedure, I would like to ask a question. I would like to know whether I will have more than ten minutes to speak to each group. Since the motions have been grouped, I know I will need more than ten minutes. How does this work?

Mr. Boudria: You ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Guimond: I should ask for unanimous consent? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The Speaker: There is a request to speak for a little bit longer than the usual amount because we are putting three groups together. Is there unanimous consent to give each other a little bit more time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guimond: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize. I hope you will not take the fact that I thanked the Government Chief Whip for agreeing to extend my speaking time as a lack of respect on my part for the Chair.

I would like to start by speaking to Motion No. 12 standing in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke, which proposes to delete clause 15 which reads as follows: "The Official Languages Act continues to apply to CN as if it continued to be a federal institution within the meaning of that Act".

I think it is too bad that my Reform Party colleague, who is an ardent Canadian and wants to maintain Canadian unity, does not behave like one and is indulging what is referred to in English Canada as Quebec bashing. That is really too bad, and the Reform Party will suffer the consequences when one day it decides to field candidates in a federal election in Quebec. Mr. Speaker, in Quebec our motto is: "Je me souviens", I remember. And we certainly will remember, provided Quebec is still part of Canada, which is unlikely once we have won the referendum.

We will take every opportunity to remind Quebecers that the Reform Party proposed amendments to remove the privatized company from the application of the Official Languages Act. And this is not the first time, as the hon. member for Bourassa pointed out. This party makes a habit of presenting petitions in the House of Commons to complain about the Official Languages Act. I would like to point out that the government acted responsibly by including Clause 15 in Bill C–89, under which the Official Languages Act will continue to apply to CN when it is privatized.

The government's actions reflect those of the previous government in 1988 when it proceeded to privatize Air Canada. I could also mention another amendment by the hon. member which proposed to reverse the present government's commitment to keep the company's headquarters in the Montreal Urban Community.

• (2425)

I would now like to touch briefly on amendment no. 14, which would provide for the federal government, therefore the Minister of Transport, to remain responsible for the maintenance of the Pont de Québec, despite the privatization of CN.

The Pont de Québec is a jewel in our world heritage. This is no bridge over some backwater creek at the end of some concession. This is the structure that Sir Wilfrid Laurier called an architectural masterpiece when it was inaugurated, a source of pride not only for the Province of Quebec and Quebec City, but for all of Canada.

I publicly denounce here in the House the attitude of my colleagues on the Standing Committee on Transport. Both the chairman, the hon. member for Hamilton West and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, the member for London East were impolite to the people from the Coalition pour la sauvegarde du Pont de Québec when they presented their brief to the committee last week. And that is putting it mildly.

The chairman of our committee and the parliamentary secretary are both unilingual anglophones. With their earphones off, our committee's chairman and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport chatted away throughout the unilingual French presentation by the representatives of the coalition, taking in absolutely nothing at all.

After it was over, they went so far as to ask me why the coalition had not applied under the infrastructure program. That is utterly unacceptable. Canadian National, and not the City of Quebec, is the owner of the bridge. And why should the City of Quebec have applied under the infrastructure program to renovate the bridge? This shows how ignorant they are of the whole issue and, to top it off, how impolite they were to the unilingual francophones who came before the Standing Committee on Transport to present their brief.

I would like to remind you that the coalition to save the Pont de Québec is not a partisan organization, on the contrary, it is non–partisan. And I can assure you that I have never personally met any of the members of this coalition and they have never been associated with me or affiliated with my party. Their work falls squarely outside of the political arena. The people of the region of Quebec were very disappointed by the reception this coalition received in Ottawa.

The bridge is in a pitiful state. According to the coalition, the required work is estimated at between $41 million and $45 million. What will happen if the new privatized CN refuses to honour its commitments with regard to the bridge? What will happen? Will it be left to deteriorate? It is a world heritage jewel.

Here again, I deplore, I forgot to mention it earlier, I deplore the fact that the chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport downplayed the Pont de Québec, saying that the new privatized CN would never save any old bridge crossing a stream at the end of a concession or any bit of rail line in some village in Canada or some old station in Canada.

This was how the bridge was described, and it is crazy. Perhaps it was to convince himself that those watching us would think the Bloc member was fantasizing and making it up. I suggest they read the minutes of the Standing Committee on Transport; they will see where the truth lies.

In closing, I would like to talk briefly about Motion No. 15. The aim of this amendment is to avoid short line railways CN might have an interest in being put under federal jurisdiction.

• (2430)

At the moment, all intraprovincial transport comes under provincial jurisdiction. We are concerned about the wording of clause 16 of the bill and so we have proposed an amendment to ensure that SLRs remain within provincial jurisdiction and do not become federal.

Obviously, by stating that interprovincial transportation structures—check the wording in the bill—are "for the general advantage of Canada", we avoid having SLRs in which CN has an interest being automatically placed under federal jurisdiction, and this is the aim of our amendment.

CN could thus become a partner and share in the creation of SLRs. I think that our party has shown great openness towards SLRs; it may be the way of the future, an instrument that will give us more flexibility to satisfy the clients' needs, etc. But what is important is that, to prevent abandonment, it isimportant that many lines be taken over by SLRs. Some of them may even belong to CN. I think that instead of eliminating regional services, it isimportant, and I will conclude with this, to consider rail transport in the same way as air or water transport. A mode of transport is above all an instrument for regional economic development.

It is obvious that when a rail line is abandoned, it can make regional economic development much more difficult.

To conclude, I will give you an example. A cement factory is planned in Port–Daniel, in the Gaspé. Unfortunately, the member for Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine has not intervened and never made any inquiry regarding this planned cement factory, although it is in his riding, probably because he is not interested. Anyway, there is a plan for a cement factory in Port–Daniel, in the Gaspé, a beautiful village with a 25 per cent unemployment rate. The developers have two requirements. First, they require a sea port; Port–Daniel is located in Chaleur Bay; I believe that having a deep water sea port will not be a problem. Second, to move cement to Canadian and American markets, they require a railway since, as we know, Gaspé roads cannot take heavy trucking.

Therefore, if they close the railway in Gaspé, how will it be possible to attract companies and develop Quebec? This is what I wanted to say to conclude my remarks.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask you for any extra time or for anything over 10 minutes. As a matter of fact I may not even speak for five minutes.

I have noticed a certain ambivalence on the benches opposite toward this privatization bill. Clearly privatization is not something you do just to do it. It is done for a reason. The reason is to try to put a crown corporation in a position where it becomes an efficient money making organization.

The hon. member for London East has spoken on several occasions about the fact we must not apply constraints to the company after it is privatized. If we do that we defeat our purpose. One of the constraints the government is proposing to apply is to maintain the Official Languages Act for this private corporation. The Official Languages Act is intended for government organizations.

If CN has to maintain the extra cost and the extra inefficiencies of having the hand of the official languages commissioner on the throttle of every locomotive, it is not going to be as competitive as it needs to be. It is unnecessary. Most of CN's operations are west of the lakehead. There is very little French spoken by either the employees or by the customers.

There will certainly be circumstances in any company working in Canada where it will want to maintain the use of two languages voluntarily.

• (2435)

[*Translation*]

I worked from time to time in mines or other work sites where workers spoke two or even three different languages. We had to use these languages correctly for the sake of efficiency or safety, but never for political reasons. That is sensible bilingualism. It is not always necessary to impose rules for everything.

[*English*]

I would like to speak even more briefly on Motion No. 14. Again, we have an example of an attempt by government to maintain control over the corporation after it is privatized. No one but the management of a company should be in a position to decide what bridges it is going to maintain, what tracks it is going to maintain.

This is something that is not done if the government really means what it says about making the thing run properly. It does not allow bureaucrats or politicians to stick their cotton pickin' hands into the operations of a private company. If it does that, it may as well forget about privatizing the company, just keep on dictating to it. Government cannot have it both ways.

Either the company is going to be private or it is going to continue to be a semi–crown. I strongly agree with the proposal to privatize it.

On the last motion, the question proposed by the hon. members of the Bloc to simplify the regulatory regime, to give the provinces more regulatory powers and the federal government less, in principle I agree with that but this is neither the time nor the place to debate that question.

It certainly should not be written into the bill. With that, I have had my five minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I will confirm what my colleague from Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans has said.

The Pont de Québec is indeed a heritage jewel. However, it is in very poor condition due to the irresponsible behaviour of Transport Canada as well as of CN. The reason why it is necessary to propose this amendment is that both entities, Transport Canada and CN, never fulfilled their responsibilities. Therefore, by adding this element to the bill we might have a chance to see the Pont de Québec become once again what it used to be, a source of pride for the Quebec region.

Just as the Eiffel Tower is the symbol of Paris or the Statue of Liberty the symbol of New York, the Pont de Québec is something which symbolizes the Quebec region.

The amendment is necessary because, in 1993, CN and Transport Canada signed an agreement that they never fulfilled. Why should we believe that a privatized CN, in the hands of private shareholders, would all of a sudden tell its shareholders: We must now ensure that the Pont de Québec be kept in good repair. We do not believe it would.

The agreement signed in 1993 was very clear, it said in section 4: "Canada transfers the Pont de Québec to CN. CN undertakes to finance a major maintenance program on this bridge, including installation and maintenance of architectural lighting, to restore this structure to a condition which guarantees its long-term viability and maintain it in this condition. Without limiting the specified obligations of CN, the company will try to conclude an agreement with the Province of Quebec." I should say that Transport Quebec was never against such an agreement.

• (2440)

Section 13 of the same agreement reads: "This agreement comes under Canadian legislation, is interpreted in accordance with that legislation and binds parties and their successors and assignees". Therefore if an agreement signed by the Transport minister and the CN has remained totally inoperative, how can we believe that private shareholders would fare better? This is why we believe it is essential to pass amendment no. 14 in order to make sure that the Pont de Québec will be maintained by those who have the responsibility to do so.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are inviting me to justify my presence in this debate. If the hon. member for Louis-Hébert can justify his presence because one of the bridge pillars is located in his riding, I must add that there is another one in my riding.

This bridge was built in 1917 and, in the beginning, it was used to allow trains to cross the St. Lawrence River. It is a river, I say to the whip of the Liberal Party. It is not a brook, as my colleague for Beauport was saying. If ever this bridge were to collapse through lack of maintenance—I do not want to make people feel uneasy about this—if ever it were to collapse and CN trains could not go over it, imagine the detour we would have to make in order to ship our goods. We would have to go from Quebec City to Montreal, and then to the Maritimes.

This does not make sense. This is unacceptable. Of course, the bridge may not collapse in the next 20 years, but its physical appearance is deteriorating to such an extent that people in the Quebec City region tell us that this bridge belongs to the federal government and has become a symbol of the decrepit state of federalism in Quebec.

This is getting a reaction from some of the people here. If members of the current Liberal federal government wanted to enhance their visibility before the referendum, they should do as the coalition suggests because every day, every person who comes to see me—not only people from the Quebec City region but also foreign visitors—note the state of disrepair of this symbol. I think it would be to the Liberal Party's advantage—I am giving them some valuable advice—to ensure that the bridge is being maintained, to give it a new image.

Coalition members should also remind them that this would create 200 jobs over six years. Is this not right, my dear colleague? Over six years. This would allow the bridge to be renovated and create jobs, in addition to the purchase of materials. There would be an economic impact. We are looking for ways to put people back to work, for useful projects, and the Pont de Québec would fit the bill.

This would cost $40 million but we must spend it. Strangely enough, an engineer told me this week that CN asked a U.S. firm to study the whole matter. The Americans recognize the value of this bridge. They took an interest in it and even gave it an architecture and engineering award. It has been described as one of the eight wonders of the world. That is quite something.

But the wonder does not impress anyone any more. On the contrary, it has become an object of shame. Something must be done, but it does not make sense to leave this in the hands of a company that will be privatized.

• (2445)

No privatized company will want to invest $40 million to repair this bridge, unless it is forced into it. Nobody will do it. So, we are asking the federal government to act as the owner, not as a tenant, because it really is the owner, and it is responsible for these repairs.

Finally, the amendment proposed by our colleague, the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, is valid, as the federal government saw fit to remove the CN Tower from CN's assets. If it is good for Toronto, it should be good for Quebec City. I will end here, as it is quite late.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. No one will wonder why I rise on the issue of the Pont de Québec.

An hon. member: We want to know.

Mr. Langlois: It is first for historical reasons. When the bridge collapsed for the second time, my grandfather was there. Consequently, that event was the topic of many stories when I was young. I often cross that bridge. The hon. member for Lévis referred to the CN Tower, in Toronto. It would be more appropriate to compare the Pont de Québec to the Tower of Pisa, considering that both structures are more or less in the same condition.

There is also a more personal and even religious reason. Indeed, every time I cross the bridge on a train, I cannot help but feel a need to say my prayers, because I always wonder if we will make it to the other side.

If you have been in Quebec City on more than one occasion, you should go at least once to have a look at the bridge from the lovely city of Saint–Romuald. You will realize what an eye–sore it is, not to say anything about the risk it represents for those who have to use it.

If it remains a federal crown asset, we will see what will happen later on. We will at least get an assurance that that bridge will be repaired. Everything that needs to be done has already been identified. In the notes my colleague from Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans was kind enough to give to me, I notice that as late as 1994, that is last year, an American company called Mojeski and Masters was paid $700,000 U.S. for a visual inspection of the substructure and superstructure of the bridge. Surely, we must have qualified people in Canada to do that kind of work, but the contract was awarded to an American company anyway.

When the railway service was dismantled, in Bellechasse, the entire Monk line, from Charny to Edmunston, New Brunswick, was dismantled. Even the rails were torn up. The right of way has not been given back to the original owners yet, but the rails have disappeared.

The dismantling of the railroad is a real disaster, since the railway has always been a symbol and a reality for Canada ever since 1867, which is why I will be pleased to support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans and to vote in favour of the Pont de Québec remaining a public asset.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me assure everyone in attendance I will not be quite as long as the Bloc was with all its members. I will be about the same time as it took the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke.

With regard to Motions Nos. 12 and 13 which affect clause 15 in the bill, CN currently operates under the Official Languages Act in both official languages. In its continuing capacity as a national railway CN will continue to serve both anglophone and francophone clients across the country.

Continued application of the Official Languages Act will not require any change to its operations. In addition, CN management has indicated it makes good business sense to operate a bilingual railway.

• (2450)

Moreover, CN's intention to continue operating as a bilingual railway will also have no effect on the value of the company's shares when they are sold.

With regard to Motion No. 14 and the Quebec bridge, Motion No. 14 deals with the renovation and maintenance of the Pont de Québec in Quebec City. Although the government understands the desire to ensure the Pont de Québec is maintained in good condition, Bill C–89 is not the proper venue for such assurances.

Putting such a clause in the bill would draw negative attention from investors as an operating cost imposed on CN. CN has stated its willingness to increase its contribution for maintenance to $1.5 million but needs matching funds from the province of Quebec, keeping in mind the province has an interest in the bridge because it is a highway structure, an area of provincial jurisdiction.

I hope members of the Bloc would impose upon their friends in Quebec City that they have an equal responsibility to maintain that bridge, as 70 per cent of the traffic on it is vehicular, which is under provincial jurisdiction.

Let me assure everyone this bridge is in safe condition. It is in need of repair. CN is obligated to maintain it and it has promised to do so. I encourage everyone to have the province put in its fair share as well as those people who want to keep it for historical purposes.

Therefore we cannot support Motion No. 14.

On Motion No. 15, which impacts on clause 16, Bill C–89 will have no effect on the jurisdiction under which either an interprovincial or an intraprovincial railway operates. Currently interprovincial railways come under federal jurisdiction and must comply with federal safety regulations. Intraprovincial railways may choose to incorporate either under the provincial jurisdiction of the province in which they operate or under federal jurisdiction.

Currently most intraprovincial shortlines choose provincial jurisdiction. Internal shortlines, whether they be intraprovincial or interprovincial remain part of the class one railway and therefore operate under federal jurisdiction.

An example of this is the internal shortline in northern Quebec recently established by CN and its employees. Again, none of the foregoing would be affected by Bill C–89, and the proposal to amend clause 16 is therefore unnecessary.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 12 negatived.)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 13 negatived.)

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 14.

• (2455)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We are now proceeding to Group No. 6, Motion No. 15. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, although I will not use quite the same wording in French as the chief government whip, I think you will find unanimous consent to put forward an additional motion. Do I have to read it?

Some hon. members: We would like to understand it.

Mr. Guimond: You would like to understand it? Okay. At this hour, I tend to be solitary.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup:

That Clause 8 be amended by adding after line 19, on page 5, the following:

"(5.1) Paragraphs 5(*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) shall apply only:

(*a*) to persons who are Canadian citizens or are permanent residents of Canada;

(*b*) to corporations established in Canada that are not controlled by individuals who are neither Canadian citizens nor permanent residents of Canada or by corporate bodies established abroad".

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the member to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I will try to proceed as quickly as possible.

You will know that the firms Scotia McLeod, Nesbitt Burns and Goldman Sachs have been hired to co–ordinate the sale of CN shares at the international level. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that CN remains under Canadian control, since it is Canadian taxpayers' money that was used to build it. That is what our amendment is all about.

I can tell you that, in the transport committee, I was very disappointed that the syndicate of the three companies responsible for launching the issue of shares refused to answer my questions, and in particular a very legitimate question asking what their fee for this operation would be. I think the taxpayers of Quebec and Canada have the right to know how much Scotia McLeod, Nesbitt Burns and the U.S. firm Goldman Sachs will be paid to launch the new issue of CN's shares.

The question was perfectly legitimate, but I was told this was confidential information that could not be divulged. I want to say that the answer is unsatisfactory.

I had other very pertinent questions for which I did not get any answers either. I will read a few to the House. I had 21 of them. For instance, I asked:

[*English*]

What are the prospective financial statistics for CN upon which the sale price will have to be based? I am interested in the following for the years 1990–95 through 2000. I wanted to know the operating cash flow, the free cash flow after capital spending but before dividends, operating income and the net income.

• (2500)

[*Translation*]

I had all kinds of questions to which I received no answer. I asked them, for example:

[*English*]

What is your estimation of the value of land and other real estate property?

[*Translation*]

I received no answer. That is why I am very concerned about the fact that the new privatized CN could fall under foreign management when taxpayers in Quebec and Canada have made such a major contribution to the development of this company.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will also be very brief. I just want to explain to hon. members what the consequences are of adopting or defeating this amendment.

I would like to provide some historical background. Certain choices were made in the course of Canada's history and one was that the railroad would go from New Brunswick through Eastern Quebec and then to Ontario. These decisions also led to the introduction of transportation subsidies to compensate for the fact that the distance was greater than it would be through the United States.

If we do not adopt the amendment before the House today, we might easily land in a situation where American interests would be able to buy or get a controlling interest in CN and thus be able to close down certain parts of the line for the benefit of American lines, in other words, the routes through the United States.

This is true in Eastern Canada and also in Western Canada. I think that if we do not watch out, 25, 30 or 35 years from now we will realize we made a strategic mistake that will cost Quebec and Canada dearly. In the past, we saw that Quebec was adversely affected as a result of certain choices made with respect to railway routes. The amendment before the House today would prevent this kind of situation.

Incidentally, a Canadian group would not be prohibited from owning more than 15 per cent of CN shares. This might give Quebec interests a chance to ensure that in the future, the entire railway network in Quebec is harmonized with the road network. That is why this amendment should be passed.

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, even though it is late, I would like to say just a few words, because I think this is a very important subject.

I support this motion and it is important, because when the Liberals were in the opposition, they were more nationalist and Canadian in their outlook than they are today. I think they defended the interests of Canadians better than they are doing now. Today, that is history. I think some people in this country are apprehensive about the foreign interests that might control CN.

The very fact of selecting Goldman Sachs in New York does not augur well, as far as I am concerned, and that is why I want to support this motion which I think is very important.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a couple of minutes to address the amendment and a very fundamental question here.

First, let me indicate there is no evidence in other countries where privatization has taken place of foreign takeovers. In fact, to protect against any individual gaining control of CN, as has been indicated, a 15 per cent individual ownership restriction has been imposed.

Moreover section 8 of the enabling legislation protects against investors colluding to control the company by combining the voting power of their shares. To insert such an amendment into the bill would negatively impact on both the value of the shares as well as what the government would receive and hence the Canadian taxpayer.

I do not believe we need to take any lessons from the Bloc Quebecois in protecting Canadian interests. The government wants to maximize the return for Canadians in this national railroad and does not need any lessons from them on how to build good national railways.

Let me also take this opportunity to assure my friend in regard to the question he asked about fees. Obviously they will be made in due course. I believe he also heard of this global team that will offer these shares across North America and beyond, that is why this team was put together.

• (2505)

He also heard that our Minister of Transport has negotiated the best deal with regard to fees and they have complimented the hard bargain he drove. I assure members we will be getting good value for the fees from our global underwriters.

The Speaker: We are now dealing with Group No. 7, Motion No. 17. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the divisions are further deferred to Monday, June 19 at 11.30 p.m.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

(Motion agreed to.)

(The House adjourned at 1.09 a.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 16, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision; and of Motions Nos. 1 to 7.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, the last time the House considered Bill C–85, the hon. member for Longueuil had four minutes left. Since he is not in the House today, the hon. member for Yellowhead has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before I comment directly on Bill C–85 I remind the House it has been almost two years since the government took over office and Canada's deficit. The problem still remains unresolved.

During the last 24 hours the deficit has increased by $100 million and in the last hour the deficit has increased by $4 million. Since I began speaking the deficit has increased by about $40,000. When I an through with my remarks on the MP pension bill the deficit will have incredibly increased by about $700,000. Our country's debt stands at over $550 billion and the government has added about $100 billion to the debt over the last couple of years.

• (1005)

Into this kind of deficit disaster, this spending brinkmanship, the government introduced the outrageous, incredibly rich gold plated MP pension bill which government members are reluctant to debate in the House and which they certainly will not debate outside the House or across the country.

Government members should hang their heads in shame. Every member who votes for this bill, this elitist double standard bill, should be embarrassed. When MPs who support the bill go back to their ridings, how can they look their constituents straight in the eye and tell them they deserve a pension at least twice as rich as those of their constituents? For the 74 Liberal members of Parliament presently here, the trough heavies, how can they look their constituents in the eye and tell them they deserve a pension at least four times are rich as those of their constituents?

Politicians in Ottawa have created two sets of rules, one for the ruling elite and one for regular folks. A case in point recently of a double standard is the mileage allowance increase for MPs, about 12 per cent higher than is allowed in the private sector. Politicians set themselves apart, above regular folks.

I am talking about a double standard, which is really an euphemism for hypocrisy. The ultimate hypocrisy takes shape in the MP pension plan. It was an issue during the 1993 election campaign and it will grow to a major issue in the next election.

My constituents in the Yellowhead know what the federal government is doing about the gold plated pension plan and they do not like it one bit.

Sadly, the Liberal government lacks the intestinal fortitude to do the right thing and bring MP pension into line with pension plans available in the private sector. It is a double standard. Whether the Liberals want to accept it or not, we are all regular folks, just like the people who voted for us. Dignity and respect are in order for Canadians, not double standards or double talk.

There are many things hypocritical about Bill C–85, the pension bill. It allows benefits to accrue at double the rate legally allowed in the private sector under the Income Tax Act. Senior Liberal MPs, 74 of them with more than six years of service, will retain their gold plated pension and start collecting immediately on retirement regardless of age.

Seventy–four Liberal MPs even under the provisions of the bill will still receive a pension four times richer than most other Canadians'. Freshman MPs who opt into this new plan will still be part of a pension plan twice as generous as that available for most Canadians, and they can start collecting pensions at age 55. This group of MPs will also be able to collect 75 per cent of their salary after serving 19 years in office. Most Canadians have to

work 35 years to collect a pension worth 70 per cent of their final income.

It is this kind of better than thou attitude Canadians are tired of. Average folks are being asked to tighten their belts, to pay more in the form of all kinds of taxes. MPs have created an insulated world for themselves which shields them from the financial burden regular Canadians are asked to carry.

Perhaps one of the most hypocritical elements of the MP pension plan is it allows former parliamentarians who are wealthy to continue to collect an MP pension. Seniors citizens can only dream of such a system for them. These folks have to abide by the rules set by law. Any senior 65 years of age or over who has an income exceeding $53,215 must pay 15 per cent of the excess net income up to the full amount of old age security collected. In other words, seniors who cross a certain income threshold have their old age security benefits clawed back and most people would say it is fair and reasonable.

Those members who have six or more years experience can begin to collect their MP pension immediately on leaving office regardless of age. Freshmen MPs can begin collecting their MP pensions at age 55. To top it all off, former parliamentarians who are well off are not subject to any pension clawback. For some unknown reason they are put on a pedestal and are somehow deserving of every cent because they served their country.

• (1010)

What about the seniors who have their OAS pensions clawed back? Many of them are veterans. Most seniors helped build this country. Surely they can claim they have contributed to their country and are deserving of every cent as well. Again it is a double standard, one the public should not and will not tolerate.

To deal with this unfairness I will be introducing a private member's bill this fall which is the basis for an Amendment No. 39 to Bill C–85. Both require all former parliamentarians whether senators or MPs to have their pensions clawed back exactly the same way many seniors have their OAS benefits clawed back. This clawback would take effect immediately once the parliamentarian begins to collect his pension regardless of age. It would apply when a former member attains employment which pays him in excess of $53,215, the exact same threshold level which applies to seniors eligible to collect OAS.

I will be the first to admit such a clawback will not save the country billions of dollars. It will save the taxpayers money in the long run. That is something every member in the House should be interested in. It will help to alleviate the widespread cynicism federal politicians encounter. It will help to restore perhaps a little confidence. This is most important. It will send a signal to the long suffering taxpayers that cuts must start with those who legislate.

Why should former Tory Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, who is independently wealthy, pocket $33,500 of taxpayers' dollars every year? That is his MP pension benefit and not one dime of it is clawed back. To add insult to Canadian taxpayers, Mulroney stands to collect an additional $50,000 per year in priministerial pension when he turns 65 in the year 2003. This is the man who brought the country to its knees. As the MP pension plan is laid out now none of that can be clawed back and after a member turns 60 it is all indexed.

Then there is millionaire Liberal Pierre Trudeau. With inflation protection he collects well over $100,000 per year from Canadian taxpayers. Here as well not one thin dime is clawed back.

We cannot forget some of our colleagues presently in the House. They will be the heavy troughers when they leave this place. The Deputy Prime Minister staunchly defends the obscene MP pension plan. It is no wonder, she would stand to collect about $34,000 per year if she retired today. That is almost $3 million by the time she reaches age 75. If on her retirement she gains meaningful employment or contracts from the ex–heritage minister certainly she should be susceptible to an MP pension clawback.

Then there is the leader of the Tory party. It appears we cannot get the rich blue blood out of the Tories. He has been extremely quiet about the ludicrous MP pension plan. I suspect it is because he stands to collect about $45,000 per year on retirement, with a total of $4.5 million, mostly taxpayers' money, until he reaches age 75. It is no wonder the Tory leader is silent about the MP pension plan.

Surely everyone would agree that on retirement the leader of the Tory party, the independents really, should be subject to an MP pension clawback if he earns over $53,000 per year in the private sector.

It is unfair to ask seniors in a certain wage category to give a portion of their pensions if former parliamentarians who fall under the same wage category do not have to give back a portion of their incredibly rich pensions.

• (1015)

I sincerely hope all members of this House will give careful consideration to amendment No. 39 under Bill C–85, which calls for an MP pension clawback to well off former parliamentarians. There cannot be two sets of government imposed rules, one for seniors collecting pensions and one for MPs collecting pensions. It is undemocratic, unfair, and just not right.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to speak today on Bill C–85, commonly known as the MP pension plan.

I first have to express my extreme disappointment with this government for using time allocation on a bill such as this. The obvious question we have to ask is why the government did it.

Why did it impose limits on debate on a bill such as this? What is the hurry? We have two years, under normal conditions, before an election is called. Why does the government have to ram this through before the end of this Parliament?

I submit that the Liberals want to get to the bank before the end of the day to cash in and make their big deposit to take advantage of what they just awarded themselves.

What did they award themselves? They awarded themselves an obscene pension plan. In the red book the Liberals outlined that they were going to be reforming this MP pension plan to bring it into line with what the average is in Canada. That simply has not happened here.

I also want to examine the role of the official opposition of Canada in this particular bill. Why would a party whose main goal is to leave this country by separating from Canada want an MP pension plan? They must have some idea that maybe this is going to fail and they are going to be here for a lot longer than they originally expected. As a matter of principle, should this party not say that they are going to use this opportunity to opt out? They want to opt out of Canada but they want to stay within the MP pension plan. Talk about double standards.

We have double standards from the Liberals on the MP pension plan, but I would say there is a complicity here with the Bloc. They also co–operated in the vote on time allocation on this bill. I am really disappointed with Her Majesty's official opposition, or loyal opposition I should say, which is what the word actually is.

Mr. Strahl: Using the term loosely.

Mr. Penson: Yes. My colleague just reminded me that I am using that term loosely.

I want to outline my concerns of what I think the public has to say on this issue, especially the public in my riding. The main issue in the last election campaign in my riding was MP pensions. It was not MPs' salaries. There were a number of other issues, but one of the main issues and one that was brought forward at every public meeting I attended was the MP pension plan. People asked: "Why would the MPs award themselves a pension plan four or five times more generous than the average pension plan in Canada? Is this not a double standard?" I had to agree that it was a double standard in my view.

The question came up several times: "Why do they have the power to award themselves their own pension? Should it not be put out to an independent commission and the power be left with the Canadian public?" I had to agree with that as well.

The public understands very clearly that there is a double standard here, a public standard they are not prepared to accept. I do not think this can be sold to the Canadian public. Even this revised plan is twice as generous as any public sector plan. How can that be sold to the Canadian public at a time when we are facing cutbacks? We are trying to inspire people in Canada to do with less to make our country competitive again to get it back on the rails and here we are in this very House of Commons, where we need to show leadership, going in the opposite direction. It is a very bad tactical move on behalf of this government. It cannot be sold to the Canadian public.

I want to take a moment to examine some of the clauses in Bill C–85. We still have a plan that is put forward here. They have changed the eligibility. MPs do not have to serve two terms or six years. Now it is going to be that MPs will be eligible to start collecting at age 55.

• (1020)

Pension plans through Canada pension and old age security start at 65. There is quite a bit of talk they may have to be rolled back to maybe 66 or 67, as they cannot be sustained. Here we have another double standard. At 55 years of age an MP can start collecting a pension. It is going in the opposite direction from where the public is going. As I said before, it is still twice as generous as any other plan out there.

Why is the opt out provision only available to current members? That seems like a little sleight of hand, a little smoke and mirrors. Yes, it is just for us, and I am happy to take it, because I simply could not live with my conscience and I could not sell it in my constituency. I would suggest that there are a lot of members on the other side who are going to find out in two years that they cannot sell it in their constituency either. I am happy to opt out.

Our party surprised the President of the Treasury Board when he made his big announcement and tried to put us in a very difficult position by either taking this overly generous plan or using the opt out provision where we get nothing. At least the members on my side of the House and my party said that if that is what the government is offering, we simply will not take it. We are opting out of this plan. We look after ourselves. We do not want anything, rather than put up with something that is obscene.

If there is going to be an opt out provision, and I think that is a good way to go, why is it not extended from here on in to future members? The door is being closed very quickly. It is a window of opportunity for us, but it is certainly not a window of opportunity for any future members. There again it is out of the old bag of dirty tricks.

What is the real issue here? The real issue is salary. I have heard it from numerous members on the other side of the House or from the Liberal benches. When we started talking about this MP pension plan, they said that is part of their pay, that they are not getting paid very well and that is how they compensate. It is a very poor method. If we want to talk salary in this House, let us be upfront and open with the Canadian public and talk salary. I have enough faith in the Canadian people that they will do what

is right in terms of salary. I heard that during the last election campaign.

What we have is a group over on the other side that are not prepared to be open and forthright with Canadians, so they bring around through the back door what they are not prepared to do through the front door. They bring in an MP pension plan that supplements their salary. We have seen other provisions where they have special privileges, and those privileges are not going to be accepted by the Canadian public.

If it is really an issue of salary, let us get to that debate at some point and set an independent commission that can travel across the country and ask Canadians to tell us what an MP should be paid. I am prepared to live with the recommendations they make. Some people suggest they would say we should just pay the MP a dollar a year. That is nonsense. I have faith in the common sense of the common people. They have enough sense to elect members to this House and they expect those members to operate on the same premise they have to operate on. If they have to tighten their belts, they expect members of Parliament to tighten their belts.

We are getting a lot of chatter from the other side. I think it is one of the career politicians we have generated in this House. That is the danger we have when we have these kinds of MP pension plans: we get career politicians, exactly the opposite of what the Canadian public wants.

I have found in travelling in my riding and other parts of the country that the way most Canadian people would like to see their MP come forward to the role of MP in this House is to succeed at something else they have tried first. Whether it is a farmer, as I am, a businessman, whatever, they should have some type of successful career first and bring those experiences to this House. Unfortunately, with that carrot dangling, we have had a lot of the other type who have tried to make this a career which is a dangerous thing in itself.

Mr. Strahl: Just because you memorize the Standing Orders, it is not necessarily a job.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I submit it is a dangerous thing to try to be a career politician. That particular type of member will do whatever is necessary to stay here and vote exactly the right way so that at some point down the road they will become a parliamentary secretary perhaps, and maybe even a cabinet minister. I think the government is really misdirected in that approach.

• (1025)

I think the Canadian public wants to see a fair pension plan. I know it does not rate up there with the pension plans of university professors, but we did make a choice to come here; we did make a choice to run. I made a conscious choice that I was going to try to do something about reforming this MP pension plan.

In the face of what we see today in this poor legislation, I have decided to contribute by opting out. I invite the members on the other side to do the same thing, until a reasonable pension plan can come into force in this House with a one for one contribution that is on a level with business and the public sector. Then I think we will have acceptance from the Canadian public, and that is the only time it should happen.

Who will be the judges in the end? I submit it is not going to be the people in the House today. We can debate this for a long time. The ultimate judges are going to be the Canadian people in the next election. This is going to be an issue which is why I say this government is misdirected. I hope it will reconsider, but obviously it will not. It is trying to ram it through with time allocation. We will have to wait for the will of the Canadian people on the MP pension plan. I think we are going to see it expressed very loudly in 1997 or before.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in the dying moments of the debate on Bill C–85.

I would consider this MP pension plan a political barometer. In the bill we have before us this government has an opportunity to establish its credibility, its sincerity. The message conveyed by the changes to be made to this pension plan is actually more important than the money involved. The message to the Canadian voters is: "Are you listening? Do you understand the problem? And will you lead by example in doing something about this gold plated pension plan?" Bill C–85 misses those marks by a country mile. It does not even come close.

First we will talk about listening, listening to the Canadian voters, listening to the people who are paying our salaries. It was mentioned earlier that no single issue had a higher profile when I was campaigning. It continues to enjoy a high profile at my town hall meetings and as I speak around the province of Ontario. It is a flash point with the voters in Ontario and certainly right across Canada.

This gold plated pension plan sends a message to the Canadian voters that we in this place do not understand what is going on in the real world. If the government has missed the message regarding Bill C–85, then what did it hear? Was there anything its members heard when they were campaigning and supposedly listening to the Canadian people?

I suggest that Bill C–85 reinforces the fact that the government was tuned out; it was not listening but only paying lip service to the voters and giving them the changes they have been looking for. We have the problems of ever–increasing taxes and

lower levels of service. That is the situation the Canadian people want to have addressed. We have high levels of unemployed and underemployed people. I know many of us hear about the young people who find jobs they are overqualified for but they are taking whatever they can get because of the desperate situation they are in.

Our people are concerned about unsafe streets and unsafe communities and they are worried about the deficit and the debt and our children's and grandchildren's future. They want a government that will do something to bring that overspending under control. This revision of the gold plated pension plan would indeed be leading by example in showing they understand the problem and they are prepared to deal with it.

The other message is the voters wanted to have a voice in Ottawa. I think with 205 new members in the House we had a great opportunity to respond to some fresh thinking, a new vision.

• (1030)

Let us examine the old ways. They have not been working, and that is obvious when we look at the level of debt. It is obvious when we look at the state of our country as far as being united.

I read the report of the Citizen's Forum on Canada's Future, better known as the Spicer commission. The commission went across Canada. It performed open soul surgery on 26 million Canadians to find out what the mood of the Canadian people was. The commission spoke to 400,000 Canadians, plus about another 300,000 elementary and secondary school children. Those are impressive numbers.

Chapter 9 of the Spicer commission report deals with responsible leadership in participatory democracy. That was one of the strongest messages the commission received when travelling across Canada. The message was Canadians have lost faith in the political process and in their political leaders. The report was issued in June 1991 and that mood was there in 1993 when we knocked on the doors seeking election to this place. At door after door the response I received was that I was another politician telling the people what they want to hear at the door, and then I would go to Ottawa and do exactly what I was told.

We had a terrible example of that very thing on Wednesday in this place. Government members were being told not to vote. They were in the House but were not to register, not express opinion. It was unbelievable. That is democracy. That is elected officials doing their job, representing the people who sent them here to Ottawa. Whether they were to vote yea or nay, to be denied that opportunity was unbelievable. I was shocked as I am sure Canadians from coast to coast were shocked at what took place. I see the government is laughing at that comment. That is the arrogance it displays for the voters. It could care less.

Pension reform was a critical message the government missed in getting to the Canadian people that it understands and wants to give the Canadian people a voice in Ottawa. We hear that the pension plan is all part of compensation, part of our pay package. It is the old trick of mixing apples with oranges; salaries and pension, gun control, law-abiding and criminals. We seem to have difficulty with the government in getting focused on what the real problem is.

All Canadians want and all we should expect is a fair salary and a fair pension. This idea of trying to justify a gold plated pension plan because we have a lead salary does not wash. We have to deal with one issue at a time, making sure everything we are paid is above board and visible to all Canadians. If it is fair there will not be any problem with that. The Canadian people will accept it. That is not what is happening in this bill.

The Ontario election was another strong message. MPP pensions were a big part of the common sense revolution platform. The common sense revolution identified that voters were fed up with pension plans far more generous than what is available in the private sector. The Tories responded to that and are eliminating their gold plated pension plan and introducing RRSPs, similar to what is available to Canadians from coast to coast.

It is a flash point with the voters. Ontario responded to it. Prince Edward Island has responded to it. Alberta has responded to it and Manitoba has responded it. I cannot believe this message still has not been understood in Ottawa.

Unbelievably this week few members in the House on the government side stood up and represented the people who sent them here, their constituents, the people who voted them into office.

• (1035)

I was so dismayed when I read the Prime Minister praised those members who hewed the party line and scorned those members who stood up and represented the people who sent them to this place; an unbelievable display for the democratic process to scorn those members who stood up and did what they were voted into office to do. Whether you agree with what they did or not, they had every right to do that. Instead of that they were criticized, threatened, taken off committees. They will not have their papers signed next time: "Buck your voters but do not buck me or you are gone".

We already know what happened. Three members were booted off their committees for doing what they were voted into office to do. We know what the message is. It was loud and clear right from the beginning and all Canadians were appalled at what happened here.

We should not have been surprised because we are dealing with a government and a Prime Minister who appointed 14 candidates. Do members know why those 14 candidates were appointed? I quote the Prime Minister when he was in my riding: "You cannot always trust the Canadian voter to appoint the best candidate". That says it all. That mistrust is still here and it was displayed this week.

A cabinet minister had a dollars for contracts dinner. It flies in the face of restoring integrity, honesty and open government and nothing is done to that minister. People who represent their ridings are scorned. A minister is accepting dollars for contracts, and that is all right. It is unbelievable the double standard that exists here. Canadians are watching what is happening here and they are appalled. There is a price to be paid and it is coming.

I wonder who the government is listening to. It is obviously not listening to the voters, to the polls. The polls are all showing this gold plated pension plan has to be changed. I do not think I have read anywhere in the media where there is any support for this plan.

Let me quote from these polls because I think they are very indicative. A poll done by Environics showed 86 per cent of Canadians, 86 per cent of Liberals, say the plan is too generous; 93 per cent of Canadians and 93 per cent of Liberals say fundamental MP pension reform must happen before social programs are touched; 88 per cent of Canadians and 85 per cent of Liberals say make the plan equal to the private plans; 93 per cent of Canadians and 91 per cent of Liberals say the MP plan should have the same limit on growth as the private sector plans; 91 per cent of Canadians and 89 per cent of Liberals say collection should start at 65.

Very clearly Liberals who were part of this poll were almost the same as Canadians from coast to coast. The government is not listening. I cannot recall an editorial supporting Bill C–85. The beauty was the Toronto *Star* and we all know where the Toronto *Star* is. It is quoted quite often. An editorial of February 13 with the headline "Pension puffery" stated "Our politicians get some of the best pensions in the world. They only have to work six years to qualify and the generous payments adjusted for inflation can last a lifetime. That is why Prime Minister Jean Chrétien's impassioned defence of underpaid MPs in the House of Commons last week offends—in both substance and timing".

We know where the Toronto *Star* is relative to the government. Even its paper is not supporting it. If it is not listening to the voters, not listening to the polls and not paying attention to the Toronto *Star*, to whom is it listening? Who is driving this agenda? I cannot believe this. There is something missing here.

The Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired. The hon. government whip on a point of order.

• (1040)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the vote to occur on private members' hour in the name of the hon. member for Red Deer on Monday, for second reading of Bill C–309, if a recorded division is requested on that item, be deferred until 11.30 p.m., at which time we will be taking other votes in the House and we would do that vote at the same time.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to participate in this debate because we need to straighten the record on some remarks made.

We said in our red book, "Creating Opportunity", the Liberal plan for Canada, that the pension regime of members of Parliament has been the focus of considerable controversy. We said we wanted to ensure reform took place. We also said we would use an independent review and that a Liberal government would reform the pension plan of members of Parliament to end double dipping, MPs should not be able to leave office and receive a pension from the federal government if they accept a new full time paying job from the federal government, and we would review the question of the minimum age at which MP pensions will begin to be paid.

The commitment of the government and the Liberal caucus to reform pensions has been unwavering. We have brought this to the House. These were promises we made and these are promises we have kept. As promised, the Liberal plan will do what we said it was to do, eliminate the practice of double dipping, introduce a new minimum age requirement for receipt of the pension, 55, reduce the government's contribution to the pension plan by one–third, saving taxpayers $3.3 million in the first year.

Those reforms are significant. Reforms members across the way should keep in mind. Pension benefits earned by all MPs will be reduced by 20 per cent. All MPs earning pension benefits will be affected by the accrual rate of benefit reduction.

Several statements made in the House are erroneous and the discussion has gone beyond the pension plan to a whole series of issues which do not have specific significance to this debate.

The Prime Minister stated over and over after the review that we knew in comparison to other occupations, MPs are not paid for the job they do, the work they commit to and the assignments they take on. The Prime Minister also pointed to the comparison between what we do as members of Parliament and other people who are public office holders.

In looking at the topic of integrity the Liberal Party has nothing to worry about and we should not be taking lessons from the Reform Party. It is often hypocrisy to listen to the mouthings on the way procedures are laid out in Bill C–85 and what we are attempting to do in this pension reform. It is also important for the opposition to note the changes we have made and to stand with the government in support of these changes.

• (1045)

The bill went further than the red book commitment to reduce government spending on MPs' pensions. It has gone to 33 per cent. I do not hear any talk across the way about that reduction and that saving to the Canadian public. I do not hear discussion across the way about the lowering of the age. I do not hear any discussion across the way about significant measures that are savings to the Canadian public.

I do not hear discussion across the way about the fact that we have done away with double dipping. I do not hear any discussion across the way that speaks to some very positive elements. I do not hear discussion across the way that would take us back to the earlier pension plan of the 1950s, the 1960s, the 1970s or the changes that the government is making in order to meet our present fiscal needs and to ensure that our pensions are in line with other public pensions and other private plans.

It is one thing to stand in the House and constantly berate the government and make grand statements of political and ideological positions. It is important for members to know what they are doing, what the government is attempting to do for the taxpayer to ensure we save tax dollars.

Mr. Milliken: We are keeping our promise.

Ms. Augustine: We are definitely keeping our promise because we said we would do this.

What are the existing provisions and what are the provisions we are proposing? It is important for the party across to see where we are presently and where we hope to be with the bill. We are calling for their support because we feel that lowering the minimum age, taking out double dipping, ensuring the accrual rate, will make the pension plan a far better one than it is presently.

We also spoke to the option of coverage. The members across the way have that option available to them and at the same time they are asking for a review of the remuneration on a yearly basis. They are talking about a time period in which they can opt out and they are not really taking the opportunity to use the 60–day period.

Members of the House of Commons will now pay 9 per cent of their salaries per year toward their pension plan, rather than the current rate of 11 per cent. This reduction reflects the reduction in the pension accrual rate.

This is a good bill, a good way in which to proceed, to ensure we meet the needs of the public, to ensure we save taxpayer dollars, to ensure we reform the plan as we said in the red book. We call on all members to support the motions and to ensure the bill gets through the House.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I am sorry to rise again, but apparently there has been a change on the Order Paper. The bill to which I referred when I sought unanimous consent earlier is in fact a different one. The principle is identical.

However, I now ask for unanimous consent:

That any recorded division requested on Bill C–295, if such a recorded division is sought, be held on Monday at 11.30 p.m.; rather than the normal time which would be approximately noon.

(Motion agreed to.)

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak to Bill C–85, the great pension debate; with a little trepidation. I confess some varied emotions.

• (1050)

I do not think anyone in the House would say this debate necessarily brings out the best in people on both sides of the table. We are talking about something which is visceral and deeply personal. As members know, we are talking about how much money eventually winds up in our pockets. When people's pockets are threatened directly, it tends to bring out very visceral feelings. We have seen evidence of that over recent days.

As colleagues know, as a member of the Reform Party and caucus, I have decided to opt out of the pension plan. Before anybody puts angel wings on me, it is important for people to know that it is not that big a deal for me because if I did not opt out, I could not get elected dog catcher in my constituency. This is a fairly important issue in the ridings.

If I may, I would like to quote from an article in the Edmonton *Journal* written by Barbara Yaffe, June 3 of this year. She puts it very succinctly and very well:

Because beyond the cosy bounds of Parliament Hill there's quite a bit of pension passion. The consensus is that Bill C–85 stinks. If the bill passes, taxpayers, who might not mind a system of matching contributions, will pay $3.88 for every $1 an MP contributes. (Formerly taxpayers paid $5.75.)

She goes on to say that the most cynical feature of the pension plan, and this is the feature of this bill which I personally find most offensive, is its mean spirited nature. I can understand the Liberal government's motivation in making this mean spirited because it wants to break the Reform ranks and have its

members not opt out of the pension. Then at the next election they would be able to go door to door and say, "Wait a minute. We are not so bad. Look at those sanctimonious Reformers. Some of them stayed in the plan as well."

The fly in the ointment is that all Reformers have opted out or have indicated they will opt out of the pension. It is going to make it very difficult for our Liberal colleagues to be knocking on doors in the next election and explaining why they voted themselves a pension that was disproportionate to those held by anyone else and at the same time were so mean spirited in trying to get us to reverse our position.

That is politics. I can understand that. Most Canadians are fair minded. Most Canadians would be very happy if members of Parliament had matching contributions. It would be so simple to say, just like in the private sector, that members of Parliament will pay this much of the pension and the government, the employer, will pay this much, put it into RRSPs and forget about it.

This pension plan really strikes the note of dissonance between elected politicians and the people. One of the reasons I became involved in politics was to try to restore the bonds of trust between the elected and the electors. I thought that the 35th Parliament with 200 rookies would be a prime mover in this.

The best way to do that is to provide leadership by example. Leadership starts at the top. We cannot have two sets of rules, one set for everybody else and one set for us. It is not just the pension thing. It is in the way we treat our salaries in general.

Canadians do not mind that we be paid reasonably or even that we be paid well. What Canadians do not understand is why we should have tax free allowances, why we should have that bonus. Before I came to the House I ran my own business. I supplied receipts for everything I did. As members of Parliament why do we not provide receipts for everything that we do? Why is it that when government employees take a plane anywhere they get $25 taxis on both ends of the trip without having to provide receipts?

This pension issue really is a flashpoint for Canadians who, as reported by Statistics Canada, have not had an increase in real income for 10 years. Most Canadians feel like they are on a treadmill. No matter how hard they walk and no matter how fast they run, they do not get anywhere.

The reason they do not get anywhere is because of the incredible burden of taxation required by the federal, provincial and municipal governments which have spent so much more than they have earned over recent years. Over 30 per cent of every dollar that comes in goes to pay the debt on money already spent.

It is like buying groceries on a credit card, consuming them and then having to pay the bill. Canadians in general feel like they are on a treadmill and those who were elected in a role of leadership do not lead by example. That breaks the bond of trust between the elected and the electors.

This is a sacred fiduciary duty which we have been given by the people who sent us here. I would ask my colleagues opposite to please reconsider.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, it being 10.55 a.m., pursuant to order adopted June 8, 1995, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on Motion No. 2 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 3.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 5 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76, a recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76, the division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred.

• (1100)

[*English*]

I understand there is a motion on behalf of the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. I understand the member wishes to ask unanimous consent to move his motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. I will not therefore proceed with the matter.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I understood that there was also going to be a motion from the Minister of Justice to move this. He has repeatedly stated to the House that he supports amending the Canadian Human Rights Act and extending same sex benefits. I understood we were also going to have a motion from the Minister of Justice to seek unanimous consent to move these motions.

The Deputy Speaker: There is clearly not unanimous consent to the question proposed by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. Accordingly, I will go to Motion No. 10 which is also in Group No. 2.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C–85, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 36 to 41, on page 4, with the following:

"an allowance equal to one half of the basic retirement allowance, but if more than one person is entitled to an allowance under this paragraph, the total amount of the allowances shall not exceed one half of the basic retirement allowance".

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the division on the motion stands deferred. The deferral also applies to Motion No. 38.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I think you might find there is unanimous consent in the House that the remaining motions in Groups Nos. 3, 4, and 5 are deemed put, divisions demanded and the votes deferred.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 9, with the following:

"(A) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 9, with the following:

"(B) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 4, on page 10, with the following:

"(A) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 11, on page 10, with following:

"(B) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 15

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 10, with the following:

"(A) 0.02 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 16

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 10, with the following:

"(B) 0.02 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 17

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 42, on page 10, with the following:

"ty years of age, 0,".

Motion No. 18

That bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 45, on page 10, with the following:

"age, 0, and".

Motion No. 19

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 48, on page 10, with the following:

"thereafter, 0.02 for the years or portions".

Motion No. 20

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 18, on page 11, with the following:

"years of age, 0;".

Motion No. 21

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 20, on page 11, with following:

"son has reached sixty years of age, 0;".

Motion No. 22

That Bill C–85, in Clause 9, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 11, with the following:

"ter, 0.02 for the years or portions of years".

Motion No. 23

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 41, on page 11, with the following:

"(A) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 24

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 3, on page 12, with the following:

"(B) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 25

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 13, on page 12, with the following:

"(A) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 26

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 20, on page 12, with the following:

"(B) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 27

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 12, with the following:

"(A) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 28

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 40, on page 12, with the following:

"(B) 0 for the years or portions of".

Motion No. 29

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 6, on page 13, with the following:

"(i) 0 for the years of pensionable ser–".

Motion No. 30

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 13, on page 13, with the following:

"(ii) 0 for the years of pensionable".

Motion No. 31

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 12, on page 14, with the following:

"ty years of age, 0,".

Motion No. 32

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 15, on page 14, with the following:

"age, 0, and".

Motion No. 33

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 18, on page 14, with the following:

"thereafter, 0 for the years or portions".

Motion No. 34

That Bill C–85, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing line 26, on page 14, with the following:

"therein, be 0."

Motion No. 35

That Bill C–85, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 14, with following:

"sixty years of age, and".

Motion No. 39

That Bill C–85, in Clause 20, be amended by adding after line 38, on page 19, the following:

""beneficiary" means the spouse or child of a deceased former member;"outside income deduction" means the same amount or percentage that, pursuant to the Income Tax Act would be deducted in a year from a payment to the former member or beneficiary under the Old Age Security Act, in respect of other personal or household income received, if the former member or beneficiary was entitled to receive such a payment during the year in question.

(2) From the amount payable to a former member or beneficiary in each year under this Act shall be deducted an outside income deduction calculated in accordance with this section.

(3) The Governor in Council may make regulations (*a*) defining the other personal and household income to be taken into account for the purposes of this section, which is to be equivalent to that taken into account in calculating a deduction under the Old Age Security Act; (*b*) requiring a former member to report an estimate of other income for every year before the commencement of the year and to report the actual amount of other income after the end of the year; (*c*) providing for the amount to be deducted under this section to be deducted in instalments from periodic payments to a former member or a beneficiary under this Act.

59.2 (1) In this section,".

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 40

That Bill C–85, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 4 and 5, on page 21, with the following:

"coming into force of this section, holds or commences to hold a federal position or is a party to a federal service contract or enters".

The Deputy Speaker: Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of the divisions at report stage of the bill now before the House, however pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the divisions on the motions stand deferred until Monday, June 19, 1995 at 11.30 p.m.

The Speaker: It being a little after 11 a.m., question period will be extended to a little after 12 p.m. Pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to congratulate the University of Ottawa for a remarkable fund–raising campaign. Through its Vision campaign, the university raised $38.6 million, which was much more than the university's objective.

This campaign will allow the University of Ottawa to remain a leader in the area of teaching and research.

In more concrete terms, it has enabled the university to begin construction of the first phase of a new building for the Arts Faculty, D'Iorio Hall, which will be devoted to research in the pure sciences and the neurosciences research institute.

The campaign also raised close to $9 million that will be used to endow chairs, as well as for centres of excellence and institutes, and over $1.5 million for scholarships and student financial aid. In addition, this campaign was an excellent opportunity for the University of Ottawa to forge new partnerships with industry and the business world.

Once again, congratulations to all who contributed to the success of this campaign and long life to the University of Ottawa.

* * *

• (1105)

G–7 SUMMIT

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the G–7 summit in Halifax gives us another example of Canadian federalism. Although French is, in fact, totally absent from the summit site, the Leader of the Govern-

ment in the House said yesterday that Canada projected "the image of a bilingual country".

This image came into sharp focus during a press conference by a Japanese official. Faced with the reporters' stupefaction when he started his presentation in French, he continued in English, explaining that he thought Canada was a bilingual country. The people of Quebec have had enough of this veneer of bilingualism, which does not respect the Canadian reality and does not even keep up appearances any more.

The person who said that the summit was not held in Quebec City because the separatist mayor of that city had not put a Canadian flag over city hall did not even notice that the mayor of Halifax had not done so either.

Again, the Prime Minister is clearly showing his inconsistency and contempt for the French fact in Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has a bill before the House which would ban the octane enhancer MMT from Canadian gasoline. She says that since the United States EPA has banned it, Canada should follow suit.

This week the United States District Court of Appeals issued a mandate ordering the EPA to grant a waiver to permit the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline in the United States. The court found that MMT does not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system.

The industry minister has added that the key to banning MMT in Canada is to create a uniformity of standards between the U.S. and Canada. Now with the U.S. on the verge of reintroducing MMT, Canada again will be on the opposite side.

The government is too stubborn to initiate third party tests which would show one way or another whether MMT is hazardous to our automobiles, our health and our environment. It works now to make things cleaner. The Minister of the Environment has shown that she is swayed by political lobbies rather than scientific evidence.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Stratford Central Secondary School environmental club.

Environment Canada and the Stratford Central Secondary School club have been working together as partners on an environmental education project. Through the environmental partners fund the federal government has invested $5,400 in this project.

This partnership has resulted in the development of a Carolinian forest ecosystem, an area of rich biodiversity that represents Stratford's natural heritage. The forest will serve as an example of community action, a piece of natural heritage, and an educational tool for students.

During the developmental stages of the project various stakeholders and community members worked together to plan and plant the ecosystem. These partners include the Stratford Parks Department, Lawson Killer Insurance Ltd., Canada Trust, Stratford Rotary Club, the city of Stratford, the Stratford civic beautification and environmental awareness committee and most important, the students of Stratford Central Secondary School. All of them were partners with Environment Canada in this outstanding project.

* * *

VOLUNTEERS

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give special recognition to the many volunteers in Etobicoke—Lakeshore who donate their time and energy for the benefit of our community.

In particular, I would like to commend the efforts of Tamara Cooper, Jo Matson and R. J. Welsh, recipients of the 1995 volunteer of the year award. These individuals are among over 13 million Canadians who care for children, visit the sick, organize special events, serve on local boards or committees, or bring attention to important issues affecting Canadians.

The value and importance of voluntarism cannot be underestimated. It factors into our gross domestic product contributing 191 hours per volunteer per year of non–paid work, the equivalent of an estimated $12 billion wage bill or 617,000 full time positions. While the country gains tremendously from the charity of volunteers, voluntarism also enables individuals to acquire and sharpen skills in today's highly competitive job market.

At this time I would like to welcome to Ottawa individuals from the Lakeshore Immigrant Aid Centre who play an important part in our community's volunteer sector.

* * *

PARLIAMENTARY INTERNS

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding interns from the University of Michigan–Dearborn political internship program.

Since the beginning of May eight interns have been expanding their knowledge of Canada by working in the offices of members

of Parliament. These fantastic university students have had the opportunity to learn more about Canada's unique political structure and distinct cultural identity, while fostering cross–border relationships.

• (1110)

By encouraging participation in programs such as these we are cultivating a relationship between the future leaders of both Canada and the United States. As the global economy expands we need to increase mutual understanding between our nations. Programs such as these facilitate that development.

On behalf of the eight members of Parliament who benefited from the services of these outstanding interns, I would like to thank them for their hard work and dedication and wish them the best of luck in their futures.

Thank you Leo Addimando. It has been a pleasure working with you.

* * *

[*Translation*]

2002 WINTER GAMES

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon around 1.20 p.m., a large number of Quebecers will be riveted to their televisions and radios to find out the olympic committee's decision regarding the location of the 2002 winter games.

Bloc members are convinced that the Quebec City region offers the best sites, unsurpassed cultural events, and a population full of warmth and joie de vivre.

We wish to commend and thank all members of the Québec 2002 organization, who worked relentlessly to promote this most challenging collective project for the people of Quebec.

Good luck, Quebec City.

* * *

[*English*]

FREE VOTES

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker.

There are strange things done when the midnight sun
Has set in the month of June,
By politicians old who set as their goal
To make us sing their tune.
There's little time left, so let's be deft
And invoke tight party rule,
For we know what's best and ignore the rest
And oh, can we be cruel.
If a pesky MP says, "This bill's not for me",
That's a sticky situation,
Like a ton of bricks, we'll stop those tricks,
And revoke the nomination.
But the citizens of this land we love
Have had it up to here,
With the ancient way this game is played,
Oldtime politicians should fear.
For when a member of this House
Votes against the party,
They solemnly stand for a new type of land
That the voters say is hearty.
There soon won't be space

In this marvellous place,
All the members to try
Who have stood with pride
And been muscled aside
But have said to the old ways, goodbye!

* * *

DIAL–A–LIFE HOUSING CORPORATION

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and congratulate Winnipeg's Dial–A–Life Housing Corporation on the official opening today of its second housing project for people of native ancestry.

These individuals are five times more likely to develop serious kidney problems than other Canadians. Due to a lack of health care services on reserves they have to travel to urban health centres for dialysis treatment. The Dial–A–Life project will meet their needs during treatment in Winnipeg.

I salute the Dial–A–Life Housing Corporation under the leadership of Mrs. Winnie Giesbrecht for its hard work, voluntarism and dedication to seeing that its projects are initiated, developed and managed by persons of native ancestry. Their dedication is a source of pride for the Winnipeg North community and beyond.

I am proud to be part of a government committed through the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to building projects such as this one.

Please join me in conveying best wishes to all residents of Dial–A–Life Housing Corporation on this proud occasion.

* * *

NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently the auditor general stated that Canada's serious nuclear waste disposal problem would require $9 billion to remedy. On top of this the government is now under pressure to provide $570 million in the form of a subsidy to the international thermonuclear experimental project, otherwise called ITER, a nuclear fusion megaproject.

I urge the government to turn down this subsidy request in keeping with the promise made in the last budget not to finance megaprojects. So far the nuclear industry has been subsidized by Ottawa to the tune of over $5 billion. Canadians can no longer afford to subsidize megaprojects.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the dictionary of synonyms of Quebec separatists is full of words and expressions which have one thing in common: they all refer to the same reality.

There is the sovereignty association, with no hyphen, of the Bloc leader, the European type of union suggested by the ADQ

leader, and now the independence of Quebec, the new idea proposed by the PQ leader, who did not want to be left out.

• (1115)

Indeed, this is the expression used earlier this week by the pequiste Premier to describe the propaganda operation conducted by his Deputy Premier in Europe.

I ask the Bloc and ADQ leaders to tell us whether they are prepared to sign a new agreement with the PQ, in which the expression used this time will be the independence of Quebec.

* * *

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers are not taken in by federalists' criticism of the extraordinary historical agreement reached this week by the Action démocratique du Québec, the Quebec government and the Bloc Quebecois.

The sincere offer made by sovereignists to form an economic and political partnership is a concrete and solid proposal, particularly when compared to the about–face by the Minister of Labour and member for Outremont, who has had such changes of heart in the past.

By calling this offer an unacceptable proposal, the new passionaria of the status quo, as she is rightly called today by Lise Bissonnette, is displaying intellectual dishonesty. Not only does the minister reject the offer contained in the Allaire report, which she supported, she also thinks Quebecers are stupid.

Sadly, federalism has nothing to offer Quebecers but resignation and resistance to change.

* * *

[*English*]

BERNARD HARMS MEDAL

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute my colleague, the member for Capilano—Howe Sound, who will receive a prestigious prize in international economics on Monday, June 19.

The member, a former economics professor at Simon Fraser University for over 17 years, is one of Canada's best known economists and one of the few Canadians listed in *Who's Who in Economics in the World*. He will be recognized for his outstanding contribution to international economics.

The prize, the Bernard Harms Medal, is given biannually by the Institute for World Economics of the University of Kiel, Germany. The institute, a leading economics research centre, is Germany's official depository for all international economics publications.

To my knowledge, the member for Capilano—Howe Sound is the first Canadian to win this medal and one of the very few Canadian parliamentarians to win such a prestigious award while in office. On behalf of my colleagues I want to congratulate the hon. member for Capilano—Howe Sound for his achievements.

The Speaker: My colleagues, I think it is appropriate to say that we are all very proud in this House of the hon. member for Capilano—Howe Sound and we congratulate him.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY AWARD

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this being National Public Service Week, I would like to congratulate the Department of Canadian Heritage, which recently received an employment equity award for its contribution to the promotion of women in public institutions.

The employment equity awards board was impressed with the significant contribution made in 1994 by the National Advisory Committee on Women's Issues and their positive accomplishments, including the annual women's conference held in June 1994.

[*Translation*]

Moreover, they recognized that women's noticeable presence in the management category, as well as the support showed to the national advisory committee by senior management, confirm that the Department of Canadian Heritage recognizes the contribution of women in the public service.

Mrs. Marie Trudeau was delegated by the deputy minister to accept the plaque from Mr. Eggleton, on behalf of the department. Congratulations to the Department of Canadian Heritage.

* * *

THE OUTAOUAIS

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint–Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during his visit yesterday to the Outaouais region, the Quebec minister responsible for restructuring tried to downplay the fact that 3,500 jobs in the region could be lost if Quebec becomes independent.

At a time when the PQ government is closing hospitals and reviewing the education budget so as to provide for the establishment of a university in Lévis, how can the minister claim that an independent Quebec will create 3,500 jobs in the parapublic sector just to help the region?

Outaouais residents do not believe these promises made by separatists, nor do Radio–Québec union members, who recently

had to ask the Bloc Quebecois leader to put pressure on the PQ government so that it would fulfil its commitments.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government says it is concerned about the situation of the peacekeepers held hostage in Bosnia and about the confrontations between the Serbs and the Muslims. Canada's position remains unclear on the situation in the former Yugoslavia, particularly with regard to participation in the rapid reaction force.

Would the Minister of National Defence bring us up to date on the situation of the 12 Canadians held hostage in Bosnia and the 800 peacekeepers confined to their camp without any possibility of leaving, it appears, as fighting intensifies on the outskirts of Visoko?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I should point out that 699 soldiers remain on the base at Visoko. They are in good shape. Their safety is not at risk, but Muslim forces do block access to the camp.

In addition, 115 members of our team are at Kiseljak with British and other forces. There is no problem, and movement is not restricted. Unfortunately, we also have 11 soldiers at Ilijas. We are very concerned about their safety, because of the concentration of Muslim forces. This is the reason I strongly registered our objection with the Bosnian Serb authorities in a meeting this week with the chargé d'affaires of the Yugoslav government.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with the UN Security Council ratifying the establishment of a rapid reaction force of 12,500 this morning, could the Minister of National Defence now tell us once and for all whether Canada intends to participate in this force?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister raised this matter in Halifax and the final decision is up to him. We need assurances on the command and control of this force and on all the other factors related to deployment. The decision to take part or not should be made today or over the weekend, therefore soon.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think we would agree that all Canadians are eager to find out what sort of commitment the government will end up making in this difficult matter.

By continuing to fight in Bosnia, the Bosnian Serbs and the Muslims have clearly rejected the formal warning of the G–7 last night. What new initiative does Canada plan to propose to its G–7 partners and to the Russian President, who are meeting in Halifax today, in order to resolve the continuing impasse in Bosnia?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night the Prime Minister said on behalf of the G–7 leaders that the only way out of this very difficult situation is to reopen negotiations for the parties to come to some kind of an agreement.

The international community has protested very strongly the actions that have gone on with the hostage taking and also with the build–up of the forces of the Bosnian federation. This matter is of grave concern and will be the subject of discussion throughout the day.

With respect to what we can do at the moment, given the fact that our people are there not as belligerents but as peacekeepers, we are concerned that they take all precautions at the base in Visoko to minimize any damage should any artillery or any other type of shelling occur. It is to that end that extra fortifications have been erected and precautions have been taken by the commander, Colonel Redburn.

• (1125)

I am pretty confident that the people in Visoko, although we do not accept the situation at all, will be fine and are not in any immediate danger. I continue to be preoccupied with the safety of the 11 people detained in Ilijas because of the growing conflict in and around that town and the fact that the Bosnian federation has said they want to liberate Sarajevo and that town is between the concentration of forces and Sarajevo.

I also want to add that we remain concerned about Captain Rechner but we have had information over the last few days that he is okay and is near the Bosnian Serb capital of Pale.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LECLERC INSTITUTE

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. It has come to light that the Leclerc Institute, a federal penitentiary, is controlled by organized crime. It seems that, one of the inmates actually had a jogging track installed in the prison in addition to throwing a seafood party for the prison population.

Given the apparent involvement of the penitentiary's management in the incidents which are currently under investigation,

will the Solicitor General tell us whether he is investigating the matter and whether he will commit to making the investigation's finding public?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a special commission of inquiry was established at the end of April to investigate all of these allegations. We expect it to complete its investigation shortly, and I will do everything possible to bring the conclusions of the inquiry to the attention of the hon. member.

These allegations are very serious, and we are treating them as such. That is why the commissioner established a special commission of inquiry several weeks ago, at the end of April of this year.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue, yet we still do not know who is leading the inquiry. Will the Solicitor General tell us whether the people under investigation who work at the Leclerc Institute have been suspended from their jobs for the duration of the inquiry?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not have this information with me, but I will get in touch with my hon. colleague later to give him the name of the members of this commission of inquiry. At the moment, there are only allegations, but we are taking them very seriously.

* * *

[*English*]

ETHICS

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, one year ago today the Prime Minister rose in this House and gave a stern speech about earning public trust and restoring political integrity. He said that both were vital to democracy and were more than just nice words.

Twelve months later this Prime Minister's speech rings hollow. We have seen a heritage minister defended, even applauded, for dishing out departmental contracts as a reward for political donations. We have seen $26 million diverted to a tourist highway in the public works minister's own riding. We have seen the revenue minister's campaign workers lining up for patronage appointments in B.C.

Canadians expected as much from Brian Mulroney. They demanded more from this government.

Why has the government turned its back on the Prime Minister's words of only one year ago, abused the public's trust, and abandoned political integrity?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the unfounded innuendo of my hon. friend, the facts of the matter are that this government treats matters of ethics and integrity very seriously and gives them a high degree of priority.

We have great confidence in the way we are responding to what the Prime Minister said a year ago. Those words remain as valid today as they were a year ago.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let me refer again to the Prime Minister's speech.

He promised to give a meaningful voice to elected representatives in the House and end the politics of cronyism and secret back door deals. I am sure that is cold comfort to the one dozen Liberal dissidents soon to be punished, cold comfort to the police officers in B.C. who have to deal with incompetent Liberal appointments, and cold comfort to the people of Wentworth Valley who have to travel along the deadly highway 104.

What has happened to this government's promise of giving a meaningful voice to MPs, ending the politics of cronyism, and ending secret backroom deals? They made the promise and broke it. Why?

• (1130)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have kept that promise, as we have kept generally the promises on which we campaigned.

Just to take the example of the role of MPs, we changed the rules of the House to enable measures to be sent to committees before second reading to enable members to play a bigger role in committees in the development of legislation.

We changed the rules of the House so that committees could develop legislation. That was done for the first time in the history of the Parliament of Canada.

We are also treating Private Members' Business, measures presented by members individually, on a free vote basis in every case, something never before done in the history of Parliament.

Instead of being blinded by her own innuendoes and prejudices, the hon. member should look at the facts and recognize the achievements of the government.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, they say they have generally kept them, but specifically backbenchers are being nailed one by one the minute they open their mouths.

The Prime Minister said that he sets the moral tone for the government, and he certainly has. He has ignored the federal code of ethics, sidelined the ethics counsellor and has broken red book promises, all in the name of party loyalty and political expediency.

I guess we should not be surprised. In 1983 the current Prime Minister defended Alastair Gillespie, a former energy minister who had received financial favours from the Trudeau government. Twelve years later the Prime Minister dusted off *Hansard*,

spiced up the rhetoric and gave the same speeches in defence of the heritage minister about ethical behaviour.

Will the government revive its promise to restore integrity in government and demand the resignation of the minister of heritage?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that promise remains valid. It is being carried out.

There is one interesting thing about the hon. member's questions. They show that she on behalf of her party and her party are totally satisfied with the way we are handling the economy. They show that she and her party are totally satisfied with the way we are handling the reform of social programs. They show that they are totally satisfied with the way we are handling our relations with other countries.

Because of the way she chose the priority of questions in the House on behalf of her party, she is doing nothing more than giving a general endorsement of the work of the government and we appreciate that endorsement.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister.

It seems Immigration Canada has retained the services of Philippe Rayntjens as an expert witness during the proceedings to revoke the status of Léon Mugesera as a Canadian resident. The House will recall that Mr. Mugesera was a friend and adviser of the former president who was responsible for the genocide in Rwanda.

Could the Acting Prime Minister explain why Canada retained the services of Mr. Rayntjens who, like Mr. Mugesera, was an adviser to the president at the time of the genocide in Rwanda?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and the government have made a commitment to remove all criminal elements from our society. Unfortunately, since the case is now under investigation, we cannot comment further. The case is now under investigation, and we hope to settle this matter very shortly.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the government expect the public to trust the process, when it is clear that the services of a person close to Mr. Mugesera have been retained to clarify his role in the Rwandan genocide?

I would also like to have assurances that the investigation will be public, and that its findings will be made available as soon as possible.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can inform the hon. member that the investigation will start next week, when the person concerned will have a chance to answer all these questions. An independent judge will rule on this case.

* * *

ETHIC COUNSELLOR

• (1135)

[*English*]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the Prime Minister's speech a year ago he announced that the ethics counsellor would be empowered to investigate conflicts of interest.

The heritage minister has broken these conflict of interest guidelines no less than four times: first when he intervened for a constituent on a CRTC licence; second when he overturned the DTH policy for friends in Power Corp; third when he lunched with the Bronfmans in L.A.; and again when he held a dollars for contracts dinner in Montreal.

In not one of these instances was the ethics counsellor allowed to conduct a proper investigation—

The Speaker: Maybe it is because it is Friday but it seems to me that the preambles are getting a little long. If members could just shorten the preambles and the questions a little, it would help us in question period.

The question, please, from the member for Simcoe Centre.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, why will the Prime Minister not live up to his rhetoric of a year ago, live up to his red book promise and appoint an independent ethics counsellor responsible to Parliament?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I do not accept the accuracy of the innuendos and allegations in the premise of the hon. member's question.

Second, the Prime Minister has said that in a parliamentary system he has to take the ultimate responsibility for his cabinet and he cannot evade that responsibility. While he has carried out his promise to appoint an ethics counsellor, he still has to carry out the responsibility which is that of a Prime Minister in a parliamentary system.

If my hon. friends agree with our parliamentary system, they would agree with the Prime Minister.

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, not only do I agree with it but we have respect for it.

A year ago today the Prime Minister stated in this House:

> Canadians have a right to know who is trying to influence their elected and public officials.

Canadians have a right to know who was influencing the heritage minister. Every person who attended the fundraising dinner received a contract or an appointment from his heritage department.

Why will the government not release a complete list of who was invited and who contributed to the heritage minister's dinner? Does the Canadian public not have a right to know?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I point out again as I pointed out yesterday that the dinner was not organized by the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada did not send out the invitations.

The material my hon. friend is seeking is not under the control of the Government of Canada. At the same time information has been provided and certainly I will be happy to see what further information is provided.

My hon. friend in his question says he has respect for the parliamentary system. The hon. member's question showed just the opposite. He lacks that fundamental respect. He ought to start showing some if he is serious about what he says.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last April, the Bloc Quebecois denounced the flagrant inequity to Quebec in the awarding of professional and special contracts by the Department of Justice. Let me remind you that the value of contracts awarded to Ontario entrepreneurs is 15 times higher than that of contracts awarded to Quebec entrepreneurs. In his written response to Bloc members, the Minister of Justice confirmed our allegations.

Given that only 5 per cent of the value of Department of Justice research contracts is awarded to Quebec entrepreneurs and that only 1 per cent of contracts are in French, does the minister acknowledge that this situation is totally unacceptable and should be rectified as soon as possible?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have furnished a written response to the hon. member's party answering questions put in the House during the past several months about the statistical breakdown of the awarding of contracts across the country.

The evidence shows that those contracts are distributed to various provinces and the number is disclosed by the letters that I have delivered. The numbers suggested by the hon. member are more or less correct.

As I have also said, there are many factors that determine to whom a contract is awarded. Sometimes these things are for specialized purposes or research to be done by individuals with particular knowledge.

In any event, I have also made it clear in my letter that the awarding of contracts based on language is strictly in accordance with the principles of fairness. I will look again at the whole process to ensure that those principles are being complied with absolutely.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I admit that there is a difference in the interpretation of figures. We say 5 per cent, while the minister says 6 per cent. As for the 1 per cent of contracts awarded to Quebec entrepreneurs, let us admit that it could hardly be any less.

Given that most Department of Justice contracts are awarded directly without tender by department officials and taking into account, I imagine, the minister's obvious authority over the awarding of contracts, can the minister make a commitment to issue and make public clear directives designed to ensure that a fair share of research work is done in French, as must or rather should the case&

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we already have full written guidelines. We have established policies.

[*Translation*]

We clearly stated in the letters I gave the hon. member that government departments already had guidelines concerning the awarding of contracts to the private sector. I would be very happy to provide a copy of these guidelines to the hon. member if he so wishes, as they already exist.

We in the justice department comply with these guidelines.

* * *

[*English*]

HIGHWAYS

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was on this Friday a year ago that the Prime Minister said: "I rise today to talk about trust". With all the moral fortitude that he could muster, he announced that things would be different. His government was going to be ethical.

How does this reconcile with the minister of public works engaging in the most blatant form of pork barrelling by diverting money from highway 104 to his own riding? Why does the Prime Minister not live up to his words of a year ago and reinstate the funding to highway 104 where it belongs?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transport today I think this question demonstrates perhaps as well as any just exactly how ethically challenged the Reform Party is.

The reality is that the issue raised by the hon. member is one in which a decision was made by the responsible level of government in an entirely transparent and open way. To try to suggest that this is an ethical question implies that somebody improperly benefited in a personal or pecuniary way from the awarding of a contract. That is not the case at all.

There was a political issue. It was debated openly in the province of Nova Scotia. The decision was made close to the people affected by it and the political consequences will be faced. That is not an ethical question; that is a political one.

By trying to move political questions into the realm of ethics we can see why the hon. member has a basic misunderstanding of what the process of government is all about. Ethics deal with the propriety, the transparency and the openness of a decision making process. What in fact the member complains about is the decision that was taken at the provincial level close to the people.

Some hon. members: Order.

Mr. Manley: We have listened to preambles almost three minutes long. Therefore it is appropriate to have a long response.

The issue being debated in this question is one which lies at the provincial level. To try to turn it into an ethical question in the House shows the lack of understanding on the part of the member.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we certainly would not want to have political questions impinging on the question of ethics, would we?

The Prime Minister said that his government would serve all Canadians and not just the privileged few. Tonight, the mayor of Amherst, Cumberland–Colchester councillors, business people and ordinary citizens are pulling together to send a common message: Give the money back.

Let us be very clear. Is the government telling these people that they are wrong and that there is nothing wrong with what the minister of public works has done?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem the member has is that he has to deal with the framework of law.

There is the strategic highway improvement program agreement between the province of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada. The determination of issues related to the allocation of resources under that agreement is very clearly provided for.

• (1145)

Mr. Abbott: So what do you say to the mayor?

Mr. Manley: The mayor needs to address the proper level of government, the province of Nova Scotia, where the decision was made in a way that was very transparent and open. If there is disagreement in the province of Nova Scotia with the people responsible at that level then that is the proper place for the debate to occur.

They are not only ethically challenged, but they seem to have difficulty listening as well. I do not understand why the Reform Party has such difficulty focusing on the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments in this matter.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

For several months now, milk consumer representatives have been telling the government that the moratorium on the use of somatotropin must be extended. Only the government and Monsanto seem interested in seeing that hormone back on the Canadian market. Two days ago, the health committee unanimously asked that the moratorium be extended for another two years.

Will the minister follow up on the unanimous request made by the three parties represented on the health committee and extend the moratorium for two years?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to say once again that the somatotropin hormone has not been approved for sale or consumption in Canada. Consequently, we have to wait. There is a process, at the Department of Health, to approve drugs such as somatotropin. That process is under way, and no decision has yet been made.

A favourable decision will only be made if health department experts are convinced that the hormone can be safely used in Canada. It is important to keep that in mind.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the moratorium ends in 17 days and the processes set up by the health minister are as flawed as her will to protect the health of Canadians.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Daviault: Will the Minister of Health recognize that she can either make specific recommendations to the government to extend the moratorium, or propose measures to prohibit the use of somatotropin in Canada, since that hormone is not currently prohibited?

[*English*]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, BST is not approved for sale in Canada. That is a fact. It will only be approved if it is safe and efficacious and if it does what it purports to do.

When we speak of moratoriums, the voluntary moratorium was arrived at by the industry and Agriculture Canada in order to allow the committee to study the issue further. On health grounds, the product has not been approved. At this time we do not know if it will be approved. We must allow the work of Health Canada to go on.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question concerns the social security overhaul.

Structural unemployment must be addressed by structural change. Can the minister explain how we will ensure that social programs lead to real jobs?

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Victoria Haliburton for a very important question as our government deals with the transition from cyclical unemployment to structural unemployment.

One program that is very successful in our department is the self–employment assistance program, which has generated 34,000 jobs. The program helps people on social assistance and unemployment insurance to start up their own business. The multiplier effect of the program is 1.1 full time jobs; in other words, 68,000 jobs have been created. The budget for this program has also been increased by 62.1 per cent.

• (1150)

During this time when the Canadian economy is going through changes, it is very important that our government devote itself to programs that help people help themselves and create sustainable employment.

* * *

BOSNIA

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Canadian government toward the mission in Bosnia has been wavering and inconsistent since the beginning.

The Minister of National Defence rashly disbanded the airborne regiment but now needs its capabilities. It wants to be neutral in Bosnia but approved air strikes and may join a rapid reaction force.

In its heart, this government wants out of Bosnia but cannot make the tough decision. Will the minister agree that Canada has done its part in Bosnia and that it is time to leave, rather than sending more troops into an impossible situation?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said on a number of occasions, and all of us on this side agree, that the continued presence in the former Yugoslavia of the United Nations forces is perhaps the only way we can avert a very difficult situation and more lives being lost.

The Canadian government undertook to continue its engagement until next October. We fully intend to discharge that unless circumstances prevent us from doing otherwise.

I realize that at the moment it is very awkward, it is very difficult, and the situation is unacceptable, but we still believe this mandate can get back on track with the willingness of the parties to start talking to each other and start working toward a lasting settlement.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister and the G–7 leaders plead with the Bosnian Serbs and Muslims to play nice, the European peace envoy says: "At the moment there isn't a political process. At the moment we're heading towards war."

Will the Minister of National Defence categorically assure this House that the government will decline to participate in any rapid reaction force and announce its intention to withdraw Canadian troops as soon as possible?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had this question asked a number of times in the last couple of weeks and the answer has been the same. We are considering the question of the rapid reaction force and Canada's participation in it. We certainly believe that force should have been set up. Canada supported it at the NATO meeting a few weeks ago.

The Prime Minister will be reflecting on whether or not it is in not only the best interests of Canada but the best interests of the UN if we participate in that force, as to whether or not even a small contribution would make a difference. Also, we are concerned about further implicating ourselves in that particular crisis with larger numbers of people. We have 2,100 people in the conflict.

All of these things are being reflected upon. As for the peace process at the moment, it may be true that no formal negotiations are going on between the parties, but as was said last night on behalf of the G–7 leaders, and I think everyone in this House would share that sentiment, the parties must get back to the negotiating table. They must bargain, because that is the only way to resolve this very difficult problem.

[*Translation*]

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Yesterday, the Minister of Industry stated here in the House that he intended to review DIPP next year. For the first time, the minister appeared open to the opposition's arguments that the ability of Canadian and Quebec companies in the defence and aerospace industry to develop technology must not be eroded.

Will the minister admit that we urgently need to re–establish DIPP budgets, in order to keep our aerospace industry as competitive as it currently is with foreign companies, which are heavily subsidized by their governments for the research and marketing of their products?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member is very aware of my reluctance to subsidize private enterprise. I believe that the best economic strategy is to avoid subsidies. This is not only advisable here in Canada, but also for all of the world's governments.

I accept what he said, and I agree with him that indeed there are other countries which subsidize the aerospace industry. This is one of the issues that we have to take into consideration when reviewing DIPP. He will also understand that the government is obliged to take its fiscal framework into consideration. I am ready to work with him and the aerospace industry and other sectors which are developing new technologies to try to find a new way of making them competitive with other countries of the world.

• (1155)

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my next question contains a solution for the minister, so I would ask him to give me his full attention.

Since the Quebec Minister of Industry is planning to put a program similar to the federal government's DIPP in place, will the minister commit to entering into an agreement with the Government of Quebec to put in place an overall conversion plan for the defence industry?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, firstly, I believe that the hon. member is also well aware that the federal government and the Government of Quebec already have an agreement on industrial projects and that we really work well together. Take Bell Helicopter for example. We found a way to stimulate the development of technology in high tech companies in the province of Quebec.

I would also note that today, despite the enthusiasm of my Quebec counterpart, Moody's has stated that it is aware of the problems the Government of Quebec is having with its budget. I think that it might be a good idea for Quebec to find a way to regain the international markets' confidence. To do this, they would have to do two things: one, concentrate on their budget problems, and two, finally reverse the loss of confidence caused by the separatist policy proposed by this party and the Government of Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

INFLATION

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the Liberal House leader that we are concerned about the Liberal budget. This morning we got the disturbing news that inflation has risen for the fifth consecutive month some 15–fold to 2.9 per cent. That is a concern.

The only sure way to fight rising inflation is to raise the interest rates. However, unless interest rates are lowered, and fast, Canada will likely go into a recession.

My question is for the minister of financial institutions. What is the government's priority at this time, to contain inflation and thereby risk a recession, or to stimulate the economy and thereby risk runaway inflation?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, fortunately there are more than two choices.

I think the hon. member should analyse the inflation numbers a little better. The 2.9 per cent is well within our target range of inflation. If he looks at the recent history of the Bank of Canada he will find that interest rates have fallen recently and that those numbers are well below budget projections.

I would also like to remind the hon. member that if we are going to have continuing inflation in the country it has to be pressured by wages. The wage increases in the country have been very subdued, very low, which indicates that future inflation will not be out of hand but rather will be very low as well.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister well knows that inflation is now hitting the top of the government's target. It is not within the range, it is hitting the top. It is time for the government to be concerned.

I would like to ask the minister for financial institutions this question. The Government of Ontario has decided to lower its

revenue projections by some $2 billion because of the slowdown in economic growth. What is the government doing within the federal Liberal budget at this time to adjust to the slowdown in economic growth?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer the hon. member's question.

Our budget projections were based on very prudent economic assumptions. They were also based on the holding of some reserves. Our budget projections are well within reason.

• (1200)

With interest rates being substantially lower than our budget projections it seems much more likely we will come in with a better budget deficit rather than a higher one.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

Last week was environment week and we asked Canadians as individuals and in business to focus on the environment and to assist with its clean up. Canadians expect us to lead by example.

What is our minister doing to clean up the operations of our own government?

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is moving in four key areas in response to red book commitments.

It is creating the post of commissioner of the environment and sustainable development through Bill C–83, which is going through the House now, which will enable the commissioner to monitor sustainable development strategies on behalf of all the ministries.

The government has proclaimed the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, making all department projects subject to assessment. The ministers of finance and the environment created a task force on economic instruments whose recommendations will be looked at with regard to the 1996 budget.

All the various departments of government are now trying to green their operations. Through the building initiatives of Natural Resources Canada we are now retrofitting buildings for energy savings, giving huge savings in addition to benefiting the environment. In the inland centre in Burlington we are to save $590,000 a year in addition to protecting the environment.

[*Translation*]

VOISEY BAY

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs. The Voisey Bay deposit in Labrador, which promises to be one of the richest in Canada and more important for Newfoundland than the Hibernia Project, is located on lands claimed by the Innu. The federal government and the Government of Newfoundland suspended negotiations on land claims during the very month the deposit was discovered.

Can the minister give the Innu guarantees that the federal government will do everything in its power to settle the land claims before the start of mining operations in Voisey Bay?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, about three weeks ago I met with Premier Wells in St. John's. This was the main topic of discussion. The premier wants to have the negotiations ongoing. What is being done there is important not only for the Government of Newfoundland but for Newfoundlanders as a whole, including aboriginal people.

This is ongoing; it will be done. It is tremendous for both aboriginal and non–aboriginal people of Newfoundland and Labrador that they have found such resources at Voisey Bay.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, press reports in B.C. are saying the predictable thing: British Columbians should expect a long, hot summer of blockades, quoting Shuswap band leader Ken Dennis.

Mr. Dennis says blockades will continue because they work—surprise, surprise. Now we have professional consultants, advisers and participants for roving native blockades.

Can the minister assure British Columbians he will commit to consistently involving himself in these disputes rather than passing the buck to the province?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a rare thing has happened in the House which all members now see. Where do we get the blockades? In B.C. where there are so many Reform members.

The hon. member today talked about trust and speaking for all Canadians, not just a privileged few. It is about time Reform takes some of its own advice.

CUBA

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Senator Jessie Helms and others in the United States continue to attack Canadians for carrying on perfectly legitimate business activities in Cuba. They threaten actions that violate basic principles of international law, undermine trading rules they have argued for and act as if they have the right to dictate conduct to all countries in the western hemisphere.

• (1205)

What is the government doing to tell the American government it does not decide where Canadians go, what we do and that our perfectly legitimate business activities are our concern and not its?

Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement of my colleague.

The government is already on record as communicating with the American administration our opposition to the Helms bill. We will continue through the proper channels both through the World Trade Organization and through NAFTA to deal with this issue. It is our hope that whatever resolution will come out of it will be in the best interests of Canadian businesses.

The American administration is already on record as having some concerns with reference to the Helms legislation. That is very encouraging. It is our hope this bill will go down the tubes.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Anthony Nelson, Economic Secretary to Her Majesty's Treasury from the United Kingdom.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, implicit in the response of the minister of Indian affairs to the question of the hon. member for North Island—Powell River was the suggestion Reform Party members in B.C. were responsible for the ongoing blockades in that province. I ask him to withdraw that comment.

The Speaker: With regard to what was said in question period, hon. members have been given a great deal of latitude both in the formulation of questions and in answers.

I hope all hon. members would consider when asking questions and giving answers to use rather more judicious language. In so doing, the hon. member's point is for debate. No hon. member was mentioned and it is not a point of order.

This concludes question period.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 17 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), copies in both official languages of consultants' reports of the environmental assessment of the net income stabilization account and the crop insurance program.

These assessments were conducted to fulfil our responsibilities under the federal-provincial NISA and crop insurance agreements and as required under section 5(2) of the Farm Income Protection Act.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present in both official languages the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Monday, March 27, 1995 your committee has considered Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code with respect to self-induced intoxication. After a series of meetings and witnesses your committee has agreed to report the bill with amendments.

This is Parliament and the government's response to the Daviault judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present in the House the fourteenth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. This report deals with the management of federal buildings. Their value has been estimated at between $40 billion and $60 billion, in 1985 dollars.

• (1210)

In its report the committee has included a series of recommendations for the Treasury Board Secretariat. The Auditor General concluded in his 1994 report that not enough attention was being given to managing federal property in accordance with Treasury Board guidelines.

Consequently, the public accounts committee has recommended in its conclusion that the Treasury Board Secretariat apply the policy directives set forth in its property management manual and ensure that they are complied with and their objectives are met.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee asks the government to table a comprehensive response to this report.

* * *

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS ACT

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–99, an act to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–334, an act to amend the Canada pension plan (cancellation of benefits).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill I am introducing today and which I wish to table is to fill what I consider a gap in the Canada pension plan.

The bill will allow people who became disabled after they started drawing a retirement pension to cancel that benefit at any time before the age 65 so they can apply for a disability pension.

As the Canada pension plan reads now, a person receiving a retirement pension, which can be received as early as age 60, can cancel the plan only within six months of plan start up. My bill seeks to amend that.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition requesting discrimination against same sex relationships be removed by amendments to the human rights act.

I endorse this petition. I have four petitions to that effect which I would like to table in the House.

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Shawville, Quebec, dealing with a social issue, requesting that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

BILL C–41

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to present eight separate petitions, still protesting against Bill C–41. These are in addition to the 19 I have already submitted to the House on the same issue.

Today there are another 553 of my constituents concerned about Bill C–41 and the undefined phrase sexual orientation which they feel will set a precedent in federal legislation. They are quite concerned about that.

They are also concerned that Bill C–41 will establish a dual standard of justice by punishing identical crimes with different sentences.

I am happy to concur with the petition.

NEWFOUNDLAND DOCKYARD

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the workers at the Newfoundland dockyard, I am pleased to present a petition signed by over 30,000 Newfoundlanders.

The undersigned residents of Newfoundland draw to the attention of the House that the dockyard has provided significant employment in St. John's and surrounding area for the past 112 years. It has employed 850 people with an income and payroll of over $26 million.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to cease all efforts to sell or close the Newfoundland dockyard and provide the necessary capital to retool the dockyard with new equipment so the jobs of these many Newfoundlanders that are desperately needed will be ensured.

• (1215)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition on behalf of the Religious Faith Community supporters and members, who call upon Parliament to put an end to

discriminatory treatment in Canada of gay and lesbian citizens in their familial relationships by amending federal legislation that currently allows unequal treatment.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many Canadians expressing a deep interest in the Canadian Armed Forces.

Our petitioners request that Parliament, at the earliest possible time, initiate a wide ranging public inquiry, replacing many being convened piecemeal, into the Canadian Armed Forces, including the reserves, which will investigate, report, and make recommendations on all matters affecting its operations, tasking, resources, effectiveness, morale, and welfare.

HAMILTON WEATHER OFFICE

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to rise in the House today to present a petition with over 2,800 signatures from my constituents in Hamilton—Wentworth calling on Parliament not to support the closure of Mount Hope, the Hamilton weather office, since it would adversely affect the safety of both aviation and marine operations as well as the agricultural community, local businesses, and recreational interests.

This is a very fine facility at the Hamilton airport and I fully endorse this petition.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada.

This particular petition comes from the Bolton, Ontario, area. The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession, which has not been recognized for its value to our society. They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families who make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of the motion that Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. David Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are in third reading of Bill C–70. As I outlined when I spoke previously, the intention of my speech is to encourage the House to accept the final reading of this in the House of Commons as quickly as possible and to outline in a very factual way what the act intends to to do. It is related to the budget of 1994. This is one of two bills that deal with the amendments to the Income Tax Act.

In addition to what I outlined previously in the House, new rules are provided for debt securities that are not required to be marked to market. These rules deal with the measurement of income while the securities are held and the treatment of gains and losses on disposition.

Bill C–70 also amends the rules for the taxation of resident shareholders of foreign affiliates. This action is being taken as a result of the government's ongoing monitoring of developments in this area. The changes expand the categories of income of foreign affiliates that must be reported as income of their Canadian affiliates. Another modification prevents the use of an affiliate's foreign active business losses to reduce Canadian shareholders' income. This change also protects the Canadian tax base. The amendments are generally effective for taxation years commencing after 1994.

There are also a number of measures that were announced after the 1994 budget. These include six new tax measures that I would like to outline briefly.

• (1220)

First, this bill addresses the issue of eligible prepaid funeral and cemetery arrangements. Under this legislation individuals making such arrangements will not have to declare interest on their deposits up to a $15,000 maximum contribution as income, provided the deposit is not withdrawn for other purposes. The provider of eligible funeral and cemetery arrangements is, however, required to include in income the total amount received from an eligible arrangement.

Turning to the next measure, the bill proposes that real estate trusts with publicly traded units be allowed to qualify as mutual fund trusts. This measure responds to representations from the real estate sector, which is interested in expanding the available methods of financing real estate. We believe the proposed change will facilitate the restructuring and refinancing of this sector.

The third of these post–budget measures is a measure that will help mutual funds to reduce overhead costs and improve services to investors. These amendments will allow mutual fund corporations to convert to mutual fund trusts on a tax free basis and also allow tax free mergers of mutual fund trusts.

This bill also proposes new rules to speed the resolution of objections and appeals, particularly by large corporations. Large corporations will now have to specify the issues under dispute, the amount of relief sought, and the facts and reasons for objecting. The rules also limit the ability of large corporations to raise new issues in a notice of objection where the objection relates to reconsideration of an assessment. However, new issues raised by Revenue Canada on such reconsiderations may still give rise to a notice of objection.

In addition, the legislation will ensure that the new requirements relating to the notices of objection will not apply to assessments that have been appealed to courts before this legislation receives royal assent.

The final measure I want to highlight deals with the tax treatment of dividend compensation payments and other amounts connected with securities lending.

The Income Tax Act currently provides that the lender of securities not be treated as having disposed of the securities under these arrangements. As well, payments to the lender as compensation for dividends are treated as dividends in the lender's hands. While these dividend compensation payments are generally not tax deductible, a special rule established in 1989 allows security dealers to deduct two–thirds of such payments. This legislation extends the use of the two–thirds rule, thus ensuring that our securities industry remains competitive. However, the deduction of these payments will be somewhat limited.

I can assure hon. members that the government will continue monitoring these measures to make certain they can operate effectively.

Other changes clarify the effect of certain dividend rental arrangements and the meaning of securities dealers registered or licensed to trade in securities for the purpose of the Income Tax Act.

In closing, Bill C–70 amends the Income Tax Act effectively and equitably. It seeks to better target tax assistance delivered to certain business sectors while at the same time broadening the tax base and thus protecting government revenues. The legislation contained in this bill also clarifies a number of important issues related to the act.

Given all this, I have no hesitation in encouraging all of my hon. colleagues to support this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to speak on Bill C–70. I am pleased because, first, I thought the government was going to talk about tax reform in Canada with this bill, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related Acts.

Like many Canadians, I think Canada's tax system should be changed significantly, if not completely overhauled. So, I thought, perhaps very naively, that the Liberal government was going to do its homework. Why was I so hopeful? First, in part, because I had read the red book. The red book promised tax equity and that those who had taxes to pay in Canada would pay them.

• (1225)

From what I can see, the book has faded. We hardly ever hear mention of it. At the start, last year, I remember seeing this book resplendent in all its redness on the desks of the members opposite. Now, from what I can see, the red is more likely on the faces of the members. Some members are looking embarrassed at the outcome of the Liberal's election promises.

Let us look at what we were supposed to have in Canada. We were to have jobs; we were to have tax equity. There are no jobs; the jobs we lost were not even replaced. As far as tax equity is concerned, we may have it next year, or maybe in two, ten or twenty years, from what I can see.

It is true that there is a very strong lobby on behalf of those who do not want reforms in Canada, those who are benefiting from the existing tax situation. I remember a debate on this a few weeks ago. One Liberal member naively said that change was slow. He himself had proposed a reform, but he knew that change was slow because of the strong lobby of the well heeled, who benefit from the weaknesses of our tax system.

I am delighted to see that a Liberal member who has been in the House much longer than I can confirm what we in the Bloc already knew. However, Canadian taxpayers really want tax reform.

If we look at the papers and talk with our constituents, we realize that people are not happy with the present tax system. Looking at the size of the bill before us, which contains perhaps 200 pages, I naively thought that the measures proposed by the Minister of Finance would be quite substantial, at least as

substantial as the size of the document itself, but I realized—and will try to demonstrate to you—that what the minister came up with falls far short of real tax reform.

It is not only taxpayers but also experts who are demanding changes. Canada's tax system—which over the years has been modified by legal precedents and amendments, by new regulations, and by various interpretations of the legislation in effect—has led to the emergence in this country of various tax experts and consultants, who help large corporations and wealthy individuals get around the Canadian tax maze to avoid paying their fair share.

The experts themselves tell us—I read a few newspaper articles—that Canada's current tax system is very confusing. A mother cat would lose her kittens in such a maze. There are various interpretations. There are people who manage to get around the system without paying their fair share, simply because the tax structure has become so complex that no one can find their way around it, except for experts who take advantage of this situation by directing work to their firms, which charge substantial fees and often engage in lobbying activities.

The hope I had has been dashed. This hope, which was reflected in the red book, shared by the public and confirmed by the experts, has been thwarted once again.

For the information of the people listening to us, or the colleagues who were perhaps not paying attention and who may not have noticed, the bill before us, Bill C–70, implements measures proposed by the Minister of Finance in his 1994 budget. On this day of June 1995, we are here in this House to discuss tax measures that were proposed by the minister in February 1994. It is obvious that, if we wait for the minister to speed up tax reform, we will wait for a long time.

• (1230)

If we take a look at the clauses now, we could say that the minister has made an effort and that at least there will be a few amendments to the Income Tax Act that will bring us closer to a comprehensive reform. All those who listened to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance speak before me will have realized that this was not the case.

What, essentially, do we find in this document? We find a few rather trivial reforms which are just a drop in the bucket, when what the Minister of Finance should really be doing is delivering on the Liberal government's promise of a fairer tax system for Canada.

So, when we look at these measures, those which, in my opinion, have the greatest impact are the provisions exempting from tax the interest earned on prepaid funeral arrangements. Some Canadians have been more prudent than the governments of recent years. Figuring that one day they will die, they are prepaying their funeral expenses. These amounts generate interest, with the result that the Minister of Finance has devoted a great deal of attention in this close to 200 page bill to this issue. It is one of the five or six measures in the bill. Funeral expenses are tax exempt.

There are other proposals for exemptions, such as tax–free arrangements for mutual fund corporations. These are also very interesting, but we are still talking about people who will not be paying taxes. This is perhaps as it should be, but it does not augur well for tax credits, and I will come back to this a bit later. The bill deals with exemptions for those who invest in mutual funds, as well as foreign affiliates.

When I saw these words, I said to myself: "At last, the Minister of Finance is going to tackle tax havens". I saw the word "foreign" and I said, "Now we have it, the Minister of Finance is proposing a measure on tax havens". I will come back to this shortly. But no, it was merely a question of what shareholders are required to report. These are trivialities.

The bill also talks about debt forgiveness and objections on appeal. Large corporations who object to their assessments will have to be more specific. Is it really important for the Government of Canada to deal with this issue in the bill now before this House and provide for special measures ensuring that large corporations file their claims promptly concerning the taxes they owe? Certainly, I have no doubt about that.

These large corporations include Seagram, Power Corporation and all those we keep hearing about during question period or bumping into at private dinners hosted by the heritage minister. The fact remains that, in view of the situation and the need to reform our tax system, it is rather pointless to put forward amendments such as these. It figures that the government would present them on a Friday, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, because we would see him turn redder than usual, with embarrassment no doubt, because he is calling on the Parliament of Canada to consider such pointless measures, when the Canadian tax system needs to be revamped.

Tax reform is required in Canada and we will try and take a closer look at that. I would like to start by clarifying a point. I read in *La Presse* today the famous annual announcement issued by the Fraser Institute. It said that we will be starting to work for ourselves next Sunday.

• (1235)

As you know, the Fraser Institute is a group of right wing, ultra–conservative economists funded by unknown sources. In fact, I think that we know and perhaps we should say that it is backed by large corporations, which stand to profit from measures like the ones before us today and certainly claim a tax exemption for their contributions to the Fraser Institute.

The Fraser Institute calls itself an institute. It may look like an extreme right or conservative lobby, but it calls itself an institute. They are telling us that every one of us, in this House and throughout Canada, has been working for the government so far this year, but that we will now start earning money for ourselves.

They are telling us that we are overtaxed, that the government is rifling through our pockets. You see what I mean. They seem to want to have us believe that no one pays for the services available in Canada, be it health, education, national defence, infrastructure, highways or what not, and they benefit no one in Canada. These people come and try to peddle the idea that the money paid in taxes by Canadians is actually money being stolen from them.

Before going any further, I would like to denounce such pronouncements. Taxation is a very serious subject that is tied to the very nature of democracy. We live in a democracy where the government provides services, and these services must be paid for by all taxpayers who, through their members of Parliament, vote on a budget that will allow the Minister of National Revenue to raise, in the form of taxes, the money required to pay for these services.

I think no one in Canada, except the people at the Fraser Institute and their ilk, would criticize this system. We receive services, and the government has to pay for the services it provides. People are prepared to pay taxes. When they go to the hospital or send their children to school or university, they realize there are certain costs involved, and they are willing to pay their share.

They are willing to pay their share, but they want their tax assessment to be fair and equitable. The first question is whether in Canada as a whole, we are being overtaxed. Should we repeat the Fraser Institute's mantra and say it does not make sense, we are overtaxed, the government should withdraw from everything and should pay no taxes at all? In the end, this would mean there would be no more government.

When there is no more government, we no longer have a democracy but a feudal system. The Fraser Institute and people of their ilk want to take us back to the middle ages when someone would conquer a territory and be given the title of duke, count or prince. He would then raise taxes, not to provide services but more often to provide a rich dowry for his daughter who was supposed to marry his neighbour, who had also managed to impose his rule on part of the population. In the end, this is the law of the jungle, and that is not what we have in Canada.

Are we overtaxed? I will not answer that question, but I will make a few comparisons. If we look at the figures and compare them with other OECD countries, in other words, the 25 richest countries in the world, in 1992, our tax rate was about 36 per cent of GDP. That sounds like a lot, but is it really when we compare it with the tax rate in other countries? It is easy to say we are paying too much, but we have to find out whether we are paying too much, compared with what other countries are paying. There are no absolutes in economics. Everything is relative.

• (1240)

I do not want to insult anyone here who is an economist by profession, but in economics, we often realize that everything is relative, even the results. We often see economists contradicting their colleagues, and in the end, we realize that some economists are more accurate in their predictions than others. There are certain basic principles that economists ignore at their peril.

In the Scandinavian countries, the tax rate is not 35, 36 or 37 per cent as in Canada, but 45 per cent. That is quite a bit. In Germany and Italy, between 40 and 44 per cent of GDP goes to taxes. Compared with other countries, Canada is about average. This is not the disaster described by extreme right wing parties that think government should get out of everything and stop providing services in the areas of health care and education and let the law of the jungle prevail.

These people use a certain ideology based on certain principles to mislead the public so that people start to challenge the government's right to raise fair taxes.

I say that we are about average among industrialized countries and that taxation is not the main problem. We have to see where the problem is. I think the real problem is that the tax burden is poorly distributed in Canada. Some people do not pay enough taxes and some people pay too much.

This is why I was asking earlier and expecting tax reform. I hope my children will perhaps see tax reform in Canada. When Quebec becomes independent, we will have an eye on the world. We will be reading papers like the *Toronto Star* and the *Globe and Mail*, and I hope to read that Canada has finally started its tax reform.

How is the tax base distributed in Canada? With a brief look at history, we will discover that taxation is a matter of choice. It is a political choice. Someone somewhere decides a tax will be levied in one area and not in another. A choice is made.

I have consulted a number of books on individual and corporate taxes. In passing, I noted that, among the countries in the G–7, Canada has one of the lowest tax rates. The members of the G–7 are meeting in Halifax. It is a beautiful city that I had occasion to visit a few years ago. I reached the same conclusion as the Quebec journalists: it is an English city.

In 1950, personal and corporate taxes in Canada were comparable. The rate was 28 per cent for individuals and 27 per cent for corporations. These were the federal tax revenues. Now, individuals are taxed at the rate of 48 per cent, corporations at 7 per cent.

As you can see, personal income tax has increased, while corporate taxes have decreased, and I am not counting here the effect of the GST and the QST. We can see that we have moved from a situation in the 1950s where there was a certain balance between personal and corporate taxes to today's imbalance.

Our first reaction is to say: "Tax the corporations". We will talk about this in a few minutes, but, before we look at what is going on with corporations, let us look at the situation of individuals. There are things worth considering.

• (1245)

I am not necessarily making any proposals; I am trying to channel our thoughts to avenues which could be of use to the Minister of Finance or the finance committee or the next Liberal Party committee in line to issue a red book or a red and green book, because I have no idea how to define the colour of the Reform members. However, I do feel that, at some point in the future, the colour red and the colour of the Reform Party will be mixed together. What will be the new colour?

Mr. Loubier: Drab.

Mr. Caron: According to one colleague, it will be drab. I have the feeling that the next book will be the Liberal Party's drab book.

There are, I must say, some avenues which are worth exploring. Individuals. They are always telling us that we have to be careful with personal income taxes because, if we tax the rich, they will have less money, less money to invest. We have to be very careful. But I think that we still have to look into these possibilities. A dollar is a dollar. But, we have noticed that a dollar earned through employment is taxed more heavily than a dollar earned through capital gains. In Canada, people with money and who invest it, pay less tax on the money they earn on their investments than people who are salaried and on fixed incomes. Go figure. Is a dollar worth a dollar or are some dollars worth less than others under the current tax system?

Canadians have the impression that the tax scale is progressive, that everyone pays taxes. That if you earn $50,000, you pay a certain amount and if you earn $100,000, you pay twice that. This is not how it works. In 1992, based on figures I have seen, 2,000 Canadian taxpayers who had earned over $100,000 did not pay any income tax. How can these people not have paid tax? It could not be that they hid income from the tax people. I am sure that all citizens in that tax bracket are honest citizens who would promptly pay any amount owed to Revenue Canada. The fact remains that they did not pay any tax. This was made possible by all the tax credits, the many credits they could take advantage of. There were people investing in real estate, and others investing in movies or research. Anyone who had money started investing, with the result that a number of them ended up not paying any tax.

We could say good for them, if they were clever enough not to pay tax and were not doing anything illegal, all the better for them. I guess we could say that. However, there is a downside to that. I had noticed it in my region and I have friends who have looked into this whole thing. They are middle class people, earning between $40,000 and $50,000 a year, and they were wondering why the system was benefiting the rich and not them. Lawyers and accountants set up all kinds of limited partnerships from which people could borrow in order to invest, get a tax deduction on part of this investment and then repay their loans. In the end, they managed to divert money from taxation like the rich.

The downside of this is that, in many cases, the investors found that the properties selected by the limited partnership were not worth as much as they had been told. So, they lost money. They lost money in order to save on income tax. In fact, they took money owed the government to pay for services, and the only ones who benefited from all this seem to be those who set up some limited partnerships or made certain arrangements allowing some people to divert money from the taxman.

Finally, here in this House, the opposition questioned the Minister of Finance about people who had invested in research and development for that purpose. In Canada, the motto in tax matters is "save on taxes". These people, who usually came from the middle class, borrowed money to receive tax credits.

• (1250)

With these tax credits, it is always the same system. People take money from the government and manage to get tax credits, but the ultimate winner is the initiator of the financial scheme, the company that put forward phoney research projects. The bottom line is that these people end up with nothing.

The Department of Finance straightened some of this out. It realized that some of these companies were not seriously into research, and the credit was denied. You may say, "People knew that the government could go back three years for all these things", but the fact remains that these people got hooked because there is a belief among Canadian people that those with money can save on taxes.

I think that this is a prime example of a tainted system in which people who cannot afford to invest in sectors eligible for tax credits are urged to do so through all kinds of scams and end up being taken for a ride. I think that the Minister of Finance should look at tax shelters and tax credits for an explanation of why so many people in Canada do not pay taxes.

If this is legitimate and normal, the minister should tell us so and, if not, he should take the measures needed to correct the situation. I have some figures here. From 1984 to 1992, taxes paid in Canada by middle income households increased 6.7 per cent, compared to only 3 per cent for households with incomes

of $150,000 and over. Again, it is the middle class which is really paying the tax increases, while those with a higher income are taxed less. Some might say: But listen, 6 per cent of $50,000 is $3,000, while 3 per cent of $150,000 is $4,500; consequently, the rich are paying more. However, this is not the way things work.

With this system, the rich get richer, while middle class people see their taxes go up every year. This is not normal, and I think that the Minister of Finance, or a Liberal caucus committee, should take a close look at these issues.

And now, on to another topic. Recently, during the French presidential campaign, I read something about taxes on personal wealth. Candidates in France and elsewhere, and this may become the case here some day, have to make a statement of their financial position. In France, there is a tax on personal wealth.

It seems that such a tax existed in Canada in 1972, but it is no longer the case. We are apparently the only OECD country which does not tax personal wealth. Consequently, very wealthy families and individuals continue to get richer; yet, the Canadian government is not even considering taxing such wealth.

There are other things too. I will not go back to the issue of family trusts. We talked about it during the election campaign, and we raised it many times here, during question period. The Minister of Finance finally did something about it in this year's budget, not last year's budget, which is currently in effect.

So, this year's budget includes a provision on family trusts in which the minister made some changes to the rules. However, these changes will only come into effect in three or four years, thus giving time to the tax experts to find another way to exempt rich families, not to mention the possibility that a successor to the current finance minister could provide another tax shelter so that these rich people would avoid having to pay taxes.

Consequently, you see rich taxpayers who do not seem to be paying taxes when they should. There are people with large personal fortunes who never pay taxes on that wealth.

• (1255)

Some people can set up family trusts for the benefit of their descendants, maybe not for ten generations but just the same, this raises questions.

So something can be done in Canada about personal income tax. I disagree with what the former president of the United States, Mr. Reagan, used to say, that if they stopped taxing the rich, the rich would invest. Mr. Reagan tried it, but the rich did not invest. The rich went on accumulating their wealth, because that is what they do. They do not necessarily invest. And when they do, they usually invest with borrowed money, with other people's money.

As far as corporations are concerned, I think it is obvious that the corporate tax system in Canada must be changed, because corporations receive extremely preferential treatment. They will tell us—and I heard it said this morning by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance—that you have to be careful, that corporations must remain competitive. So their taxes should not be too high. Their tax burden should not be too heavy.

Mr. Speaker, do you know which G–7 country has the highest tax rate? Japan, apparently. Would anyone in this House claim Japan is not competitive? Competitiveness is not just a matter of taxation, it is something else. And people who use being competitive as an excuse not to pay taxes are definitely misleading the public.

We saw a very obvious example of this recently in Quebec, where the Quebec government wanted, in fact it still wants, to introduce a 1 per cent payroll tax for businesses with a certain number of employees, to oblige them to provide vocational training. Ghislain Dufour, the Quebec equivalent of the Fraser Institute, perhaps not the equivalent because Mr. Dufour does not qualify as an institute, and I do not think he is eligible for a tax credit, Mr. Dufour said: "Quebec corporations will be less competitive. It will be harder to compete. It does not make sense". A corporation with a payroll of let us say $500,000 would pay 1 per cent, which works out to $5,000. So the corporation is supposed to go bankrupt because it has to pay an additional $5,000 for vocational training for its employees?

In Canada, corporate taxes are too low. In 1987, 90,000 corporations did not pay income tax in Canada. Not bad. In 1991, it was 77,000. Incredible. Granted, some corporations may not be doing that well and so they do not pay income tax, but I would say that one–third of corporate profits in Canada are made by corporations that did not pay taxes. So these are not companies with two or three employees that are leading a hand–to–mouth existence, these are companies that made a profit and thanks to certain measures in the Income Tax Act, manage to avoid paying income tax. So this raises a lot of questions.

It raises a lot of questions for people who have no access to tax shelters and who pay income tax on their weekly pay cheques. How disgusting. There is also the whole issue of deferred taxes. Businesses, billion dollar multinationals established in Canada, are able to put off paying taxes from one year to the next through tax deferral. There will always be a point where their profits are lower, therefore, they will be able to pay less tax, etc. These are all things that make us wonder, and that give us the right to question the Minister of Finance regarding the legitimacy of this system.

The Bloc has also talked about tax havens. The Bloc finance critic has raised this issue with the Minister of Finance many times. He has asked him questions as Minister of Finance and perhaps as a first–hand tax haven expert. It is well known that Canada's Minister of Finance stopped managing his own affairs when he came to office, got in to politics.

• (1300)

The Minister of Finance used to be notorious for letting his financial affairs be conducted under a different flag than the maple leaf. Some companies open up in reputable countries, often very old countries, like Cyprus, Malta, Barbados, or even in countries quite far south, close to Australia, like Papua New Guinea, Panama. There are even Canadian companies which have set up shop in these areas. They have offshore subsidiaries in places like Cyprus, Malta, etc.

There are certainly people in these areas who can afford to buy the goods produced by the Canadian factories with subsidiaries there. However, I cannot believe, for instance, that all the 20,000 or 30,000 companies registered in Panama are there for the climate, for the location half way between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and because this is good for business.

We have only to think back to the scandal following the death of Mr. Irving, so well known in New Brunswick, who moved most of his businesses and who specified in his will that his children in Canada would be cut off if they did not set up in tax havens.

When you are the Minister of Finance and you see Canadian companies setting up ghost subsidiaries abroad and you know all about tax havens and you do nothing, I think you are shirking in your duty.

This proves that it is time for a good clean–up, a thorough tidying–up of the Canadian tax system. I think we have to review the agreements we have with 16 countries on tax rates and other tax matters. The official opposition has often called for such a review. The minister's reply is that the matter is under consideration and, given Canada's competitiveness and the current situation, we are in the best of all tax worlds. I do not think this is the case.

The Bloc will obviously vote against this bill, not because the measures are so awful in themselves, they are Canadian measures for the Canadian tax system, that is to say they cloud the situation a little more, and the system will be muddier and muddier.

Finally, I think the Income Tax Act is a little like the country. I do not want to get into a demagogic diatribe on how Canada's situation compares with the Income Tax Act. What is the Income Tax Act. It is a heap of tax measures with more measures piled on every year. No one has gone through it; no has organized it.

People have called for change, and the answer has always been no. So now we have a jungle of an Income Tax Act where the strongest manage to inch their way through and impose their rule and where, often, the people who earn their living and do their best are unfairly taxed. I think the government has to propose a tax reform. Canadian taxpayers deserve it.

[*English*]

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, certainly the Reform Party will not be supporting Bill C–70 at third reading for a number of reasons.

With regard to the comments of the member for Jonquière and the presentation we heard for the last 40 minutes, I can understand completely why the economy in Quebec is in trouble. I can understand completely why the credit rating of Quebec was downgraded last week.

• (1305)

We hear the left wing, socialist diatribe about more spending by government and about punishing those who have achieved in society to the point where they have accumulated some kind of wealth to reinvest, have created jobs and have paid a major portion of the taxes that often goes to support people who want to work on the public purse in universities or at other public jobs. Who creates the revenue to pay for those jobs and to improve quality of life? Who creates it? Who takes the risk? When people take the risk, does the government have a responsibility to punish them more, to raise taxes, or to take it away from them? Are they bad people in society?

The Canadian economy was built on people using their initiative, having freedom, having the right to take risks and to lose their funds and lose respect in a community within the market system.

Those members want more legislation. They want to take money away from someone else. They want to depress the economy. The obvious result is what we see in Quebec. We also see the results in Canada.

We have had 20 years of governments thinking it could improve the economy of Canada by spending more, by increasing the level of expenditure. What has happened? It has increased the level of debt. Every year we are in a deficit position. Today it is out of control. We have inflation that is out of control, an issue that I raised in question period today. I have not received an answer to that question. We have a dilemma with the Bank of Canada. It is going to be very difficult.

The Reform Party has an answer which I will talk about today. It is time somebody said something. It is unfair that members of the Bloc Quebecois hide behind their separatist cloak. The people of Canada do not know they have a second characteristic. They think they are most likely free enterprisers. Not only do they bring to the House separation and the breakup of Canada,

but they bring socialist diatribe into the House that has ruined the country in the last 20 years. We do not need any more of that.

I am very disappointed in the words that were spoken. We have a free society. The House is a place for everybody to present their views. I will always support that. When I do not agree with something I have the right to stand and say so.

Bill C–70 brings in changes to the 1994 budget, which was a disastrous budget for the government. It came here ill prepared and presented it to Canadians. We are living with the ill effects of its poor planning, its partisan politics when in opposition, and its lack of action in the 1994 budget. Unfortunately Canadians will feel the ill effects.

The legislation is a perfect example of why we need to simplify the Income Tax Act and have a flat tax as my hon. colleague from Calgary Centre is calling for. We in the Reform Party support him.

I guarantee that even accountants will find it difficult to understand the contents of Bill C–70. Fortunately my colleague from St. Albert is an accountant. The other day he addressed the specifics in second reading of the bill. I want to spend my time talking about the budget from which the bill flows. It was the first Liberal budget that unfortunately announced the government's plan to add $100 billion more to the federal debt over a period of three years.

More important, I want to talk about the outcome of the 1994 budget and its implications for us today. The Prime Minister and the government keep insisting things are fine, the economy is growing and there is nothing to worry about. If this is the case why did Moody's downgrade our credit rating this year?

Moody's decided that Canada was a greater risk than when the government took office. After 18 months it has not convinced any investors in the country that it is serious about putting its fiscal house in order. It has presented two budgets in which it had the opportunity to announce a medium and a long term strategy to bring about deficit elimination and debt reduction. The government has failed to do that and has caused all kinds of serious implications for the economy.

• (1310)

It has had almost two years to come up with a plan to balance the budget by a specific date, but it has refused to do so after many questions by the Reform Party. The only commitment we have is that the Liberal government will bring the deficit to 3 per cent of GDP. That is an easy one, but it may change. With inflation changing and with interest rates doubling, it could make it very difficult.

What has the government's fiscal plan as announced in its first budget achieved to date? Members of government will say that it has resulted in economic growth and job creation. However the growth has occurred in spite of the government's plan, not because of it, and for the past six months there has been no growth at all. Employment levels have not moved in months and the economy actually shrank in both March and April.

The government's soft fiscal policy has had three important impacts on the economy. First, it has led to a rapid depreciation of the value of our currency. Second, it has forced the Bank of Canada to keep interest rates dangerously high. Third, it has allowed inflation, which was all but dead when the Liberals arrived in office, to pull itself up off the canvas. Once again it has become a major concern to investors and Canadians.

Let us look at what happened to the currency. When the Liberals came to office the dollar was traded at 76 cents U.S. By January of this year it had fallen to 70 cents. It has only managed to struggle back to the 72 or 73 cent range due to the support provided to it by Bank of Canada Governor Gordon Thiessen. It was not the action of the government. It was the Governor of the Bank of Canada who took action to make it happen.

However this is not the whole story. While declining only modestly versus the American dollar, our currency has done much worse versus other major world currencies. Since the release of the government's first budget our dollar is worth 23 per cent less in terms of the mark and 25 per cent less in terms of the yen.

Why is that bad for Canadians? There are two very key reasons. The first is that imports become more expensive. To show just how big a difference it makes, our fall versus the yen means that a Sony camcorder which cost $3,900 last year will cost $4,800 or an extra $900 in one year. The second is that it leads to inflation. As we saw in the camcorder example the prices of imported goods are jumping rapidly, which places upward pressure on the consumer price index. We learned today that inflation in Canada is now running at 2.9 per cent.

Let us talk about high interest rates. The impact of the budget on interest rates has been no better. When the Liberal government released its first budget in February 1994 short term interest rates were under 4 per cent. It is only in the last six weeks that they have fallen below 8 per cent. In other words interest rates have doubled in the space of one year. That is a record. I would say to the hon. House leader of the Liberal Party who spoke today that should be a concern with regard to the budget.

This is having a significant impact on our economy, particularly those sectors which are highly sensitive to interest rates. For example, first quarter housing starts fell 18 per cent reaching their lowest level since 1982, while housing resales fell by over 40 per cent. Automobile sales are also off significantly, down 10 per cent from last year's pace. Not only are these high rates hurting the private sector, the federal government has been the biggest loser having to pay an additional $1.8 billion in interest for every 1 per cent of interest increase.

The consequences were brought home in the government's second budget, which showed that debt servicing costs or interest payments will rise by $8 billion in the next year to a total of $50 billion.

• (1315)

That $8 billion as an increase almost completely wipes out the effect of all of the spending cuts that came from the government's program review and carried out by the hon. minister who is here with us. That was a good idea but the government has not controlled the interest rates and we are in trouble.

The finance department's Fiscal Monitor that came out this week notes that the public debt charges for March were up 27 per cent and were $4 billion higher than the year before. This is a 27 per cent increase, which is very significant.

I would like to talk about inflation. That is the newest problem facing the economy here today. It results directly from the soft fiscal policy announced in the government's first budget. That is where the problem is. It is a resurrection of these inflationary pressures.

In the last year, inflation rose from .2 per cent to the present level of 2.9 per cent and it is clearly threatening to escape the 3 per cent target band set by the Bank of Canada. This means that the Bank of Canada Governor Gordon Thiessen is facing a very difficult decision. If he chooses to support the value of the dollar and contain inflation within its 1 to 3 per cent target band, he will be forced to raise interest rates. As I mentioned earlier, any further increases will hit both the government and the economy very hard.

On the other hand if his concerns for the economy prompt the governor to lower interest rates, then the dollar will continue to fall and the inflation genie will escape from the bottle. This in turn will lead to higher, longer term interest rates as expectations of future inflation are priced into the bond market in a vicious cycle in which there can be no winner.

I would like to remind members of what happened the last time we entered the vicious cycle. It was in the late 1980s and early 1990s when the Liberals were in opposition. All through this period, the Liberals used the former Bank of Canada Governor John Crow as their whipping boy due to his tough stand on inflation.

As we know, they released him after they came into government. They demanded that he lower interest rates to prevent the economy from slipping into a recession seems fairly straightforward in terms of economic policy. What happened is that it eventually did.

Whether they realize it or not, the Liberals criticized the wrong man. It was not the tight money policy of John Crow that caused this recession, it was the chronic deficit spending of the former Conservative government.

The point the Liberals missed in opposition and are missing again now that they are in power is the government has two instruments with which to influence the interest rates, inflation and the dollar.

First, monetary policy as carried out by the Bank of Canada plays a very important role but it is not the only player. The government must also shoulder some of the burden through its choice of fiscal policy. That is the primary instrument which must be used to deal with the problems in the country.

What happened in Canada under the Conservatives is that a fiscally irresponsible government ignored its own responsibilities, effectively forcing the Bank of Canada to carry the ball single handedly.

I am warning the government today to not make the same mistake as the Tories. We cannot afford to let that happen. I hope the Finance Minister and his colleagues will have enough sense to provide the new governor with support in order to keep the lid on inflation and to bring down interest rates.

If the government does not reverse course and adopt a stronger fiscal policy, then we in the Reform Party will not be pointing our finger at the Bank of Canada. We will place the blame squarely at the feet of the government, which has not honoured its fiscal responsibility. My responsibility and my colleague's responsibility is to do just that. For the sake of this country, I hope this does not become the legacy of the government's first budget, the last piece of which is Bill C–70, a bill that we will not support.

There is still time to change the course. The government's second budget began to do this but the job is left to be done. It is incumbent on the government to bring about a budget for 1996–97 which puts in place a plan of deficit elimination and a plan toward reducing the debt of the country. If the government does that possibly we will have a stable economy, an economy in which jobs are created, in which Canadians will be able to risk, to invest and to live with their families in a very proper way.

• (1320)

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C–70. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Income Tax Act because of certain budgetary measures which were taken.

Members of the Reform Party vehemently opposed that budget. We opposed the budget because we felt it did not go far enough. It did not address the situations in the country which threaten every Canadian from coast to coast. Canadian jobs are

threatened, their homes are threatened and their social programs are threatened.

The reason the budget threatened each and every Canadian was due to the economic and fiscal irresponsibility of the government in not addressing the debt and the deficit which increased every year. Furthermore, the budget sought to compromise those in our society who are most vulnerable, those who cannot take care of themselves and those who are most dependent on government largesse.

We in the Reform Party proposed the zero in three plan. We gave the first half of that plan to the government. We said to the government: "Here is a how to plan". It was not something esoteric, it was a how to plan to bring the economic situation under control. We told the government how much to cut and where to cut. Did the government heed that? No.

We gave the second part of the plan to the government and said: "Here is the product of hard work. Here is the product of something which is followed by a great many Canadians. It is a plan which is fiscally responsible and sound. It is a plan which will address the debt and deficit problem". Did the government listen to us? No.

As a result we have the problems of today. Figures came out this week that showed the real income of Canadians has dropped significantly over the last two years. The Canadian dollar has dropped and inflation is rising. As well, the investors of the world have downgraded our bonds. Moody's has downgraded our bonds for the first time ever. If this is not a harbinger of things to come, I do not know what is.

It is unfortunate that the wool has been pulled over Canadians' eyes by a budget which is an illusion. The government told us that it is the first government to cut. That is true. This is the first government to actually make cuts. Let us analyse those cuts.

A third of the cuts which were made truly were cuts and the government deserves credit for that. However, two–thirds of the cuts were made to provincial transfer payments. Whose shoulders did they fall on? The provinces. The provinces also tax the same taxpayers and at the end of the day it is the taxpayers who have to pay.

Whether it is the federal government, the provincial government, or the municipal government people who work hard have a huge amount of their money taken away from them to go to the governments which are in difficult financial situations. Governments have not recognised the situation they are in and continue to spend taxpayers' dollars in an irresponsible fashion.

I plead on behalf of all Canadians that the government take heed and work with us on the problem to develop a sound, fiscally responsible solution which is going to help all Canadians from coast to coast. That is what everybody in the House wants to have. We need a strong, aggressive, forward thinking economy that is going to help all Canadians while preserving the core of our social programs to ensure that all those in Canada who need it will be taken care of.

• (1325)

An hon. member: They owe it to the young people.

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Yes, that is right, they owe it to the young people. This government and previous governments have mortgaged the future of Canadians to pay for what we have today. That is the height of irresponsibility. The young people of today and those who are not yet born are the ones who are going to bear the brunt of this most tragic situation.

The current tax situation is an unwieldy, ineffective system that is bogged down in bureaucratic largesse. All of us here pay taxes. All of us see the tax plans. All of us see the forms that have to be filled out. How can we see these every year and not ask: If we are having a problem with it, is not the rest of Canada?

Why does the government not simplify the tax system to ensure that it is fair and equitable across the whole spectrum of individuals earning money? We must ensure that everybody pays their fair share without going through loopholes and favouritism within the system.

To that end, my colleague from Calgary who is our finance critic has just mentioned the flat tax system that we in the Reform Party have been speaking about since we were elected. It was one of the pillars of our economic and fiscal plan.

Essentially the flat tax system would simplify the tax to ensure that all Canadians pay their fair share. That is extremely important. As we speak to businesses and individuals alike they shake their heads and ask: "How can we deal with this tax system, a system that is so unwieldy, so unforgiving and so complicated?" There are many simpler ways of doing it.

The GST is another aspect of the tax system that was supposed to be revisited. The Deputy Prime Minister stated that if the GST was not gone a year after she was elected, she would be gone. Unfortunately she is still here. I think she should live up to her promises.

That is another aspect of the tax system which needs to be revisited. I ask and implore members on the government side to please listen to business leaders in their communities, not leaders of the business community leaders who come to us. Go out and walk among the business community/leaders and ask them what it is that absolutely frustrates and prevents them from maximizing their potential as a business person. They will say, nine times out of ten, it is the GST.

The second thing they will mention nine times out of ten is the unbelievable red tape they have to go through to operate within this country. It eludes me why, in a country as rich and as potentially powerful as ours, we have to hamstring the business community with bureaucratic entanglements.

I implore the government to look at ways of simplifying the taxation system, the bureaucratic red tape and internal trade barriers which hamper Canada.

The trade barriers in our country hamstring and prevent businesses from being the best that they can become. We aggressively pursue, and rightly so, international free trade agreements like the WTO and previous to that the GATT. It is done to help our business communities. That is done on the international scene. However it eludes me why on our domestic scene we turn around and say: "No, you cannot do business here. We are going to put tariffs there. We are going to oblige you to follow these rules and engage in the same type of bureaucratic entanglements and anti–free trade rules that we do not follow in our export and international endeavours". It is hurting our businesses and people wonder why we are not doing better. In part it is because of these internal trade barriers which are hamstringing the ability of businesses to do that.

When it was elected the government said it was going to aggressively pursue the elimination of these interprovincial trade barriers. It has only nibbled around the edges and Bill C–88 will prove it to the Canadian public.

In closing, there are good parts to Bill C–70 and many bad parts. We must simplify the tax system. Let us look at the flat tax system we want to apply. Let us ensure that we simplify expenditures. Let us attack the deficit and bring it down to zero. Listen to the zero in three plan of the Reform Party and move forward to a strong economy for all Canadians.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would there be unanimous consent for the Chair to put the question now and then proceed to private members' hour?

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Then we will put the matter to a vote. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the division on the motion stands deferred until Monday, 11.30 p.m., at the time of adjournment.

[*English*]

It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ALTERNATIVE FUELS ACT

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in support of Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for internal combustion engines. With the passage of this forward looking legislation, the federal government will assume a leadership role in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by requiring by the year 2004 the conversion of 75 per cent of its fleet vehicles to cleaner burning fuel.

The federal fleet consists of 39,000 vehicles that release 150,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide and over 4,000 tonnes of other pollutants into the environment each year. These pollutants collect in the atmosphere and contribute to global warming. As a result of Bill S–7 we will reduce CO2 emissions by 20,000 tonnes annually and will take positive steps to address the greenhouse effect. We will lead by example.

It is anticipated that the conversion of government vehicles will encourage automobile companies to market vehicles that burn renewable fuels and will also increase the number of service stations providing alternative fuels. Not that many years ago gas stations offering ethanol were few and far between. Now they are everywhere. This too will happen with other cleaner burning fuels.

We have all contributed to the environmental problems we now face and it is time to be part of the solution. Bill S–7 will allow us as parliamentarians to take positive action to ensure that our children and our children's children enjoy cleaner air and a healthier environment. We owe this to them.

By requiring government vehicles to be converted to cleaner burning fuels, Canada will be making a significant step toward fulfilling our international commitments to reduce greenhouse

gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. The Liberal government is committed to ensuring that these obligations are met for the good of Canada and for the good of the world.

• (1335)

In addition to greening our country, this legislation will result in long term savings to Canadian taxpayers. During the five years it will take to convert 75 per cent of our government fleet vehicles, we will save $7 million. Once conversion is complete we will save $7 million every year. This represents direct savings to government and direct savings to taxpayers.

Bill S–7 is fuel neutral. It promotes the use of ethanol, methanol, propane gas, natural gas, hydrogen or electricity. The choice of fuels to an extent will be regionally determined based on economic factors and availability.

The expansion of the use of ethanol is of particular importance to me given the benefit it is for the environment and as a growing market for prairie grain. Not only is prairie grain feeding the world, it is getting the world where it wants to go and in a more environmentally friendly way than traditional fossil fuel.

Ethanol provides an excellent opportunity for economic growth and diversification. It greatly expands the market for agricultural products thereby increasing farmers' incomes. It also provides opportunities for value added development and jobs in rural Canada.

The people in my Dauphin—Swan River riding are excited about the prospects of ethanol production. Groups from the towns of Russell and Swan River have approached me about possibilities of establishing ethanol plants in their communities. They are excited about contributing to the greening of our environment and the economic spinoffs for their communities. The construction of ethanol plants in rural communities will not only boost our self–sufficiency in ethanol supply but will also diversify our communities, provide needed jobs and greatly contribute to the long term viability of rural Canada.

To help our rural communities build innovative economies, the minister of agriculture and the environment minister announced the biomass ethanol program which will encourage investment in the ethanol industry, thereby expanding domestic demands for corn, wheat and barley produced on the prairies. The biomass ethanol program shows this government's commitment to encourage the production and use of renewable fuels where it is environmentally sound and economically viable.

I am pleased with the support that companies like Centra Gas in Winnipeg and Ford Canada have given to this initiative. Propane and natural gas suppliers have indicated that they are prepared to convert suitable vehicles in the government fleet at their own expense. These are the types of partnerships we need to encourage to work toward environmental sustainability.

I am very pleased to offer my wholehearted support to this forward looking initiative. It is not often that an idea comes about that is good for the environment, good for agriculture and good for the taxpayers. In short, this is a win–win proposal.

I commend Senator Colin Kenny for his foresight and his commitment to the environment. I urge all members of this House to support this important legislation.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address my amendments to Bill S–7. There are four in number but all deal with one subject which is mainly to remove crown corporations from the effects of this bill.

It is a well known and well developed tradition in this country that crown corporations at the basic managerial level should be able to operate at arm's length from the political sector. This type of interference is totally unwarranted. The companies are inefficient enough as it is. If the managers are going to have to be constantly looking over their shoulders to see what the politicians want them to do, they are going to be even more inefficient.

There is a basic thrust to this bill which is expressed very well in a briefing note I received from I know not where. It says that legislation is preferable to government guidelines. That is fundamental Liberal policy in just about every sphere of activity. This will be about the fifth time in this House I have drawn attention to what I consider to be the very basic philosophy of the Liberal Party of Canada, that everything that is not prohibited shall be compulsory.

• (1340)

My colleagues are going to address the environmental concerns. I will leave that to them, except I would like to state that as somewhat of an engineer and scientist, I find there is a lot of voodoo science involved in some of the lobby documents I have received backing this bill.

This is not a black and white situation. Certainly propane and natural gas do have some environmental advantages over gasoline and diesel, but they also have disadvantages. On balance perhaps they are better. Over all, ethanol is undoubtedly deleterious to the environment if we consider all of the aspects.

I see an hon. member grinning over there. He wants to have an ethanol plant in his riding. If we study the scientific literature, from a basic, scientific point of view the evidence on ethanol does not add up.

I have noticed there has been an incredible amount of corporate lobbying on this bill. As a matter of fact the corporate lobbying on behalf of this bill has been more intense than anything which has taken place on the Hill since the halcyon days of Dome Petroleum. It is incredible. I have a huge stack of papers.

If this is such a good idea, if the producers of the conversion systems and the people who want to sell propane and natural gas have such good products and they are so sure of their position here, why should government have to interfere in the marketplace to mandate markets for them? This is not the business of government; this is the business of business.

If they cannot break into this market, albeit a small market, I do not know why they are fighting so hard to get it. It is a small market. Let them prove themselves, flex their muscles, talk to the people who do the purchasing, put on some demonstration projects and win the market fair and square in the marketplace instead of getting the politicians to do their marketing for them and shove it down the throats of the bureaucrats. This is not the way government should be run. This is not the way the civil service should be operated.

I most emphatically oppose the bill. However, if we must have it, as it has very clearly become a government bill now, then let us at least have my amendments which will permit the people who operate our crown corporations to continue the unfettered management of these companies on our behalf.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having listened to the argument just made by the member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, I have to deal with the point he makes in relation to crown corporations. He says he does not want to interfere with the operations of crown corporations in implementing this measure.

I have to remind the hon. member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia that crown corporations are created by acts of Parliament. They express the will of the elected representatives and of the elected government.

• (1345)

Budgets of the crown corporations are scrutinized every year by committees of Parliament. They undergo therefore very close examination on the part of the political arm. Therefore there is nothing wrong in also asking crown corporations to adopt a measure that is economically and environmentally sound.

I begin to wonder whether the Reform Party is interested in economy and environmentally sound measures. I know for sure the member for Comox—Alberni is a very good environmentalist. I know also his colleague, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, is a very fine environmentalist and has proven that on a number of occasions.

Now the moment of truth has come for the Reform Party to show its true colours and to demonstrate where it really stands. As has been underlined on several occasions in this debate, the measure proposed in Bill S–7 to switch the use of fuels from fossil to alternative fuels just emerging in the marketplace would save the government $7 million in consumption and in maintenance terms.

That is not a minor feature considering the interest expressed by the Reform Party on reducing government expenditures. Here is a golden opportunity for the hon. member to demonstrate to his constituents and to the House that he means what he says. I hope he is not using crown corporations as an excuse for not supporting the bill because that would be a very sad matter.

The member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia also made a plea for the marketplace to take care of this matter. We all know new technologies, new usages and new fuels when they appear on the market need some help. That is the intent of the bill before us.

Why is the bill before us? This is an important consideration. It relates to economic savings and we have gone over that a moment ago. We have a responsibility in relation to the trend in climate change. I am glad to learn the member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia is a scientist. He must know the scientific community warned about the serious trends in climate change and climate warming. These are caused mostly because of our dependence on fossil fuels.

It would seem only logical, in the public interest and desirable that the government seek fuels less damaging in terms of climate change.

In the case of the fuels proposed in this bill we have an alternative approach that will cut in half the so–called greenhouse gases, helping the momentum in climate change which has attracted the attention of a number of international bodies and of a number of leading scientists in Canada .

Therefore it seems to me the Reform Party is at crossroads. I am sure it will want to demonstrate to Parliament and to the public that it means what it says, that it is really concerned as it claims at times with economic measures and environmental objectives.

The bill is well known because of interventions made by previous speakers. It demonstrates the time has come for us as a society, as consumers, to move away wherever possible and as rapidly as we can from our dependence on fossil fuels.

• (1350)

We are internationally committed to the stabilization of carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2000, taking the year 1990 as a base. At the rate we are at now we will reach the year 2000 with a minus 13 deficit; in other words, we are badly behind schedule.

In addition to that, in "Creating Opportunity" in 1993 we made a pledge to Canadian electors that we would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2005 by 20 per cent. This measure is helping to move us in that direction and it seems every member of Parliament has a great opportunity to demonstrate we are taking to heart the public interest and that we want to take every opportunity to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this bill.

I cannot agree with the overall need for the bill in the first place. However, the amendment would certainly enhance it. I will direct my remarks specifically to the bill and whether we need it.

I believe the bill is an excellent example of how we as parliamentarians can get caught up in believing that enacting new or revised legislation is the answer to problems we may encounter. Making the bill law is an example of how we have allowed too much government into our daily lives.

The bill's objective is to accelerate the use of alternate fuels for motor vehicles, and specifically targets the government motor vehicle fleet of approximately 30,000 vehicles. The bill then devotes its text to the mechanics of the process deemed necessary to achieve a 75 per cent success rate by the year 2004.

I shall address my remarks to the main objective, as the semantics of the process are irrelevant at this point if one disagrees with the main objective and the overall concept.

The bill is asking us to make a law based on a verb, to accelerate or not to accelerate. The concept of converting gasoline motor vehicles to alternate fuels is already in place. Activity in the government department toward achieving this end is already underway. Therefore to accelerate this activity is not a legislative concern but a management concern in the government departments and corporations, et cetera, this bill includes.

We do not need more laws in our lives. We need to improve the existing ones in their appropriate jurisdictions to resolve problems; if it is a management problem, put the problem there. In this case senior management should have a plan for converting to alternate fuels and the plan should include the number of vehicles by certain dates, be it 2004 or otherwise.

Our colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, has also indicated the legislation should empower management or bureaucrats to make changes rather than telling them what to do. That was in the *Hill Times* on April 20. In other words, delegate the authority to carry out the action to management and then expect it to get on with it to achieve the policy as stated by the standards.

The basic principle of delegation when used effectively reduces the number of rules and regulations, laws, et cetera, required and creates the necessary direction at the level of the department or corporation as a policy and procedure versus national law to actually implement the act. By effectively using the principle of delegation we succeed in reducing the amount of law and government in our daily lives.

I am not suggesting this proposal is not an effective action toward reducing the greenhouse effect in our environment. I agree with the comments made by the Minister of the Environment, a member of the Bloc Quebecois and my colleague from Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia for publicly supporting the concept of converting gasoline motors to alternate fuels.

I agree legislating this type of action, the converting of gasoline motors, et cetera, is in our jurisdiction as legislators, as it provides direction for the people of Canada in this regard. How it is done or the process to achieve this is a managerial concept.

• (1355)

A law of this nature tells all Canadians Canada is working toward this conversion. It provides a sense of direction. The marketplace would be aware of this overall objective and we can pass this as legislation. How fast it goes should be a management situation.

It is not our role to legislate the process to be used by individuals or groups and in this case government departments or corporations. Individuals and groups should be managing their own resources, finances and otherwise and developing a plan conducive to their own situation to achieve this goal.

Bill S–7 is in the realm of management, as I stated earlier, not law. Why is it deemed necessary to be concerned about the speed at which this is occurring? Obviously there are barriers present and the nature of today's marketplace may well be one, as resources for alternate fuels are few and far between.

By legislating that 30,000 plus government vehicles be converted within an eight or nine year period will create much more demand on the marketplace and force the issue on it for change in existing trends. We are not only legislating management techniques for government organizations, we are also becoming involved in the marketplace in that we are suggesting it change its management practices within the next eight or nine years to accommodate the demands this bill will put on it.

Another concern is the cost factor involved and the effects of the time limitations we will have on the budgeting process of an organization, not only the actual conversion costs but the operating costs. The rationale now is alternate fuels are cheaper. If we use the supply and demand principle once we get into the process of conversion at some point the cost of that fuel will also go up.

Bill S–7 will have an effect on several principles or concepts considered important in society. The environment is one. Some of those concepts are government interference in the management process, that is, lack of delegation, government interference in the marketplace which relates directly to the principle of too much government in our daily lives and government entering into the field of free enterprise.

I agree this accelerating process for conversion would definitely contribute toward improving our environment. However, I do not see the need for a national law to achieve this objective. The appropriate position in senior management should send a memo to the appropriate position in purchasing to recommend a conversion program within the budgetary parameters and considerations, et cetera, of the existing vehicles and get on with this conversion through a management process versus a national law.

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every now and again, and not often enough, a nation has an opportunity to provide leadership to not only its people but to people in other countries.

Every now and again its elected political people in the democratic process have a golden opportunity to participate in that leadership. Every now and again those elected people who want to participate in that leadership have to drag along other elected people who want to keep the country in the dark ages.

We are on the threshold of beginning the energy transition from a hydrocarbon energy economy to a carbohydrate energy economy. Petroleum resources are finite. Their reserves are declining.

• (1400)

As exploration reaches farther out into more difficult areas, the product becomes more and more expensive. At the same time, the consumption of these products is increasing, particularly when we witness the explosion of industrial growth in nations that were considered third world less than a generation ago. I refer specifically to China and India with a combined population of approximately two billion souls.

Therefore, it is essential that we as an industrialized nation begin to look seriously at bringing alternative energy forms on line. Hence the creation of Bill S–7 to the credit of Sen. Colin Kenny who had the vision and has exploited the vision. I am proud to stand here today hoping to bring this bill to fruition so that we can begin the transition of 75 per cent of the national fleet to alternate fuels by the year 2004.

That transition will not be limited to just those fuels that are named in Bill S–7. Since that bill was written, two more fuels have emerged with great potential, not only for the economy of western Canada, but also to enlarge the options available to individuals.

The question was raised why is legislation preferable to guidelines. The guidelines have been in place since 1976 and nothing has happened. The neanderthals remain in place and nothing moves. Obviously it is necessary to legislate.

There is one more reason for legislating. Bringing something new on stream is a chicken and egg situation. If one does not have enough demand for the fuel then the distributors of the fuel cannot afford to set up to supply the fuel. The manufacturers of the vehicles really cannot afford to retool to supply vehicles that will burn alternative fuels. This is the chicken and the egg. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a critical mass of alternative fuel burning vehicles so the distribution system will follow.

Because the country is beginning to move in that direction, two of our major automobile manufacturers, General Motors and the Ford Motor Company, are now in a position to supply vehicles to the market which will burn up to 85 per cent ethanol or any combination from straight gasoline on up at no additional cost. We have an obligation to get the stream started and get things rolling.

My hon. friend in the Reform Party talked about the undesirability of having crown corporations included in the conversion process. One crown corporation, Canada Post, has a major competitor that advertised it used alternate cleaner burning fuels. If I were the manager of the Canada Post Corporation I would be clamouring to convert my fleet of delivery trucks, vans and whatever to alternate fuels and advertise it in order to get the public relations value. Crown corporations need to be included.

I remember a comment being made when we were in committee by someone regarding the conversion of some vehicles of the RCMP and how undesirable that would be because they needed pursuit vehicles. I had to remind that gentleman the Indy 500 which had run two weeks earlier was not run on gasoline but on methanol. The idea that some conversions produce a little less is just not plausible.

I also had the opportunity to tour the Pratt and Whitney plant in my riding last Monday. It has already completed all the work on burning ethanol in jet engines for the Brazilian government. The technology is already in place and all ready to go.

• (1405)

I know my friend in the Reform Party does not like the word ethanol. Somehow it does not have a nice ring to it. He comes from western Canada and I would think he would be an enthusiastic supporter of ethanol as one of the options which is available to us.

Mr. Morrison: We cannot afford it.

Mr. Reed: My friend says that we cannot afford it. I always said that if we had a surplus of it we could drink it.

The fact is that all of these fuels, while they may be a little more expensive at the present time, will find a niche market as times goes by. As production increases in efficiency, the cost per unit will decline. When the transition occurs, when the demand for petroleum resources puts the prices through the roof, Canada

will be in the driver's seat and will be able to lead the world in the supply of alternate fuels. It is a natural that will happen and we have this glorious opportunity to help it along.

We are on the cusp of the future. No longer can Canada be looked at as a country we can put a fence around. We have to think of our resources as being marketable to the world. We have to think of where the demand is going to go as the population accelerates, as it will in the next 25 or 30 years, and we will have to be ready for that. This is one bill which will get us ready for it and put us in a position of leadership.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles.

Bill S–7 proposes that by the year 2004, following a scheduled phase in period of over seven years, 75 per cent of the 39,000 federal government fleet of vehicles will be fueled by alternative transportation fuels.

I agree with the environmental intent of the bill and I agree that we need to take action against priority air quality concerns. Our party supports the efforts to reduce pollution, but these must balance economic with environmental considerations. I believe that there are other more economical and effective solutions available than those proposed in Bill S–7.

As my colleague before me has said, there has been an unprecedented effort to ram this private member's bill through the House. I have to ask: Why is that so?

If the government supports the legislation, then why is it not putting it through itself? Why does it take a Liberal senator to initiate the bill? When approached by the sponsor of the bill no minister in the government was prepared to sponsor the legislation. Again, I have to ask why.

There appears to be a controversy between the Minister of the Environment who appears to support the concept of the bill, and the Minister of Natural Resources who does not come out in support at all. The Minister of Natural Resources has expressed concerns about the government not incurring unnecessary and unreasonable short term costs which push up the deficit and that government still needs to understand the economic as well as the environmental implications of fuel conversion.

Obviously the bill does not have the full support of the Liberal caucus. That is why it is coming in through the back door. I have to ask myself: Why is it not receiving the support of the government? There have to be a lot of reasons and they need to be answered before we support the bill.

The Reform Party strongly supports the principle of market forces. I do not support the principle used in the bill of pushing the market as Bill S–7 would have us do. We are talking about a considerable number of vehicles, 30,000 in fact. The precedent of government interference in market decisions is unwarranted and unwanted and the bill is a direct attempt to manipulate the marketplace by mandating government vehicle conversion to natural gas.

Government purchasing agents are hired to make the right and the best decisions possible for government purchases. Environmental and economic considerations are supposed to be taken into account when decisions such as fleet purchases are made. If the legislation is as good as the Senator claims and if the environmental and economic benefits are so obvious and certain, then why must it be legislated? Are these managers not paid to make the decisions themselves? Why is it necessary to go over the mangers' heads and mandate these purchases and conversions? Something is not right here.

• (1410)

Alternative fuel vehicles can be purchased openly on the market today. There is no need for the heavy hand of government to attempt to manipulate the market in any particular direction.

Canadian energy policy is best served through the open and fair operation of market forces to manage energy development, production and consumption in an efficient manner which should be subject to standards established to protect against risks to human health and the environment.

Mandating the use of alternative transportation fuels and vehicles is inappropriate as it restricts the consumer from routine economic choices which are fundamental to a successful market economy.

The Reform Party is fundamentally opposed to subsidization within the marketplace and alternative fuels require major subsidies in order to be competitive in the transportation sector.

All alternative fuels are exempt from the 10 cents a litre federal excise tax. Provincial road taxes are also reduced or even not applied to alternative fuels in most provinces. Alternative fuels could not survive in the marketplace today without these government subsidies.

I am also concerned about the bill because I do not believe that mandating fuel choices will achieve its proposed economic and environmental objectives. Mandated or subsidized use of alternative transportation fuels comes at a high cost to Canada's economy and is contrary to the government's stated goal of reduced government expenditure and deficit reduction. Government and taxpayers are penalized twice in the bill, first through subsidies and second, in forgone tax revenues.

If the principles of Bill S–7 were applied to Canadians at large with mandated use of alternative transportation fuels with current subsidies, it would be at a high cost to Canada's economic base because of loss of government revenue. If the bill were applied to 10 per cent of Canadian vehicles it would cost taxpayers over $730 million in lost revenues.

If the policy does not make sense in the private sector, then why should it be applied to the government? I am sure there are other policy options available to the government that will help it achieve the environmental intent of the bill in a manner that can demonstrate that the government is using best practices to achieve its policy goals.

An examination of the bill shows that there will be significantly higher costs and marginal benefits achieved by mandating alternative fuels. For example, the relative time required to get a payback on a vehicle converted to alternative fuels needs to be looked at much more closely. Bill S–7 defines alternative fuels as fuel that is less damaging to the environment than conventional fuels, including ethanol, methanol, propane, natural gas, hydrogen or electricity.

When we are speaking of alternative fuels we are referring to several different formulations and vastly different environmental effects. Some alternative fuels such as compressed natural gas and propane offer advantages in air quality over conventional fuels. However, the advantages of compressed natural gas are minimized when used as a transportation fuel. Compressed natural gas is less convenient than gasoline because of its limited range and the fact that it has to be stored in heavy, bulky storage tanks. Compressed natural gas vehicles are also more expensive to own and operate than gasoline vehicles.

Liquefied petroleum gas is also a cleaner burning fuel but it does not contribute to reduced emissions in any significant way because it has a limited overall supply and like compressed natural gas it requires bulky storage tanks.

When we think of alternative fuels, many confuse it with environmentally friendly forms but this is not always the case. Some alternative fuels are actually more environmentally damaging than conventional or reformulated fuels.

For example, the production of ethanol which uses corn or other grains is more environmentally damaging in its production than gasoline. Electric vehicle technology may be non–polluting itself, but the environmental effects of the energy source for production of electricity, whether it is nuclear, hydro or fossil fuel, has to also be brought into the equation.

• (1415)

Environmental impacts associated with after market vehicle conversions which currently dominate alternative transportation fuel applications have not been favourable in comparison with ordinary gasoline. The environmental attributes of alternative fuels must be assessed on a lifestyle basis of both the vehicle and the fuels.

Significant emissions can occur in the extraction, processing manufacturing and distribution of alternative fuels. This bill attempts to force the hand of the market to make alternative fuels more competitive in the transportation sector rather than allowing purchasers to drive the market through need and demand.

I am concerned by some of the claims associated with the bill that it will save taxpayers money. These claims are false. On the one hand the bill claims to save upwards of $43 million in fuel over five years and $15 million the year after. This sounds pretty good. If it were true I would wonder why the government had not implemented this many years ago.

The bill is being rammed through using the guise that it will be good for the environment when really it is the gas companies that stand to make billions of dollars.

I cannot support the bill because of the attempt to manipulate the market and the fuzzy economics that do not add up to the program that will benefit Canadian taxpayers.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76, the recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 3, 5 and 6.

Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of deferred divisions for the report stage of the bill now before the House. However, pursuant to Standing Order 45, the divisions stand deferred until Monday, June 19 at 11.30 p.m.

Shall we call it 2.30 p.m. and call for orders of the day?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CODE OF CONDUCT

The House resumed from May 2 consideration of the motion:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to develop a Code of Conduct to guide Senators and Members of the House of Commons in reconciling their official responsibilities with their personal interests, including their dealings with lobbyists;

That seven Members of the Senate and fourteen Members of the House of Commons be the Members of the Committee, and the Members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be appointed to act on behalf of the House as Members of the said Committee;

That changes in the membership, on the part of the House of Commons of the Committee be effective immediately after a notification signed by the member acting as the chief Whip of any recognized party has been filed with the clerk of the Committee;

That the Committee be directed to consult broadly and to review the approaches taken with respect to these issues in Canada and in other jurisdictions with comparable systems of government;

That the Committee have the power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the Committee have the power to report from time to time to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee have the power to retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff;

That a quorum of the Committee be 11 Members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long, as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairpersons be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever six Members are present, so long as both Houses are represented;

That the Committee be empowered to appoint, from among its Members, such sub–committees as may be deemed advisable, and to delegate to such sub–committees, all or any of its power except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons;

That the Committee be empowered to authorize television and radio broadcasting of any or all of its proceedings;

That the Committee make its final report no later than October 31, 1995;

That, notwithstanding usual practices, if the Senate is not sitting when the final report of the Committee is completed, the report may be deposited with the Clerk of the Senate and it shall thereupon be deemed to have been presented to that House; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deem advisable, Members to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, as official opposition critic for parliamentary reform, to speak on Motion No. 24 regarding the appointment of a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to develop a code of conduct for parliamentarians. I will address three points.

I will start with the issue of committee membership, as it seems very important to me. Second, I will give the whole historical background to this effort on the part of governments to try to introduce a code of conduct for parliamentarians, an effort going back over almost 20 years. Finally, I will touch on the present context in terms of ethics, which obviously leads us to believe that all this is nothing but window dressing.

In fact, the motion put forward by the government House leader regarding a Canadian parliamentarian code of conduct is nothing new in the history of parliamentary government and even democracy in the western world.

• (1420)

The fact that this government wants to appoint a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to develop a code of conduct is another manifestation of the Liberal tradition of giving the appearance of having a clear conscience publicly, while continuing to scheme behind the scene.

Before getting into what this Liberal code of conduct is really about, I would like to call the attention of the House to a specific point. The fact that eight senators and 14 members of Parliament would be appointed to this committee is sheer nonsense to me.

How can the government have the nerve, the gall to table in this House of elected representatives of the people, a motion to appoint a joint committee, which would include senators, to develop a code of conduct for parliamentarians of this Canadian democratic institution?

The Liberal government's attitude is revolting. To appoint a committee on parliamentary ethics which would include non–elected senators violates the most elementary principle of western democracy. The public knows that the Senate is an archaic and useless institution whose sole purpose is to reward friends of the regime, whether Liberal or Conservative, so that they will do some partisan work for the government or for the interests which they represent.

I will simply say that senators can continue to work and practise their profession or calling. As you know, a senator recently joined a prestigious law firm.

We deplore the fact that the Bloc amendments, which oppose the presence of senators on the committee, are bluntly rejected by the government. Again, senators are not elected representatives. The government's attitude shows once again that its motion is just a joke and that the Liberal Party of Canada is antidemocratic and does not care about the public.

The Bloc has always been opposed to the existence of the Senate, a position which is supported by a large number of Canadians. Given the extremely hard economic context, a debt exceeding $550 billion, as well as the current unemployment and poverty problems in Quebec and in Canada, the amount of $42.6 million allocated to that committee could be used to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

The Fathers of Canadian Confederation defended the appointment of senators on the ground that members of the Upper House had to be independent. Indeed, considering that they do not have to be elected by the public, that they are appointed until the age of 75, which is no small job security given how precarious jobs are these days, and given that unemployment is so high in Quebec and in Canada, one would think that senators deal more or less at arm's length with the government. On the contrary, the members of the upper Chamber have always been more interested in playing party politics than in fulfilling their more proper role as impartial legislators.

It bears repeating that senators are appointed on a strictly partisan basis and that the party in power is itself trying to take over control of the Senate by appointing a greater number of senators. A large number, close to 50 per cent, of the senators recruited by the Prime Minister have political experience, and most of the rest have performed valuable services for the party in power. Everyone knows that it is a snug retirement haven for politicians and others who have always supported the interests of the Liberals and Conservatives in the House of Commons and who were always there to serve Canadian big business.

And the Liberal Party of Canada talks about parliamentary ethics; it is a disgrace to democracy and the Parliament of Canada.

Having said that, I would like to look at another aspect of the question of a parliamentary code of conduct, and that is conflict of interest. There is no obligation to divulge the pecuniary interests of a member of the House of Commons. However, section 21 of the Standing Orders of this democratic institution provides that no member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he or she has a pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested will be disallowed.

• (1425)

If I am reminding this House of this basic rule of conduct governing the conduct of Canadian parliamentarians, it is because the events of the past few years, in particular those involving the conduct of this government, have raised serious doubts about the Liberal government's political will to establish a code of conduct which would really bring total transparency to the management of public affairs.

This is a very important issue. The waffling done over the past 30 years by the two parties in power regarding the implementation of a law really governing the conduct of elected representatives would indicate that there is no real political will to change things. For example, in 1973, the federal government published a green paper, "Members of Parliament and Conflict of Interest", in which it proposed to group and extend the scope of the rules which existed at the time. This green paper was studied by a committee of the House of Commons and by a committee of the Senate and both made many recommendations.

Two years later, on June 10, 1975, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections tabled its report on the green paper. In general, it approved the provisions and recommended a few amendments. Two years later, on June 26, 1978, Bill C–62, the Independence of Parliament Act, was tabled in the House of Commons complete with new regulations for the House of Commons and the Senate. It died on the Order Paper when Parliament was dissolved on October 10, 1978.

However, there was a new beginning. On October 16, 1978, a slightly changed Independence of Parliament Act was reintroduced as Bill C–6. The accompanying Rules of the House and of the Senate were tabled in the House on October 30, 1978. The bill was referred to committee on March 8, 1979, but there was no ensuing action and the bill died on the Order Paper when Parliament was dissolved on March 26, 1979.

At the end of the Liberals' term of office, on July 7, 1983, a federal study group was set up to examine the principles and rules governing conflict of interest and their evolution and to decide whether the issue should be dealt with differently.

The report did not appear until May 1984. These people are unbelievable Mr. Speaker; they are constantly carrying out the same studies over and over! That report was entitled: "Ethical Conduct in the Public Sector", and was known as the Starr–Sharp report.

Another government, other political practices. On November 25, 1985, the Conservative government asked the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services to consider the appropriateness of setting up a register of members' interests. As part of its work, the committee was to decide whether it was appropriate to disclose the remuneration members received for sitting on the board of directors of a public or private firm or for performing other duties or occupying other positions in various organizations. After consulting the members of all parties, the Liberals, the Tories and the NDP—the committee concluded that there was no need to set up such a register and that existing legislation on members' conflicts of interest was sufficient.

And the saga continues. In February 1988, Bill C–114, Members of the Senate and the House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act, was given first reading.

In September 1988, the legislative committee on Bill C–114 met three times, but was unable to finish considering the bill before Parliament was dissolved, on October 1, 1988.

In November 1989, the scenario was repeated with the first reading of Bill C–46, Members of the Senate and House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act. This bill was essentially the same as Bill C–114, with a few minor changes. This bill died on the Order Paper when Parliament was prorogued on May 12, 1991.

November 1991 marked the first reading of Bill C–43, Members of the Senate and the House of Commons Conflict of Interest Act. This bill was almost identical to the bills I have already mentioned: Bill C–114 and Bill C–46. And then, the same old story, the bill was immediately referred to a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons.

• (1430)

In March 1993, first reading of Bill C–116, the Conflict of Interests of Public Office Holders Act, which included amendments to the Parliament of Canada Act. Finally, in June 1993, a report from the Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate recommended that Bill C–116 be set aside. You can hardly take this process seriously! The same day, a similar report was tabled in the Senate. Bills C–43 and C–116 died on the Order Paper, upon dissolution of the 34th Parliament on September 8, 1993.

The process is a political masquerade and shows the controversy that exists around a code of ethics for Canadian parliamentarians. All this is necessary to make the Liberals feel good about themselves and as a sop to democracy in the Canadian federal system.

Now what? We start over. Throughout the 1993 electoral campaign, the Liberal Party of Canada was saying that ethics should figure strongly in its mandate. It also said that in 1973. In the January 1994 speech from the throne, the government said it attached the greatest importance to integrity and wanted the people's trust. What a dream.

However, as regards conflicts of interest, the most important element in a code of conduct and ethics, the ethics counsellor, appointed by the Liberal government, still reports to the Privy Council, has no independent investigative powers and continues to report to the Prime Minister.

The Liberal Party's red book provided that, and I quote: "The integrity of the government is put into question when there is a perception that the public agenda is set by lobbyists exercising undue influence away from public view". Recent events have shown that the entire Liberal strategy on a parliamentary code of ethics, confirmed by the government motion before us, is simply window dressing.

Thus, the Broadcasting Act, which comes under the Minister of Canadian Heritage, carries no weight in the face of the powerful lobby of Power DirecTv, headed by André Desmarais, son–in–law of the Prime Minister. The Liberal government has even reached the point of defending ideas dear to the hearts of Brian Mulroney's Conservatives and is becoming the advocate of North America wide competition. In reading the releases from the Minister of Canadian Heritage one can only bow to the strength of the Power lobby and kiss federal democracy goodbye, because money is king.

We should be concerned by the pettiness of our institutions and some of our political representatives. Not only does the government mock its own legislation and renounce the CRTC, which is responsible for implementing it, but it takes measures retroactively, preventing Expressvu from starting up its service in September. All this in the name of competition. Meanwhile, the ethics counsellor of red book fame is sleeping in the Prime Minister's waiting room. After only 17 months in power, this government already has a long track record attesting to its lack of openness.

In addition to the previous examples and the government's mediocre record for introducing legislation establishing a code of ethics for parliamentarians, you will recall that, on September 26, 1994, Canadian Press reported that, according to documents obtained under the Access to Information Act, lobbyists arranged more meetings in the months prior to the tabling of Bill C–43, which was passed on May 8, while others vowed to go to court should the law force them to disclose their public and political relations.

In this case as in many others, the lack of transparency prevented the public from learning the extent and nature of lobbyists' representations with regard to Bill C–43. Ironically enough, lobbyists managed to influence the law aimed at limiting their influence. That takes some doing.

Worse yet, according to Mitchell Sharp himself, the Prime Minister's senior consultant on ethics matters, even if Bill C–43 had already become law at the time talks were held on privatizing Terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson airport, the public would have been none the wiser.

• (1435)

The majority report on Bill C–43 tabled by the Liberals reflects a faint willingness to oversee lobbying activities and ensure that the management of government is as open as possible. The government's attitude in that regard shows that, once again, the Liberals are using double talk on the issue of ethics. They are only trying to make themselves feel good and to score points with the electorate.

While the Government House Leader is tabling a motion calling for the establishment of a special committee responsible for developing a code of conduct for parliamentarians, behind the scene, this very government is flouting the most basic rules of democracy by favouring friends of the Liberal party and governing on behalf of the financial establishment and big business in Canada. How could we not want to leave this place of political scheming?

The Bloc Quebecois, as the official opposition, feels that, to restore the integrity of our democratic institutions, we must first do away with the futile commitments of the past 20 years, which mislead voters. We must also ensure that the management of government is as open as possible, in order to eliminate grey areas and assure the people that public policy decisions are consistent with their general interests and not those of the lobbyist friends of this Liberal federal government.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the rules governing the conduct of members of Parliament are as outdated as they are widespread.

The Parliament of Canada Act, the conflict of interest code, Beauchesne's, the standing orders and House procedures all contain guidelines for the appropriate conduct of MPs. For years governments have talked about consolidating all these different rules into one code of conduct while at the same time bringing them up to speed with the realities of governing in the nineties, realities that could not have been imagined at the time when these rules were written.

Since 1973 consecutive governments have championed the issue of a code of conduct, yet not one significant piece of legislation has ever been passed. From Trudeau to Mulroney task forces were set up, special committees were struck, and reports and bills were written, all in the name of establishing ethics guidelines for MPs.

While in opposition members of the Liberal government were highly critical of the Tories for their legislative inaction. The following question by the Liberal whip in 1993 is clearly a case in point:

> Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and it concerns the government's so-called commitment to ethics in government. In February 1988 the Tory government introduced a conflict of interest bill and has allowed it to die twice on the Order Paper. Given that nearly five years has past since then, is the government, in its dying days in office, ready to commit itself again to conflict of interest legislation?

The Liberal whip was criticizing the Mulroney government for its failure to pass legislation regarding its 1985 throne speech promise to create a parliamentary ethics package.

Today, 10 years after this Mulroney promise, members of the House are again addressing the issue of parliamentary ethics, this time in the name of a Liberal motion; not a bill, not a discussion paper, not a white paper, but a motion that calls on members of the House of Commons to appoint a special joint committee of the Senate and the House to study and develop a code of conduct for politicians. The committee composed of seven members of the Senate and fourteen members of the House of Commons will travel across Canada and once again hear how the government should hold its representatives accountable.

The 22-year history of the development of ethics guidelines for members of Parliament is as long as it is uneventful. In 1973 the President of the Treasury Board, Allan MacEachen, a Liberal, tabled a green paper entitled "Members of Parliament and Conflict of Interest". Among the issues addressed in the 69-page report were problems associated with conflicts of interest, corrupt practices and government contracts. Potential solutions and sanctions for these problems were also proposed. The document was studied in the committee of the House of Commons as well as in a Senate committee but was never debated in the House.

• (1440)

In 1978 legislation relating to the green paper, Bill C-6, was tabled but was left to die on the Order Paper. Five years later, in 1983, Prime Minister Trudeau set up a task force to study conflicts of interest for MPs as well as public sector ethics. A comprehensive report was produced but like so many reports commissioned by the House nothing became of it.

In 1987 the Ontario Supreme Court found that former cabinet minister Sinclair Stevens had breached the Canadian conflict of interest rules on 14 different occasions prior to his resignation in 1986. As a direct result the Mulroney government introduced conflict of interest Bill C-46 for MPs, which unfortunately once again died on the Order Paper at the end of the parliamentary session. A similar conflict of interest Bill C-112 was introduced in the next session. It too died on the Order Paper. Again the Tories introduced legislation, this time Bill C-43 which was along the same lines as its predecessor. It too died on the Order Paper.

The pattern which has developed is incredible. A code of conduct is studied, legislation is drafted, introduced in the House, and after months of sitting idle it is finally dropped. Study, introduce, drop; study, introduce, drop.

None of the bills was ever really debated. They went from first reading to the Order Paper and that was it. It was as though the Tories kept the bills around to point at in case one of their MPs got caught with their hands in the public cookie jar.

As a result of their failed attempts, and I use the word attempts loosely, the Mulroney government created a special

joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate to study the issue of conflict of interest. Does it sound familiar? It should. That is exactly what the Liberal government now wants to do.

A lengthy study of ethical issues confronting politicians was conducted by the committee. Witnesses were heard, testimony was given, and a 60–page report was submitted to the House and Senate. The report made 14 principal recommendations for a code of conduct and among them listed compliance obligations for politicians, post employment restrictions, criteria for negotiating government contracts, the need to create an independent jurisconsult or ethics counsellor, disclosure obligations for politicians, conduct for inquiries and possible sanctions, and Criminal Code provisions in relation to bribery, influence peddling and breach of trust.

These are just some of the 60 pages of recommendations made by the special joint committee to Mulroney's government in 1992. At the time the Liberal whip was a member of the committee. His official title was government operations critic but in commenting on the special joint committee report he wrote:

> The challenge for Canadian legislators—is to ensure that such reports as this are not allowed merely to gather dust on a bookshelf.

Needless to say, like all previous ethics initiatives and despite what the Liberal whip said the report gathered more than just dust as it was completely buried. At the time the Liberal whip was obviously frustrated by that fact and on February 17, 1993 he moved a lengthy supply day motion which read:

> That this House condemns the government for its continued failure to establish and to adhere to a clear and high standard of public sector ethics, for its incessant inability to function within the framework of existing legislation, guidelines and standards, and for its reluctance to bring forward strict new codes and legislation with regard to conflicts and other public ethic matters.

That motion applies today to the government.

Mr. Speaker, you have sat in the chair and you have heard our questions over the last month or two. The government was self–righteous when it was on this side of the House. Now look at what is happening. Look at the Minister for Canadian Heritage: dollars for contracts dinner and personal intervention on radio licence renewal. Look at the minister of public works and the highway 104 diversion of funds. Look at the Minister of National Revenue in cahoots with the Minister of Justice who helped fire a law firm with years of drug prosecution experience in favour of an inexperienced firm that contributed heavily to his campaign. Those matters are all well documented and were brought out during the last three weeks in question period.

What about the ethics counsellor, the Maytag repairman? He reports directly to the Prime Minister rather than to Parliament as promised in the red book.

• (1445)

If a code of conduct said that you make an election promise in writing, signed by everybody and everybody campaigns to get here to do that, what would happen if they broke their promises? I just wonder how they would handle that in this joint committee. This ethics counsellor is never asked to look into anything, from the Perez affair to the Liberal family compact.

The appearance of conflict of interest is overwhelming, and there are definitely sufficient grounds for actions on what I have pointed out. If the Liberals do not apply the rules that we have now, then why in heaven's name create more rules under the guise of a special joint committee? They will not follow them anyway. It is a sham on the Canadian public.

In his usual verbosity, the Liberal whip criticized the Mulroney government for its failure to establish an ethics code during its mandate. During debate he chastised members of the government because "six years of waiting for conflict of interest rules is long enough, and that shows a complete lack of interest in the ethics on the part of the Tory government". He has been in the government now for two years and we do not even have anything on the floor except a motion to form a joint committee once again, doing the same old thing as the previous governments.

On that day, the Liberals did more than just criticize the government. They offered some ideas and solutions that they felt could be implemented right away. This government, when it was in opposition, had some good ideas, some concrete suggestions. One of these ideas was the establishment of non–partisan nomination and confirmation procedures for order in council appointments such as the officers of the House, deputy ministers, heads of crown corporations, citizenship court judges. Have they done this? No.

A second idea was the establishment of a central registry of awarded government contracts under which the details of any government contract awarded should be open to public scrutiny. Have they done this? No.

A third idea was the elimination of registration fees for tier one and tier two lobbyists and that they should be required to disclose in a public register major expenses and fees with description of the lobbying activity and most importantly what political body they are lobbying for. Have they done this? No. Could they do it? Yes. They could do this, but no, let us set up another expensive, exciting, expletive joint committee.

These are just a few of the recommendations the Liberal members made for an improved code of conduct for MPs. It is quite clear that these were not off the cuff ideas but well thought out initiatives made by a party that had witnessed eight years of Tory corruption. I hope we do not have to sit here for eight years of Liberal corruption.

With this special joint committee, the Liberals are now saying that everything that was said in the past, all the ideas and initiatives that were to be followed through on, if only they had the chance, are all history. Kaput. They say one thing on this side of the House and once they get over there they do the other.

Why is it that we cannot just sit down in this House and write out a code of conduct that is acceptable to all parties? Why must we spend thousands of dollars for another series of committee meetings and setting up the overhead to send senators and MPs all over to listen to witnesses, only to find out what we already know? We already have it done.

We have two previous Liberal ethics initiatives—they are now government—four Tory bills, countless discussion papers, and a 60–page report on the conduct for MPs. Why do we not just dust some of these off, and look in the book, find out what they said and pass something?

Again I quote the Liberal whip from 1993, when he attacked the Tory government for its failure to pass an ethics bill: "Does the member actually think that it is reasonable after five and a half years of delay to have had nothing happen yet? It has been six months since the unanimous report of the committee, and nothing has happened yet."

If this joint committee ever does file a report, how many years will the government let it sit on the shelf collecting dust? Does the Liberal whip think it is reasonable for the Government of Canada to examine the issue of political ethics for 23 years with no results and then ask the taxpayers to fork out for yet another group to study the issue?

Heck, he can write the bill himself for all the work he has done. But do you know what, Mr. Speaker? The Prime Minister is no longer listening to him. Give us a break. Ring the bell and ask everyone to bring a pen and a paper and we can have this thing written in a day.

If the Liberals want to talk about reasonable, then I suggest they acknowledge the fact that this House has more than enough information to establish a code of conduct without any road show.

• (1450)

Unfortunately, it is apparent from today's debate that the Liberal government, like the Tories, does not have the intestinal fortitude to enact major reforms to the code of conduct for MPs. Like the Tories, it is in their best interests to bury the issue in committee, and I will tell the House why. When political parties are in opposition in Canada one of their primary objectives is to try to limit the power and authority of the government, hold the government accountable, point out incompetence and always question the integrity of the government. That is when you are on this side of the House.

On the other hand, the government always tries to perpetuate its own power by denying and/or ignoring opposition scrutiny, as is the case in this Parliament. Any increase in scrutiny of governmental affairs means a decrease in its authority in that particular area: health, revenue and taxation, public works. What is good for the goose is not always good for the gander, as the Liberal whip likes to say. And what is good for the Liberals in opposition is no longer in their best interests in power. It is sort of a power paradox.

All members have to do is look at the facts. They speak for themselves. In opposition the Liberals harped on the Tories for their failure to establish an effective code of conduct for MPs. They made some constructive suggestions in debate, in reports, in articles and endorsed the last report of the special joint committee. Did they invoke it? Did they bring a bill forward? No. They wanted to ignore it and do the work all over again.

As the Liberal member for Edmonton Southeast stated, "I would like to see the recommendations of the special joint committee enacted". The fact is, the recommendations were never enacted and the Tories were booted out of office. All of a sudden the Liberals, the party of integrity, became the government. And what has happened? They have lowered the definition of integrity.

What happened to the ethics report they endorsed? What about all the proposals they made to increase the scrutiny on members of the House? What about all the criticism they gave the Tories for not acting immediately? Why are they not doing what they said they would do in opposition? At least when Prime Minister Mulroney was on that side and a minister got into trouble or gave the appearance of a conflict of interest, the minister stepped aside. Now we have that case and the minister is not stepping aside, nor has the Prime Minister asked him to step aside.

Like all previous governments, the Liberals realize they cannot possibly give away the kind of power that was suggested in opposition. Instead they give out small tokens and establish needless committees like the one we are debating today, which will not accomplish a darn thing.

The Liberals have done nothing to increase scrutiny over order in council appointments, an issue they were adamant about in opposition. As a matter of fact, they used an order in council to create another possible conflict of interest over the direct to home satellite TV business.

To quote the Liberal whip in 1993, my favourite witness on the topic, "The only thing we have had is an order in council review process that gives no power to a committee, not even the power to make a recommendation to the House of Commons". What has changed since then? The problem still exists. Why do they not just fix it? They have been in office for two years, and what have they done? Nothing.

The same can be said about Liberal inaction to introduce legislation that would open up the government contract process. In fact, on Wednesday, May 31, we heard that the president and vice–president of the riding association of the Minister of National Revenue were awarded contracts. Now the Liberals are going to bury all this in a special joint committee, which I guarantee will not report back anything new to the House in the area of political ethics or code of conduct initiatives. The Prime Minister will point out how great this committee is when it is nothing more than a dog and pony show and a waste of time, effort, and money.

This government is no better than the Tories when it comes to legislating a code of conduct for politicians. The creation of this committee is a déjà vu of how Mulroney kept ethics on the back burner.

The Liberal whip has been sitting there devouring each and every word I am saying here today. He wrote down his ideas in a 1991 discussion paper entitled "Public Sector Ethics and Morals". In this paper many questions are raised on the issues of government advertising, government contracts, order in council appointments, lobbyists and whistleblowing.

The Liberal whip then went on to write an article in 1992 entitled "Members' Interests—New Conflict of Interest Rules for Canadian Parliamentarians". How much more study does the Liberal whip have to do on this issue? How much more? This is getting ridiculous.

• (1455)

We have here the people, the skills and the information to write out a code of conduct right now. The member opposite has the ability to make a tremendous contribution to this. He has studied it to death. He has read it to death. Why in heaven's name would the Liberal whip then want to have a joint committee to do all this work all over again when he has spent years on it already? Does he want to spend another year on another joint committee to come up with the same conclusions, the same recommendations he has already made? I challenge the federal government to just do it.

This motion is going to pass. Since the government wants to do another review, this time the Reform Party will be there to hold it accountable to actually bring a bill to the House and pass a code of conduct. Reformers object to this joint committee because of the senators, but we will work toward giving Canadians what they should have—politicians with integrity and a new code of conduct bill.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to digest Motion No. 24 and my thoughts range from somewhat confused about the purpose of this motion to anger.

Let me talk about the confusion first, because I am a little confused about what the Liberals believe. What does this Liberal government believe? What kind of rocket science do they really think is needed to do things that are good, right, and honest? Those are fundamental characteristics of integrity. Yet this government, despite the numerous studies, commissions, inquiries, investigative bodies that have tried to determine what is the right thing to do when one becomes an MP or a government, is missing some basic points: good, right and honest. That is not rocket science. That is what we are taught by our parents when we are kids, when they are trying to groom us into becoming responsible adults: do things that are good, right, and honest.

It is unbelievable that after over a hundred years of this Parliament being in operation we have a government that wants to find out how to restore and keep the trust of the Canadian voters. Let me save the government a whole lot of time. I want to give it five very simple suggestions. It will save the committee time. It will save a lot of MPs and senators time. Here they are, and they are free. I will repeat these after and I will send each of the Liberal members a memo on this. The first one is do not lie. The second one is do not cheat. The third one is do not steal. The fourth one is do not reward your friends with taxpayers' money. The fifth one is if any member of Parliament does this, that member them out.

Therein you have a code of conduct in the first four points and the last one is a deterrent. That is not rocket science. I did not need a committee to come up with those points. This government does not need a committee to come up with ideas on how to be a good, honest member of Parliament. This government does not need a committee to know how the Canadian voters regard politicians at a slightly lower level than used car salesmen or lawyers—with all due respect, some used car salesmen and some lawyers.

• (1500)

In the last 15 years the level of respect for politicians and the level of trust that was felt by the Canadian voter have severely deteriorated. In this 35th Parliament we not only have a job to run the country to make sure the economy, the social programs and everything else are going to run smoothly, we also have a profound obligation to begin to restore the trust of the electorate which is missing.

I have heard it said time and time again that the only reason our current Prime Minister looks so good is that he followed the Mulroney Tories who were so bad. In my opinion our current Prime Minister has a lot of latitude but because of the way this government is running things and because of some of the things which have happened since this 35th Parliament convened, people are starting to wonder if this government is just another wolf in sheep's clothing. Some hon. members have already

talked about them but it is worth going over some of the very disparaging things which have happened.

There is the Minister of Canadian Heritage's now infamous $2,000 a plate dinner and the subsequent perception of his rewarding his friends with government contracts paid for with taxpayers' money of course. We have talked about the monopoly status awarded to Expressvu and the ties between Power Corp. and the Prime Minister. The list goes on and on.

Most recently there has been the appointment of a legal firm in Vancouver. Lawyers were engaged by the government to prosecute drug cases but they had no previous experience in dealing with the prosecution of drug cases, a very serious crime. In prosecuting a drug case in particular, a lot of factors are involved, including the gathering of evidence by the police and putting it together by the crown which is most important in order to win the case. The evidence is clear that the lawyers from the legal firms recently appointed by the Minister of Justice had no experience in this area. However they did qualify for the appointment because one happened to be the president of a Liberal riding and the other was a fundraiser for the Liberals.

The Canadian public was fresh from a Tory regime in which it completely lost trust in the leader of our country and they elected the Liberal government whose red book was trumpeted at every occasion. It promised to restore integrity, trust and honesty to government.

When Canadians think about those promises, about the way the red book was flashed around for everyone to see and then they see those things happening, they ask: "Who can we believe?" They get pretty discouraged. Even some people who did not vote for me come into my riding office and say they thought the Prime Minister was going to change things. They thought the Liberal government was going to bring back some form of honesty to government. They are very disappointed.

Now a joint committee of MPs and senators is going to be formed to try to rediscover life in so far as honesty and integrity goes.

• (1505)

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak as long as my hon. friend who just spoke. I do not have the sense of humour he has about this. It is a very serious subject.

At the end of the day and most recently when walking home at 11 or 11.30 at night we might ask ourselves: "What on earth am I doing here?" We hear about some new revelation of conflict of interest the government has and we remember why we are here. I am here because I was so disgusted with the way politics were run in this country that I wanted to come here to do something about it. I am going to try, but at the end of the day if nothing changes in this House at least I can say that I tried.

I want to go back just for a moment and review those points I made at the beginning. This government does not need a committee to understand the things that are good, right and honest. We do not need a committee because those things are fundamental in how we develop character. Any member of Parliament who does not possess those characteristics does not belong in this place.

Free of charge for the Liberal government, let me go through it again. Do not lie. Do not cheat. Do not steal. Do not reward friends with taxpayers' money. Those are the four very condensed codes. The deterrent is that if any of those are broken, they should be thrown out of this place. That is free for the Liberal government and free for every member of this House.

We do not need a joint committee of senators and members of Parliament to try to discover some nirvana being dreamed up by the government, some field of operation that is so clouded no one can understand it. Do not lie. Do not cheat. Do not steal. Do not reward friends with taxpayers' money. That is all that is needed and honesty and integrity will return to this House once that is accomplished.

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the points I was going to make on this motion have been admirably expressed by my colleagues before me.

We are talking about Motion No. 24 which is part of the process in carrying out Bill C–43. This motion deals with the creation of another committee to study the parameters for a code of ethics for MPs. When we consider the historical activity this topic has been subjected to over the years, we cannot really commend it surfacing again even though the need is very predominant. However, we cannot say it is a step in the right direction or give congratulations that we are actually addressing this. It has been around too long. The matter has been put forward so many times with no action resulting from the process in the past. The reputation of this topic is such that one wonders if we mean business or if it is a filler that is just going to be brought in again, discussed for a bit and then allowed to die.

Considering that we come from all walks of life, ethics is a moral topic that we are dealing with. We all have different value systems. The existing rules from the various sources we receive direction from are very general so that they are subject to all kinds of interpretations depending upon one's value system. The consequences over the years of all those sorts of variables have resulted in the general public not trusting or believing in the integrity of members of Parliament and senators and it is time that we address this.

• (1510)

I really question whether we need to set up another joint committee. Certainly all the guidelines and actions that have happened in the past which have set precedents should be correlated. We should study the present code of ethics or conflict of interest situations to see what we have and try to tighten them up so that we have less interpretations of what the actual situation is. Then we can see if we need to take this further or at least get back to the public for input.

This has gone through a number of studies. Possibly all that is needed is to gather together what we have and with the members of the House and the other place get on with setting a code of ethics versus travelling the country spending many dollars to get input from people who have been here in the past.

We have had an example which should be considered. If this motion is passed and the committee is put together we could use the 35th Parliament as an example from the point of view that we have 204 rookies. We are all learning. When it comes to what is ethical and what is not ethical the first thing we discovered was that we were never off duty. Everything we do is viewed by the public. One is always an MP. When does our personal life begin or even come into being here? One always seems to be an MP.

When talking to learned people who have followed this through the years, it absolutely boggles the mind the kind of things that can get you into trouble. They can seem very innocent. These sorts of things should be defined. It would be very nice if we could go somewhere, look at the ethics and come up with an interpretation that would at least provide a standard or average for what MPs and senators believe. Right now it is all over the ballpark.

We work hard. We spend a lot of time working. We are very concerned about the country. Yet we get ourselves into positions of trouble and there are no guidelines to help us. We should be providing some sort of rules with tighter interpretations. If it means another committee, then that is the way to go. I certainly do not want to see it die. The reputation of this topic is poor. Let us try to do something about it.

We do not have to go out and be subjected to bringing more people in. We have the data here. Let us put it together and come up with something.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am almost honoured to be one of the last speakers of the week. It is interesting to address Motion No. 24 which arises out of the provision contained in Bill C–43, the Lobbyist Registration Act.

This motion is for the creation of a joint House and Senate committee to establish a code of conduct for MPs, senators and lobbyists and I have to say that an ethics code is a worthwhile effort which must be pursued.

Let us look at the pursuit of that. I have a very interesting pile, not a prop, of parliamentary documents on my desk which show that there has been interest in this subject for years and years and where is it getting us? I have here "New Conflict of Interest Rules for Canadian Parliamentarians", by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. Good show.

• (1515)

I have here Bill C–116, which was first read in the House of Commons in March 1993.

I have here Bill C–43, conflict of interest guidelines for parliamentarians, dated June 1992, the Hon. Senator Stanbury and Don Blenkarn joint chairmen.

Here is another one from the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell entitled "Public Sector Ethics and Morals: A Discussion Paper" dated October 1991.

Then there is Bill C–43, dated November 1991, an act to provide for greater certainty in the reconciliation of the personal interests and duties of members of the Senate and the House of Commons, to establish a conflict of interest commission and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

These show real interest on the part of the House over the years to say let us do something about the ethics around here.

There was Bill C–46 in 1989, Bill C–114 in 1988, and "Ethical Conduct in the Public Sector" by the Hon. Michael Starr and Hon. Mitchell Sharp, a book written in May 1984.

Then there was Bill C–6 in 1978. How far back do we need to go to show that there has been real bona fide interest by both Houses on the subject matter of ethics?

There is the little green book by the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, which was written in July 1973.

There it is. Years of evidence saying that something must be done. Here we are in 1995 and again we are hearing declarations of great intent. We really must get at it now. This is the time to get at it.

I will compliment the government for the initiative which says: "Let us do something about ethics". However, my note of caution concerns the recent actions of the government. The words are fine. What are its actions? I do not think the actions of the government meet the lofty rhetoric.

Since the government came into power, which is now approaching two years, we have had many examples of what I would call less than ethical behaviour. We had the Minister of Canadian Heritage interfering with the CRTC in the matter of a radio licence application for a constituent. We had the same minister lunching with movie moguls in Hollywood at the same time the Seagram takeover of MCA was being negotiated. Now we have that same minister engaged in a dinner for dollars affair, which has clearly placed him in an apparent conflict of interest.

If these ethical breaches were confined to just this one minister one could conclude that he was simply misguided, ill–informed or just plain incompetent. However, the Minister of Canadian Heritage is not alone in this fall from the ethics bandwagon.

We are all aware that currently the auditor general is investigating a situation involving the diverting of $26 million in highway funds. In this instance the Minister of Public Works and Government Services has benefited politically, not financially I am sure, by seeing the money go from a busy and deadly stretch of the Trans–Canada highway to a seldom used tourist trail in his Nova Scotia riding.

We have also seen the justice minister awarding contracts for crown prosecutors to highly placed Liberals, some of whom have connections to the revenue minister. While it is commonly accepted that the awarding of such legal contracts is based on partisan politics or downright patronage. The government promised it would do business differently. It promised to break with politics as usual in favour of a more open and honest process. Has that promise been kept?

• (1520)

These are a few examples of some of the less than ethical behaviour of government ministers. I could go on at length but time is limited and it might be of more use at this time to review exactly what the government had to say on the issue of ethics during the election campaign and look at the promises it made.

The now infamous red book, dead book, states: "The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored". These are wonderful words.

Similarly, the red book promised to appoint an independent ethics counsellor who will report directly to Parliament. Has the government met this promise or its overall commitment to restore honesty and integrity? On the issue of the promise of an independent ethics counsellor reporting to Parliament, the answer is very clearly no. The counsellor is not truly independent, as he is beholden to the Prime Minister and he is certainly not free to report directly to Parliament.

On the general issue of restoring honesty and integrity, I also submit the government has failed. A quick look at the newspapers these days will provide evidence of this fact. The Ottawa *Sun* on June 13 in an editorial entitled "arrogance" slams the Prime Minister over his handling of the latest debacle involving the heritage minister: "For a party that campaigned on the premise of restoring ethics and integrity—the Grits sure have a funny way of going about it".

Ottawa Citizen columnist Greg Weston summarized the government's code of conduct on June 11 in the following manner: "Thou shalt do nothing that lands thee in jail. Other than that, boys and girls, have fun at the trough".

Columnist Sean Durkin has also questioned the integrity of the government: "Day by day, the Liberal government is acting and sounding more like the Mulroney government of old". Hardly a ringing endorsement of the red book pledge to restore honesty in government.

From today's Ottawa *Sun*, Robert Fife, page 12, talking about the ethics councillor:

> Wilson has been silenced and the role of the ethics counsellor has turned into a farce. The sole reason that Chretien has stubbornly refused to fire Dupuy is to show that he is different from Mulroney. He wants to be able to boast that he hasn't had to fire a single minister to scandal unlike the dastardly Tories.
>
> Instead, what he is doing by defending Dupuy is demonstrating that he is every bit as bad as Mulroney when it comes to ethics.
>
> In fact, he is worse.
>
> At least Mulroney would do the right thing and remove ministers who did wrong from the cabinet table, albeit only after concerted pressure from the opposition benches.

Clearly these examples show the government has neither the will nor the intestinal fortitude to truly divert from its politics as usual policy. This is one of my big concerns about this motion. It may look good on paper but it is obvious the government is not serious about the issue of ethics.

Maybe I should be fair and clarify the statement. It is obvious the Prime Minister is not serious about the issue of ethics. I add this clarification because the member for York South—Weston has publicly urged the Prime Minister to ban the type of fundraisers that have landed the heritage minister in hot water.

• (1525)

The hon. member says this would be an important move to restore integrity to politics. He is quoted in the Ottawa *Sun*, June 12, as making the following comments about such practices: "They are buying access. There are always IOUs attached. You have to be pretty naive and deaf, dumb and blind to think otherwise".

The Prime Minister's top personal adviser is quoted in the same paper: "Cabinet ministers must separate business from fundraisers. Some cabinet ministers are not following conflict of interest rules".

I stated at the start of my address that I believe this motion has some merit. As I have illustrated, allowing the government to control this process is like allowing the fox to guard the henhouse. Surely it is not in the best interests of restoring public faith in the integrity of politicians to appoint politicians and lobbyists to draft a serious code of conduct. To me such a process would be an immediate conflict of interest.

I also question the value of involving unelected, politically appointed patronage hacks in the process. Appointed senators have little if any legitimacy in the democratic process and therefore should not participate in what we are trying to do here. The public must have full access to and involvement in this process. This is the only way to restore integrity and ethics in government.

To accept this motion is to accept the Prime Minister's ethical code of hear no evil, see no evil. Surely no one in the House can find that acceptable.

The overall intent of the motion is good. I support the intent but I have lots of reservations with the process. We must find a way to include the public. We must severely limit or eliminate the role of politicians and lobbyists in the process and we must insist that the ethics counsellor be free to report directly to Parliament.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate unfold this afternoon and have seen five or six inches of various reports the House has done on ethics over the last few years.

I have been very blessed in my life to have more than one mother. One of my mothers is my Jewish mother. She comes up with little pearls of wisdom we refer to as chicken soup for the mind.

Once when we were talking about ethics specifically in business she said ethics is simply doing the right thing even when you know no one is looking.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has been really interesting this afternoon as we have listened to this debate in talking about the whole issue of ethics, particularly the number of reports.

There has been report after report starting as far back as the report of Senator MacEachen dated July 1973. There is all of this information. As has been pointed out by my colleagues, why are we having another committee? Why are we doing this?

• (1530)

Why do we not simply assimilate all of the information, put it together if we need to and come forward with a plan in the next couple of weeks, instead of months or years?

Surely with all of the work put into this process thus far we do not need to have more input. Particularly instructive to me is the amount of involvement reported that the government whip has had in this process. The member has had input and input. Is he really so short of things to do as the government whip that he needs to have a make work project to have more input into this process?

This is a joint committee. I will refer with respect to the other place. I will not play games. We are talking about the other place being a place where people are appointed fundamentally on the whole basis of patronage. What has it done for the existing Prime Minister? What has it done for the party currently in power?

We have a very interesting situation at this moment as we all know. Because the Conservatives had power for a period of nine years, the Liberal government is having some difficulty getting certain pieces of legislation through the House, not the least of which is Bill C–69, and certainly when we get to the gun control bill, Bill C–41 and hopefully Bill C–85, they will be slowed down over there so Canadians can really see what the government is up to.

Nonetheless, the point is the people in the other place have been appointed on the basis of patronage and we are having a joint committee with them to figure out what is wrong with the whole parliamentary system based on patronage. It seems to me things are slightly out of order.

We came to the House with 52 members of Parliament in October 1993 whose electors at that time thought they were the best people to represent them. I think of the member for Ottawa—Vanier who used to sit across from me. What does the government do? It has a place it needs to fill. Why did it put him there? Why did David Berger suddenly resign his seat to work for the Prime Minister? It was to get the labour minister here.

There is the whole issue of manipulation of the political system by the existing party. It talks about transparency. It is very transparent. The government has absolutely no concern for the dollars of the ordinary Canadian taxpayer when it will force a byelection in order to fill the place of patronage to accomplish certain political objectives.

Furthermore, there is no direct accountability by the people in the other place to the people of Canada. Let us assume every member in the other place is honourable. Let us create that as a basic assumption. The point is still not one person in that place has direct accountability to the people of Canada. We have accountability to the people of Canada by coming here on the basis of an election. Why in the world will the government not get serious, including this whole debate? Why will it not get serious and start to do something about making the other place accountable on the basis of getting the people over there elected?

There is no question that could be done. Reform Senator Stan Waters was the first and only elected member of the other place. It can be done. The existing premier of Alberta and the Government of Alberta brought forward legislation that created a situation in which there could be an election for the Senate. Again, the Liberals could have done exactly the same thing when they got their own bag person to be appointed to the other place on the basis of patronage. Just as easily as not, they could have gone through a legitimate election process and started to

legitimize the other place rather than just having people there on the basis of sheer patronage.

I am in support of this motion on the basis of the fact that we will perhaps get some movement forward on the issue of ethics within the government, although there is some question about the existing government on that basis, nonetheless we can always hope. The point I am driving at is that when we ask people who are in a place of patronage to be involved in a process of talking about ethics and patronage, it just does not make any sense. If a commission has to be formed, I would see it as being the responsibility of those of us who are elected to this Chamber who have the confidence of our constituents.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, June 19, 1995 at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment which is 11.30 p.m.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That between June 24, 1995 and September 30, 1995, the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration and the necessary staff be authorized to travel to Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto, Halifax and Montreal to hold consultations on settlement renewal.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Deputy Speaker: I wonder if there might be unanimous consent to call it five o'clock?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 3.38 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 19, 1995

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

PEACEKEEPING ACT

The House resumed from June 13 consideration of the motion that Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof, as amended, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am resuming remarks interrupted by other House business on another day and we now return to the motion of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East.

To recapitulate what I said earlier on this bill, one respects the intention and the purpose behind it. In the interim I have had the privilege of sitting as a substitute member on the all party committee on national defence. The experience reinforces the comment I made earlier. This is one of the very strong committees of the House. I was very impressed with the degree of knowledge of the members and the degree of co–operation across both sides of the table from all parties. In other words, there is a great deal of awareness in the committee of the gravity of the problem and the search for proper remedies.

That brings me back to the main point that the failure in Bosnia is a failure in foreign policy and not in the military sphere of the operation. The failure goes back to a basic criticism many contemporary historians have made that this is one of the low periods in foreign policy in the world community.

If we look at the confidence, the reaction to the events of the emerging cold war in the late forties and fifties, the very creative period in American foreign policy, in European foreign policy with Adenauer, Schuman and De Gasperi creating the European community, we are now in one of those periods in which foreign ministers simply seem unable to cope with the problems.

Returning to Bosnia, the failure was in lacking a vision of what to do with Yugoslavia once it broke up, as inevitably it was to break up. Everyone predicted this when Tito should die and Tito's regime should pass into history. We find there are alternative plans. Greater Serbia has been spoken of but there is a greater Bulgaria concept, a greater Greece concept, conflicting ambitions of Balkan powers restrained by the facts of life of the cold war and bipolarity but broke out with the breakdown of the cold war system of world public order and the new pluralism which dangerously at times comes close to anarchy.

In this area Canada has played a constructive and useful role. We were not in at the beginning on the decisions on Yugoslavia and post–communist Yugoslavia. We were not part of the contact group. To be frank, I see no point in our trying to join the contact group now. We would in effect be trying to correct errors made by European foreign ministers who should have known better.

We have to search for solutions using other arenas like CSCE, NATO, forum available to make our point. In terms of military operations, the Canadian forces have behaved with intelligence, good judgment and restraint. We have recognized that United Nations peacekeeping as devised by Prime Minister Pearson absolutely prohibits a political role. What is now talked about in contemporary international relations activities as crossing the Mogadishu line is something Canadian military men above all have always observed with proper self–restraint. We have to face the reality that our peacekeeping forces have not been developed with a view to imposing political solutions by military means. There is nothing in the training of our staff colleges that lends itself to this.

I have had the privilege of lecturing to our national defence college and the military college at various stages in my pre–parliamentary life. They are very well trained but they cannot cover the whole world. If we are to send them to Somalia to impose a political solution or to former Yugoslavia to impose a political solution the training is not there. We have behaved properly and correctly.

Counting this we have had three debates in the House on the future of peacekeeping. What emerges on the future of peacekeeping is a large interparty consensus which crosses the House that we wish to maintain the classical conception of peacekeeping. That is something we developed and which we do very well. If it is a matter of moving into peacemaking, imposing political

solutions, we have to recognize the limits of our special competence.

• (1110)

In countries that have connections with the former British empire, the Commonwealth and la francophonie there are special ties of culture and experience that give us perhaps the ability to make political judgments if that is what is called for. Elsewhere, it is entering unchartered seas. Therefore, the clear conclusion emerging from our debates is that we maintain peacekeeping as our function for the United Nations, that we do not get into peacemaking and that we do not cross the Mogadishu line.

In relation to the bill presented by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, I respect the intention here but I wonder about the attempt to legislate what sensibly can be left to executive administrative judgment. In article 5(2) the Canadian forces shall not participate in any action designed to force the governor of state to leave office or to install a government other than by facilitating a democratic process in accordance with the laws of the state or a resolution of the United Nations general assembly or the United Nations security council.

We are bound by international law. Because it is one of the currently contested points before the International Court and elsewhere, it is arguable whether a United Nations general assembly or security council resolution can go beyond international law. Where it does go beyond that it is arguable it is unconstitutional in United Nations terms.

I wonder why one should try to legislate this. We are bound by common sense. The one thing emerging from the debates in the House and which any foreign minister would take note of is that Canadians do not want us to get into political ventures in the Balkans or areas where we have no special historical ties and no background of historical experience to aid our judgment. In other words, we have done very well with General MacKenzie and the people we have had there. The all party consensus is there and the defence committee reflects this. There is no need to legislate this. Good sense prevails.

This bill is taking us into an American style constitutional solution but it is unnecessary in our context. Even in the case of the United States, all the legislation in the world and the American constitution have not prevented the president of the United States making those errors of political judgment and getting involved in political military ventures overseas that go beyond the letter and, some would argue, the spirit of the constitution.

These debates on peacekeeping have been an educational experience. In many respects there have been inspiring contributions by members. The consensus is very clear that no foreign minister will take us on a creeping course into foreign military involvement. All reports of the summit meeting suggested we have exercised prudent self–restraint. Within the limits of our powers we have spoken to other foreign ministers, presidents and heads of states and have said as far as we are concerned we are peacekeepers, we cannot ourselves get involved in political–military ventures.

That is the spirit of the House. I do not think it is necessary to legislate it. However, I commend the member for Fraser Valley East for giving us yet another occasion to reaffirm a striking consensus.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on several occasions already we have had a chance to speak in the House on subjects concerning the peace missions. As did the member from the Liberal Party and my colleague from Foreign Affairs, we thanked the member for Fraser Valley East for having given us, by means of this bill, an opportunity to discuss the peace missions.

• (1115)

During the review of Canada's defence policy, the question of peacekeeping missions came up in the discussions of the national defence committee, of which I am a member.

When you look at Bill C–295, as the previous speaker remarked, you realize that there is an all–party consensus on the principle of peacekeeping missions and the humanitarian way. I would like to add that the people of Quebec and of Canada accept the fact that Canada participates in peacekeeping missions.

However, I am far from sure that this bill will remedy the shortcomings that have been noted during recent peacekeeping missions, whether in Rwanda or more recently still in the former Yugoslavia.

In my opinion, the bill—and we support it in principle, as I said—contains certain restrictions that are not spelled out as the Bloc Quebecois has requested on a number of occasions. As well, in the report on the review of Canada's defence policy, the member for Shefford and I asked on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois that criteria for peacekeeping missions be defined. Nowhere, either in the bill or in a statement by the government, is there set out what Canada thinks should be the basis for a clear definition of criteria governing participation by our military personnel in other or possible future peacekeeping missions. And yet Canada is supposed to be a leader in peacekeeping missions.

The government or some of its spokesmen have expressed reservations about the bill, saying that the fact that a peacekeeping mission agreement would have to be discussed in the House would slow down the effectiveness and speed of a decision and that this could be prejudicial to certain categories of mission.

Looking at the current mission, I think that argument does not hold a great deal of water, because ever since the conflict in the former Yugoslavia started, the Canadian government has been havering and wavering and sometimes even flip–flopping. When the Minister of Foreign Affairs told the UN last summer that Canada would be encouraging the UN to set up a permanent contingent and that Canada would participate, the Department of National Defence retorted that Canadian military personnel could not serve under an operational command that was not Canadian, and the whole issue is still up in the air.

In my opinion, with respect to peacekeeping in general and the current conflict in the former Yugoslavia in particular, the views of the citizens who pay for the humanitarian mission with their taxes are not given much attention.

Almost 1,800 of the peacekeepers in Bosnia come from CFB Valcartier, which is in my riding, and I can tell you that the people there are extremely interested in any discussion in this House of peacekeeping missions and also in statements from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Prime Minister, or the Minister of National Defence. Some of them would like to know how it happened that in April 1992 Canada recognized Bosnia–Hercegovina as a sovereign state and called attention to Serb aggression, when throughout the conflict there seems to have been a certain slackness on the UN's part, recognized on all sides.

I have already reminded this House once that General Dallaire said that more than 200 UN resolutions had never been implemented and that with the amount of dithering going on it seemed possible the Serbs would end up laughing at the UN and the international organization.

• (1120)

The Minister of Defence was also reported recently to have said he was beginning to believe that the Serbs were playing cat and mouse.

I would like to add, because the bill does address the peace missions, that when soldiers return from missions, we hear some strange things. We also hear them from European parliamentarians who say that, since the UN has taken a great deal of time to act and change course—Indeed, several persons have requested either a change in the Security Council or a change in the way its resolutions are actually implemented; some persons are trying to say that at present the peace missions are no longer peace missions but no more than buffers between warring parties. They are even going so far as to say that UN peacekeepers, sometimes against their will, or because of the laxity of the UN, will practically be maintaining the conflict or making it drag on.

Mr. Speaker, you are not unaware—you have certainly heard—that when humanitarian convoys travel in the former Yugoslavia, Bosnia, or the self–proclaimed pseudo–Serb republic inside Bosnian territory, they are stopped at the checkpoints and, often enough, equipment, trucks and even food supplies are seized; Serbian soldiers or sometimes Bosnian soldiers then use the goods—ostensibly requisitioned for checkpoint purposes—to line their own pockets by selling them.

I think that the bill on the peace missions is certainly of value, and we agree with it in principle. I would go farther in that direction and say that it is high time the government made a decision once and for all, some aspects of which would certainly be referred to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Defence Committee. It is high time to specify some basic criteria, before sending off our peacekeepers as part of peace missions without previously defining how far they are to go, how long they are to endure being slapped on one cheek and turning the other, and how long they are to be given equipment; I say "given" ironically, because very often that equipment is seized. Unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately—those things are known.

When soldiers return from missions, they mention the damning facts I have mentioned to you. At that point, the public, which, through its taxes, does send our peacekeepers on humanitarian missions, finds it hard to accept that Canada, the leader in peace missions, does not take the lead at the UN once and for all and make a really valid proposal for change that, I am sure, would be accepted by the parties in this House.

There is far too much hesitation and procrastination. I believe we have reached a point where we must—without necessarily pounding the table and becoming belligerent, something Canada has never been—at least manage to define a clear policy. For some eight or 10 months, since the first debates in this House on the peace missions, the Bloc Quebecois has in fact requested that specific criteria be established regarding the role our peacekeepers are called upon to carry out and also regarding a definition of our participation—military or humanitarian—that can be targeted, not only within a budget, but also within the limits of what is acceptable.

After all, we must not delude ourselves and begin to react energetically when we see hostages taken by the Serbs. People saw that on television screens all over the world. I think that chaining up a soldier as a human shield alone runs counter to every principle of the Geneva Convention governing countries at war. Unfortunately, both Canada and the other UN member countries took that incident lightly and hardly reacted to acts that can only be described as barbaric.

• (1125)

In conclusion, I believe that this bill is essentially a good idea, but it needs elaboration, and I would suggest to the government that it initiate a discussion process, both at Foreign Affairs and in the defence committee, with very precise criteria.

[*English*]

Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the bill we are addressing today, Bill C–295, proposes to shift control of the Canadian peacekeeping activities from the crown to Parliament as a whole and to amend the National Defence Act to reflect this wider decision making responsibility. Rather than offering an improvement to the system now in place, such legislation may well substitute rigidity for flexibility and inaction for responsiveness.

The bill before us was created out of concern for the Canadian forces' personnel serving on peacekeeping missions and the desire to ensure the government follows a sound decision making process; of that I am certain. However having examined the bill I am equally certain that it confuses more than it clarifies and that it will impede decision making rather than assist it.

In short, the bill will worsen rather than improve the system now in place. It will add time to matters that demand urgent responses and it will dilute responsibility for decisions that demand clear, unequivocal leadership. For these reasons I must oppose Bill C–295.

Bill C–295 would restrict the prerogative, speed and discretion of the crown to decide Canada's contribution to UN or regional peace operations. Peacekeeping like other military operations is carried out under the authority of the Minister of National Defence. Section 4 of the National Defence Act identifies the minister as the representative of the crown responsible for the management and direction of Canadian forces and for all matters relating to national defence.

However, the proposed bill would remove the responsibility and direction not only of the minister but of all the government respecting military operations. As a result, the bill would slow down the government's response to UN requests for assistance in peace operations and compromise its ability to respond to changes in the peacekeeping mandate in a timely manner.

It has been said that lost time is never found again. That certainly is the consensus of many former Canadian UN commanders who have identified as a major problem the length of time it takes for the international community to respond to a crisis.

Major–General Roméo Dallaire has spoken publicly of the importance of speed in responding to emergencies. He has estimated that tens of thousands of lives would have been saved in Rwanda if his urgent request for troops had been met with action.

I do not think Bill C–295 would improve the situation for a commander who found himself in a position similar to that of Major–General Dallaire. With another layer added to the decision making process it would require even longer for Canada to become involved and provide help. If a situation is deemed an emergency it should be treated like one.

Bill C–295 would also compromise a structure in place to manage international Canadian forces' operations. Every potential operation is evaluated against guidelines that include the broad political and foreign policy context, the overall mission requirements as well as our own military capability. These guidelines have been refined for more than 40 years of practical experience. They also reflect in a prudent but pragmatic manner the new thinking that has emerged since the end of the cold war. This new thinking was articulated in a 1994 defence white paper which contains a list of key principles that underlie the design of all peace missions.

I should like to remind the House the Minister of National Defence consulted widely before formulating this policy. The overriding principle determining each peacekeeping mission is that it addresses genuine threats to international peace and security, such as the worsening situation in the former Yugoslavia, where there are emerging human catastrophes such as we have seen in Somalia and Rwanda.

• (1130)

I have explained why and how Bill C–295 would slow down Canada's ability to respond and contribute to international peacekeeping. Now I would like to talk about how the bill confuses the issues that underlie our current system. The confusion represents many more impediments in what must be a rapid and flexible decision making process.

First, Bill C–295 as it is currently written contains restrictions that would prevent the government from carrying out its obligations under the UN charter. Chapter VII of the charter provides for action by the security council with respect to threats to peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Under various articles of the charter UN member states are required to carry out the security council decisions aimed at maintaining international peace and security.

Although as worded the bill appears to cover the UN chapter VII operations, most of its provisions contradict chapter VII requirments. I question whether Canada would have contributed to the gulf war if Bill C–295 were in effect a few years ago.

What troubles me more however is the provision of Bill C–295 that gives up Canadian sovereign command of Canada forces elements. I believe strongly that this would lead to an unworkable command and control relationship. The intent of the bill seems to be taking us back in time to the first and second world wars when Canadian troops came under allied rather than national command. This indeed appears to be a regressive step and one that I doubt the bill's proponents meant it to take.

Canadian forces personnel serving on peace operations today are always commanded by a Canadian. Canadian units and personnel can only be placed under the operational control and not the operational command of the UN or other multinational commanders for specific tasks. Under operational control, changes to the tasks assigned to Canadian peacekeepers or to their area of operations must receive Canadian national approval. Under operational command, Canadian troops could be reassigned and moved without such approval.

Under current legislation a non–Canadian commander who only has operational control cannot separately assign components of a Canadian unit. A company of infantry soldiers, for example, cannot be removed from its battalion to serve with another unit unless the deployment is approved by Canada. Once again, under the non–Canadian operational command this could happen.

Currently commanders of Canadian contingents are directly responsible to the Chief of the Defence Staff for the success of their operations. However under Bill C–295 Canadian commanding officers would be placed under UN or other international command. To my mind this would mean less national control, not more.

To sum up, I cannot support a bill that appears to provide for greater control by the government over peacekeeping operations when in fact it reduces government control, compromises national authority over troops abroad and confuses several key components and concepts. Moreover, at a time when flexibility of response is critical to meeting the demands of rapid change, the bill proposes significant restrictions on the government's ability to manoeuvre.

The government has demonstrated its commitment to consultation. We have listened to the views of parliamentarians and ordinary Canadians alike in formulating defence policy and we will continue to do so in the future.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of Bill C–295 presented by my colleague from Fraser Valley East.

The bill has several important features that commend it. The first is that it is a peacekeeping bill. I believe it is important that all Canadians, including their representatives in the House, understand the difference between peacekeeping and peacemaking. This is little understood.

• (1135)

The situation in the former Yugoslavia gives us a good example. If I understand it properly, there is a real peacekeeping operation going on in Croatia. This is so because the warring factions there agreed that they wanted peace and agreed to the UN going in to keep it, which the United Nations did under chapter VI, the peacekeeping chapter of the UN charter.

In Bosnia, on the other hand, we do not have a peacekeeping operation there because there was no prior agreement among the Serbs, the Muslims and the Croats to have peace. Therefore, as is very evident, there is no peace to keep. What is going on there is humanitarian assistance under chapter VI of the UN charter. What is needed in Bosnia–Hercegovina is an agreement between the warring factions that there be peace, or we need a declaration with follow up actions by the United Nations that peacemaking is required under chapter VII of the charter. We need one or the other to happen there and we have neither.

Canada's help to Rwanda, if we take another example, was one of humanitarian aid: the provision of medical assistance, food, water and communications under chapter VI, which is the peacekeeping chapter.

Let us look at our activity in Somalia. This came under both chapters VII and VI of the UN charter. From January to June of 1993 members may remember seeing pictures of Somalian warlords roaring around the country in vehicles that had machine guns mounted on them. What was required there was a military operation to bring the bandits under control. Canada during that first six months was in Somalia as a peacemaker under chapter VII of the UN charter. Once the situation was under control and some agreement had been reached with the warlords, Canada moved into operating under chapter VI, which is the peacekeeping chapter of the UN charter.

Aside from understanding the difference between peacekeeping and peacemaking, the important point to be made is that it has got to be clear in everyone's mind before we get involved in any military operation what kind of an operation it is. Is it clearly peacekeeping or is it not? This lack of clarity has led us to the situation we now have in Bosnia.

It is also important to know what the terms of reference are or what the mandate is before we get involved. Canada has a good example and a bad example of each in our experience in Indochina, in Vietnam. Canada, as part of the International Commission for Supervision and Control, spent nearly 20 years in Indochina along with India and Poland. The problem was that we were ineffective there because the rules governing the ICSC did not allow Canada to tell the world what was going on. We could not unilaterally bring the world's attention to the violations of peace agreements.

After nearly 20 frustrating years we finally learned our lesson in 1973. In that year we responded to the U.S. desire to extricate itself from Vietnam and get its prisoners of war out of North Vietnam. Canada agreed to be one of the four nations that formed the International Commission for Control and Supervision. There was a juxtaposition of the initials ICCS as opposed to the former ICSC.

• (1140)

We went into that commission with what we called an open mouth policy which allowed Canada to make public all violations to the peace, which were for the most part by the Viet Cong. I have described this operation before in this House and do so again because it illustrates a certain amount of savvy on Canada's part. We went into Vietnam, did our job, got the American prisoners of war out and then left the commission within six months without getting bogged down as we did in the previous ICSC or as we did in Cyprus for 29 years.

What Bill C–295 does is bring Canadian peacekeeping missions before Parliament. It is important that we do this. The debate and review that would take place would diminish the chances of our going into a military operation with inadequate terms of reference and without knowing what we are getting into and for how long.

Bill C–295 would not tie the hands of cabinet or the Department of National Defence in reacting swiftly where military intervention was required. It would simply ensure that things were properly considered and that the Canadian people were involved in the decision making process through their parliamentary representatives here assembled.

Several weeks ago I was in Hungary and I discovered in that rather new democracy that they are very interested in civilian control over the military. What I found is that their Parliament has more control today over their troops than Canada has over its own. Even one Hungarian soldier may not cross the frontiers of that country without parliamentary approval. That is not so in good old democratic Canada.

Canadians take pride in the fact that we have been leaders in the international community in peacekeeping operations and particularly in the United Nations sponsored ones. We take pride in the professionalism and compassion shown by our troops. This applies to Somalia as much as it does anywhere else. We have heard the negative stories out of Somalia and there is no excusing those transgressions but there has been precious little publicity given to the good works of the men of the airborne regiment in that unfortunate land.

Our men in uniform are a cross section of the population of Canada. They act humanely and compassionately. We have heard far too little about the help our troops gave to the Somalians from restoring order to medical assistance, food, shelter, schooling and so on. I really do wish the news media would bring out this aspect of the airborne regiment's performance. Perhaps the Somalia commission of inquiry under Justice Létourneau, which continues hearings today, will be instrumental in telling the story about what went right as well as what went wrong.

In any event, our experience over the years, good and bad, in peacekeeping and peacemaking in Croatia, Bosnia, Rwanda, Somalia, the gulf war, the Sinai, the Golan Heights, Suez, Kashmir, the Congo, Vietnam, Korea and other operations should give us pause as Canadians to think about what we have done in the past and what we will do in the future.

We should not take such pride in our past participation that we join in all such operations without due consideration. I suspect that there was an element of that in our entry into the former Yugoslavia. Bill C–295 would enhance our decision making process and I heartily commend it.

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak at third reading of Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof.

Like other members on the government side of the House, I find Bill C–295 to be a flawed, contradictory piece of legislation that would do irreparable damage to Canada's reputation as a skilled peacekeeper. If this bill were to become law our ability to participate effectively in future peacekeeping missions would be put at serious risk. The very lives of our peacekeepers would be put in grave danger.

• (1145)

Before I look at some of the specific details of Bill C–295 I think it is important to understand the nature of Canada's current involvement in peacekeeping activities and the way in which we manage our participation in these operations. Only then will the shortcomings of this legislation be fully appreciated.

Canada has a long and proud tradition of helping the global community to defend peace, freedom and democracy. We remain committed to creating an association with our friends and allies and a stable international environment.

[*Translation*]

We realize that our security and our prosperity depend on a more stable world order. Because Canada is a responsible member of the international community and one of the world's major trading nations, we know that conflicts must be contained and their expansion prevented. We also want to help reduce or eliminate suffering in cases where outside assistance can make a contribution.

[*English*]

Canada has long viewed peacekeeping as an extremely useful tool in international efforts to manage and resolve conflict. We have excelled at peacekeeping and we like to boast, with some authority I would say, that our experience and skills are unmatched. Our contribution to peacekeeping reflects our belief that a stable international order is essential to Canada's long term peace and security. It is for this reason that we provide well

trained and suitably equipped military personnel for peacekeeping and related operations.

[*Translation*]

However, although Canada reviews attentively all requests for it to participate in peacekeeping missions, our participation is not automatic. Our participation is second to none, certainly, but it does not follow that we will be part of every mission. There have been UN peacekeeping missions in which Canada has not participated.

[*English*]

Nevertheless the international community turns to Canada almost as a matter of course whenever a new mission is getting off the ground. The world not only understands that peacekeeping is an integral part of our own foreign policy but it also knows that our flexible, multipurpose combat capable forces can do the job.

We have a long tradition of peacekeeping expertise based on professionalism, training and the resources of our personnel. We have a wealth of experience in preparing, deploying, sustaining and repatriating great peacekeeping forces of various sizes. More recently we have been the vanguard of new concepts. Our corporate memory in peacekeeping makes us a natural choice for a wide variety of missions. It has taken years to build this marvellous reputation. We do not want to see it disappear now. This bill I fear would do just that.

Let me look at some of the specific problems of Bill C–295. First, I do not believe the authors of Bill C–295 fully understand the nature of modern peacekeeping. For example the definition of peacekeeping offered is too imprecise and does not specify the types of operations covered. Peacekeeping as we know from our experience in the former Yugoslavia has become a generic term covering a broad range of activities, from traditional Pearsonian peacekeeping and preventive deployment to peace enforcement and peace building. These distinctions are glossed over in the legislation.

[*Translation*]

Nor is it explained anywhere in the bill why this applies only to the Canadian forces. Civilians are often used in UN peacekeeping missions—elections personnel, for example, and police officers. But there is no mention of civilians anywhere.

[*English*]

Bill C–295 confuses other fundamental concepts. It would amend the National Defence Act so all members of the Canadian forces assigned to a peacekeeping mission would be on active service for all purposes. This proposal is unnecessary. Pursuant to Order in Council P.C. 1989–583 dated April 6, 1989, all regular force members anywhere beyond Canada and all reserve force members beyond Canada are currently on active service. Moreover, all members of the regular force have been on active service continually since 1950.

In other words, there is no legal requirement for individual orders in council placing members on active service for specific peacekeeping missions. Our practice of issuing orders in council is simply a parliamentary convention, although I might add that it reflects the government's commitment to involve Parliament more frequently in defence matters.

With respect to termination of Canadian contributions, let me move on to some of the provisions in the bill which deal specifically with peacekeeping operations.

[*Translation*]

For example, clause 8 of the bill requires that when the objectives of a mission are reached, all Canadian forces shall be withdrawn. At first sight, this is a very sensible idea. But in reality it will be difficult to determine at what point objectives have been reached, or how much expenditure it will take to reach them. And yet those are the very conditions that the bill would like to see defined in advance.

If a Canadian contingent were withdrawn from a mission too quickly, our participation could prove pointless, and worse still the whole mission could be compromised.

[*English*]

Moreover, the bill states that Canada should set its own peacekeeping objectives. However it is not clear how international and national aims might be reconciled. As it stands if we do not like an operation's objectives we do not contribute. However once we join we understand the operation is multilateral. We take pride in our role as a team player in international missions and we do not want to compromise it now.

The muddled thinking that dominates much of Bill C–295 carries over into the section dealing with rules of engagement. Let me first provide a little context. Rules of engagement are always issued to armed Canadian forces personnel participating in international operations. Our personnel often operate under UN rules of engagement, although these are frequently drafted in conjunction with the Canadian forces staff at national defence headquarters as well as the Canadian contingent commander.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is the end of the debate on this bill. I would just like to thank all members for contributing to that debate. The bill was drafted in response to the recommendations of the joint Senate–Commons defence committee in its recommendation that Parliament be consulted before future peacekeeping missions.

I thank hon. members for their debate and ask that they support this bill.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 11.52 a.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second stage reading of the bill before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made Friday, June 16, 1995, the recorded division stands deferred until later this day at 11.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: There is one motion in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of this bill. Motion No. 1 will be debated and voted on.

[*Translation*]

We are a little ahead of schedule, and apparently the member moving the amendment is on his way to the House. We can suspend for a few minutes, or we can wait for him. The choice is yours, colleagues.

[*English*]

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, if the member will be arriving shortly we will then suspend for a few minutes, but if we have no news of the member then we should put the question.

The Deputy Speaker: I am told he is on his way. We are a couple of minutes early. He might not have expected we would be doing this.

Does anyone else wish to comment? Could one of the members of the Reform Party indicate how long the member is gong to be?

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, we are just checking on that now. If the House would indulge us and give us a minute or two, I will definitely get back right away and let you know what is going on. We expect him here any moment now.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, shall we suspend for two or three minutes? If the member is not here in two or three minutes we will come back. Agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.57 a.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 12 p.m.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C–86 be amended by adding after line 43, on page 2, the following new Clause:

"2.1 the Act is amended by adding, after subsection 9(1), the following:

"(1.1) the Commission may exercise the powers described in paragraphs (1)(*f*) to (i) only with the agreement of

(*a*) the province where the power is to be exercised, or

(*b*) the Board that has jurisdiction over milk or cream in the province where the power is to be exercised.""

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present an amendment to Bill C–86, which will change the Canadian Dairy Commission Act. I recognize and acknowledge up front that changes are necessary to the act which will allow it to operate within the trade agreements now in place, particularly the NAFTA and the GATT.

While acknowledging that the changes are needed, I have some concerns about Bill C–86. The main concern is that the Canadian Dairy Commission will be allowed to exercise powers which have traditionally belonged to the provinces. Concerns have been expressed by dairy farmers and others in several provinces about the movement into provincial jurisdiction.

While I have concerns about what is in Bill C–86, my larger concern is with the discussions which have taken place since its introduction. What I have heard in the discussions is that the bill will accommodate supply management. It will allow supply management to continue pretty much as it is with some changes. We have heard from the agriculture minister, the parliamentary

secretary to the agriculture minister and dairy groups that because the legislation will accommodate supply management no changes are required. That concerns me. Certainly a lot of dairy farmers who I have spoken to know that changes are coming in supply management. These changes will come not because of legislation passed in Canada but as a result of pressure, particularly from the United States, through the trade agreements NAFTA and GATT.

• (1205)

The discussion surrounding Bill C–86 is that it will fix the problem and allow supply management to continue. Supply management has been working well and this will allow it to continue to work well. As a result of that kind of discussion, many dairy farmers are not aware that change is inevitable. It is important for farmers to acknowledge that, to allow for a reasonable transition period and to move from the present supply management system which will be accommodated under this legislation to a system which will assist them to respond to more competition, particularly through more imports from the United States.

In the discussions the parliamentary secretary to the minister, the minister and even the leaders of some farm groups have said this will help solve an immediate problem but the long term concern is still there because change will come. Many farmers did not get that message. It will mean that the dairy supply managed industry will not have the transition time needed to move from the present system to a system with more competition.

That is my single largest concern surrounding the legislation. The amendment I propose is essential before the bill passes because it will prevent the federal government, once again through its agencies, from interfering in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

I have specific concerns with the bill. I will address those later. My main concern is for the dairy farmers. I am extremely concerned they will not be prepared for the coming changes.

Over the past months I have made trips to different parts of Ontario and I made a point of talking to dairy farmers. This is an area where I feel Reform must do more work. Certainly I need more knowledge in the area. I make a point of talking to dairy farmers about what is going on in their industry. I find from discussing the industry with dairy farmers that different groups of dairy farmers look at the change in different ways.

For example, dairy farmers who are quite close to retirement and maybe plan on farming for five or ten years are asking why the system cannot remain exactly as it is. They do not even want to talk about change. They want us to do everything we can to get the maximum price now and pretend that change is not going to happen. I understand their thinking. Change is intimidating to most people.

These dairy farmers who will only be in business for maybe another five years would do well to keep the system exactly as it is. I understand their concern and acknowledge their view.

Another group of dairy farmers have borrowed a large amount of money to finance quota. They are concerned as we move into a more competitive system. Many are willing to acknowledge it will happen, that change is coming. They do not know whether it will be in five years, ten years, two years or three years. These farmers are concerned because if their quota loses value, which it certainly will when there is more competition allowed into the system, in some cases they will become insolvent. They will not have the equity to back loans. In other cases their retirement, even though it is down the road, is being eroded. This is a concern to them.

• (1210)

Then there are the young farmers coming into the system. Many of them feel they would do well not having to pay for quota at all. That means the competition is not as big a threat to them.

The amendment I have proposed will fix up one of the problems in the bill. It will allow provinces to keep jurisdiction which is rightfully theirs. It does not fix the problems with the change in the industry.

Mammoth changes are coming to the industry. That must be acknowledged. Let us discuss them openly as we discuss this amendment and this bill as it passes through the House.

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to comment on the motion that is before the House.

First, I am very disappointed in the lack of knowledge or understanding that the member who has just spoken has concerning the bill that is before us today. He needs a few more trips to some place in Canada where there is supply management and he needs to talk to more producers and more stakeholders in the industry to get a better understanding of it.

I am also disappointed he does not seem to recognize and have faith in the dairy industry that which the rest of us have to adapt to the changes that the dairy industry does know are happening. It is addressing them.

It is very clear that in all sectors of the dairy industry, including the primary producer and the processors, are prepared and are rolling with the punches as the industry evolves not only here in Canada but throughout the world.

The bill before the House does absolutely nothing to change the role and the participation at the present time. Reaching consensus on any major Canadian industry initiative, whether it is in the dairy industry or wherever, is always difficult. Reach-

ing unanimity is even more difficult but that is what has happened with this bill.

The representatives of 26,000 dairy farmers and some 300 processors and marketers have clearly voiced their strong support for the bill. I remind the House that the value of this industry to Canada is $8 billion a year.

The members of the national Canadian milk supply management committee, provincial governments and the milk marketing boards and agencies throughout Canada have agreed to all aspects of the bill. I find it very contradictory for the member to stand in this place, representing a party which continually says that the industry should be able to adapt the way the industry wants, and give a contradictory message. That is exactly what this bill does today. It is an industry decision.

None of the parties involved, and this shows the distance of the member from the issue we are discussing, agrees with this motion. The parties have been to the standing committee. None of the parties involved in this have asked for this.

The administration of pricing and the pooling of milk and of returns by the Canadian Dairy Commission on behalf of the producers requires legislation dovetailing certain provincial and federal powers. There is absolutely no infringement on provincial authority involved in this legislation.

Most provinces currently have legislation allowing milk pricing and pooling within their boundaries. Bill C–86 has absolutely no effect on current provincial powers.

To duplicate the equity which the current levy system provides to the new national pooling system, similar powers must be provided for milk sold across provincial borders and that is interprovincial movement of milk and for export.

There are four points in the bill. The first is the bill provides the power to establish and operate a pool or pools. The second is the power to establish the price of the milk or cream to be included in the pool.

• (1215)

The third is the power to collect the returns from the milk or cream to be pooled. The fourth is the power to establish and operate a special program that will enable processors and further processors to obtain milk or milk components at special prices.

Only the last of the powers is subject to formal agreement between the Canadian Dairy Commission and the provincial milk marketing boards. While the other three powers will be delegated to the provincial authorities under the new pricing and pooling system they are and should remain strictly within federal jurisdiction.

The legislative changes replicate the same federal–provincial power sharing now in effect through the levy system and the special assistance program for processors and further processors. The bill will allow maintenance of the dairy sector's current successful, effective and equitable framework for the orderly marketing of milk and dairy products in Canada.

In closing I emphasize to the member and to other members in the House that the motion would not represent a change from what exists at the present time. It certainly would not be what the industry asked for. I remind the member to touch base closer with the industry so that he can assist us in doing exactly what he keeps asking us to do: provide the industry with what it wants.

More formal agreements between the federal and provincial governments would only be further restrictions on the dairy industry which is not our wish. Our wish is to do what is wanted by the Canadian milk supply management committee which represents the total industry. That is what the bill does.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise this afternoon to discuss Bill C–86 and more specifically the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Vegreville.

First I would like to make a statement that contradicts my colleague's assertions about supply management. When you want to fill a glass with water, it's easy, you turn on the tap. If you want the glass to be filled right to the brim, you take care to turn off the tap just at the right moment for the glass to be filled up; if you only want half a glass, you turn off the tap when the water reaches halfway.

In the early 1970s, farmers, provincial governments and processors got together and introduced what is now generally referred to as supply management. Regulated supply management in the dairy industry is profitable for all levels. First of all it is profitable for the farmers, who are the base of the dairy pyramid.

Previously, our producers found it much more advantageous to produce milk in May, June and July, when their herds were at pasture. In those three months they could make a better profit on their milk while in the winter it was less profitable, more costly, to produce milk. The result was that consumers and processors ran short of the raw material, milk, that was needed for a full year, so that there were periods when there were no fresh dairy products the way we always have now.

Today dairy producers are assured steady income throughout the year, and not just for one defined portion of the year. Consumers can get fresh butter and cheese every day, thanks to competent management of dairy production. And processors can run their plants all year round and not just for a few months.

I have to say to my colleague from Vegreville, who has visited dairy producers in southern Ontario who want to keep the existing arrangement, that this is not in compliance with the agreements we have signed with our international partners.

• (1220)

We are not in compliance with our GATT commitments and we have to modernize, we have to position ourselves by the start of August to respect the agreements signed by the Canadian government with the 140 other GATT members.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Vegreville does not, given the present system, constitute a change that gives more powers to provinces, as its wording might suggest at first glance. Given the system as we know it, this amendment would simply limit the effectiveness of the consultation process that exists at the present time through the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee.

Currently industrial milk is managed by the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee. The committee is made up of the chairmen of all the provincial milk marketing boards. The Canadian Dairy Commission just chairs the committee. The committee operates on a consensus basis and in case of dispute on any point that requires unanimity, the budget for example, a preliminary management committee will be struck.

If consensus is still not possible after three meetings of this committee, the majority decides. As in any good family—you know this, Mr. Speaker, you are the father of a family—there comes a time when someone has to wear the trousers and make the decisions. If after three meetings unanimity is not possible, the majority decides. In no case does the Canadian Dairy Commission have a right of veto.

Moreover, it is important to point out that the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee has never, in living memory, failed to reach agreement. That means that the Canadian Dairy Commission cannot impose its views on representatives of the provincial boards. So why include in the bill that their agreement is necessary?

There are some other anomalies in the wording of this amendment. It refers to amending a clause affecting the Canadian Dairy Commission. That commission has jurisdiction over industrial milk only, while the provinces are responsible for fluid milk.

The proposed amendment means that the Canadian Dairy Commission can exercise certain powers only with the agreement of the provinces in which the power is to be exercised, but the provinces have no say with regard to industrial milk. Most importantly, when the amendment refers to agreement by the province, it does not seem to take into account the fact that the provinces do not sit on the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee.

Provincial representation is provided through the provincial marketing boards. Thus paragraph (a) of the amendment adds nothing to Bill C–86, because it refers to a level of government that, under the present system, has no direct jurisdiction. Since the agreement needed under paragraph (a) of the amendment will be that of the marketing boards, we now question whether paragraph (b) of the amendment is relevant.

In my opinion, there is even a problem of interpretation with the bill itself and with the principle underlying the amendment; since the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee operates by consensus, why include in the bill that the commission can exercise the powers mentioned therein only with the agreement of the boards?

• (1225)

Even if the provinces had jurisdiction in the area to which the amendment refers, the amendment's reference to either the provinces or the boards would not succeed in achieving a majority whereas, at present, as I was saying, the committee operates on consensus.

For these reasons, we of the Bloc Quebecois would ask our colleagues to oppose this amendment proposed to us this morning by the hon. member from Vegreville, who represents the Reform Party on the agriculture committee.

Overall, maintaining the system as it now operates beyond August 1 would be illegal. The government, in consultation with the provinces, reached agreements with the vast majority of them, with the result that today six provinces out of nine participate in milk marketing. Six provinces agreed to sign the memorandum of agreement. Those six provinces, including two important ones, Quebec and Ontario, produce 82 per cent of all the milk in Canada.

At present three provinces have signed partial agreements, but on very specific points, still hesitating to jump in with the six other provinces. They are the three western provinces: Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, which together produce 18 per cent of Canada's milk, an average of 6 per cent each, if we do a very simple calculation.

I am delighted that in 13 or 14 months at the outside, milk producers in all parts of Canada will be paid a single price for their milk. There will be no more discrimination between industrial milk and fluid milk.

You know, Mr. Speaker, right now there is still a discrepancy of more than 10 per cent between prices for these two types of milk. The odd thing is that it is often the same cow that produces the milk. One day she produces fluid milk, the next day industrial milk; one day that cow is 10 per cent more profitable, the next day she is being milked at a 10 per cent loss. You have the same standards for cleanliness, the same care, the same cooler, or ball tank, of milk. You have the same cows, the same

dairy producer, of course—and there is a 10 per cent difference. That is unaccceptable.

If we go back 30 or 40 years, it was logical and even acceptable that there be a 10 per cent discrepancy because fluid milk producers had to be much more careful, they had to produce 12 months every year, and they were subject to supply management: if they produced too much milk, they could not sell it.

In closing, then, I ask my colleagues in the Bloc Quebecois to oppose the Reform Party's amendment. In fact, I have just learned that the party in power does not agreee to this amendment either.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your careful attention to my remarks.

• (1230)

[*English*]

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C–86, the act to amend the Dairy Commission Act.

This bill is significant because it provides for the replacement of the existing system of levies with a system of pooling market returns from the different classes of milk. The government claims the move to a pooling system will maintain equity among producers and will be consistent with Canada's international trade agreements, NAFTA and GATT.

Changes are needed to allow supply management to continue while meeting the requirement of our agreements. For this reason my colleagues and I can support the stated purpose of the legislation.

We have talked to dairy farmers and others in the industry and they have said they feel the legislation is necessary to allow supply management to continue under GATT and NAFTA. For this reason we can at least support the intent of the legislation.

We do have some major concern with clause 2, which affects clause 9 of the Dairy Commission Act. This bill extends the powers of the Canadian Dairy Commission and could possibly diminish the authority given to the provinces under the original act. Therefore to guard against this possible erosion, my colleague from Vegreville has proposed an amendment which will affect clause 9 of the Dairy Commission Act.

There is a problem in supply management in maintaining the status quo. With respect to supply management, change is inevitable. We have already seen change and nothing stands still in the face of time and advancement. Dairy farmers will be forced to compete more and more with American farmers and the odds are change will come sooner than the Liberal government is prepared to admit.

I am not saying this is what I want, but this is what reality tells us. The rules are changing and dairy farmers will need transition time in order to adapt to more open trade in the future. This bill will allow the supply managed system to continue for some time but there are nagging doubts as to the longevity of the current system if we do not consider changes.

Members of the Canadian Dairy Commission claim this bill properly reflects the changes affecting dairy farmers, but what the bill actually does is maintain the status quo for now. Given that a change to supply management is inevitable, there will be a problem over the long run.

The message the government has been presenting along with the legislation concerns us. I want to speak briefly about a concern with Bill C–86 from the discussions we have had with the minister of agriculture, the parliamentary secretary to the minister, some farm groups and some dairy farmers we have had the opportunity to meet with.

The legislation will allow supply management in the dairy industry to continue in a form quite similar to the present system. This does not mean supply management will continue in this form forever. Several trade issues may lead to more direct competition from the U.S. by allowing more access to dairy products from the Americans.

Before I begin discussing trade issues which could have a substantial impact on our present supply management system, I will make one thing very clear to the House. I am not talking about these issues because I want to see the demise of supply management or because Reform wants to see the demise of supply management. We are discussing these issues because they could have a dramatic impact on the dairy industry, and this discussion will provide an important service to the dairy farmers and others in the industry. Just because change will be difficult and is not wanted does not mean it should not be discussed.

Reformers have had enough courage to talk about probable change while the minister and the parliamentary secretary and even leaders of the dairy organizations publicly pretend the present system will exist indefinitely. This sends a dangerous message to dairy farmers that they can be protected against further competition, particularly from the American dairy farmers. This was the message the previous Conservative government gave to dairy farmers. It said article XI of GATT will not be touched under the new arrangements it was negotiating, and several Liberals echoed that. The NDP said it would not let anybody stand in the way of article XI. None of them could carry out that promise because it was not feasible.

I want to talk about why some change is inevitable and why it may be sooner than later. NAFTA began as an agreement between Canada and the United States. The deal is already being expanded now to include Chile and other countries. The world is forming into international trade blocks and we cannot be

certain that our supply managed industries will be totally isolated from new arrangements being negotiated.

What must the government do? It must acknowledge there is a high probability of more access for American dairy products, therefore a move to more competition. The government must help ease diary farmers' legitimate fears that Americans will not compete fairly unless they are forced to through tough action by the Canadian government

• (1235)

We need a government that stands up for our producers and will not be bowled over by the Americans. We need to make the commitment to our dairy farmers that our government will stand with them.

We must start working toward levelling the playing field between Canada and the U.S. before more competition occurs. Now is the time to set the rules for the new economy. We should not go into this blindfolded and not prepared to deal with the inevitable consequences of relaxed trading agreements with our trading partners.

We must recognize there are different concerns about change to the supply management system among different groups of dairy farmers. They are not homogeneous. Each group must be listened to and asked for recommendations on how to deal with problems which will result from the move to competition for more imported products.

My colleague from Vegreville has put forward an amendment to the bill before us today in report stage. We have spoken to dairy producers and many in the west have expressed concern with certain aspects of the bill. Clause 2 of Bill C–86 extends the powers of the Canadian Dairy Commission which could possibly limit authority of the provinces. That is a concern. The proposed amendments appear to give the CDC very wide new powers. They appear to include much wider powers than would be needed to address the reduction of export subsidies and the provision for national pooling of milk returns. Though delegated administrative functions, the amendments do not necessarily reflect the stated objectives of the CDC to delegate all these powers to provincial boards by way of agreement.

Therefore to prevent this from taking place the motion put forward would make the proposed new statutory powers of the CDC subject to agreement from the province or the board. I think that is very important. I hope hon. members can see the merits of this motion and that they will support it.

My colleagues and I are supporting the legislation despite the fact we feel it is not always sending the right message to supply managed farmers. However, we cannot argue with what the industry and the majority of farmers want.

When change does come we will have to take into account older dairy producers who are close to retirement who want to hold their quota and make sure things stay the same while they are still in the industry, and younger producers who may have borrowed money and bought quota at high prices. Their equity is tied up in their share of the quota. We need to consider consumers, those who consume the products dairy farmers so adequately supply.

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

We all know the importance of moving the bill through the House for the dairy industry and the unanimity out there. In the spirit of co–operation this side of the House showed a few minutes ago to get debate on the bill, I wonder if there would be unanimous consent to move right to third reading to move this along for the good of the Canadian dairy industry.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to move to third reading?

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, if there is unanimous agreement to accept the amendment as put forward by the hon. member for Vegreville, we would be agreeable to proceeding to third reading immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: In any event, we have to deal with one thing at a time. We can have another point of order when we get there.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1240)

The Deputy Speaker: At the request of the chief government whip the vote is deferred until 11.30 p.m.

Government Orders

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

The House resumed from June 8 consideration of the motion that Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I take this time to talk about the Canadian Wheat Board and some of the changes proposed in Bill C–92.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act for several reasons. The first is to change the pooling points on which initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to points in Canada designated by governor in council regulation, and then to establish a deduction from the initial payment which reflects the relative transportation cost advantage for each producer; in other words, to make the new pooling system work using the old system. We cannot see how anything old and new can be mixed. It reminds me of a Bible verse about putting new wine in old skins and vice versa.

To put a new pooling system into place when we are still using the fundamentals of the old system simply will not work. The whole move was partly caused by Alberta's recent move to hold a plebiscite on dual marketing which will include asking farmers if they wish to open up the Canada–U.S. border for direct shipments to the U.S.

The bill, which is supposed to come into effect August 1, will change how eastern grain transportation costs are paid. This means eastern prairie farmers who ship through the St. Lawrence seaway will have to pay the full cost of transportation. In the past all prairie farmers shared the cost through the Canadian Wheat Board pool accounts. The changes will result in higher relative grain prices for producers in eastern Saskatchewan and Manitoba once deductions for transportation are made.

The immediate effect after August 1 will be higher initial prices of about $5 per tonne for wheat across the prairies and $6 per tonne for feed barley. It is expected the increased costs will depress eastern prairie wheat prices by about $5.80 per tonne in the first year. For the transition assistance, partial compensation will be provided from the $300 million Western Grain Transportation Act adjustment fund to offset higher costs as a result of the pooling changes and to facilitate the transition to a deregulated system after August 1. Although these changes sound good, under a new system we have to ask why we are using the fundamentals of the old system to ensure that happens.

One way to real, meaningful change to the Canadian Wheat Board is through a farmer elected board of directors to replace the present system of government appointed commissioners, basically another patronage trough and an advisory board with no real power.

• (1245)

We have seen it happen over the years where people get government appointments to the Canadian Wheat Board. If the whole system is to be democratized and updated we need to pay attention to the requests of farmers, which are in fact becoming demands, to democratize the whole Canadian Wheat Board system and make sure that farmers elect their board of directors. I think of every situation across the country, every board of directors, every community group or whatever. Those people are elected yet somehow the Canadian Wheat Board is still in the old system of government appointed commissioners.

Farmers should be given the authority to decide what type of wheat board they want. After all they pay the bills. It is the very same as it is here in the House of Commons. If people are demanding something from government they will make sure they vote in and elect people who will effect the changes for them.

Farmers are paying the bills through the Canadian Wheat Board just as Canadian taxpayers are paying the bill for this place. We need to make sure that if we are to open up the Canadian Wheat Board, if we are to put new systems in place, it has to basically go all the way. We must make sure that we democratize it fully and that the wheat board directors are elected by the farmers who pay the bills for them.

Farmers should be given the chance to democratically examine their organization and all jurisdictional options. This would allow grain farmers to carefully consider and vote on a variety of market opportunities, for example introducing greater domestic and international domestic competition, allowing the purchase of wheat and barley on either a cash basis or a pooled price basis and allowing the board to operate as a seller from export terminal positions only.

If we are to see any changes in the Canadian Wheat Board these things will have to be updated regardless of who is in power and regardless of their views on the Canadian Wheat Board or on the dairy commission that we have just spoken about. We are getting close to the 21st century and we cannot continue with a system where government appointees who have been faithful political hacks are transferred to some of these boards.

These and other issues must be decided directly by farmers through referenda. My party has proposed national binding referenda in the House since I have been here in 1989 and we will continue to push that.

The Charlottetown accord was a perfect example of that through a national referendum in 1992. It was a really exciting day for everyone in Canada. Politics changed forever in the country as of that October evening when we had a choice of putting down yes or no. Of course the no side won. I was the only federal parliamentarian of a federal party in the House of Commons who was on the no side. It was not really a happy occasion for me in this place but fortunately the lives of most of

us do not just take place in the Chamber. We found incredible support in the rest of the country outside these hallowed halls from people who said they did not want a government dictating to them what would happen in the country. That was really exciting and opened the way for referenda.

As we move now toward democratizing the Canadian Wheat Board we need to continue to put pressure on the government as well as on various groups if we are to open up the system regarding the pools with which the bill deals. Maybe that is a good first step, but we need to open it totally after that and make sure people who are in the positions of power in the Canadian Wheat Board, in fact the directors, will be voted in and have some measure of confidence from the farmers who put them into place.

Referenda are exciting. Because we had one in 1992 does not mean that we have to put it off nationwide for another 40 years or 50 years. It is something that could be worked quite well into the Canadian system.

Reform believes that now is the time for a fundamental evaluation of the role of the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain handling transportation system in Canada. The Canadian Wheat Board will continue to be a contentious issue until the democratic rights of farmers are restored and they are given real choice.

We see the battle around the country about pro–choice. Farmers need to be given real choice so that they could elect the people who will sit on their boards. After all it is their organization, as I mentioned earlier. They are paying the bills for it. If they are paying the bills they should be the ones who decide how it is run in the future.

• (1250)

Obviously the minister of agriculture has made some changes but I am wondering whether he has the political will to make all changes that are necessary to the Canadian Wheat Board. The changes will come anyway and the big question is: Will our producers be prepared for them? That is what we are concerned about more than anything else. It is not with what the government is saying, that it is putting legislation in place or it thinks this is best. Let us be sure the producers are the ones who will be freed up in this and thereby the consumers.

In the earlier discussion on the dairy commission a Liberal member said that all dairy farmers felt that way because the dairy commission said thus and so. We have to be a little nervous about that. I am not sure any particular organization speaks for every one of its members.

We have just lived through the contentious Bill C–68, the gun control bill, in the House last week in which various interest groups had a vested interest. For instance the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police not only obtained a government grant, which seems rather ironic, but it was supporting the legislation and basically saying that every policeman in the country supported gun control.

I invited you, Mr. Speaker, to Beaver River last week to talk about pensions. I invite you again to come to listen to any producer. Being from Alberta you know they say whatever the organizations are, whether the Canadian Wheat Board or the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, they do not speak on their behalf, just as I am able quite freely to say that although the National Action Committee on the Status of Women claims to represent me as a Canadian woman it simply does not.

For us to take a blanket statement that my group speaks for me and we know what every producer thinks because some group said it means that we are making huge leaps in logic. We are pleased to see some changes in the pooling system. However, as I said about the old and the new, if we are to make changes and to make something new then let us make them completely new. Let us not just tinker with the system and try to keep the old in place and put patches of new cloth on the wineskin. It simply will not work. If we are to move in the direction of freeing it up for producers and ultimately consumers, let us go whole hog and make sure the Canadian Wheat Board is changed.

Having spoken of hogs I will sit down.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow my colleague from Beaver River. I would like to raise many of the same points but it is important that I have an opportunity to speak on Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. The bill is very near and dear to my heart. It affects many of the people in my riding. The Peace River riding has a large and very dynamic agricultural community. We are watching with great interest what will happen today as the bill is amended.

By way of background, the bill amends the Canadian Wheat Board Act to change the pooling points on which the initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to points in Canada designated by regulation of the governor in council. The bill also amends the Canadian Wheat Board Act to establish a deduction from the initial payment that supposedly reflects the relative transportation cost advantages of each producer.

The way the system works now shipping charges are determined by the distance a farmer has to ship grain to its designated pooling point of Thunder Bay and Vancouver. In my riding of Peace River approximately 95 per cent of all the grain produced in that riding is shipped west to the Pacific coast although one of our designated pooling points has been Thunder Bay. This means farmers in Peace River and other farmers in the western prairies have subsidized part of the costs of farmers in the eastern prairies through the freight pooling system the Canadian Wheat Board has implemented.

My understanding of what is being proposed is a system of four catchment areas. Each area will have a different deduction for transportation to a new designated pooling point. There are few specifics in the bill so I can only speak to the larger concept of what is being proposed.

The changes will result in higher grain prices for farmers in Alberta and western Saskatchewan and lower relative grain prices for producers in eastern Saskatchewan and Manitoba once deductions for transportation are made.

• (1255)

It is thought that the bill which becomes effective August 1 will raise wheat prices in the west by an average of about $5 per tonne and feed barley prices by about $6 per tonne. Similarly prices in the eastern prairies will drop. This is part of what we call a rationalization that needs to take place in the total transportation industry and grain industry so that farmers can be effective, efficient and able to compete on the world market where they must compete. We must get transportation prices in line and this is a step in the right direction. It goes part way to addressing some of the distortions caused by the blanket pooling system and replaces it with a bunch of mini–pools.

However I have a problem with the whole concept of straight pooling no matter how it is done. As a farmer I do not want anyone to subsidize my freight costs. I certainly do not want to subsidize anyone else's either. I propose that we pay the real cost of moving our grain from point *a*, in my case the Sexsmith area, to Vancouver or Prince Rupert and let the producer who lives somewhere else pay his or her real costs.

I am opposed to any type of freight pooling system. My preference would be to move to an open user pay system where farmers can decide where they want to ship their grain and where the market decides how much it would cost.

The changes proposed in the bill seem to maintain the control the Canadian Wheat Board has enjoyed in past decades. Just as a bit of history, the board was established first in 1917 for the war period and then again in 1935 to ensure the orderly sale of grain when western Canada faced economic and environmental disasters. In its original form the Canadian Wheat Board was a compromised tool for increasing returns and stabilizing incomes. Participation by farmers was voluntary. I stress very clearly that it was voluntary. It was not the way it is now where it is compulsory on all export grain.

In 1943 when supplying food to Canada's allies once again became an important national goal, the participation of farmers in the Canadian Wheat Board became compulsory. Unfortunately that did not end when the war ended, although that is the time it should have ended.

The board's chief mandate is to market wheat grown in western Canada in the best interest of western Canada's grain producers. Its designated areas include the three prairie provinces and a small part of British Columbia. The board is the sole marketing agency for export wheat and barley and the main supplier of the grains for human consumption in Canada.

Canadian feed grains for domestic consumption could be marketed either through the board or directly through grain companies. The sales of the Canadian Wheat Board fall between $3 billion and $6 billion annually. The board is administered by a chief commissioner, an assistant chief commissioner and three other commissioners. All costs of the board's operation are paid for by western grain producers. It is a user pay system and will lead to the concept that we should have control over the board.

An advisory committee was touted in the House last year elected from the producer group. It would advise the board on policy but would have no real power. It is just an advisory committee. However it has a very important function; it was democratically elected.

I have run through a bit of the background because I want to point out that the Canadian Wheat Board did not always exist in its present form. There was a time when farmer participation was optional. I also want to lead into some other changes that are necessary to bring the Canadian Wheat Board into the times.

The Reform Party has been saying for a long time that commissioners to the board should be democratically elected. Producers should have a real say on how the board operates and what kind of power it has. Only if commissioners have to run on certain platforms in certain designated areas can producers truly have a say in the board's operation.

The government is willing to allow an elected advisory committee, which is what has taken place for the last several years. Why not extend the same democratic process to where it really counts, to the people who run the Canadian Wheat Board themselves, the commissioners? I would like to see a dual system of marketing so that it would be the same for export grain as we currently enjoy on domestic grain in Canada. That would mean there would be a Canadian wheat board type of system where farmers who wanted to pool would be allowed to do so and those who did not would be allowed to sell on the open market.

I would like to give two examples of situations that are nonsensical but exist because the board is not accountable to the people it is supposed to be helping. These two examples are of farmers who have been trying to diversify. The very thing we want is for farmers to diversify however both of them have been frustrated by the rigid structure of the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (1300)

First there is the story of Bob Numweiller, a Saskatchewan miller who lives close to the U.S. border. He wants to mill his own wheat, let me emphasize his own wheat, into flour and sell it from his farm. The board says he cannot do that. First he must sell his wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board. Then he can apply to buy it back but he must also pay the board's price and its administration fee even though he does not go through the Canadian Wheat Board. Then he has to wait a year or more to find out how much money he got for his wheat, his wheat, which he so–called sold to the board. It sounds like something which could have happened in Russia 20 years ago.

There is an absurd twist to the story. Now that the Canadian Wheat Board can no longer control imports because of the passage of Bill C–57 which brought us up to speed with the World Trade Organization, that farmer has discovered he can cross the United States border, buy American wheat and bring it back and mill it on his farm but he cannot mill his own wheat without going through this rigid structure. Something is obviously wrong.

Then there is the story of a farmer in my riding who is a friend of mine. He has gone on to diversify and has started to grow organic wheat. However the wheat board does not sell organically grown wheat. As such it has to be pooled with conventional grain where of course it loses all of its advantages and its distinctiveness.

The board deals in boat loads. There is not enough production at this time to fill a boat and it is too much hassle for the board to administer a container load, or so it seems. The question is: Is Mr. Schmidt allowed to do his own marketing? Only if he goes through the Canadian Wheat Board first. He has to do his own marketing but he has to apply to go through the board first.

Here are the steps he must take: First he has to go to his own local elevator to sell his grain on contract. The elevator writes out the sales ticket. Mr. Schmidt writes out a buy–back cheque for $36.94 a tonne. He also has to pay the elevator a $5 per tonne administration fee even though he does not use it. Now he owns his own grain. I have to emphasize that at this point he now owns his own grain. How absurd. He can sell it as he pleases. However he has to wait a year to get his original $36.94 per tonne back or he may not see it at all depending on how the pool did that year.

If he tries to bypass the Canadian Wheat Board he commits a criminal offence and must pay a penalty of $12,000 and spend two years in jail. What kind of a system do we have in this country? This gentleman has gone out and found his own market for a product which we are trying to encourage, organically grown grain, and the system which we use is inhibiting him and many other farmers who want to diversify.

Those are just two examples of why the Canadian Wheat Board needs an overhaul. I would start by ensuring that the commissioners are democratically elected by producers. After that the board would change its ways and meet the needs of the farmers of the 21st century in a hurry. Otherwise they would not be re–elected.

Today's new generation of commercial farmers want to substitute their management skills for the collective approaches which have dominated the system for the past few decades. They see new opportunities and hot new products such as organic grain. Using their own skills and their own comparative advantages they want to be free to grow new crops and market them themselves. That seems a reasonable approach to me and one which has to be worked out. Otherwise the Canadian Wheat Board will lose in the end.

My experience in my riding is that the farmers who are questioning the Canadian Wheat Board's approach to a single desk marketing agency are those of a younger age. Unless the board adapts they will be gone. These new farmers are not knocking on the government's door asking for new subsidies. All they are asking is for government to get out of their way to let them do business. I hope the government is listening.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

* * *

• (1305)

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: I did not hear anyone from the Reform Party or the Bloc. On division, or is it agreeable to go without division?

It is not a debatable motion. I am asking whether it should be on division or by unanimous consent.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, could I just have some clarification as to what we are on? There is some confusion here.

The Deputy Speaker: We are at concurrence in report stage of Bill C–87. Can we do this by unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

Mr. Gagliano (for the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much time on the bill because I spoke on it before it went to committee.

This bill could probably set a model for future bills to be passed expeditiously. When the bill came to committee we asked the chemical producers and other witnesses to appear. Because the chemical producers and other interested parties monitored this problem during the convention they did not see any need to appear before the committee other than to endorse the legislation. Canada showed leadership in trying to convince other countries to accept this convention against the development, production, stockpiling and use of any chemical weapons or their precursors.

All three parties were very co–operative. We all saw that we are making the planet safer for future generations. We are very fortunate to have a member on this side of the House who actually witnessed the signing of the convention. He will be one of our speakers in this debate.

It is important to get the legislation through the House and the Senate before the summer because Canada would like to be one of the first 65 signatories to ratify this convention. With the kind of co–operation we have been getting from the official opposition, the Reform Party and independent members, I think we will have this legislation passed very quickly through this House and then hopefully passed just as quickly in the Senate.

• (1310)

The reason this convention was so successful is that companies which are producing chemicals were involved. Canadian manufacturers were even used as a test ground to see if this is the kind of convention that will work. It is a convention that is doable. Canadians can be proud that here again when it comes to the security and environmental cleanup of our planet, Canada always shows the lead.

In closing I thank all parties and the private sector for helping us to get this legislation passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again address Bill C–87 which, when proclaimed, will enable Canada to implement laws prohibiting the production and use of chemical weapons and providing for the regulation in Canada of certain chemicals which could readily be turned into chemical weapons.

This new law will fulfil Canada's obligation under the United Nations chemical weapons convention signed by Canada and over 130 other states in Paris in January 1993. Almost a quarter century of negotiations have taken place at the conferences on disarmament in Geneva to bring this initiative to fruition.

This is a major achievement and the first multilaterally negotiated treaty to abolish an entire category of what can only be called weapons of mass destruction. Not only will all chemical weapons and their production facilities be destroyed under international supervision, all government and industry activities falling under the convention's objectives will be liable to international monitoring and possibly inspection. This is a mammoth undertaking and the success of this important milestone in world affairs is dependent upon each participating state or country ratifying the convention and then abiding by their treaty obligations.

Canadian negotiators have done a tremendous job and can take great pride in the instrumental role government in co–operation with the private sector has played in the successful negotiation of the convention. An important multilateral process has taken place. Its success can fuel even greater co–operation among nations so that even larger strides can be made to make our world a safer place in which to live.

Because trade with nations which have not signed the agreement will be prohibited, our ratification of the treaty will ensure our chemical industry remains competitive. Additionally, speedy passage of this bill will make it possible for Canada to be among the first countries to ratify the treaty. It is fitting that Canada be among the first 65 nations to ratify the treaty. After all our nation has worked diligently to ensure its success.

The treaty will come into force 180 days after it has the validation of 65 of the 160 signatories to the agreement. Should some member nations require more than the 180 day period to meet the criteria, there are provisions to extend this period but it may not be extended beyond two years.

Because of the implications and complexity of this convention, every avenue has been sought to ensure that all obligations under the convention are fully met. It is important that we

recognize those who have dedicated their efforts to ensure that implementation will go smoothly for our industries.

With the co–operation of the Canadian Chemical Producers Association, the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, Merck Frosst and government officials conducted a trial inspection of the Merck Frosst facility in Quebec to test the verification provisions. These results were presented by both associations to the annual industry consultations with negotiators in Geneva. This ongoing private sector co–operation was instrumental and invaluable in ironing out the wrinkles during the negotiations and in drafting the legislation.

• (1315)

The Canadian Chemical Producers Association played an integral role by submitting one of the first papers on the issue of confidentiality to the conference on disarmament. This preliminary private sector involvement provided valuable constructive support and all participants are to be applauded for their contribution.

Additionally, officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs deserve commendation for their extensive preparatory work initiated to ensure the legislation will be effective while at the same time minimizing any negative impact on or interference with the affected industries.

By choice and representing the views of Canadians, Canada does not possess chemical weapons or chemical weapon production facilities. Therefore the overall impact will not be as difficult or significant for us as for those nations that do produce these instruments of war.

The greatest impact within Canada will arise from the provisions dealing with industry activities. The underlying thrust of the legislation is, as dictated by the chemical weapons convention, to completely prohibit any activity relating to the production of chemical weapons.

The most toxic, destructive and dangerous chemicals are listed in schedules 1 and 2. These chemicals will have the least impact on Canadian industry because production in Canada of chemicals on these lists is negligible. They have little or no commercial use. The more commonly used industrial chemicals noted in schedule III will have the greatest impact on our industry. Because of the commercial value of schedule 3 chemicals, industry production will proceed without inspection up to a limit of 30 metric tonnes.

As for Canadian industry, the initial and annual declarations will be mandatory for all plant sites that were in production the previous year and/or those plants expected to produce in the following year more than 30 metric tonnes of schedule 3 chemicals.

The initial declarations where necessary must be made within the 30–day period after the treaty comes into force. Chemical amounts exceeding 230 tonnes will be subject to verification and random onsite inspections to ensure compliance. They will require an initial declaration followed thereafter by mandatory annual declarations. Such declarations must include aggregate national data from the previous year on quantities produced, imported and exported of each schedule 3 chemical. Also each involved country must provide a quantitative itemization of each product exported and imported. This information will be declared no later than one month after the convention enters into force.

Reporting will commence in the calendar year following ratification of the treaty. Canada will be required to submit annual declarations within 90 days after the end of each calendar year. Also annual declarations on past activities are to be presented no later than three months after the end of the previous year.

Should production estimates exceed the projected threshold a new declaration must be submitted within a two month period. Should projected production be greater than the reported estimates such new activity must be reported at least five days before such production commences.

To allow some flexibility for industry declarations may not be necessary for any schedule 3 chemicals that are mixed in low concentration with other substances. The guidelines dictate that if these chemicals could be easily recovered from the mixture or if the total weight represents a risk factor reporting could be required.

Reports for production exceeding the 230 tonne threshold will include the purpose, the chemical name, common or trade name used, the structural formula and chemical abstracts service registry number if one has been assigned. The declaration of anticipated activity will be indicated in ranges starting for example between 20 and 200 metric tonnes and extending all the way to ranges above 100,000 tonnes.

Production levels for previous years will be similar in nature to the outline just mentioned. Verification within Canada will be carried out by onsite inspections. Using mechanisms such as specially designed computer software, the technical secretariat will randomly select plant sites for inspection. Such selection will be based on factors such as the identified chemical designation, as provided for in the legislation, plant site characteristics and the nature of activities carried out at the plant.

• (1320)

Every effort will be made to ensure there is an equitable geographic distribution of inspection activities. As a note, provisions clearly stipulate that no more than two inspections per year will take place at any one plant although special provisions pursuant to article IX will permit more inspections.

The combined number of inspections in any one country shall not exceed three plus 5 per cent of the total number of plant sites declared by a state or the maximum number of 20 inspections, whichever of these two figures is lower.

The general aim will be to verify that activities are consistent with the information reported in the declarations and ensure that no chemicals indicated on other schedules are being produced or used. Inspection teams will be authorized to demand access to records, particularly in situations where it is determined this information is needed for verification.

Sampling and on site analysis will be conducted to check for the presence of undeclared chemicals. If on site analysis is not possible, analysis may be required at a designated laboratory. Plant areas to be inspected will include storage sites, delivery sites, reaction vessels, feed lines to the reaction vessel valves, flow meters or other equipment associated with the production. There will be an external inspection of reaction vessels and ancillary equipment as well as any lines leading to long term or short term facilities for the chemicals, areas for waste, effluent handling and disposition of chemicals not meeting specifications.

Inspections are not to take more than 24 hours but in some cases extensions may be sought and negotiated. At least 120 hours' notice of an inspection must be given prior to the arrival of the inspection team. Industries producing chemicals such as phosphorous, sulphur and fluorine, which can be readily adapted to produce chemical weapons, will have to report their activities but at least at this stage will not be subject to random inspections.

Inspection data will then be compiled and forwarded to the International Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, OPCW. Our government must also control and report the import and export of these chemicals ensuring the confidentiality of the data collected.

For the most part the necessary structures are already established in Canada. The national authority will be set up within the Department of Foreign Affairs. Our current export and import permits and laws will facilitate the monitoring of the products.

Domestic enforcement is to be conducted under the Criminal Code. Industries must co–operate with inspectors or be subject to conviction if indicted and found deficient. The most serious infractions can make industry liable for up to five years in prison and a $500,000 fine. After five years an international conference will take place to evaluate the success or failure of measures implemented to monitor the agreement. If necessary new methods or requirements may be established at that time.

In establishing mechanisms to bring this convention into effect, every effort must be made to ensure the paper burden and costs do not become so prohibitive that smaller industries will be adversely affected or even forced out of business. Government must also continue to be sensitive to the financial implications of administrative costs. Extreme care must be taken to ensure the decision making will be streamlined and effective avoiding the creation of an excessive bureaucratic machine to track these chemicals. Already business in Canada has far too much bureaucracy and red tape to contend with.

The collection of data and conduct of inspection should be cost effective and any industry feedback must be heard and receive due consideration. Hopefully the co–operative relationship established between government and industry during the preliminary development stage will continue.

Although some of our veterans were subjected to it most Canadians are fortunate to have been spared the horrors of the use of chemical weapons such as were experienced with the use of mustard gas or nerve gases in wartime. Chemical warfare in the Iran–Iraq conflict brought vivid pictures of the terrible lethality of these weapons. The indiscriminate and massive loss of human life convinced the international community that every effort has to be taken to outlaw these terrible weapons of human destruction.

Our world has changed. The cold war is over but recent events in Japan bring home the necessity of continuing to work toward the elimination of these terrible weapons. That event proved it does not take a war to result in chemical weapons intruding into our lives.

• (1325)

At the time when the nerve gas assault on Tokyo's subway system took place, leaving 12 dead and 5,000 sick, it was not illegal to make or possess sarin and other nerve gases. In the days and even weeks after the nerve gas attack, a series of frightening incidents affecting defenceless civilians continued. The cult's top scientist was fatally stabbed in front of reporters. Burning bags containing a form of cyanide were found in a public washroom in a huge train station. Mysterious noxious gases were released several times in train stations and other public places making hundreds of people ill.

Police raids on cult sites yielded tonnes of chemicals and equipment necessary for the manufacture of sarin. There is even further evidence that research was taking place on biological weapons. Because of the cult attacks, Japan recently enacted laws to prohibit these chemicals.

Moving to another region, there is now very conclusive evidence that chemical and biological weapons were present in the theatre of operations during the Persian Gulf war. In this instance the introduction of low levels of such chemicals may have resulted from bombings of either Iraqi chemical weapons facilities or caches of Iraqi weapons on the Saudi border.

The Canadian Peacekeeping Veterans Association in Victoria has been approached by field engineers who were involved in operation axe. One of their duties was to destroy objects that could not be specifically identified and some are now suffering from what appears to be exposure to highly toxic substances. Their reported symptoms include severe headaches, bleeding gums, rashes, joint pain, memory loss, dizziness and breathing difficulties.

Collectively these symptoms, first traced to their origins by the doctors examining American veterans, had become known as the gulf war syndrome. Not only is this of great concern to those directly affected, a molecular toxicologist at the University of Maryland, Dr. Ellen Silbergeld, told a congressional hearing last fall that scientists now know that those exposed to these toxic chemicals can pass the poison on to their children.

Dr. Francis Waickan, an environmental pediatrician, has compared birth defect statistics between gulf war babies and other children. His findings reveal that abnormalities among children of gulf veterans is probably tenfold that of the normal population.

There is additional evidence that some of these toxins are released from the body during night sweats experienced by these veterans thus transmitting the chemicals to their spouses. This explains why many veterans' spouses are reporting similar rashes, fatigue and other symptoms of this ailment.

Clearly the effects and tragedies connected with chemical warfare do not end at the time of their use. The ramifications persist even being passed on to the future generations and causing untold harm to the human race.

The passage of Bill C–87 is just the first step on the way to eliminating future tragedies such as these. The real test will come when we are able to measure the willingness of the major powers of this world, those having the greatest number of production facilities and the largest stockpiles, to indicate their commitment to accept and institute these measures.

It is my fervent hope that the obstacles facing the international community can be overcome and that we can look forward to a day when both biological and chemical weapons will be no more.

To reiterate, we now stand at a pivotal junction on the road to eliminating these cruel, indiscriminating and devastating weapons. Let every nation accept the challenge by agreeing to continue to further the implementation of co–operative approaches and multilateral efforts to promote world peace and security.

The Reform Party supports Canadian agreement to and execution of Bill C–87.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will split my time with the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

This bill provides for the ratification and implementation of the chemical weapons convention which I have supported for a very long time. In January 1993 I had the good fortune to be present at the signing of this treaty in Paris, where I chaired a parallel conference of parliamentarians. The purpose of the parallel conference was to mobilize parliamentary support for the ratification of this important treaty. As a result I am now part of an international task force working toward this goal.

• (1330)

Unfortunately the ratification process has been very slow. Of the approximately 160 countries which signed the treaty since 1993, more than two years ago, only 27 at last count have thus far ratified and deposited its ratification. This is a very small number if we consider the great number of about 160 that have signed the treaty. I should point out that the treaty can only come into force six months after the ratification by 65 countries. We still have a long way to go.

The chemical weapons convention is the most comprehensive disarmament treaty ever developed. It is the end product of a quarter of a century of negotiations and culminates 100 years of international effort to eliminate chemical weapons from the world.

Many Canadians will still remember the horrifying experience of the chemical poison gas attacks of World War I which caused 1.3 million casualties and 100,000 fatalities. Many Canadians were killed in the gas attacks at Ypres in Belgium. Following World War I, great effort was made to ban these weapons. There was agreement in the 1925 Geneva protocol but this treaty only banned the use of chemical weapons in war and did not provide for inspection and verification.

This protocol, however, was never adequate. As members will know such weapons were used by Iraq 10 years ago and were threatened to be used during the gulf war. Fortunately they were not used. They have been described, because they can be delivered by missile, as the poor man's nuclear weapons. Without this treaty they would cause a serious threat to many countries in the world.

In comparison to the 1925 Geneva protocol, the chemical weapons convention, which is before us, bans the use, development, manufacture, distribution, transfer and stockpiling of chemical weapons. It also provides for the monitoring, inspection and enforcement of the treaty and provides for penalties when the treaty is broken. One provision provides for the destruction of current stockpiles.

Part of the enforcement machinery is the establishment of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons known as the OPCW in The Hague as well as the establishment of national

authorities in all countries to monitor the internal enforcement as well as the import and export controls of these chemical weapons.

There is also the provision of criminal penalties for those who violate the treaty as implemented by this law. Consequently some cost is involved, such as the cost of the national and international authorities to monitor and enforce. However we understand that this is essential if we are serious about banning these cruel and horrible weapons.

There is also the cost of destroying existing stockpiles. This could be a considerable amount for those countries which have such weapons. In particular, I refer to the United States and Russia. Under the treaty, if these countries sign and ratify, they will have up to 15 years to destroy those stockpiles. Unfortunately neither the United States nor Russia have ratified although both have signed the treaty.

In conclusion I want to congratulate the Canadian government for its work in developing the treaty and now for its ratification through this bill. It is hoped that with this ratification by Canada impetus will be given to other countries to ratify as well. As I said at the beginning, 65 countries have to ratify before the treaty can be put into force.

I also want to congratulate those Canadian companies that manufacture chemicals and are co–operating with the government in the implementation of this treaty. This is the most advanced, complete disarmament treaty ever developed and I am extremely pleased to stand in the House and support it.

• (1335)

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in support of my colleague, the distinguished member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, in support of this bill.

It is a subject that has occupied the world community, as a general subject, since The Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907. In fact one of the most significant acts of international law making was the act referred to by my colleague, the member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, the Geneva protocol of 1925. The protocol prohibited the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare.

The Geneva protocol reflected the spirit of its time. You dealt in general prohibitions. You established the legal norms. There was not the same attention that, by bitter experience, we have given in recent years to the machinery for concrete implementation of general principles. This is one of the significant features of Bill C–87. It is not merely the prohibition of chemical weapons, it is prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling as well as use and it includes measures for destruction.

It follows on the experiences that we derived most recently from the INF treaty of 1987, the Reagan–Gorbachev treaty on the destruction of intermediate and shorter range nuclear weapons, that general principles without supporting implementing machinery and sanctions are like tinkling cymbals. They are noble but they do not bring us down to concrete reality. I welcome this measure.

I also welcome it as another step in the process of development on a pragmatic, empirical, problem oriented, step by step basis of general universal disarmament. The Sermon on the Mount in the large, general treaties is too often ignored. It is the poetry of international law. It is not the material substance of it.

If you follow through the period when the cold war was giving way to detente and eventually ended, it was by this step by step progression: the banning of nuclear tests above the ground and in the atmosphere in the Moscow test ban treaty on through the non–proliferation treaty, on through various treaties on banning of placement of weapons on the seabed, eventually culminating in the INF treaty of 1987. It is a process and this particular treaty is a very distinctive and very happy part of that whole process. Congratulations to all the officers who have been involved.

My colleague, the hon. member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce referred to the issue of ratification. This is one of the problems with international treaties. There is an attrition rate. Perhaps 100 countries sign a treaty but then when the officials go back home perhaps half of those only will proceed to ratify or ratify in a timely fashion. If the treaty is non–self–implementing, even fewer countries will introduce legislation to adopt it. We have signed, we have ratified and we are implementing. Thus attrition is avoided.

In terms of the treaty becoming general international law, some would argue as to what sanctions, what controls should there be. If I may, I will cite the general opinion of doctrinal authorities, of legal text writers. It is part of general international law as it now stands that the use of chemical weapons is against international law. This is the view expressed, as based on the evolution of customary international law through a number of international acts.

I have referred to The Hague conventions. I have referred also to the Geneva protocol. The view was advanced by the late President of the World Court, President Nagendra Singh and myself in a joint work on general disarmament we published in 1989 that the use of chemical weapons in warfare is against international law. In the gap between the signing of the treaty and ratification in good faith and implementation by individual countries like Canada, and the treaty finally becoming general law because of the necessary minimum number of state ratifications, that principle of international law applies.

• (1340)

Canada, in communicating its ratification of the treaty and implementation for other countries, might draw attention to the fact that it is not necessary to wait for the ratification by the minimum number of states joined by the treaty to have recognized the principle of the use of chemical weapons in warfare being banned.

The treaty itself goes well beyond that. It follows in the spirit of the INF treaty. It is part of this step by step progression toward a system of general international law and humanizing warfare—the oxymoron that is there—temperamenta belli is what it is called, reducing the agonies of war if it has to be conducted but moving toward a general system of interdiction of armaments.

The issue has been raised with this treaty, as with other treaties, of whether it is missing some of the major problems. One of the most serious problems today is the resumption of nuclear weapons tests. It may interest the House to know that in the same volume in which we suggested chemical warfare is already outlawed under international law, the same learned authors expressed the opinion that nuclear weapons tests, as such, are against international law today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the bills tabled in this House, whether they are government bills or private members' bill, do not always have the same impact. Some legislation is merely technical, without any reference to principles or values.

From time to time, however, bills do affect us personally because they reflect our values and are for us an opportunity to contribute to the progress of human kind and strengthen our solidarity with the rest of the world.

Consequently, I welcome this opportunity today to speak to Bill C–87, an Act to implement the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction. The bill before the House today is a response to Canada's obligations to implement, at the national level, international commitments made by the Canadian government.

This convention, signed in Paris in January 1993 by more than 160 countries, was the result of 20 years of negotiations. In fact, I want to take this opportunity to note the leadership role played by Canada in the negotiations leading up to this convention.

Unfortunately, by January 1995, only five countries had ratified the convention, and today, only 28 countries have proceeded with ratification. At least 65 signatures are needed for the convention to come into force. The Bloc Quebecois is therefore pleased to support the Canadian government on the passage of legislation to implement the convention so that it can come into force as soon as possible.

To explain our position, I would like to provide a little background information on the use of chemical weapons in warfare throughout the ages and their capacity for massive destruction.

First of all, we must realize that the use of chemical weapons is not exclusive to the twentieth century. In antiquity, certain forms of chemical and biological weapons were already in use, although on a very limited scale. I am thinking for instance, of the custom of poisoning the wells of cities under siege or throwing plague corpses into the enemy camp.

However World War I marked the tragic advent of the science and technology of chemical warfare. On April 22, 1915, at Ypres in Belgium, the Germans used chlorine gas for the first time as a lethal weapon.

• (1345)

The result was horrible: 15,000 soldiers out of commission, including 5,000 dead. Sadly notorious, this gas now bears the name of the town where the slaughter took place and is still widely used.

Once this new weapon had been developed, there was a rush to improve it and make it even more deadly. At the time, since the wind, which was the main vector of the gas, could suddenly shift and turn against the user, science went on to develop projectiles that provided a better guarantee of hitting enemy targets. Bombs and mortar shells were used to accomplish this deadly task. Developments in aviation further increased the threat to civilian populations and the military. Meanwhile, science also tried to overcome the protection afforded by the gas masks in use since 1915. From now on, toxic gases were to become an increasingly devastating weapon on a massive scale.

During the Second World War, chemical and biological technology became even more sophisticated. Worse still, as increasingly toxic products were discovered, it also became possible to manufacture them on an industrial scale. The gas chambers and the thousands of Chinese gassed by the Japanese are examples of the horrifying consequences of this new deadly technology. After 1945, not only was the development of chemical weapons unprecedented, their low cost and ease of manufacturing also made them readily available.

Effective and deadly, chemical weapons soon became the poor man's atom bomb. In recent years, the use of chemical weapons has been most widespread in developing countries. Industrialized countries had already decided that chemical weapons no longer had any use strategically or as a deterrent because they had the necessary detection and protection technology. In addition, the two most developed blocks struck a

balance of terror at the beginning of the 1950s with the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

The tragedy is that the have–not countries which use chemical weapons do not have access to the same kind of protection as industrialized countries. Since poor countries are unable to acquire the hydrogen bomb, they are using chemical weapons as a means to deter and to threaten. The balance of terror below the tropic of Cancer depends on mustard gas, which is dubbed the poor man's atom bomb.

The most recent demonstration of this was the Gulf war, which was an immense laboratory to fine tune chemical weapons. People all over the world were able to see on television the innocent victims of chemical warfare. On March 16, 1988, within a few seconds, 5,000 people from the Kurdish town of Halabjah died after neurotoxins were dropped on it. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein did not stop there. In June 1988, he bombed the Iranian Majnoun islands with mustard gas and phosgene, killing between 10,000 and 15,000 people. Some 40,000 Iranians are still suffering from the after–effects of the many chemical attacks made by Iraq. In addition, according to a report issued by the Senate of the United States, tens of thousands of allied soldiers who fought in the Gulf war were exposed to Iraqi chemical weapons and now are showing pathological symptoms, referred to as the Gulf war syndrome.

Do not forget that this terrifying arsenal was built with the help of industrialized countries who, up until yesterday, continued to export large amounts of products which can be used to create chemical weapons. One of the reasons for the spread of chemical weapons is the fact that industrialized countries produce some of the substances used, certain pesticides for example, for civilian uses.

As I stressed earlier, western countries stopped using certain chemical substances for military purposes some time ago and continued producing them uniquely for civilian uses. I would like to remind you that Canada has already destroyed its chemical weapons factories.

This tacit abetment and lack of care in exporting toxic substances on the part of western countries have helped certain third world countries to amass a huge arsenal.

• (1350)

Libya is one of the countries that traded with the West in order to build up a supply and then began exporting this deadly technology.

This is how the government in Khartoum ended up using mustard gas against the people in southern Sudan, and how Somalia got hold of neurotoxins. Other countries where there is fighting, such as Afghanistan, Egypt, the former Yugoslavia, Laos and Cambodia are suspected of using these toxic gases, which quickly attack the nervous system causing convulsions, paralysis and suffocation. As states cannot be forced to submit to investigations, they cannot be condemned by any evidence, and international sanctions cannot be used against them.

Many of these countries have yet to sign the Chemical Weapons Convention. Iraq is one of them. For the moment, however, its chemical industry is not functioning, having been destroyed by a commission of the United Nations. Its arsenal of bacteriological weapons, the size of which we now know, did not, unfortunately, suffer the same fate.

In response to the horrors and destruction of chemical warfare, a number of countries in the international community decided to take measures to prevent the manufacture and use of chemical weapons. These countries had already tried to limit the use of biological weapons as early as the middle of the 1970s with a convention on biological weapons. However, as the convention did not establish a verification regime, it was not particularly restrictive and therefore of little use for disarmament purposes.

In 1925, with the Geneva convention, the international community prohibited the use of gas in wartime, but did not prohibit its possession or manufacture. Great thinking, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the 1993 convention, there was nothing in international law to prevent the acquisition and manufacture of chemical weapons.

I would first point out that the 1993 convention will benefit everyone and is in the interest of all developed and third world countries, even though it is in the latter that chemical weapons are most often used, as I mentioned earlier.

Canada, unlike other countries, does not have equipment for its armed forces capable of rapid detection of the dangers caused by chemical or biological weapons. However, Canadian peacekeepers are serving in countries which have or are supposed to have these deadly weapons. It might be more relevant to equip our peacekeeping troops with detection equipment rather than buying four submarines, as the defence minister is planning to do.

The convention is very far–reaching since it sets up a stringent inspection system aimed at discouraging states which might overwise be tempted not to abide by the terms of this international agreement.

In fact, certain provisions allow for the control and monitoring of the destruction of the weapons and civilian chemical industry of the signing parties, anywhere, anytime. Inspections and verifications will be carried out by teams of international inspectors reporting to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, created under the convention.

In this sense the signatories to this multilateral agreement are going beyond wishful thinking. They are equiping themselves with the means to ensure that the terms of the convention are abided by and to facilitate the implementation of the convention.

In brief, the convention prohibits the production, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons. This ban covers not only chemical products manufactured for military

purposes, but also vectors and equipment used in connection with such weapons.

A planning commission has already been set up in The Hague to oversee the creation of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Several panel of experts have been reviewing different instruments and means to implement the convention. This commission is to ensure the transition to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

With Bill C–87, Canada is giving itself the means to meet its obligations under the convention, namely to gather information for the benefit of the organization, by setting up a national authority. Under its terms of reference, that national authority will also have to maintain a direct link with the organization and facilitate international inspections on Canadian territory.

• (1355)

Some information leaflets have already been printed on the subject and distributed to Canadian chemical companies to inform them of their new responsibilities and obligations under the terms of the convention. This shows how important the Canadian government considers the national implementation of the multilateral agreement on chemical armaments.

This commitment also does credit to the mostly pacifist attitude of Canadians in general. Let me explain to the House how much Quebecers are interested in world peace and security. Quebec sovereignists have already included specific commitments to that effect in the Parti Quebecois platform.

In the chapter on international relations, the Parti Quebecois promises to declare Quebec a nuclear weapon free zone and, consequently, not to permit any research, production, testing, stockpiling or deployment of nuclear, chemical or bacteriological weapons, or of any of their vectors, on Quebec territory.

This commitment is totally in line with the intent of the convention on chemical armaments. Also, there is no doubt possible about the intentions of Quebecers who definitely want their country to be party to that convention once Quebec is sovereign. Quebec supports this collective action on the part of the international community, which aims at the complete eradication of weapons of mass destruction.

Therefore, let me reiterate my support, and that of my Party, for Bill C–87 which will allow Canada to ratify the convention on chemical weapons as soon as possible. After all, we must not forget this is the first multilateral disarmament agreement which comes with an effective control plan.

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m. we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

LACROSSE

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those imploring the Minister of Canadian Heritage to restore funding for lacrosse, a uniquely Canadian sport.

I would remind my colleagues that lacrosse is central to one of the most famous stories in Canadian history, the capture of Fort Michilimackinac during the Indian uprising of 1763 led by the great Indian chief Pontiac. Members will recall that the Ojibway, allies of the French at the time, played lacrosse just outside the fort, much to the amusement of the British garrison. When the ball was deliberately flung over the palisade, the British made the fatal mistake of opening the gates to allow the Indians to retrieve it.

Thus the balance of power, despite the fall of Quebec, shifted away from the British and toward the French. So it has happened in Canada from time to time ever since.

It would be a great disservice to Canada's founding peoples, aboriginals, francophones and anglophones, to allow lacrosse to perish. It is a vital part of our shared history and culture as Canadians.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we were relieved to learn yesterday about the release of the last 26 UN peacekeepers and observers, including 12 Canadians, detained by Bosnian Serbs.

This further hostage–taking incident, which shows incredible defiance, followed three years of ethnic cleansing, mass destruction and carnage by Bosnian Serbs that have claimed more than 200,000 victims.

Although today we salute the release of the Canadian peacekeepers and observers, we must still vigorously condemn the Bosnian Serbs' ruthless behaviour.

We also remain deeply concerned about the fate of some 700 other Canadian peacekeepers deployed in Visoko and Kiseljak, as the Bosnian government forces are mounting a vast offensive against the Bosnian Serbs to break the siege of Sarajevo.

S. O. 31

[*English*]

SPECIAL OLYMPICS

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Special Olympics organizations all across Canada provide opportunities for the mentally handicapped to develop their physical, social and psychological abilities.

I have been involved with Special Olympics for a number of years now and can attest to the benefits that result from these Special Olympics programs.

On July 16, I will be hosting a fundraising golf tournament in my riding in support of the B.C. chapter of Prince George Special Olympics. I invite all members to come out and support this tournament but if they cannot come out I will be happy to take a donation back to the tournament on their behalf.

I also take the opportunity to urge all members of the House to support local organizations that participate in Special Olympics programs. Let me end my statement with the motto of Special Olympians: "Let me win but if I cannot win, let me be brave in my attempt".

* * *

THE LATE MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM TRAINOR

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice William Trainor of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, who died last Friday, was one of Canada's most distinguished jurists, senior adviser to several federal justice ministers and author of our law governing the legality of wiretaps.

As judge he had extensive and varied experience in the Yukon Territory and on the courts martial appeal court before going to the Supreme Court. He had a deep knowledge of legal history but recognized in his judicial opinions the need to up date old legal doctrines to meet new societal conditions and needs.

Our sympathy goes out to his wife of 50 years standing, Betty, and to his family.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

CYPRUS

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of welcoming His Excellency, Mr. Andreas Jacovides, the High Commissioner of the Republic of Cyprus, to our country and to our capital city.

I take this opportunity on behalf of 200,000 Cypriots who to this day find themselves refugees in their own country and on behalf of 1,619 persons who to this day are still missing and unaccounted for to denounce the July 1974 brutal invasion of Cyprus by Turkish forces.

Twenty–one years later and despite various resolutions from the United Nations, the Commonwealth heads of governments and the European community condemning this brutal invasion, the Turkish regime refuses to come to the table and negotiate a peaceful and just solution for the island of Cyprus. Why? Because no solution is the solution for the Turkish regime.

Cyprus is not looking for pity. Cyprus wants what we all want as civilized human beings. Cyprus wants what all progressive institutions are advocating, justice.

* * *

ELIZABETH BISHOP

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 10 I had the distinct pleasure to attend the outstanding day of celebration for our home made poet, Elizabeth Bishop.

We celebrated the life and work of Pulitzer prize winning poet Bishop in Great Village, Nova Scotia. Bishop was born in New England in 1911 and spent her early childhood in Great Village with her grandparents. Her experiences as a child in rural Nova Scotia influenced, in fact dominated, her prose and poetry with the theme that all people are home made.

Elizabeth Bishop died in 1979. However, her literary works grow and are ever more popular. She is classified in the top five modern poets and is taught in virtually every department of modern literature in universities throughout the world.

The Elizabeth Bishop Society is a rapidly growing international association with memorabilia in Nova Scotia and at Vassar College, Bishop's alma mater.

Today in the Parliament of Canada I salute the Elizabeth Bishop Society of Nova Scotia and the organizers in Great Village for recognizing her literary works.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL–PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Louise Beaudoin, the Quebec Minister of Canadian Intergovernmental Affairs, took stock of the first nine months of federal–provincial relations since the election of the new government in Quebec. Social program reform, the Canada social transfer and the national forum on health are all examples of centralization and encroachment on Quebec's jurisdiction over education, health and income security.

• (1405)

By closing the military college in Saint–Jean, reducing transfers to Quebec for health and education, restricting access to UI benefits—which has doubled the number of new welfare recipients Quebec must look after—and stubbornly refusing to transfer prime responsibility for job training to Quebec, the federal

government shows how little it cares about Quebecers' interests. That is flexible federalism for you.

* * *

[*English*]

EXPO 2005

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday we learned that Quebec City lost its bid to host the 2002 Winter Olympics. We all agree Canada lost a tremendous opportunity to showcase its talents to the world when it lost that bid.

However, Canada can still showcase its talents to the world by hosting Expo 2005. Calgary has a volunteer corps that will guarantee Expo is a tremendous success. It has the financial backing of the city and the province and would be a great Canadian showcase for a world's fair.

Let me remind everyone the heritage minister promised to follow the recommendation of the Reid committee, which recommends Calgary as the best choice to host Expo 2005.

Over three months ago the heritage minister promised to make a speedy announcement. The minister's dithering has tainted the selection process and is jeopardizing Canada's chances of winning on the international scene.

I strongly urge the heritage minister to finally keep a promise, to announce Canada will sponsor an Expo bid and to choose Calgary as the city that all of Canada supports to host Expo 2005.

* * *

INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the finance minister officially opened the Industrial Research and Development Institute in Midland, Ontario, in my riding of Simcoe North.

The IRDI epitomizes the approach to research and development needed in the new economy and reflects the strategy called for in the red book.

[*Translation*]

The IRDI is a partnership between the federal, provincial and municipal governments, industry and universities. From the work done at IRDI Canada will derive major benefits that will help make our manufacturers more competitive on the international market.

[*English*]

I congratulate Mr. Robbert Hartog and Mr. Reinhart Weber, two industrialists in Midland whose vision was the genesis of the IRDI concept and whose hard work made it a reality.

Support for Messrs. Hartog and Weber represents an important investment in Canada's future.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian businesses understand that to remain competitive in a global economy and grow stronger at home they will have to use all of our human resources as productively as possible. Employment equity programs are tools designed to help Canadian businesses to do so, not hinder them.

It is heartening to hear many businesses and institutions have realized equitable participation by women, visible minorities, persons with disabilities and aboriginal people enhances the profitability of business.

Employment equity laws provide a minimum standard for employers. They do not constrain innovative leading edge employers who want to tap into existing and emerging markets. The Conference Board of Canada made it quite clear in its recent report that diversity is a bottom line business issue.

Employment equity is not a mystery. It is not a threat and it is not a drag on the economy. Just ask business leaders in Canada who understand Canadian customer demographics.

* * *

HALIFAX G–7

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata attacked the city of Halifax on the successful G–7.

Halifax has just delivered one of the best summits in recent history in French, English and in other languages as well.

[*Translation*]

Halifax gave visitors and delegates from every country a warm welcome in their own languages. We in Halifax celebrate what unites us, not what separates us. We in Halifax appreciate Canada in all its cultural diversity.

[*English*]

When the member opposite made her statement she accused the mayor of not having enough pride in Canada to fly the Canadian flag over city hall. The member owes Haligonians an apology and should check her facts before she makes accusations.

As the member made her claim, the Canadian flag was flying high over Halifax city hall. We are a military town. We raise the

flag at dawn and we lower it at sunset. We also raise our flag over business, schools, vacation spots and community meeting places because we are proud of our flag, proud of our country and proud of all our people.

* * *

• (1410)

THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Brian Mulroney may be gone but his legacy of damn the voters lives on in the Liberal government. Patronage, arrogance and the appearance of corruption were all hallmarks of Mulroney's regime and the same can be said for the members opposite.

I thought I would never see it but the government's refusal to have the heritage minister resign surpasses even the Mulroney Tories in shoddy ethical standards.

Of most concern to me is the government's suppression of public opinion. The Liberals came to power on a mandate for change but nothing has. Ontario called out for change two weeks ago but the federal Liberals responded with threats to the dissenters. Unbelievably the heritage minister is defended while those who stand on principle are scorned.

It is truly a shame but the old saying about safety in numbers obviously does not apply to Ontario's voice in Ottawa.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the issue of BST was raised repeatedly by the official opposition but the government never confirmed that it would respect the citizens' right to eat products unaltered by synthetic hormones.

Without even a debate on the use of biotechnology in food production, the government is presenting consumers with a fait accompli. As a matter of fact, Health Canada has already authorized the marketing of experimental milk produced with somatotropin imported from the U.S.

It is not the interests of consumers that the government is looking after, but the economic interests of pharmaceutical companies such as Monsanto, which is lobbying Health Canada like never before.

The government must stop dragging its heels and extend the moratorium on somatotropin so that the interests of consumers will be protected in the future.

[*English*]

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government continues its initiative to halt the trade in endangered species under the convention on international trade in endangered species.

Training workshops for federal and provincial enforcement staff are ongoing. Airport photo displays advising travellers not to purchase endangered species and products are currently being installed at five major airports in western Canada. Negotiations for formal agreements to implement the government's new wildlife trade act, WAPPRIITA, the wild animal and plant protection and regulation of international and interprovincial trade act, are well under way in three of the four provincial and territorial jurisdictions in western and northern Canada.

A number of prosecutions and seizures under current endangered species legislation have also occurred in western Canada recently with substantial penalties levied.

Nationally a video was recently produced for use on international airline flights and new posters discouraging the purchase of endangered wildlife products are being distributed to airlines—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington.

* * *

CANADA DAY

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, July 1 is a special time for all Canadians wherever they live to participate in festivities that bring us together in an expression of pride in Canada and in being Canadian.

This July 1 Canadians can also celebrate the 30th anniversary of our national flag. The flag represents our values, reflected in the way we treat each other and in the regard we have for our global neighbours.

Canadians value individualism and industry. We also work hard together to ensure the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our values are evident in the dedication, discipline, tenacity and humanitarianism of our peacekeepers abroad. We have been known to be a compassionate, tolerant and rather unflamboyant nation but we stand firm when fair play is at stake. These values have made our society safe and full of opportunity.

Our Canadian flag has earned the recognition, respect and admiration of many nations. I wish all Canadians a joyous Canada Day and invite them to be generous in spirit with family, friends and neighbours.

MANITOBA

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to invite all of my colleagues to celebrate their holidays in Manitoba this summer to appreciate la joie de vivre of St. Boniface, Winnipeg in Manitoba.

There will be a number of important celebrations, including July 1, Canada's 128th birthday. At the same time we will be celebrating Manitoba's 125th birthday.

From July 6 to July 9 is the Manitoba folk festival with a variety of music for everyone's tastes. From August 6 to August 16 is Folkorama, with roughly 50 pavilions celebrating Manitoba's and Canada's multicultural diversity. From July 13 to July 16 for those who love food there will be the very best foods from our very best restaurants in Manitoba. There will be literally hundreds of activities celebrating

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

—Manitoba's 125th birthday. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will come and join me in St. Boniface and Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba this summer to celebrate who we are.

* * *

[*English*]

STANLEY KNOWLES

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I invite members of this House to join me today in congratulating the Hon. Stanley Knowles, who yesterday turned 87 years of age.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. McLaughlin: Mr. Knowles was first elected to the House of Commons in a byelection on November 30, 1942. In his more than 50 years of political life he has served as a member of Parliament and as a vice–president of the Canadian Labour Congress. He has received the Order of Canada and is a member of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada.

In 1984 a motion supported by all members of this House appointed Mr. Knowles the unprecedented status of honorary officer of the House of Commons, a post which he continues to fulfil.

His work in Parliament, especially on behalf of pensioners and veterans, and his many contributions to political life are appreciated by us all.

On a personal note, whenever I have spoken to Mr. Knowles about political life and the role of politicians, he has one word of advice, which I think applies to us all: "If we are not here for the people, we should not be here". Mr. Knowles has always been here for the people.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while everyone is celebrating the release of the hostages in Bosnia, the Muslim and Croat offensive against Bosnian Serb positions continues, in an attempt to lift the siege of Sarajevo. The fighting goes on, despite a warning from the G–7 countries Thursday evening, and a solemn appeal for a ceasefire from the UN special envoy.

My question is directed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. As we speak, some 700 Canadian soldiers are still confined to their camp in Visoko. Would the minister agree that in Halifax, the G–7 countries failed to reach agreement on a specific solution to put an end to the conflict in Bosnia?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, clearly, the Bosnian crisis which has been going on for several years could not be settled in a matter of hours at the Halifax summit. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition realizes that.

However, summit participants have reiterated their confidence in the diplomatic process as opposed to a military solution. They renewed their unconditional support for the peace plan proposed by the contact group and, more specifically, gave a very clear mandate to Mr. Bildt and Mr. Stoltenberg to continue their efforts to bring all parties towards a lasting peace in the former Yugoslavia.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister whether the Canadian government and its allies intend to take up the offer of the Bosnian president, who says he is prepared to interrupt the current offensive, provided all heavy artillery is pulled back 20 kilometres away from Sarajevo and access roads are again opened to humanitarian convoys.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this proposal is of course a positive sign. Unfortunately, to be effective, all parties involved in the conflict must agree, not just the Bosnian government but also the Bosnian Serbs. In this connection, summit participants asked Mr. Yeltsin to use all his influence to intervene with the Serb authorities so that an agreement can be reached that will involve all parties involved in the conflict.

• (1420)

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Americans have refused to contribute financially to the rapid reaction force. That being the case, does the minister believe it might be necessary to drop the idea altogether?

[*English*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear on this. The Americans have not indicated that they were in a position to be a rapid reaction force.

The financial implications of it will have to be discussed at a later date. There was some urgency to pass the resolution at the United Nations and in order to ensure that the resolution would be passed it was decided to postpone the financial implications to a later date.

The Americans, although they have not indicated that they would be participating, have not ruled out the possibility of financing part of it as they have done in the past.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

We have learned that the Canadian government's Communications Security Establishment might offer its services to private business to help pay the bills in the face of federal budget cuts. When questioned about this, the defence minister declined to answer.

Considering how important this information is, can the minister tell this House whether the CSE is really considering making its spying expertise available to the private sector?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is not signals intelligence, we are talking about the information security program, or INFOSEC. It is within the mandate of the CSE to give security advice on government telecommunications. It is an expertise that is probably the best in Canada and the CSE has been approached by other levels of government, other agencies and indeed people in the private sector to give advice.

It did occur to some officials that there should be some cost recovery associated with giving the advice. That was simply a working document with no government or cabinet approval.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, based on the information at hand, what is being contemplated is much more extensive than what the minister just described.

Given that Parliament has no control whatsoever over this agency, which is not accountable to anybody, how can the minister approve or even consider approving the provision of spying services to the private sector by a government agency?

[*English*]

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member did not hear my first answer.

We are not talking about espionage. We are not talking about signals intelligence. We are talking about the security of telecommunications. Every company, every agency, every government in the country has a concern that its data banks and its telecommunications are kept as secret as possible to preserve their integrity. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about foreign espionage.

* * *

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the government came to power it promised to make integrity a number one priority. The Prime Minister said there was an unprecedented level of public cynicism toward government and unless trust could be restored the political system would not work. Twenty months later the government is practising exactly the same ethics as its predecessor with conflicts of interest, patronage and old style pork barrel politics. What makes matters worse is that the Prime Minister has stubbornly refused to fire or even discipline ministers who violated codes of ethical conduct.

Since the government is unwilling to do the right thing overall, will it at least introduce clearer guidelines for ministerial fundraisers to prevent future conflicts of interest such as those embroiling the heritage minister?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Reform Party talks about integrity. In 1990 the leader of the Reform Party appeared before the royal commission on electoral reform and party financing where he stated: "The Reform Party of Canada believes that no tax credits or deductions from income should be permitted in respect of donations of money to political parties or candidates. Parties and candidates should finance themselves"—

• (1425)

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Copps: "Parties and candidates should finance themselves with the money of their supporters and not with taxpayers' dollars".

Some hon. members: More, more.

Ms. Copps: "We recommend that the political contribution tax credit be eliminated".

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Copps: However, that did not prevent every single member of the Reform Party from taking the government rebate that was offered to them at the end of the election campaign.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pretending to not see an ethical issue is ignoring it or covering it up. We cannot go on with that vein of reply.

What has also become clear over the last two weeks is that the government's mechanisms and procedures for dealing with breaches in its code of ethics are simply not working. The heritage minister was caught in an obvious conflict of interest, yet the ethics counsellor was powerless to act. The Prime Minister only consulted the ethics counsellor as an afterthought and his report remains a deep, dark secret.

If this government is serious about restoring integrity to government and is unwilling to act itself, will it at least free the hands of the ethics counsellor and make him directly accountable to this Parliament?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Reform Party says he sees no conflict in taking a public position that his party should not accept political tax credits nor should they accept money from the taxpayers, but when it is coming they are very happy to take it.

While the leader of the Reform Party was up very righteously in the House last week attacking the Minister of Canadian Heritage for having a private dinner, he himself was attending another private dinner at the posh Windsor Club where initiation fees are $1,000 and annual dues are $600.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Ms. Copps: However the press was not allowed because according to the press secretary of the leader of the Reform Party it was only a "get to know you" session.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, surely the minister can see the difference between a regular political fundraising event and one where a minister is soliciting clients of his own department. If the minister cannot see the difference there, we really have an ethics problem.

No ethics code can be enforced as long as the government practices double standards when it comes to dealing with its own members. Liberal backbenchers who occasionally vote against the government at the direction of their constituents are punished. "I will not sign your nomination papers", says the Prime Minister. However cabinet ministers found flouting the federal code of ethics are defended and even applauded for their actions.

As a discipline for violating the conflict of interest guidelines has the Prime Minister told the heritage minister that he will not be signing his nomination papers at the next election?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of double standards, it seems to me that the leader of the Reform Party should explain to the House of Commons why he asked for his justice critic to be removed when he did not like some of the positions he took.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REFERENDUM ON QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said that the federal government would follow the letter and spirit of the Quebec referendum act.

• (1430)

Yet, in a letter addressed to business people concerning the referendum campaign, the Privy Council suggests that they make a list of speakers to include current, former or retired business leaders who would like to speak in Quebec, and to give those names to the Privy Council or to the Council for Canadian Unity.

How can the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs justify giving the Council for Canadian Unity, which is a charity receiving 60 per cent of its funding from the Department of Canadian Heritage, responsibility for the pre–referendum campaign on behalf of the Privy Council?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Council for Canadian Unity is an independent organization. This registered private organization has no official link with us. The government finances the council because that organization seeks to promote Canadian unity, which is a perfectly valid goal.

When the opposition or its big brother finances the council on Quebec sovereignty with my taxes and with the taxes paid to the Quebec government, it is clear that the opposition's big brother uses taxpayers' money to sell its option.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is a case of seeing the mote in one's neighbour's eye, but not the beam in one's own.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: In that same letter, the Privy Council suggests to business people that they should fund the advertising or

promotion costs of events such as the 30th anniversary of the flag, or citizenship ceremonies.

How can the minister claim that federal advertising on the Canadian flag and citizenship is not part of a huge multi-million dollar pre-referendum campaign, considering that the Privy Council is asking companies to integrate these themes into their advertising, in the fight against the yes side in the Quebec referendum?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, how can the opposition dare to ask such a question, considering who is doing the advertising in the Montreal metro, who held the regional commissions, who is using Quebec taxpayers' money to carry out, through its departments, false advertising on what goes on—

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, some pretty strong words are being used today. I ask the hon. minister to retract the word "false".

Mr. Massé: Mr. Speaker, I retract that word and replace it with "misleading". Advertising which—

The Speaker: Again, I will ask the hon. minister to simply retract the word.

Mr. Massé: I do Mr. Speaker, but I want to carry on—

* * *

• (1435)

[*English*]

BOSNIA

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians are grateful that the troops at Ilijas and Pale have finally been released.

Now that they are free, the government is also free to address our continued presence in Bosnia in a more objective way. Approximately 700 Canadians remain on their base at Visoko, stuck between hostile armies in the midst of an escalating conflict. They are pinned down by land mines and threatened if they try to leave their compound.

Will the minister now accept that continuing this deployment is pointless, dangerous and irresponsible and that Canada should urge withdrawal as soon as possible?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in terms of the 700 members of the Royal Vandoos Regiment in Visoko, it is rather regrettable and certainly unacceptable from Canada's point that these people are confined to their base.

We will be making the strongest protest to the Bosnian government. The local commander has been trying to negotiate the passage of goods, food and personnel to the base. There is no reason to fear for their safety, but that is a matter we will be concerned about and we will be negotiating with the local commanders.

With respect to the general policy, the Prime Minister has made the government's commitment to the United Nations force absolutely clear. We believe the force can continue to do its job with the goodwill of the parties to start negotiating again.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government continues to waffle about whether Canada will join the UN's rapid reaction force. It stalls for time, refusing to make the tough decisions about the mission in Bosnia. The government owes it to Canadians to stop dithering and decide its course.

Will Canada join the rapid reaction force and commit itself more deeply to the fighting or will it, as the Reform Party has been suggesting, begin to wind down its participation?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very nice for the hon. member from the Reform Party to express a sign of relief at the freedom of our hostages.

However I would like to remind the House that at the height of this crisis, when all Canadians and all parliamentarians should have been rallying around, this was the party that was telling us to withdraw. This was the party with a wanton disregard for the safety of our troops.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN UNITY

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs stated that the Privy Council would be spending $2.5 million of its budget on Operation Unity this year. The Clerk of the Privy Council said that, of this amount, $1.4 million would be for salaries and $1 million for the purchase of goods and services. However, the minister and departmental employees carefully avoid talking about the total cost of Operation Unity.

Will the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tell us what the total cost of Operation Unity will be, including transferred employees, goods and services and the rental of office space?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have very clearly estimated that the total cost of Operation Unity will be $2.5 million. This was the amount noted in the estimates, which are drawn up to give us an idea of how much money we need for the fiscal year.

But obviously, since then, our big brother from the Bloc Quebecois decided to put off the referendum, so we may have to

spend more than we previously estimated. How much more, we will only know once the referendum date has been set.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the date will be quite clear, and I suppose that they are going to enlist the help of their big brother at Power Corporation for their campaign.

How can the minister claim that the Privy Council will only spend $2.5 million on the referendum, when his deputy minister, who appears better informed than he is, states that 17 per cent of the Privy Council's professionals are working mostly on the Canadian unity issue and, for the minister's information, 17 per cent of the Privy Council's total budget represents at the very least $14 million?

• (1440)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the figures in the estimates were drawn up to the best of our knowledge, given what we knew at that time about the Parti Quebecois's strategy.

And anybody who spends between $8 and $10 million on regional commissions, which were nothing more than propaganda machines, is in no position to grill us about our figures.

* * *

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister of Indian affairs met with the B.C. aboriginal affairs minister this morning. The provincial minister is here to insist on greater federal participation in settling native disputes in B.C. A native spokesman has said since last week that Adams Lake residents will have their access blocked today at 5 p.m. unless the federal minister involves himself in the dispute. There is urgency.

How is it the federal department can promote and participate in all land claim and self-government negotiations in B.C., but when the public is held to ransom the minister asserts that he has no legal, moral or statutory obligation to get involved?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. The minister of aboriginal affairs is here from B.C. Even though we are not of the same party, I want to commend him for his excellent work in a very tenuous situation.

I will go back to the basis of the complaint. This is an off reserve problem. As the member knows there have been archaeological finds there. As a matter of fact if he reads the Kamloops news it is fairly correct. Kyle Boxrud plans to build a 60-unit recreational vehicle park but has been ordered to have an archaeological study conducted to determine the heritage value of the land. He has been told that by the province. He has been told to discontinue his work. He has refused to do the study and he has also refused to discontinue his work.

That is the issue. It is an off reserve issue. We are prepared to work with the province. I want to make clear that this government and this minister do not negotiate over barricades. We are a country of law and order and no barricade will get the promise of a solution. We have had a person there at two of the meetings. We are prepared to help facilitate a settlement with the clear understanding that barricades in Canada gain nothing from my department.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand a lot of private property owners not involved in the archaeological dispute are suffering as a result of this dispute.

The minister has raised expectation levels in B.C. beyond what governments can deliver. A Penticton band spokesman is now saying that the B.C. treaty process is falling apart as he earlier predicted.

Other than to blame Reform, as the minister did Friday, what is the minister doing to reduce expectations and create a sensible and publicly acceptable set of negotiations in which the rule of law is rewarded and protests and blockades are not?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the broader issue of the B.C. negotiations. All Canada knows that it was not this government that really started the negotiations. We are doing modern treaty in British Columbia, contemporary treaty addressing the spirit of intent.

I would advise the hon. member that there was a four-hour meeting with the First Nations from B.C. this morning with the minister and deputy minister. I thought the meeting was positive. If he blames us for enhancing expectations, if we as a government can collectively raise the spirits of aboriginal people, if we can restore values and that is raising expectations, that is what we are here for in the House of Commons.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

The Food and Drugs Act, which comes under Health Canada, prohibits the sale of the synthetic hormone somatotropin, given, as the minister has said, that Health Canada's study of its impact on humans and animals has not yet been completed.

Would the minister confirm that no Canadian can consume dairy products from cows treated with the synthetic hormone somatotropin?

• (1445)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the matter is still being studied. The product will be approved once Health Canada scientists have determined that it is safe and effective.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain a letter dated October 2, 1986 from Health Canada signed by Mr. Mitchel, the director of the Bureau of Veterinary Drugs, permitting milk made with synthetic somatotropin to be marketed as unprocessed milk without any warning to consumers?

[*English*]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will say, in English this time, that rBST is under review by Health Canada. The scientists at Health Canada are doing their work and a notice of compliance will not be issued until they are satisfied that rBST is safe and efficacious.

* * *

LABOUR

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

Because of an increasing use of technology in the workplace we have witnessed an increase in global structural unemployment. In response to this the government struck an advisory group last fall to make suggestions to the government on working time and the distribution of work.

Would the minister inform the House of the government's intentions relative to the recommendations of the Donner report on working time and the distribution of work?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question by the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury is particularly relevant, because it concerns a matter currently under consideration in a number of workplaces: hours and distribution of work. The report was distributed widely, in a number of areas to encourage public debate by provincial governments, unions and business.

Certain advisory bodies are currently examining the report, including the Canadian Labour Force Development Board and the Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre. We also plan to support pilot projects at the Department of Human Resources Development on testing hours of work. Finally, there are also recommendations on changes to the Canada Labour Code, and we have submitted them to the advisory group, which comprises labour and management, for recommendations to the Minister of Labour.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the immigration minister told this House a week ago that in 1994 he had issued minister's permits to about 7,000 people who were initially denied entry into Canada. We have obtained a list of just who those people are and I find it and the minister's actions deeply disturbing.

Why did the minister give permits to 147 people who were caught working illegally, to 129 people who came into Canada with fraudulent papers and to 354 people who have engaged in a pattern of criminal behaviour?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is distorting the purpose in the execution of the ministerial permits.

Clearly, we do not go looking for people with fraudulent documentation. In fact, this government has been proactive on interdiction. In 1990 there were some 8,000 illegally documented individuals coming into Canada. Through that active program, last year we reduced it to some 3,000 individuals.

If the interdiction program is bad, why is it then that governments in the United States, Holland and Australia want to duplicate what Canada has been able to do and do well?

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, permits were issued to 524 people who posed a health threat. Seven people were engaged in acts of terrorism and subversion, 1,049 were convicted of an offence that carries less than a 10 year sentence and 10 people had been previously deported. I have just scratched the surface.

Why has this minister refused to intervene even once to kick dangerous criminals out of the country when he intervened 7,000 times last year to let these sorts of people in?

• (1450)

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member scratches the surface, other people scratch their heads in disbelief.

Ministerial permits are used across the country and internationally. They are not simply permits which are at the discretion of the minister, the discretion is also delegated to officials. The fact that they have been used 7,000 times for legitimate purposes is very different from the kind of accusation which is being levelled by the hon. member.

When he suggests that we allowed in seven individuals who had been active in terrorism he is, in a certain sense, misleading Canadians into believing that somehow their security is at risk. Some of these individuals were called by the House of Commons human rights committee. Some individuals came here for multilateral peace discussions from the Middle East. Some individuals came to testify to various human rights committees about the situation in Latin America. Some individuals came here to fundraise for the Jesuit college. These are the kinds of individuals who were let in. It was for the right reasons, not for the kind of innuendo for which the hon. member and his party are well known.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

On June 9, the minister said, and I quote: "We have taken the position at the EPA hearings currently going on in Washington that we would rather see to the disposal of our PCBs ourselves".

Will the minister admit today that the Canadian government never participated in EPA hearings, contrary to what she claimed in this House?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I personally wrote these words to Carol Browner while these hearings were being held. I have the letter, if the hon. member wants to see it.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the minister reconcile her answer with the contents of a letter by Tony Barney, chief of operations at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, who maintains that no Environment Canada official appeared before the panel he chaired, and that no letter was received from this department?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps he should talk to his boss.

* * *

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The minister is adamant that he must bring in Bill C–64, the employment equity bill and he is equally adamant that this will not mean hiring quotas, but he is not right. Let me give him an example. Seventy–four per cent of all new recruits to the RCMP training academy in Regina this fall must be from the designated groups. In other words the RCMP has declared the winners before it has even held the exams.

How can the minister say these are not quotas and how can he be sure these people will be the best qualified to be RCMP officers?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to point out to the hon. member that my very distinguished colleague, the solicitor general, is responsible for the RCMP. I am very pleased to see that he is already taking measures before the legislation is even passed by the House to ensure that fair and equal opportunity is being provided through the various services of the federal government.

The mythology and illusion the Reform Party perpetrates throughout the country is that somehow quota is part of the bill. I want to underline that quota is not mentioned in the bill. It is not designed for that purpose. It is designed to set up a system whereby we can work with employers in both the public and private sectors to ensure that barriers which apply to all workers can be reduced. In that way everyone can be given the full opportunity to advance to their level of talent and ability. It will ensure that nobody is discriminated against as they have been in the past.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, everyone wants to ensure equal opportunity but the trouble is that this type of policy and this bill will enact quotas in Canada. Let me give the exact figures to the minister for his consideration. This fall 112 new recruits will be visible minorities, 112 must be aboriginal and 95 recruits must be women. It could me more. Maybe it should be more, maybe less.

• (1455)

The point is this: Why does the minister continue to say that there are no quotas when there are numbers like this that must be filled and prove that his bill and his policy means quotas for Canada?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I say with deference that the hon. member's second question shows how ignorant he is of what is in the bill.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would urge you please to consider your language and maybe just tone it down a bit.

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase it. Obviously the hon. member is a stranger to the information contained in the bill.

I would point out to him that in the legislation itself we get away from providing any quantifiable requirements as was the case previously under certain human rights decisions. We are saying that by working with private employers we can ensure that we really aim at developing human resource plans in a wide variety of workplace situations so that we do not get to the point where one group of working people is being compared to the numbers in the workforce itself.

The bill is designed to exactly moderate and mitigate those impacts. I suggest that the next time the hon. member asks a question it might be wise for him to first read the legislation.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Ron Fewchuk (Selkirk—Red River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

On June 14, 1995 the government responded to the report by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans concerning the mandate and operations of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Can the minister assure this House that the government will maintain and uphold the proposals that were announced last week?

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri–Food, Fisheries and Oceans), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government's response takes into account a number of recommendations made by the standing committee, the main thrust of which was to allow and give an opportunity to northern remote communities to develop their fisheries.

Our response does exactly that. It provides for unconditional licensing of rough fish such as carp and mullet. It will also allow the community of Island Lake to buy and sell fish for a three–year trial period outside the FFMC. I can assure the member that the minister is committed to that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REPRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

It has now been more than 18 months since the Baird commission tabled its report before this House. Despite the health minister's promises and the justice minister's good intentions, the government has yet to show that it does take seriously the recommendations made in this report.

Can the minister confirm that, as she told the health committee in May, she will be tabling in this House before the summer adjournment measures to prevent the sale of human embryos and ova and to ban genetic manipulation for commercial purposes?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this is a very complex issue, which demands a great deal of co–operation between the various levels of government. It should be easy for Bloc members to understand how difficult this is since we have to deal with their big brother. Let me tell you that I am just as eager as you are to have something ready soon because I have been working long and hard on this.

* * *

[*English*]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the governments of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and now the premier elect of Ontario all oppose the firearms registry.

• (1500)

In the 1993 report the auditor general said: "Co–operation among the federal and provincial governments is essential if the program is to be administered effectively".

What will the Minister of Justice do when those provinces opposed to the gun registration, the very governments responsible for the administration of the regulations, do not co–operate?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the hon. member's question is faulty.

To give an example, he referred to New Brunswick's government being against the registry. That is not so at all. Frank McKenna was speaking for himself when he expressed a difference of view about one aspect of it but many senior members of that government are strongly in support of the registration of firearms.

This government has every confidence first of all that the registration system, responding to what police have been asking for in this country for many years, will help make this a safer place. Surely my friends want to stand with the police.

We have every confidence that when the registry is in place provincial governments will discharge their constitutional responsibilities and administer the law.

* * *

CUSTOMS

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada Customs has a difficult challenge at this time of year with a higher number of travellers. They have to enforce the laws against smuggling and other illegal activities at the border and at the same time they have to facilitate the movement of honest travellers and business transactions.

What is the Minister of National Revenue doing to meet this challenge more effectively?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

There was a series of measures undertaken under the general heading of the U.S.–Canada border accord but also in addition and outside that to make the border a more secure element of our national life.

We are attempting to streamline processes to make sure that for the honest traveller people have less hassle, indeed no hassle, and for those who would break the law the border becomes a brick wall.

Among the various examples of what we are doing was the announcement I made in Hamilton last Friday of a new pilot project for private aircraft that will allow free clearance of small planes coming into Canada using selective small airports. Those in this pilot project are Brantford, Buttonville, Gooderich, Oshawa, Pelee Island, Peterborough and Sarnia. We hope to expand this program nationwide next year.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: We are honoured today to have three distinguished visitors.

I would like to call your attention to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Dr. Atef Mohamed Ebeid, Minister of Public Enterprise and Minister of State for Administration Development and Environment Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Also, my colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of the hon. John Cashore, Minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs in the Government of British Columbia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Also present in the gallery, is my brother Speaker, His Excellency Ortiz Arana, President of the Senate of Mexico.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: We will have a tribute to a former member in just a few moments, but I am prepared now to give a ruling on a question of privilege.

Speaker's Ruling

PRIVILEGE

MEMBER FOR BEAVER RIVER—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: As questions of privilege affect all of us, it is always valuable for us to give attention to the ruling.

[*Translation*]

I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Madawaska—Victoria on June 8, 1995.

During Private Members' Business on that day, the hon. member and the hon. member for Beaver River engaged in a heated conversation.

• (1505)

According to the hon. member for Madawaska—Victoria, as she turned to go back to her seat in order to end the discussion, the hon. member for Beaver River grabbed her by the arm. The hon. member brought this to the immediate attention of the Chair and, the Acting Speaker heard the question of privilege.

Citing *Erskine May's*, 21st edition, at page 126, the member noted that it is a contempt to molest a member. She then claimed that she had been physically assaulted and was prepared to move the appropriate motion.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Beaver River then rose to confirm that the member for Madawaska—Victoria was correct in her description of the events. The member for Beaver River apologized to the member for Madawaska—Victoria and told the House she had intended no harm, threat or assault.

The Reform Party whip, the hon. member for Calgary Centre, and the hon. member for Mississauga South, both witnesses to the incident, assisted the Chair by describing what they had seen. The chief government whip also spoke to the matter, drawing to the attention of the Chair a number of precedents. I thank all three members for their contributions.

In my view the matter raised by the hon. member for Madawaska—Victoria is a very serious one for this House. The events that occurred were unfortunate, to say the least.

The hon. member for Beaver River has admitted she was at fault but has explained she meant no harm and has in fact apologized for her actions. I refer to her own words in the debates of June 8 at pages 13507 and 13508:

> I do apologize for that. I certainly did not mean any harm or assault. I do apologize if she thought there was any intention of an assault. I absolutely meant no harm or any threat.

As Speaker Fraser noted when ruling on a matter involving the hon. member for York South—Weston and the late Mr. Dan McKenzie, to which the chief government whip referred, once

the error has been admitted and the member has apologized, procedurally the matter should go no further.

The incident ought not to have happened and it ought not happen again. I refer hon. members to the debate of October 16, 1987, at page 10090. I concur with the decision reached by my predecessor on that occasion and with regard to the present case I find the matter is closed.

[*Translation*]

There is a troubling aspect to this incident which, if left unchallenged, could have serious consequences for us all, as members of this House. It is my hope that my remarks will clear the air and ensure that we stay on course in our dealings with each other in this House, particularly during the long hours of these final days before the adjournment.

As Speaker, I am the arbiter of House proceedings, charged with preserving order and decorum. However, I cannot do this job alone. I rely on the co–operation of you all, my colleagues, to ensure that this Chamber remains the focal point for thoughtful reasoned debate on the matters crucial to the well being of our nation.

[*English*]

While I take consolation from the fact that our House is more orderly and decorous than the one faced by my 19th century predecessors, I am constantly reminded that this is a place of strong opinions and strong emotions and that when tempers flare hon. members can get carried away. I strongly urge all hon. members, you my colleagues, to respect the conventions and traditions of this place and to conduct ourselves—myself also, because I am part of it with you—with the civility becoming representatives of the Canadian people.

There is absolutely no place for violent language or actions in this House. Our constituents expect members to be businesslike and civilized in the conduct of parliamentary affairs. So does the Chair. So does the whole House.

• (1510)

To quote Speaker Fraser on a ruling he gave on December 11, 1991, at page 6142 of the debates:

> The Chair can devise no strategy, however aggressive or interventionist, and can imagine no codification, however comprehensive or strict, that will successfully protect the Canadian parliamentary traditions that we cherish as will each member's sense of justice and fair play.

In this I wholeheartedly concur.

* * *

THE LATE ROBERT LLOYD WENMAN

The Speaker: We will now proceed to tributes for one of our colleagues who died recently. I call upon the hon. member for Sherbrooke to make the first intervention.

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the longest serving members of Parliament, Mr. Bob Wenman, who passed away peacefully at his home on June 13.

Robert Lloyd Wenman was born in Maidstone, Saskatchewan, on June 19, 1940 and would have been exactly 55 years old today. He had a distinguished academic career, attending the University of Saskatchewan as well as several prominent American schools. He trained as a teacher at Saskatoon Teachers College.

He first entered politics in 1966 at the age of 25 years. He was elected at that time to the British Columbia legislature. He was re–elected in 1969 and after a short time was also an alderman in Surrey, British Columbia.

He was elected for the first time to the House of Commons in 1974 and re–elected at every election afterward until he decided to retire from politics in August 1993.

During his time as a member of Parliament he held several posts, including parliamentary secretary to the minister of defence, and chaired the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration.

Outside the House of Commons he gave generously of his time to many causes, the most significant of which was undoubtedly the United Nations.

Mr. Wenman was a member of this place who very early on became interested in environment issues, issues that related to the global population. He was interested in these issues at a time when it was not fashionable. I remember in the 1984 Parliament he was among a few members at the time who pursued some key issues related to the environment, one of them being, as I subsequently discovered in reading some notes following his passing away, South Moresby in British Columbia. That was an issue he pursued with the previous government, that of Mr. Clark.

He was also very interested in issues that affected global parliamentarians and chaired that group for some time.

He left his mark in a conference held in British Columbia called Globe '92. He chaired the UN global parliamentarians on habitat group. A consequence of the 1992 conference was the creation of the International Centre for Sustainable Cities, now located in the city of Vancouver.

He was also very interested, in his constituents and in the issues of his own area, among them Fort Langley, which I know something of because of previous responsibilities. I can assure the House that he certainly pursued the interests of Fort Langley with a great deal of vigour.

As friends and colleagues reflect upon his great contribution, which spanned 30 years of public life in Canada, and as we think back to the significance of that contribution, may I refer to someone you have just referred to, Mr. Speaker, your predeces-

sor, Speaker John Fraser. Upon learning of his passing away, Speaker Fraser said this: "Bob Wenman took his own direction, clearly from his own star".

As we look back on his life may we encourage many other Canadians to follow the star of Bob Wenman.

• (1515)

In closing, I want to extend our very deep regrets to his wife of 32 years, Donna, and his four children, Jill, Kiven, Ken and Kraig.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I rise to recall the life and the untimely death of Bob Wenman, a man dedicated to the country, to his province of British Columbia and to public service.

My friend, Bob Wenman, died last week in British Columbia at the age of 54 after a political career spanning almost 30 years, including 19 years in the House of Commons, representing the constituents of Fraser Valley West.

It is Bob's principled and distinguished life rather than his passing which will remain fixed in the minds of those of us who knew him.

Bob began his political career at the age of 25 in 1966 as a Social Credit MLA in the provincial legislature of the province of British Columbia. From that early start until last week he led a life marked by an unwavering commitment to stand by his beliefs and ideals. Whether or not his views were popular, Bob was resolute in upholding and promoting those things that he believed to be right.

During his final years in public office, Bob's commitment to family values, the environment and Canada's relationship with countries in the Pacific rim was very evident.

He is survived by his wife Donna and four children, Ken, Jill, Kiven and Kraig, and our thoughts are with them at this very difficult time. I hope his family and his many friends are able to take solace in the knowledge that his contribution to his province and to the country will long be remembered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois and on my own behalf, I also want to pay tribute to Robert. You all remember that in 1981 only one Conservative member was elected in Quebec. However, in 1984, 57 Conservative members arrived here to represent Quebec, 56 of them being new faces. That turnaround was the result of the efforts made by Robert, who taught some skills at the sessions for Conservative candidates.

As the leader of the Conservative Party mentioned earlier, all Quebec Conservative or former Conservative members, including those who were defeated during the last election and those who did not seek a new mandate, remember Robert as an exceptional facilitator and motivator at these sessions for Conservative candidates. Robert was extremely friendly and he taught us many points which proved useful during the election campaign. In fact, several Quebec MPs elected in 1984 are very indebted to him for his good advice. Even though he had to conduct his own election campaign, Robert was generous enough to come and spend two days with us at the sessions for candidates, held in a hotel which is now a Travel Lodge, where he welcomed us. The whole session was organized by him.

He was an extremely generous person strongly devoted to the party line, but with some very progressive ideas. For example, he was always the one, in the Conservative Party who would trigger the debates on the environment. I had the opportunity to sit with him on various commissions and committees. I was always impressed by the avant–gardism of his ideas, as well as by the pragmatism which characterized every one of his statements. To be sure, he was a philosopher but he was always very practical.

We had a lot in common. Like me he was a former teacher and in business. Consequently we would often have discussions together. Robert also talked a lot about agriculture since he represented a part urban and part rural riding. Again, since our ridings were more or less similar, we had long discussions together. I have very fond memories of Robert. He was very close to his constituents and always ready to give to others. He was courteous, friendly, competent, meticulous, hard working, and showed respect for his colleagues. Robert also loved sports and we had to discuss racquetball with him every time we talked to him.

I thank him for his great contribution to democracy in this country. To his family, his wife and four children, I offer my most sincere condolences. I leave them with a quote from French author Alexandre Dumas who said: "Those whom we loved are no longer where they were, but they are always with us, wherever we are".

• (1520)

[*English*]

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that last week former Conservative MP Robert Wenman passed away at the age of 54.

Mr. Wenman worked as a member of Parliament for 19 years, proudly serving the Fraser Valley West communities of Langley, Fort Langley, Aldergrove and Abbotsford.

Bob was a longstanding politician who started his public service at the age of 25 in 1966 as an MLA in British Columbia. He joined federal politics in 1974. In the House of Commons he focused on personal projects and issues such as the environment, a bill permitting passive euthanasia, the enhancement of Canada's international ties and the promotion of B.C. business opportunities with the federal government. He also was strongly anti–abortion and supported family values.

Bob and I met after the election and in the sincere and open approach for which he was known, he was kind enough to help me in those early days. For that I shall be ever thankful. He was a popular individual and active in our community. He was respected by all people and shall be missed.

Bob's contribution has made Canada a better country in which to live. I join with my Reform colleagues and all members of the House to express sincere sympathy to Mr. Wenman's family and friends. We thank Bob for his unselfish contribution.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to extend my sympathies to the family of Bob Wenman. Mr. Wenman was a very likeable colleague over the years that I worked with him. We regret his passing and we offer our condolences to his family.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

B.C. TREATY COMMISSION

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the B.C. Treaty Commission for 1993–1994.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 16 petitions.

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations on Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, without amendment.

I would like to add a few more words on behalf of the committee. In the deliberations on Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, the Standing Committee on Government Operations heard two separate messages from both government and industry on the introduction of the new $2 coin.

First, the Government of Canada is introducing the new $2 coin because of the savings it will generate for the taxpayers. Within 20 years more than $254 million will be saved for Canadians with the introduction of the coin. Further, the government is expected to accrue an additional $449 million in seigniorage to the consolidated revenue fund within 18 months of the issue. The savings for taxpayers are significant indeed.

• (1525)

We also heard a second message loud and clear from industry, small and medium sized businesses in particular. Although industry supports in principle the introduction of the new coin because of the associated savings, business has expressed serious concern over the timing of the move. The affected businesses and associations clearly stated that the 12–month notice is not adequate time to prepare for this adjustment.

Given the fact that a delay in the introduction of the coin would cost the Government of Canada an estimated $109 million in the fiscal year 1995–96, the committee recognizes the need for the Government of Canada to balance both the requirements of industry with those of fiscal responsibility and budgetary prudence.

The committee recommends that the Royal Canadian Mint—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. The standing orders provide for a brief intervention. I would deem this intervention to go beyond the letter and the spirit of that standing order.

I would ask the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James to conclude.

Mr. Harvard: Mr. Speaker, the one paragraph I have left contains the major recommendation. Perhaps I could seek the indulgence of the House.

The committee recommends that the Royal Canadian Mint, the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada work with

industry, small and medium sized businesses, in particular, to ensure a smooth and least cost integration of the new $2 coin into the marketplace. The government should further consider participation in a public awareness campaign with the affected stakeholders to minimize any possible disruption in trade and commerce.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint–Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 31, the form and the content of the attached petition have been certified.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition from approximately 850 Canadians from the Montreal area. The long and turbulent history of humanity has, at times, concealed far reaching events of tragic proportions.

Eighty years ago the Armenian genocide, perpetrated by the Turkish government of the Ottoman Empire, claimed the lives of 1.5 million innocent Armenian victims.

Resolutions of the United Nations subcommission, the European Parliament, South American countries and in Canada, the legislatures of Quebec and Ontario have condemned this monumental crime.

Hence, the petitioners request that Parliament change its policy of indifference toward the Armenian genocide and actively initiate and promote international efforts to persuade Turkey to recognize its crime against humanity.

GUARDIANSHIP

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians of the Islamic faith want the government to consider guardianship as an option to adoption. They point out that guardianship, as they see it, would include the same legal and moral obligations as adoption.

The petitioners point out that guardianship, as they would want it, is in accord with their religious beliefs. They would like the government to begin discussions to see how this might be done.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a second petition is with respect to violence and abuse in all forms, be it verbal, physical or other in society in general. It is not seen as necessary to educate, to inform or to entertain.

The petitioners call on the government to ensure that the CRTC regulates the amount of violence and abuse. They point out that there have been some gains made. They applaud that but they want even more for the future.

• (1530)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I should like to table three petitions.

HARBOURFRONT

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the pleasure of presenting to the House a series of petitions.

The first is a petition signed by 100 residents of Toronto calling on Parliament to make a firm commitment to supporting the Harbourfront Centre. I am sure they look forward to the government's answer.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am also tabling six petitions signed by almost 1,800 Canadians calling on Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation as a prohibitive ground of discrimination.

JUSTICE

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a bushel of petitions to present on behalf of the constituents of Vegreville.

In two petitions the petitioners recognize that public safety is a number one priority in the criminal justice system. They also recognize that the existing controls on law–abiding responsible gun owners are more than enough to ensure public safety.

The petitioners are requesting that Parliament support laws that will severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of a crime, support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions that recognize and protect the right of law–abiding citizens to own and use firearms, and support legislation that will repeal and modify existing gun control laws that have not improved public safety.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the petitioners request Parliament to hold a binding referendum to accept or reject two official languages.

TAXATION

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I also have six petitions to present wherein the petitioners are requesting that Parliament not increase taxes.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present. It asks Parliament to oppose any amendments to the human rights act or the charter of rights and freedoms that provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

THE FAMILY

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two further petitions to present which ask Parliament to oppose any legislation that would directly or indirectly redefine the family.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have five petitions to present today.

The first two petitions are signed by 77 people who ask Parliament to enforce the present provisions of the Criminal Code respecting assisted suicides and that no changes in the law be contemplated by Parliament.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I also table the wishes of 96 people who humbly pray that Parliament not amend the human rights code to include in the prohibitive grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a further petition signed by 200 constituents who pray that Parliament target for all gun control in the Criminal Code of Canada the criminals who are either a danger to the safety of the public or those who have a criminal intent, not law-abiding, responsible firearms owners.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 51 constituents in full support of the Canadian Wheat Board monopoly powers with relation to marketing wheat and barley for export.

RIGHTS OF PARENTS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have six petitions to present today. The first is from an area in my riding known as boundary country.

These 42 petitioners are concerned that the rights and authority of parents over their children have been eroded by legislation and other acts of the Government of Canada. Therefore they are asking Parliament to ensure the rights of parents, teachers and people in authority to exercise judicious control over the actions of their children.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with section 745 of the Criminal Code. The 25 petitioners request that the section of the Criminal Code be repealed.

I have two petitions dealing with the same matter, another 25 signatures calling for the repeal of section 745.

VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next petition has a total of 69 petitioners.

The undersigned citizens of Canada draw to the attention of the House that dangerous sex offenders and pedophiles should be locked up for life, that statutory release should be revoked, that stiffer sentences should be imposed on violent offenders, and that violent criminals should serve their full sentence and have time added for bad behaviour.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to return the rights to the citizens of Canada from the criminals and ask that Parliament honour these requests.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is dealing with doctor assisted suicide. I have 151 petitioners from my riding who are calling on Parliament to ensure the Criminal Code of Canada prohibits assisted suicide and to ensure that no changes are made in the law that will allow euthanasia.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, 78 residents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt call on Parliament to act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

• (1535)

COINAGE

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I only have one petition to present.

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and honour to rise in the House to present a petition duly certified by the clerk of petitions on behalf of 108 individuals from the riding of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding area.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to consider, if the $2 bill is to be discontinued and replaced with a coin, that it depict the face of Terry Fox, a Canadian who has done more than anyone else we can think of to bring Canadians from coast to coast together in a single endeavour.

ABORTION

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present on behalf of my constituents today.

The first is on the subject of abortion. The petitioners are opposed to abortion and they request that Parliament consider amendments to the Criminal Code.

THE FAMILY

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is about the subject of the family.

The petitioners request that Parliament oppose any legislation that would redefine family, including the provision of marriage and family benefits to those who are not related by ties of blood, marriage or adoption, as marriage is defined as the legal union between a man and a woman.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition involves section 718.2 of Bill C–41.

The petitioners are extremely concerned about including the phrase sexual orientation for the first time in federal legislation. They believe this sets a dangerous precedent for society.

The final petition is on the subject of sexual orientation. The petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions from residents of Fraser Valley West.

The first asks that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, asks that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the privilege of presenting a petition on behalf of 31 Manitobans, most of whom are Winnipegers and some of whom are from my riding of Winnipeg St. James.

They bring to the attention of the House that the Income Tax Act discriminates against custodial parents by requiring them to declare child support payments as taxable income.

The petitioners call upon parliamentarians to introduce new legislation to end the requirement of the custodial parent to declare child support payments as taxable income.

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present today signed by numerous residents of Ontario, some from the Kingston area and surrounding districts, and some I note from Toronto and other parts of the province of Ontario.

The petitioners are concerned about the possibility of milk in Canada being treated with BST. They call upon Parliament to ban the use of BST in Canada and not accept dairy products from countries where BST is used to treat cattle.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On December 1, 1994 I placed a question on the Order Paper and I am still awaiting a response.

I was wondering what the hon. member has to say about when I can anticipate a response to my question. It is Question No. 117.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, the question the hon. member has put is one that requires answers from numerous government departments and agencies and that is part of the reason for the delay.

• (1540)

I understand two departments have not been able to get the material required to the central place where these answers are gathered. Work is continuing with respect to that and as soon as I am in a position to answer the hon. member's question I will be more than happy to furnish the reply.

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1) I wish to table a notice of ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Income Tax Act.

I ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of the motion.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, from the killing fields of Passchendaele to the bloated corpses of Kurdish people in Iraq, to the people we have seen dead and dying in the streets of Japan, chemical weapons have come to each and every one of us in our lives.

Bill C–87 is something we as Canadians should be very proud of as it enable us to implement our convention on the banning of these weapons of mass destruction. It also shows a unique amount of leadership that Canada and Canadians have demonstrated, a degree of leadership I might add that shows what we as Canadians can do in foreign policy if we put our minds to it.

I thank those members in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade who have worked extraordinarily hard to implement this very important piece of legislation, not only for Canada and Canadians but also for people across the world. As I hearken back to my original example, all of us in the House today and all Canadians hope that such tragedies will not occur in the future.

This is a landmark deal. I also thank a couple of members of the riding of Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Mr. Bob McCrossen and Mr. Ken Conrad, who have given me invaluable information on these and other policy matters.

This convention had a number of sectors and dealt with schedules 1, 2 and 3 dealing with various chemicals. Schedule 1 deals with chemicals that are known to be chemical weapons such as tabun and sarin. Schedules 2 and 3 deal with precursors. There are varying degrees of compliance among them but it enables our country and other countries to monitor each other in a co–operative fashion to ensure that no country within the international community is building up chemicals or precursors to chemical weapons that can be used for aggressive and belligerent purposes.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the bill is the degree of co–operation. If we look at just one aspect of it, it enables countries to look at other countries and demand spot checks on the countries if they are suspected of developing, producing or stockpiling chemical weapons for aggressive and military purposes. It enables the international community to go in there, investigate and demand the chemicals be apprehended and destroyed as is.

The consequences of not doing so are significant for the country that chooses not to obey. In this instance when the implications of using chemical weapons are so severe it is important to see that the international community finally has its act together and is able to penalize countries that engage in these activities.

The industries that produce chemicals have appeared before the committee on foreign affairs, on which I sit, to give their wholehearted support for the bill. That is important to know. We in the House do not want to impede or compromise in any way, shape or form the ability of the chemical producers of Canada to engage in the peaceful production of chemicals for industrial purposes, a very important aspect of the industry.

There was a level of co–operation shown in the production of this convention that has not been seen since the end of the second world war. My hope is that we can learn something from this in the application to other aspects of threats to the international security that are occurring in the world now.

• (1545)

I have two examples on the aspect of the international stage that are a major threat to the international security not only for countries half a world away but also, believe it or not, for our country.

One example is the trafficking of small arms. The trafficking of small arms in this world of ours moving from one area of conflict to another has fanned the flames of ethnic discontent. It has given the fuel to enable people to fight ethnic conflicts where 90 per cent of the time it is the civilians who bear the brunt of these wars. They serve very little purpose.

Although people might say they have a right to buy and sell weapons, it is not the same as buying and selling wheat. These seemingly innocuous trades have an enormous impact not only on the conflicts in question but also on countries such as ours which are not directly involved in it. Why is that so? Because it causes the migration of individuals away from conflicts to areas that do not have conflict. It means that people are going to move to our country. I am sure if we put ourselves in those people's shoes we would see that they want to live in their homeland. They do not want to move to an area half a world away. These people in moving to our country will then cause an economic stress on our social programs.

The second thing is that conflicts half a world away put a stress on our military and on our foreign aid dollar. No matter what we do, if we go into a country and spend decades building up its infrastructure and a civil conflict occurs in that country, all of what we and other countries have done to build a peaceful and productive society will be dashed on the rocks for generations to come. We can see that now in the former Yugoslavia, in

Angola and in Mozambique. The list goes on and on. In fact the list is getting longer all the time.

There were over 40 ethnic conflicts in the world last year. The numbers are not getting lower they are getting higher. In part, small arms are what fuel the flames of that. I ask if Canada can take a leadership role, the same leadership role we demonstrated in producing the convention on banning chemical weapons, in developing some restrictions or framework in the trafficking of small arms for our benefit and for the benefit of countries the world over.

A disturbing thing came across my desk late last week. It shows that in Rwanda the French in collusion with the Government of Zaire have been selling arms to the former Hutu government living in the camps in Zaire. This means that the French are selling arms to the rebels and the rebels, over 50,000 strong, are getting ready to go into Rwanda to continue the killing.

I say that because it is very important. They are not only destabilizing Rwanda but they are destabilizing the eastern part of Zaire and are fuelling the flames of ethnic discontent in Burundi also. What we have seen for the last two years in central Africa is going to repeat itself unless we ask the international community through the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity to get involved and defuse the situation before it gets out of hand.

The other aspect in which I would like us to take a leadership role is the banning of land mines and anti–personnel devices. These devices have no significant role in fighting a war. They are primarily meant to destabilize the civilian population and are not meant to kill but to maim. Usually they are meant to maim civilians who work in the fields and children. Many of these anti–personnel devices are in fact designed to look like toys. When the children pick them up they get their arms or legs blown off. That is what they are used for.

I would ask that we take a leadership role in asking for the land mines and the anti–personnel devices to be put in the convention for conventional weapons and put in a similar category to chemical weapons. If we did that we would do a great service by saving hundreds of thousands of lives and preventing injuries. We would also be able to prevent the situation we see now which is that after a conflict finishes large areas of many countries are left completely uninhabitable. I will give a couple of recent examples.

• (1550)

In Chechnya there are literally millions of mines seeded around the country and absolutely nobody knows where they are. Therefore large tracts of land in Chechnya are going to be completely uninhabitable.

In Mozambique thousands and thousands of square kilometres of land are completely uninhabitable. People cannot go into the fields to grow crops to get their economic house in order because of the land mines. That completely diminishes the ability of a country to get on its economic feet after a civil conflict is over.

In Croatia the Croatians say that over a quarter of a million hectares are completely uninhabitable because they are seeded indiscriminately with land mines and anti–personnel devices.

The justification is as I have described before. Let us get together and work with the United Nations to look at those two areas. This is not only in our interests but in the interests of the international community as well.

As I said before, the model we can use is this convention, the convention on banning the stockpiling, use and production of chemical weapons and the degree of international co–operation we have seen here. It is a truly remarkable degree of co–operation. If we as a country can work with our Nordic compatriots to influence other multinational organizations, such as the United Nations, and the regional groups, such as the OAU, the OAS and the OSCE, and show them it is in their self–interests to put restrictions on the purchase, sale and production of small arms and look toward banning anti–personnel devices and mines, then we might be able to make some headway in this area.

I would also like to address the aspect of preventive diplomacy. I have spoken to the Minister of Foreign Affairs about this on a number of occasions. The minister said that yes, we will get involved by sending some of our diplomats across and that we will try to influence other countries and in co–operation with them send rapid deployment forces into areas where fighting has started. I would say that is too late. We usually find that the antecedents to conflict are on the boards at least two years before a conflict blows up.

There are things we can do to prevent these conflicts from occurring. Let us use the UN crisis centre more effectively. We need to build up a network all across the world of groups, individuals and NGOs that can funnel information into the UN crisis centre. The UN crisis centre could then produce briefs which would be made public every month as to what is occurring in the hot spots. The United Nations, which again would require a new level of co–operation, could then act on these situations to try to get a diplomatic solution rather than having them solved at the end of an assault rifle.

There are some things which we have not looked at aggressively. One of the things is to use the IFIs as an economic lever to bring belligerents to the table before they start fighting it out. These are things which have not been looked at before.

The other aspect is to withhold non–humanitarian aid from countries. By doing that we can force them to engage in behaviours consistent with common international norms. Again we try to offset the conflict by engaging in a diplomatic solution. If we allow a conflict to occur the seeds of ethnic hatred are sown for generations to come. It does not end at the end of the

conflict; rather, it continues for generations to come. We will all collectively pay for it in the future.

We cannot keep getting involved in conflict after conflict. We do not have the power, we do not have the will, and rightly so, and we do not have the money or the resources to do it. Perhaps through the leadership which we have demonstrated by implementing the convention on chemical weapons we can use the lessons we have learned here and bring Australia, New Zealand, Sweden and Norway together to influence the multinational organizations. If multinational organizations are going to continue to function in the way they have been since the end of the second world war, we will get the same results we have been getting since that time which are totally unacceptable.

• (1555)

We need a paradigm shift in the way we deal with the new threats we are going to have in the international community in foreign policy. As one of the few countries in the world that can take a leadership role in this, I ask that we engage in this not only for the benefit of the international community but also for the benefit of Canadians.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute of the question and comment period to compliment the hon. member on his vision of a safe, secure planet for all. I heard this in committee and in the House. I compliment the hon. member for that vision and I hope he never loses it.

As he mentioned in his speech the most successful thing about this bill is the co–operation experienced in developing the convention and when the bill was being worked on to put it through the House before the summer recess.

I want to take the opportunity to thank the Reform Party and the official opposition.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on third reading of Bill C–87 on the prohibition of chemical weapons. It is a particular pleasure considering that Bill C–87 seems to be one of the few government bills that has not been slapped with time allocation by the government.

It is a sad indicator of the state of our democracy that our government feels there should not be free and open debate on all the bills of substance that come before the House. When the Liberals were in opposition they went insane every time the Mulroney government imposed closure, especially on controversial bills like C–68, C–41 and C–85. Unfortunately, now that they have formed the government their tune has changed. As the Liberals and BQ were voting for closure and silencing democratic debate, they were laughing and joking as if they were having a grand old time. This behaviour is reprehensible and I would not have believed it if I had not seen it with my own eyes.

The use of closure on these highly controversial bills was particularly ironic considering that the government was willing to spend as many days as necessary for debate on things like the $2 coin. If there really was a time problem in Parliament, then why would the government not limit debate on that sort of bill? If there was a time problem, then why did it not resume debate on the controversial bills months ago, rather than ramming them through in the last two weeks before the summer break? The answer is simple: Time is not the problem. The problem is that the government is putting forward flawed legislation and a free and open debate would expose this to everyone.

Does the government really think the people of Canada do not see what it is doing? Do the Liberals think that if they stifle debate Canadians will not notice they are lining their own pockets with the outrageous MP pensions? Does the government think citizens do not realize it is giving special status under the law to sexual orientation? Will gun owners not notice their legitimate rights are being trampled on? No, on all counts.

Even though there is a temptation to play the government's ridiculous game, the Reform Party does support the chemical weapons convention which Canada signed in 1993. We will support the bill which allows Canada to be among the first group of countries to implement the convention's terms of agreement.

As all members of the House know, the Canadian commitment to peace is second to none in the world. This country invented the concept of peacekeeping and we have given strong support to the UN for many decades. Because of our history, Canada has also strongly supported international agreements and regimes to limit the dangers of war. The bill we are dealing with today falls into this category.

The chemical weapons convention deals with a category of weapons that are a blight on the world. Since the use of these weapons is considered illegitimate by almost everyone, the chemical weapons convention is dealing with a virtually universal norm. When I say universal, we must remember that there are notable exceptions which serve to remind us exactly why Canada must support the chemical weapons convention.

• (1600)

Everyone here in this House will remember with horror the terrible scenes of Kurdish villagers gassed by Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein in the late 1980s. A reoccurrence of this truly evil act must be prevented in the future. By ratifying Bill C–87 Canada will be doing its part toward that end.

More recent events in Japan again reminded Canadians about the threats posed by lethal chemicals. In Japan we had the tragic circumstance where a fanatical cult was able to manufacture the deadly nerve gas sarin and then use it to poison hundreds of people in the subway system.

Once the signatories to the chemical weapons convention pass their own enabling legislation and the convention comes into force, hopefully this kind of tragedy will become preventable. With stricter controls of chemical warfare agents and their precursors, it seems unlikely that a group would be able to stockpile the kinds of chemicals hoarded by the Japanese cult leaders. Hopefully this would be detected and the appropriate officials could respond to head off trouble before it got out of hand.

Bill C–87 prohibits the production and use of chemical weapons and provides for the regulation of certain chemicals that can easily be turned into chemical weapons. Over the summer and early fall similar pieces of legislation will be prepared throughout the world and hopefully by late this fall the chemical weapons convention will officially come into force.

Currently the vast majority of countries have signed this convention and the Reform Party is quite hopeful that this worldwide effort will be a long term success.

With few countries outside the convention there will be significant pressure on signatories to adhere strictly to the convention's goals and provisions. Unfortunately the Middle East is one part of the world where several countries are refusing to join the convention. These Arab states argue that because Israel is unwilling to join the nuclear non–proliferation treaty, NPT, they cannot sign on to this convention. I do not agree. While I share the hope of these countries that the Government of Israel will consider joining the non–proliferation treaty, I also believe that this chemical weapons convention is serving the best interests of peace everywhere and it is a separate matter.

Both the chemical weapons convention and the non–proliferation treaty are agreements in the best interests of all the people and governments of the world. Therefore neither should be used as a bargaining chip by governments.

Too many times in this world countries abuse international instruments of peace and selfishly use them to their own advantage. The most ready example of this is the current situation in Bosnia with which we are all familiar. Let me review what has occurred in Bosnia to illustrate my point.

Canadian troops first went to Bosnia over two years ago, hoping they could provide assistance and humanitarian relief to the people there. They also tried to keep combatants apart and facilitate a negotiated peace for the region. Unfortunately these laudable goals were not backed up by a UN mandate that could get the job done. With no leadership from Ottawa, our peacekeepers have been left twisting in the wind.

The warring parties in Bosnia have manipulated and abused the peacekeepers who were sent there to help them. For example, we all know about the ridiculous hostage takings by the Bosnian Serbs. This has not happened once or twice but time and time again. It is an insult and an outrage to all Canadians.

However the problems go deeper than the abuses by the Bosnian Serbs. Let me quote from an article in the Toronto *Star* on June 9. It states: "Canadian peacekeepers were dealt a double blow of life threatening harassment yesterday, not from the Bosnian Serbs but at the hands of the mainly Muslim Bosnian army. In one incident, in a trigger finger stand–off, the Bosnians pointed rocket propelled grenades, machine guns and pistols to prevent Canadians from reaching and retrieving a bulldozer stuck on a remote mountain road."

• (1605)

A second article states that on May 22 Bosnian military police supported by Bosnian soldiers ambushed two Canadian UN armoured vehicles near Vares. The police demanded that the vehicles be opened, a right they do not have. Canadians refused. Suddenly a truck moved from behind a building and 15 heavily armed men hit the ground. The Bosnian bandits took radios, walkmans, personal items, smoke grenades and a number of fragmentation grenades.

These articles show clearly the kind of abuse I am talking about. The Canadian government and the international community must work hard to ensure that this kind of ridiculous and flagrant abuse will not occur in the future and will not occur with the enforcement of the chemical weapons convention.

Moving on to the substance of Bill C–87, the Reform Party supports this bill although we have a few concerns for which we would like assurances. First and foremost, Reform is concerned about the cost to the taxpayers and to Canadian industry. While we acknowledge that this bill has legitimate costs, according to our information the government does not yet know the price tag on Bill C–87.

We would like the government's assurances that it will spend the taxpayers' money with the utmost discretion and that it will present the actual costs associated with Bill C–87 to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs once these become available.

Reform wants to ensure that the implementation of Bill C–87 will be as cost effective as possible. For example, the government must avoid the creation of a huge new bureaucracy to monitor and regulate the Canadian chemical industry.

Officials at Foreign Affairs have notified Reform that a full time staff of five as a "national authority" plus one additional staffer at foreign affairs might be needed. The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs should be mandated to ensure that it does not go beyond this.

Since Reform has agreed to move this bill speedily through committee we would also like assurances that the government will use the inspection powers in Bill C–87 most judiciously and cautiously. Reform does not want to see a recurrence of the scope of inspection powers granted in Bill C–68. Provided we receive this assurance and the government ensures that inspectors will treat legitimate Canadian industry with all the respect it deserves, then we will be satisfied.

Most important, when it comes to the inspection of industry the government must take all reasonable steps to ensure their privacy. Industries subject to inspection must fully comply with the inspectors or be subject to either summary conviction or conviction on indictment.

Under the more serious category of an indictable offence persons would be subject to up to five years in prison and a $500,000 fine. In the face of these rather serious Criminal Code penalties business people will be compelled to comply with inspection requests even if they feel their legitimate rights to privacy are being violated.

Under paragraphs 14(1)(b) and (c), the inspectors can examine:

> . . .any thing in the place being inspected; . . .make copies of any information contained in the records, files, papers or electronic information systems kept or used in relation to the place being inspected and to remove the copies from the place;

Although I know the intent of the legislation merely aims to fulfil the obligations of the convention, this wording could be interpreted more widely and Reform does not want to see this happen. Investigations could be used as fishing expeditions by the government to examine companies under a microscope. This would be totally unacceptable. The government must guarantee that all inspections are required to directly investigate whether companies are breaching the chemical weapons convention. Fishing expeditions should be specifically prohibited.

• (1610)

Under subclause 15(3) the bill states that search warrants would not be required, even if an inspector were refused entry to the premises, if there are "exigent circumstances". I would like to assume this clause is merely precautionary and is not intended for regular use. Under all circumstances except an extreme emergency, the government should obtain a search warrant where entry is refused. As we all know there are not many industries in Canada that currently make or use chemical weapons, so it seems very unlikely there will be any circumstances so pressing that a warrant cannot first be obtained before an inspection is conducted.

Moving to clause 20 of the bill we find the penalties for breaking the convention. I would like to hear from the government what exactly this clause means. It states:

> Every person who contravenes any provision of this act is guilty of an offence and liable

It goes on about either an indictable or a summary conviction. I would like to know who would be subject to punishment in a large company where there was an offence committed. If a clerk made a reporting error through negligence would that employee be convicted? Would the owner? Would the board of directors? Would the clerk's supervisor? This must be cleared up. I would appreciate the government's comments on this.

Other than the aforementioned cautions and the suggestions for government, I have no doubt Canadians will support the intent of Bill C–87. Canada has always been a strong supporter of multilateral efforts to promote peace and restrict arms proliferation. This is especially true with respect to the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons. By asserting leadership in this area Canada is standing up for the extension of a rules based, multilateral system to defend our interests and promote common norms and values with like–minded countries.

In conclusion, Reform would like to give its strong support for this bill. I am glad the Liberals in this House are not imposing closure on C–87 as they seem to be doing with every other important bill that goes through this House.

Once Bill C–87 is passed we hope the government will make its implementation as pain free as possible for industry while still upholding Canada's commitment under the chemical weapons convention. If it does this I am sure all Canadians will for once be proud of something we have accomplished in this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will take only a few minutes to speak again to a bill I consider very important and which I also had a chance to discuss at the second reading stage.

I think the importance of this bill cannot be overestimated. Its purpose is to implement a convention that was signed by several countries. The fact that we are now about to pass this bill bodes well for the future, because I am against all kinds of weapons. But I am also realistic. I think weapons of all kinds will be around for a long time. However, chemical weapons above all should be absolutely prohibited because they are cruel and inhumane.

I hope such weapons will never be used again, but we cannot ignore the fact that these weapons are used and have been used in the past and that they kill adults and children who are innocent of any involvement in wars or conflicts.

These weapons could also be used against groups who are against a given religion, for instance.

• (1615)

A whole congregation of Christians, Jews or Muslims can be destroyed with these weapons. They are not just used to wage war but also to defend all kinds of ideologies and, in the process to attack innocent people. That is why today I again want to take a few moments to condemn these horrifying weapons.

These weapons can make people chronically ill. People are attacked physically, and their health may suffer for the rest of their lives. They are very dangerous in that respect as well. These weapons can also contaminate soil and water, damage the health of animals and destroy plants. They have a disastrous impact on the environment and human beings.

These weapons can also breed further hostility, as the memory of the suffering and ill health they caused will linger, possibly generating further conflicts in the near future. I think that is why it is so important to destroy these chemical weapons as quickly as possible and thus prevent recurring conflicts between peoples and nations.

Bill C–87 says we must prohibit the stockpiling, sale and production of these chemical weapons, and I certainly agree with this bill. I hope that the agency responsible for enforcing the provisions of this convention will take all necessary steps to do so using diplomacy and also bringing trade pressures to bear on countries that do not comply with the convention or refuse to sign the convention. They should be punished by means of trade sanctions, and the agency should use diplomacy to ensure they ratify or comply with the convention.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to speak on Bill C–87, the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act.

The chemical weapons convention is an extremely important treaty for the international community and has special significance for Canadians. It was just over 80 years ago in April 1915 that Canadians were one of the first victims to experience the gas of the Ypres salient. It was only three years ago that allied soldiers in the Persian Gulf had to face the threat of Iraq using chemical weapons in defiance of the international community.

Ever since chemical weapons were used on that fateful day in 1915 the international community has tried to come up with an effective treaty to contain and eliminate the use and stockpiling of these weapons of mass destruction.

The first attempt to control chemical weapons was the Geneva protocol of 1925. Sadly the Geneva protocol was as fatally flawed as the many nuclear weapons treaties of the 1970s and 1980s.

It was an agreement to ban the first use of chemical weapons only. It failed to limit or control the manufacturing of these weapons and many nations felt obliged to manufacture and stockpile chemical weapons for retaliatory purposes if attacked first.

The quest to ban chemical weapons outright continued and I am proud to say that Canada played a major role in the negotiations that resulted in the chemical weapons convention, the first multilateral weapons treaty to ban a whole category of weapons of mass destruction.

This treaty could not have come at a better time. As I mentioned earlier, at least one state has used or threatened to use chemical weapons on its neighbours and on its own people. In Japan a religious cult is currently under investigation for its role in placing deadly chemical agents in the Tokyo subway system killing scores of innocent civilians. This treaty I believe is a significant step forward in reducing such threats to the international community.

• (1620)

Since the chemical weapons convention was open for signature in Paris in 1993 it has been signed by almost 160 countries and will be ratified after 65 nations enact it. Canada will be one of the first.

This is significant in itself. However what really makes the chemical weapons convention a major success is the substance in the treaty. The convention obliges all states parties that manufacture and stockpile chemical weapons to destroy all stocks and manufacturing facilities within a set timeframe. This is accomplished under the close scrutiny of international inspections, effectively banning the future development and stockpiling of these weapons. The system of verification and inspection is the most rigorous to ever be imposed in a multilateral agreement.

Of major significance is the safeguard this convention has against the clandestine manufacturing and stockpiling of chemical weapons through international monitoring and inspection of all such facilities that could be used for that purpose.

The convention does not stop there. It also extends international monitoring into the global civilian chemical industry. To facilitate the international monitoring of civilian chemical industries, three schedules of toxic chemicals which have been used as chemical weapons or are known as chemical weapons precursors have been drawn up.

Schedule 1 chemicals are known as chemical weapons. These include chemicals such as sarin, which was used by terrorists in Japan, and mustard gas which Canadians faced in the trenches in World War I. These are not widely available in Canada aside from applications in some research facilities. Under Bill C–87 these research facilities will be required to obtain a licence and undergo two annual inspections.

Schedule 2 chemicals are more widely available in Canada. Many chemicals in this schedule have numerous commercial applications but can be directly used to produce chemical weapons. Manufacturers of Schedule 2 items will have to undergo two annual inspections if their production exceeds a listed threshold.

Chemicals listed on these two schedules will be banned for export to nations not party to this convention.

Finally schedule 3 chemicals are widely manufactured and used in Canada. These chemicals could be used as chemical weapons if present in large enough quantities. Companies manufacturing these chemicals will be eligible for occasional inspections.

Industries that work with the chemicals outlined in the three schedules will have to report on their own activities to their governments which will in turn disclose this information to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. A group of international inspectors will have the authority to inspect any facility it deems necessary. In addition to the scheduled chemicals, the convention also provides for an overview of facilities which produce discrete organic chemicals that could be adapted to produce chemical weapons.

These producers of pesticides, fertilizers, paints, textiles and lubricants will be subject to report on their production activities and will be required to allow random inspections of their facilities.

This convention will also ensure that all states parties will abide by the convention.

A provision in the convention allows any states party to have the right to demand a challenge inspection or no right of refusal inspections of the facility it believes is not acting in accordance with the convention. In addition, states not signing the convention will find themselves affected. States parties will have restrictions on the export and import of scheduled chemicals with states not party to the convention.

While the substance of this convention is important and I hope it will assist in making the international community a safer place, I have two concerns I would like to raise for members' consideration.

• (1625)

First the convention is going to be expensive to implement. It can cost up to 10 times as much to destroy chemical weapons and their manufacturing facilities as it did to initially manufacture them.

While the cost in this regard to Canada will be minimal due to the fact that we do not stockpile or have manufacturing facilities for schedule 1 chemicals, less developed nations are going to have difficulty destroying their arsenals. Take Russia, for example. Russia has 40,000 to 60,000 tonnes of chemical weapons to destroy. This will cost billions of dollars that Russia does not have. International inspectors will have to be diligent to ensure that states like Russia are not taking shortcuts to dispose of their arsenals.

At the same time, Canada must take care not to be dragged into paying other nations' destruction expenses given our own financial circumstances.

Second the international community, Canada included, must not be under any illusion that this convention will result in the absolute elimination of the threat of chemical warfare. While important, this convention is only one step in that process. Its true success is to reduce the threat only. It must be remembered that a number of states will not sign nor adhere to the convention. These states, which will remain unnamed, can still stockpile, produce or obtain, through the black market, weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons. In addition, terrorists will still pursue chemical weapons as a means to fulfil their goals.

While the convention may assist the international community in preventing these states or terrorists groups from acquiring these weapons, it does not guarantee that they will succeed. It must also be remembered that states that will destroy their stockpiles also have the knowledge to produce these deadly agents again if that international community changes.

I would like to conclude by stating that this convention, while a contribution to international security, does not mean that we should lower our defences. Canada must remain vigilant in maintaining a strong and well armed military capability of engaging in combat in a variety of theatres, including the chemical weapons theatre.

We must recognize that rogue states and terrorists will try to obtain or produce these chemical weapons. We must keep a watchful eye on those intent on this destruction.

The Reform Party therefore supports the intent and the spirit of Bill C–67.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Postal services.

[*English*]

I also wish to inform the House that under the provisions of Standing Order 30, I am designating Tuesday, June 20, 1995 as the day fixed for the consideration of private member's Motion No. 425 standing in the name of the hon. member for Comox—Alberni.

This additional private members' hour will take place from 11.30 p.m. to 12.30 a.m., after which the House will proceed to the adjournment proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it was good of you to tell me that my private member's bill tomorrow night will be at a rather late hour. I am sure the audience will be enraptured.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C–87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction. It is the enabling legislation for the chemical weapons convention which Canada signed in 1993.

This convention prohibits the production and use of chemical weapons and provides for the regulation of certain chemicals which can readily be turned into chemical weapons. The convention is the result of over 20 years of negotiations.

The international community has been trying to outlaw chemical weapons and their use for over 100 years. This is the first time the whole category of weapons of mass destruction is to be eliminated.

• (1630)

Under international supervision all stockpiles of chemical weapons will be destroyed along with the facilities that produce them. This convention also enables a system of international supervision and inspection which will work to ensure such weapons will not be developed again. Under the terms of this convention, state parties are obliged to pass legislation that not only encompasses activities on their own territory but also prohibits their citizens from undertaking prohibited activities outside their area. States that own chemical weapons will have 10 years to destroy the weapons and production facilities.

Twenty–eight countries have ratified the convention to date and 65 countries will need to ratify the convention before it comes into effect. Canada will be among the first 65 countries out of approximately 132. The chemical weapons convention will take effect 180 days after the 65th state ratifies the agreement and tables it.

It is unfortunate to note however that the United States and Russia, the two countries that have the largest stockpiles of chemical weapons, have yet to sign on. Also, several middle eastern countries such as Iraq and Libya as well as North Korea have refused to participate because Israel will not join the nuclear non–proliferation treaty. This is of great concern given the recent use of chemical weapons in the gulf war by Iraq and more recently the use of chemical weapons to commit genocide within Iraq against the Kurds.

Chemical weapons continue to be a threat to world security. The need for international agreements to remove these weapons of massive destruction is very critical indeed. Chemical weapons are not only a threat to troops in times of war but also to civilians at all times. Only a few weeks ago we witnessed with horror how chemical weapons were tragically unleashed on unsuspecting Tokyo commuters. Shortly afterward, stockpiles of sarin, one of the chemicals scheduled in this bill, were found in Japan.

This convention may not prevent individual incidents of chemical weapons attacks. However, the implementation of the act will make it more difficult for such weapons to be created. In this way it may deter future incidents.

Eighty years ago, on August 15, 1915, Canadian soldiers were the first to be subjected to a systematic gas attack in the trenches in Belgium. On that day Canadian soldiers choked and fell to the ground writhing from chlorine and mustard gas released by the Germans. Many Canadians died that day and many would suffer lifelong ailments as a result of being gassed. My grandfather was among those to be gassed during the great war and he carried the scars for the rest of his life.

Mustard gas was one of the most effective gases used during the first world war. When the vapour touched the skin it immediately caused huge blisters, then blindness and when inhaled, the gas blistered the lungs resulting in death. Only recently the Kurds suffered this same fate from mustard gas.

Canadians are fortunate to live in a country that does not possess chemical weapons or have chemical weapons production facilities. Provisions in the treaty related to chemical weapons or chemical weapon production facilities therefore do not apply to Canada except in the area of trade. The main impact of this convention on Canada comes from provisions relating to industrial activity contained in the three schedules of this bill.

I was going to briefly outline these schedules but I will bypass this section. My colleague outlined the schedules in his speech which will be recorded in *Hansard.*

The Reform Party supports this bill. Canada has always been a strong supporter of multilateral efforts to promote peace and restrict arms proliferation, especially with the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons. Canada's participation in this treaty will encourage other non–participating countries to hopefully follow suit.

A few issues need to be addressed by government before the legislation is implemented. For example, although the government has been consulting with industry for years on this topic, the government still cannot provide any figures regarding the cost of implementing this bill. It is difficult to determine exactly what the government is proposing to do without seeing these figures.

• (1635)

The government has also not been able to provide any specific details regarding the exact size of the new bureaucracy which will be associated with the implementation of the legislation. Canadians need to know the size of the bureaucracy and exactly what is being proposed. It would be useful if the government would supply these items before tabling bills rather than expecting Canadians to simply sign a blank cheque.

Members opposite mentioned on second reading that the legislation represents the most balanced and cost effective means of implementing the convention. However, those statements are meaningless because we simply cannot assess the legislation without first looking at the figures. It is important that we not create another huge level of bureaucracy. Officials at foreign affairs said that it may take as few as five or six staff, and this sounds reasonable.

There are also problems with section 15(3) which need to be worked out. This section states that exigent circumstances would make it unnecessary to obtain a search warrant when an inspector is refused entry. We need to clarify what is meant by exigent circumstances in the bill. As it stands, this could be open to very broad interpretation and may infringe on the rights and liberties of individuals if a definition is not clearly provided.

There are also problems with section 20 which states that every person who contravenes any provision of the act is guilty of an offence. That sounds like a presumption of guilt and given this presumption the implications in section 23 are far too broad.

It also states that where a person has been convicted of an offence under the act, anything seized by means of which, or in respect of which the offence was committed, is forfeited to Her Majesty in right of Canada and shall be disposed of as the minister sees fit. The provisions for confiscation are particularly open ended and it is unclear what is meant by them. Is the minister taking liberties to confiscate possessions, property, illegal chemicals or is he merely gathering evidence needed for a trial? I am concerned about these areas and we need some clarification.

We must ensure that individual rights and liberties are protected when we set out powers of inspection. Sections 13(c), 14(b) and 14(c) warrant close examination and careful clarification before they are set into law. Protection to ensure that authority for inspection is not abused must be included in the bill.

There are also questions about who will pay for the costs of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. This large worldwide organization will have up to 1,000 staff and will operate with an annual budget of $150 million to $180 million. Members will also have to contribute to international inspection expenses and costs of elimination of chemical weapons and facilities.

It is unclear where these overall costs will come from and how much Canada will have to commit to. It is important that given our current fiscal situation Canada not be too generous in its contributions. We must be frugal because we just do not have the money.

There are several areas of concern in the bill which must be addressed before it becomes law. However, Canada's participation in the convention should and will be absolute. Despite the need for clarification in the bill, I am pleased to say that I agree with its spirit and intent and I am pleased to support the bill before the House today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I would like to make a personal note with respect to the remark made regarding private member's Motion No. M–425 tomorrow evening being from 11.30 p.m. to 12.30 a.m. Of course that would be prime time in Comox—Alberni.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this much needed bill. I am also pleased to hear about the treaty and the signing of it. The legislation is a real motherhood and maple syrup issue. No one can disagree that chemical weapons are a danger to our planet Earth and must be controlled.

Once again the government has shown its failure to understand the situation. The government is not proposing banning chemical weapons because it is the right thing to do, it is proposing to rush the legislation through for political reasons. Canadians should not confuse the government's intentions in the process the bill is receiving. This government wants passage of this bill because if Canada is one of the first 65 governments to ratify the convention the government will receive political favours.

• (1640)

Just as this government has told Canadians that the firearm control bill was for public safety and the sentencing bill was a deterrence on crime, this government will tell Canadians this bill makes the world a safer place. Just as Bill C–68 was not about public safety and Bill C–41 was not about a deterrence for criminals, this bill is not about world safety in the eyes of government. This bill is about giving this government bragging rights.

Recent events have shown that chemical weapons are becoming the weapons of choice among terrorists. The sarin attack in Japan has shown that terrorists can do the maximum physical and psychological damage at low cost. The attacks on Kurds in Iraq have shown that civilian populations are at the mercy of those who control chemical weapons.

We on this side totally agree that measures must be put into place to monitor and detect those who could easily obtain chemicals to spread terror. Canadians must understand this bill will not guarantee that terrorists cannot obtain, combine and release certain chemicals upon an unsuspecting public. This bill only approves monitoring of certain chemicals that could be dangerous, just as Bill C–68 only monitors law–abiding firearms owners.

Just as Bill C–68 cannot prevent criminals from using illegally obtained firearms to wreak havoc upon Canadians, this bill will not prevent determined terrorists from illegally obtaining the chemicals they need. The justice minister continually told Canadians that the gun legislation was necessary for public safety but later admitted no legislation could prevent those criminals truly wishing to use an illegal firearm from using one in the commission of a crime. Let us not hear any talk from those opposite that this bill will make public safety certain. This bill will not do that.

What could have prevented those wishing to use chemicals as a weapon is tougher sentencing. Unfortunately the justice minister did not do that in this bill or in Bill C–41. Instead of sending a message to terrorists and would–be criminals that Canada will take a tough stand to stop the use of chemical weapons by imposing severe sentences on dangerous criminals who consider this, the government offered alternative measures in Bill C–41 and no measures in this bill.

We on this side of the House readily admit and know one important fact that the government either cannot or will not admit. We know there are criminals who cannot be treated or rehabilitated. These criminals are the kind who would use chemical weapons. Those are the individuals who require severe sentences up to and including life in prison. Life in prison for those opposite means life: no review, no conditional release, no end of sentence release. Life means incarceration until the criminal is no longer able to threaten Canadians. It means the criminal never returns to society.

The government had the opportunity in Bill C–41 to enhance this legislation by including severe sentencing. The government instead rushed this bill through the House to enhance its reputation rather than to send a message to criminals in this bill or in Bill C–41.

Instead we get legislation that makes it a severe crime to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation but no increased sentencing for those who use chemical weapons upon helpless victims. This government always puts legislation together that promises more than it delivers. Just as the government would tell Canadians this bill is to enhance public safety, the real reason for this bill is so some of those opposite can bask in the limelight of world opinion.

If this government wanted to deter the use of chemical weapons, it could have and should have included sections in this bill to change the Criminal Code, to put in punishing long sentences for anyone dealing with or using chemical weapons. This government states it is bound by international obligations to include punitive criminal sentences in Bill C–7, an act respecting the control of certain drugs introduced by the Minister of Health.

This government states international obligations obligate it to pass this legislation. I do not see any punitive sentencing measures in this bill. As I said, the bill is the right thing to do but the reason the government is doing it may not be so.

• (1645)

Instead of introducing legislation for public safety and the public good, the government is introducing the legislation for its individual praise from the world community.

If the government wanted to send the message that the use of chemical weapons will not be tolerated instead of simply pushing an inspection bill through the House to gain personal glory, it should have included measures that will deter criminals from even thinking about using chemical weapons.

If the government can increase sentences for users of soft drugs it can increase sentences for users of dangerous chemicals weapons, but it has not. I will support this inspection bill even though it has no measures that deter criminals. The government has failed in that respect.

The government joins the United States in the failed attempt of its war on drugs by removing civil liberties by allowing inspectors to read medical files of Canadians. It increased jail sentences for casual soft drug users because the United States told it so. The government will not legislate increased sentences for the use of chemical weapons.

Half measures and dreams of glory on the international stage fuel the government's desire to rush the bill. Perhaps now that the voters of Ontario have chosen Reform principles of justice the government may change its bleeding heart ways not because it is the right thing to do, not because it may lose votes if it does not; it will do it because it is the right thing to do. It is too bad the government once again chose the wrong reasons.

We fully support the bill as an initial step in deterring the crime of the use of chemical weapons of any nature.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak this afternoon if for no other reason than the temperature in the Chamber is bearable.

It is an honour to speak on third reading of Bill C–87, an act to implement the prohibition of the production and use of chemical weapons. I join most members of the world community in abhorring the use of chemical weapons.

This proposed legislation takes into account many concerns and tries to establish a compromising balance between these concerns. It acknowledges the devastation caused by the horrendous use of chemical weaponry as well as the ongoing studies and testing of these substances for future development.

The convention modernizes the 1925 Geneva protocol which was an international attempt to limit the use of chemical weapons after the first world war. This protocol was brought to present day standards by having observed past experiences and having learned from them. We now realize that putting a ban solely on the use of chemical weapons left many areas open and

allowed the stockpiling of such weapons but closed the doors for use and further study.

Bill C–87 is the act to implement the more recent convention of 1993 and realizes there are many uses of chemicals and outlines both the positive and negative aspects. The 1993 convention ensured states would not stockpile chemical weaponry for retaliation against future attacks or to instigate war. If they did they would face the condemnation of the world and sanctions as well.

Canada has always been among the first to initiate peace. In 1983 Canada made large contributions to the committee that developed and outlined a treaty on disarmament leading to the conclusion of discussions in 1992 when Canada was urging a ban on all warfare to be accepted internationally. There is now such a ban on the use of chemical weapons which caused such brutality. It is this ban we are discussing in the House today.

The convention involves not only those who engage in war but also those industries using chemical substances in their production and testing. This is where Canada assumes its role in the convention.

• (1650)

Canada will primarily be enforcing the legislation when it comes to the importing and exporting of chemicals listed in the three schedules. Canada does not own chemical weapons nor do we contain any manufacturing facilities that do so. Therefore our role in implementing the convention is fortunately not very complex.

In 1915 Canadian soldiers were victims of the first gas attack during World War I. The 1925 Geneva protocol had a certain amount of control on the use of these weapons but was not able to completely rid their usage.

Recently we have seen chemical weapons used in the Iran–Iraq war, in Japan and by Iraq against its own civilian Kurdish peoples, among others. This convention, which will be headed by the organization for the prohibition of conventional weapons, will enforce legislation in all the signatory countries prohibiting chemical weapon usage and will hopefully have the international support and pressure to impose greater sanctions against those contravening these policies.

Areas of legislation included in today's convention include verification policies, creation of an organization to implement them, specific guidelines with regard to levels of chemical ability as well as processes for destroying weapons and their plants.

The verification regime, which is global, is to ensure these weapons of mass destruction will never be developed again. The international monitoring system will safeguard against weapon production by inspecting all facilities which are or were used for these purposes. This system does not affect Canada as there are no facilities here. This verification process will also be extended into other chemical industries.

Three schedules are to be used in ensuring no chemical weapons are or can be manufactured. Industries using such chemicals will be required to report annually and each government of the signatory countries will be required to report to the international organization, the OPCW.

In Canada the Minister of Foreign Affairs will designate officials who will act as Canada's national authorities. Canadian officials will collect information from Canadian industries and transmit it to the OPCW for inspecting purposes. However international inspection teams have the right to conduct inspections without warrant in accordance with the provisions of this convention. It contains appropriate provisions for inspection and keeps them in accordance with the need to protect privacy.

As will be a requirement of other countries, Canada will enact legislation in the Criminal Code providing penalties, fines and imprisonment for warlike use or production of chemicals. Legislation will protect but keep a close eye on usage of these chemicals for medicinal purposes as well as for pesticides, fertilizers, paints, textiles and lubricants.

The convention will also require state organizations to enforce restrictions on the export and import of schedule chemicals with states that have not signed the convention. All chemicals on the list will therefore be subject to the Import and Export Permits Act. Although there are restrictions which will be imposed on exports to suspect states, the legislation has balanced these restrictions with the desire to liberalize trade for industries and medicinal purposes.

The schedules which will be used in identifying chemical legality are in three groups. The first contains chemicals such as mustard gas. Some other chemicals in this same group are used in pharmaceuticals and in cancer research. Schedule 2 consists of chemicals which are precursors to schedule 1, chemical weapons. Schedule 3 contains the least powerful of the three groups, often used in industry but can also be used as weapons when in large quantities.

Each group will be under scrutiny, whether it be checks and balances, limited amounts permissible or whether they must obtain a licence and pay a fee to use them.

Under international supervision all stockpiles and producing facilities of chemical weapons will be destroyed within a given time frame. Given this, the legislation will have to consider economic implications. There will be a 10–year limit for states to destroy their stockpiles and facilities. However a 10–year extension is also allowed which has stricter controls. I have a problem with this 10–year extension because if we continue to allow extensions on the destruction of these facilities we are allowing them to remain for greater use.

The Reform Party supports Bill C–87 and would like to see it implemented immediately. Canada has always been a strong supporter of multilateral efforts to promote peace and restrict arms proliferation.

• (1655)

By accepting the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and eventually on their destruction Canada is promoting common norms and values with like minded countries.

Reform acknowledges the government has consulted for many years on this topic but still does not know how much it will cost to implement nor the exact size of the bureaucracy to be created. Foreign affairs has speculated a full time staff of five as a national authority plus one staffer at foreign affairs might be needed. We would like to make sure the bureaucracy does not expand beyond this.

Section 15(3) states exigent circumstances would make it unnecessary to obtain a search warrant when an inspector is refused entry. This should be clarified. The wording in section 20 also seems too broad. Section 23 states:

> Where a person has been convicted of an offence under this act, any thing seized by means of which or in respect of which the offence was committed is forfeited to Her Majesty in right of Canada and shall be disposed of as the minister directs.

Exactly what could be confiscated under this provision is unclear. The powers of inspection should not be allowed to get out of control. Reform does support this legislation and hopes there will be some accountability in its enforcement to see it is not used unnecessarily.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed from May 29 consideration of the motion that Bill C–88, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate Bill C–88, a bill to implement the internal trade agreement signed last July by the various participants.

Last July the Prime Minister and the premiers came together in Ottawa to announce an agreement had been reached to break down the barriers of internal trade between provinces.

Canadians were hopeful that at last barriers would come down and they would have free access to goods and services, jobs and the competitive marketplace because the trade barriers between provinces would be broken down.

The agreement reached was said to be an important part of the Liberal promise to build an innovative economy within which all Canadians would benefit. It was touted as a vision for the future and it reflected well on the premiers and the Prime Minister. Canadians were happy.

Today, almost a year later, the euphoria has died and Canadians are questioning the vision they saw one year ago. Last July the premiers and the Prime Minister held up the internal trade agreement as a reflection of unity but Quebecers did not see it that way. They responded by electing a PQ government in their province. The premiers and the Prime Minister held up the agreement saying: "This is what we can do for one another". The then premier of Quebec was defeated in the subsequent election.

They said the agreement was a reflection of growth, but the inadequacy inherent in maintaining the status quo saw little job creation. Within the last five months job creation has dwindled to practically nothing.

Last July the premiers and the Prime Minister held up the internal trade agreement as a reflection of stability, but months later Moody's bond rating service put Canada on the alert then downgraded our credit rating because our debtload remained too high.

• (1700)

Today this House is being asked to ignore those undercurrents and put that internal trade agreement into practice by passing Bill C–88. The Reform Party of Canada cannot do this. We cannot support an agreement that so blatantly ignores the necessity to pull this country away from the edge of permanent economic instability. We came to Ottawa to prevent that. We came to champion the right of Canadians to a balanced budget, to deficit reduction, to more effective government, to a productive and stable economy and to national unity.

Despite the rhetoric that flies across this room every day, we have made every effort to keep that promise. By challenging this bill we remain true to that mandate given to us by our constituents who have asked again and again for freedom from internal trade barriers.

By not supporting this bill we know we run the risk of being accused of not supporting free trade in Canada. I ask Canadians to recognize that kind of accusation is a political move and not the truth.

Let us make it absolutely clear this afternoon that the Reform Party of Canada is committed to the removal of interprovincial barriers to trade through agreements among the provinces but we will not support any so–called agreement under the guise of freer internal trade when that agreement does not achieve this.

The Reform Party cannot support any internal trade agreement that does not once and for all recognize that the barriers to internal trade in this country are killing our marketplace. Higher taxes, a higher cost of living and an uncompetitive marketplace create a heavy and unnecessary burden on Canadians and guarantee the deterioration of our economy.

Bill C–88 I subdmit is a disguise for a non–agreement which purports to improve internal trade in Canada and improve our economic stability but does neither.

The Liberal government won an election on a promise to build a better Canada, to get Canadians employed and to ensure a stabilized economy. If this government truly seeks revitalization then it must admit that this agreement fails to keep that promise because it fails to eliminate internal trade barriers in this country.

I would like to believe that the government is committed to the future of this country but I cannot as long as politically motivated agreements like this one are held up as agreements. Canadians are looking for strong leadership, not the kind of leadership that is acted out every night on television, but real leadership, the kind that works hard behind the scenes at achieving what is best for our country. For months we were led to believe that this was happening and last July we had hoped to see the effects, but it did not materialize. What we witnessed was a photo opportunity and nothing more.

Canadians did not see progress. The government did not realize our goals. It did not put our economy on a better footing and Canadians continue to pay the price.

Some may think it is easy for me to stand or to sit on this side of the House and criticize the government for failing to produce an effective agreement. I am well aware of the difficulties involved in negotiating with many different parties. I know it is important to ensure fairness and the democratic process and that these be observed and to avoid dictating what is best. However when the stakes are high, when the best interests of the nation lie at the mercy of the government leaders, then I know that the time has come and the place has been arranged for strong and courageous leadership.

If I have one criticism this afternoon it is that the Liberal government failed to provide the necessary leadership. In an effort to avoid creating enemies it opened up a nothing lost, nothing gained, be happy approach. What we got was nothing gained and almost everything lost.

This country is threatening to break apart. Canadians no longer have that sense of unity they should have. Now more than ever we need leadership that will bring us together at every possible opportunity. Failure to bring about a good internal trade agreement only serves to enforce our differences, create more barriers and reveal a lack of confidence in ourselves.

• (1705)

The internal trade agreement was a failure. The blame must lie squarely and we must lay it squarely on the federal government. I believe the government failed in its mandate to first and foremost preserve the country. The government not only had an obligation to the future of the country to see that this happened, it had a vision to carry out, a vision that was created many years ago when the nation was first born.

In 1867 Canadian leaders saw fit to entrench within the Constitution these wise words: "All articles of the growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union, be admitted free into each of the other provinces". That is section 121 of the Constitution Act. In that section there was an agreement that was a true reflection of unity and a commitment to growth and stability.

Perhaps in those days it was easier to recognize the danger. In those days, in our bid to resist American pressures and maintain a distinct culture, we could see that strengthening our internal economic ties would be the foundation of our identity and our unity. In the Constitution was laid the reflection of courage and co–operation, of government doing what was right and fair for the Canadian people and an example of strong leadership.

Today we face a greater danger. It is a danger because we failed to recognize it ourselves. We are spurred on by protectionist attitudes that really serve no one. We have reached a critical point and it is time for strong leadership to prevail.

We are a big country, a beautiful country. We have a small population. We are a wealthy country. However we are not an economic power in the world. We are a vast land of people with different orientations. That is our identity. However we have lost sight of the common ground: our economic alliance, one with another.

In 1867 the leaders of the day recognized the need for leadership and an economic alliance. They added section 91, which declared that the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to the regulation of trade and commerce, the very essence of what we are talking about in Bill C–88 and the internal trade agreement.

The Constitution recognizes that government leadership must begin by assuring economic stability to ensure the survival and unity of our country. That is why the Reform Party of Canada has made it the foundation of its mandate and why every day in the

House we fight for economic stability. It is why we debate the bill and why we cannot support it, because the government has failed to see the urgency in removing internal trade barriers for the good of the economy and has failed to reaffirm the objectives of section 121 of the Constitution, the free flow of articles of growth, produce and manufacture.

By ignoring the precedent of section 121 of the Constitution the successive governments of the country have assured an atmosphere of protectionism, disunity and almost certainly economic vulnerability. That is why this agreement and this bill fall short.

My colleagues have stood during this debate and pointed out a number of deficiencies inherent in the agreement and in the bill. One emotion that has prevailed throughout is frustration. Their frustration comes from not being able to say Canada is a nation of free trade. Many are embarrassed to acknowledge that there is freer trade north and south between Canada and the United States than there is east and west among the provinces and territories of Canada. They are frustrated, as are all Canadians, because they can see the way toward economic rejuvenation being thwarted. They can see the opportunities that exist for them in their ridings and in their home industries if those barriers are removed, as local industries are given a fair and competitive chance to become national industries. They are frustrated because they must answer the difficult questions of constituents who want to know why their industries are not doing better and why those industries are laying off people in times when the government purports that jobs are being created.

If this nation would commit to breaking down internal trade barriers Canadian industries would flourish. Entrepreneurs would find a reason to create innovation. Investors would find a reason to support the innovation and innovation would build the economy.

• (1710)

Once we have created an innovative economy internally we will be poised to enter into the global marketplace and we will succeed there. In the process, we will have obtained many things: a strong economy and more importantly pride in ourselves and confidence in our abilities.

Canada has the potential to be more than just a collection of small protected markets, but governments must implement the means that will change what currently exists. I believe Canadians deserve that chance. Canadians deserve the rewards of an open market, job mobility and economic stability, not the provincial protectionism that creates high taxes, low productivity and unemployment. This agreement will not provide those rewards and this bill will not implement an agreement that will provide them.

It is time to stop hiding behind regional development schemes, equalization payments and cost sharing agreements. It is time the inefficient government policies were thrown away rather than contributing to the financial burden on Canadian taxpayers. It is time the provinces stopped working on the false premise that exclusivity will protect their own markets. It is time the inherently weak marketplace created by protectionist policies gave way to vital marketplaces, strong, self–sufficient industries and real job creation.

The bond markets have made it clear that we can no longer continue the premise of borrowing more and more and creating a perpetual debt. The demise of our economy will not come some day, it will come soon because we have failed to act as a nation and correct the wrongs that pull us down. It is time to revive our nationality so we can say we have our wealth in common not our debt.

It is time for strong leadership to set in motion the process of eliminating internal trade barriers. The strong leadership we want will pull together the commitment of governments at all levels, business, labour and taxpayers, all the contributors. Together we can build a common market, establish compatible standards of licensing, certification, education and create the mobility and open markets that will become the fertile ground for new industries and generate innovation.

It is time to shut out the protectionists, the naysayers and weak leadership, the businesses built on protectionism provided by internal trade barriers and the governments with poor, ineffective policies which cost the taxpayers. Those things should be stopped.

The plan has been laid out for us. In 1992 the committee of ministers for internal trade adopted these guiding principles, which we should note carefully: one, that governments treat people, goods, services and capital equally irrespective of where they originate in Canada; two, that governments reconcile standards and regulations to provide for the free movement of people, goods, services and capital within Canada; three, that governments ensure that their administrative policies operate to provide for the free movement of people, goods, services and capital within Canada.

Those are strong, good, solid principles. These were the guiding principles necessary to ensure a successful agreement but they were not implemented. It is time for this government to show leadership that is necessary to enact these principles.

I say to the Liberal government, tear up Bill C–88, go back to the bargaining table, apply the principles of the CMIT and the spirit of the Constitution and build something meaningful, something we can support. Fashion an agreement that will build trust among the provinces and give them the courage to break down the barriers. Let us do what is right for Canadians and rebuild trust in our democratic process. Let us acknowledge Canadians' right to economic unity and their desire to declare their sovereignty.

Canadians will not be served well should this bill pass. It does not reflect the government's commitment to building an innovative economy, except for one exception which is the deletion of part III of the vehicle and transportation act. This particular section within the proposed bill is the only section that was not part of the internal agreement negotiated a year ago. It is also the only provision in this act that does in fact put into practice the provisions of sections 121 and 91 of the Constitution Act. Other

than that this bill does not reflect the process which begins on the right footing.

• (1715)

It does not reflect a country built on the principles of freedom, democracy and unity. In fact it goes beyond that. There is a provision within the bill which allows the governor in council under certain conditions to amend and to suspend application of any provision legal or otherwise of another province or department.

It is unpardonable to think that Parliament should be able to tell another government: "The particular law that you passed, you cannot have it any more because we are going to suspend its operation". It does not inspire a sharing of ideas, products, technologies and people. There is no structure for innovation in it and nowhere for the talents and skills of the people of the country to grow and provide stability.

We must try to do it now and not later. Canadians deserve the chance to develop into a nation of free traders before their industries are exposed to the larger global market. If we do that Canada will be ready to take advantage when the moment comes, and that moment is coming quickly.

I urge the government to go back to the bargaining table. I urge the government to show a strong leadership and not just political rhetoric. I urge the government to provide Canadians with a free interprovincial trade agreement and begin the process of economic rejuvenation.

It will symbolize to Canadians and everyone in the world, but more important to us and our young people in particular, that we are a confident people, strong and self-assured. We are an economically stable, united nation with the ability and skills required to face the challenge of a modern world.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member. I have to say I am not exactly sure what the hon. member really wishes to do to try to get free trade within the country.

On a number of occasions the hon. member was urging the federal government to abandon the consultative process which resulted in the bill before us today. One year ago July 13 senior governments in Canada—the 10 provinces, the federal government and the two territorial governments—arrived at a consensus.

A little later in his speech he talked about the government using its heavy hand because there was a section in the legislation that may allow it, given certain circumstances under the Constitution by the way to disallow provincial legislation.

He cannot have it both ways. What does the hon. member find so offensive about a process that has finally arrived at a framework under which all governments in the country, federal, provincial and territorial, have agreed to reduce internal barriers to trade? What process would he want to put in its place? This process has been under way since 1987. The agreements that were reached in July of last year were agreements that were reached after seven years of negotiations.

Would he have the federal government use the heavy hand, the constitutional powers he says we have, to completely abandon a moral requirement for consultation in these areas? Would he have us roll over the rights of provincial governments? Would he have us abandon the consultative process? Would he have us abandon the basics of the agreement on internal trade, specifically the section that deals with the affirmation of constitutional rights and responsibilities since he spoke a lot about them, the general rules section which sets out the obligations for activities governed by the act, a special rules section which sets out the particular ways in which the rules apply in the 10 sectors covered by the agreement, and the section that sets out administrative provisions and the dispute resolution mechanism?

Surely the hon. member opposite knows that when we are dealing in the area of trade it is not as easy as walking in and saying: "Here is what I want; therefore that is what I get". This is a process of negotiation similar to what was done with the free trade agreement with the United States. It was probably a little easier in the free trade agreement with the United States because we were only dealing with two governments. Indeed when we were dealing with the NAFTA we were dealing with three governments. In Canada, because of our constitutional structure, we were dealing with 13 governments.

Should we abandon the consultative process which he seems to have condemned in his remarks and use the available tool albeit blunt in our Constitution, or does he say that we should abandon the process and start again? Which does he want? Does he want consultation or does he want heavy handed federal action in this area?

Mr. Schmidt: Mr. Speaker, that is probably one of the most thought provoking questions I have heard in the House for a long time. I appreciate the question. It is a good one.

• (1720)

In no way do I wish to suggest that the consultative process is not a good one. It is a good process and one that should be observed, absolutely. However there comes a time when the consultative process breaks down and does not result in an agreement. Then senior government has to come in and make some essential changes.

Another point I recognize is that the primary criticism is not in the process. There is no criticism of the process. The criticism is in bringing to the House a bill which says we have an agreement. It is not an agreement. There are major parts of the economy of Canada that are totally exempted from the agreement.

Let me mention one area. The whole energy sector is exempted from the agreement. It is not a complete agreement. Yet it was presented as if it were.

I say again that consultation is essential, but leadership is also essential in a country when the consultative process breaks down. The three principles in my speech are the ones we ought to take forward. The responsibility lies with the Parliament of Canada to say that we have to solve the question. We can go this far and then we have to say that we have consulted so long but there is an end to the process.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. colleague for Okanagan Centre, whom I have the pleasure of meeting regularly on the Standing Committee on Industry, how he can question not only the bill before us, C–88, and clause 9, which the Reform Party condemns with us, but also the agreement reached by the provinces, the territories and the federal government after seven or eight years of negotiations?

Is is not rather presumptuous of the Reform Party to question something that all these elected officials and all these governments agreed on, with such difficulty, I might add? Is this not the extent to which Canadian leaders had agreed to agree in a certain number of areas? Is it relevant to tear up the agreement, as my colleague puts it?

It stands to reason he would condemn the bill. However, it is another matter to tear up the agreement and reject the efforts of the premiers or ministers of trade who worked on this agreement. Is it not going too far to call the entire process into question?

[*English*]

Mr. Schmidt: Mr. Speaker, I think that was a very thoughtful question.

No, I am not calling into question the fact that the premiers got together to work on things. That is commendable. However to suggest that what they agreed to was meaningful and actually resolved some of the trade barriers is false because the trade barriers were not eliminated in many instances.

We are supposedly being presented with a breakdown of internal trade barriers in Canada, but I submit to the House that is not the case. We are being led to believe something which is not complete. We should not be led to believe that it is complete. It is not.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I gave away a little of my firepower in questions to the hon. member opposite. I indicated to the hon. member that it was very clear when I read the documents relating to the bill that nobody on this side of the House believes this is the be all and end all.

The Prime Minister in his remarks last year when this was all done clearly indicated that he thought it was a step, albeit a small but very necessary step, toward the full removal of internal trade barriers in Canada.

I understand what the hon. member was speaking about. I also understand that sometimes we have to crawl before we walk and walk before we run. There is no question the bill is long overdue. There is no question that the internal trade barriers perpetuated by various provincial governments, with the blessing of the federal government because perhaps in the past the federal government has not shown the necessary leadership, have caused a real mishmash of provincial trade barriers not just in the movement of goods and services but also of people. It is fair to say to individuals watching that the bill is a step in the right direction.

• (1725)

The hon. member opposite mentioned that it did not apply to the energy sector. That is exactly right. By the time the agreement was signed last year there was no agreement among the 13 players on how we should treat the energy sector. If my reading of the memorandums of last year is correct, it was agreed that there would be some framework to deal with the energy sector by the end of this month.

The hon. member raised some good points. If he waits 10 days—and perhaps we could wait 10 days—he will see the process concluded and there will be some guidelines, rules and framework for the energy sector.

It is clear the bill is long overdue. It does not impose anything on the provinces. It simply reaffirms the requirement in legislation of the federal government to fulfil the commitments made last year when the agreement was made. The bill provides a federal legislative framework. It does not impose anything on anyone. It encourages the type of debate that has taken place in the past and the consensus building that has arrived at the framework of today.

I mentioned that perhaps it was easier to conclude the free trade deal with the United States because there were only two partners, or the NAFTA because there were only three partners, than it was to deal with the Canadian provinces and territories.

Everybody knows there is a problem within Canada. Everybody knows there are certain things that must be done to make us more competitive. One only has to look at some of the areas that are covered. The agreement covers 10 very specific areas: procurement of goods, services and construction; investment; labour mobility; consumer related measures; agricultural and food goods; alcoholic beverages; natural resource processing;

communications and transportation; and environmental protection. It is a step in the right direction.

I want to focus my speech a little away from the bill per se and at a microcosm of some of the problems in Canada. I want to specifically focus on Atlantic Canada. There are four Atlantic provinces including the three maritime provinces of P.E.I., New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. It is very clear to me as a student of history and a student of Murray Beck, a political scientist who has written some very good and thought provoking accounts of the political history of Nova Scotia, that Nova Scotia has always felt it was at a disadvantage in Confederation.

Prior to Confederation we were free traders. All one has to do is look at our location. We are stuck out on the northeastern coast of North America. We have the closest deep water, ice free port in Halifax to the great circle route. We were great world traders. When we got into Confederation it started to change because the trading patterns were forced by regulation and by legislation to be east–west when we normally should have been trading across the ocean and north–south.

My friends from the Bloc Quebecois might be interested to know that the first secessionist movement in Canada did not happen in the province of Quebec but in the province of Nova Scotia. There was great debate shortly after Confederation on whether or not the province should stay. We chose the right course and we chose to stay even though there were some restrictions to our growth. We decided the way to deal with it was to stay in a larger unit and to try to address the problems.

Since the 1970s the Council of the Maritime Premiers realized that three small provinces, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, had less than two million people and had far too many barriers to internal trade in that small region. Each of those provinces had its own professional accreditation boards. A pipe fitter in New Brunswick may not have been able to work on a job in P.E.I., or a barber in P.E.I. may not have been able to cut hair in Nova Scotia. Those were the barriers to trade set up during that many decade period of protectionism in an effort to create jobs and keep them in each area.

We have had much talk in Atlantic Canada about how we must become more competitive and less reliant on government. If we go back to 1989 there was a gentleman by the name of Dr. Charles McMillan who wrote a very good document called "Standing Up to the Future" in which he talked about the need for maritime Canada to take up the challenge of integrating our economies. He said very clearly that governments must pursue a strategic program and that economic integration is a key to economic prosperity. He said:

> The strategy must be based on eliminating trade barriers, encouraging new investment and being outward oriented.

• (1730)

Back in 1989, after almost 19 or 20 years of having the Council of Maritime Premiers, it was clear we recognized the requirement of reducing internal barriers to trade.

In 1991, after Dr. McMillan's paper had been around for about a year and a half, the Council of Maritime Premiers responded very forcefully and effectively. It came up with the Maritime Procurement Act which stated that for goods tendered for $25,000 or more, for services of $50,000 or more and for construction contracts of over $100,000 there would be no more discrimination based on where the company that bid for those contracts came from in Maritime Canada. Clearly the movement had begun to reduce those barriers to trade.

In 1992 the council came up with the Maritime Economic Co–operation Act. It has been working on a number of major projects since then. The Council of Maritime Premiers has a number of boards, organizations and bureaucrats working for the continued removal of barriers to the mobility of apprenticeship trades people. The primary goal of this whole focus in maritime Canada is to become more competitive.

Everybody in maritime Canada knows one of the stumbling blocks to removing internal trade barriers has been the free movement of beer in Canada. Although this may not seem like a big deal to some people it is a big deal in Atlantic Canada for two reasons. We had come out of a period when individual provinces had restrictions on the movement of beer between provinces. They did that to protect brewing industry jobs in their areas.

With some of the agreements in the past, we found products were flooding into Nova Scotia but perhaps Nova Scotia or New Brunswick products did not have equal access to the most lucrative market which is in Ontario.

My point in all of this is the maritime provinces, the traditional have nots, the ones which seem to be left out of the economic cycle when it is on the up swing but always first included when it is on the down slide, have long since recognized the key to competitiveness is to remove internal barriers to trade.

I have always been a free trader. People in my area and all over Canada will only prosper and be able to recognize their potential and our potential as a nation if we work aggressively to remove those barriers to trade.

This is not a perfect bill, but it is closer to perfection than anything I have seen in the six years I have been here. I urge members of the Reform Party opposite who seek a perfect bill to support the direction of the bill and to work with us on this side and with members of the Bloc Quebecois to ensure the people we represent have access to markets unfettered by regulatory and non–regulatory barriers to free trade.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I find it odd that the hon. member made no mention of clause 9 of Bill C–88, which is the heart of the bill, the key, and which was totally unexpected.

The opposition informed the Government of Quebec of clause 9 and Bill C–88, and, in turn, the Government of Quebec contacted the Government of Ontario to see if it was aware of this provision. Apparently, nobody in Canada was aware of this bill, even though close to a month earlier, on April 10, 1995, the trade ministers met in Calgary and there was never any question of the federal government's intention to go ahead with the bill.

I would like to ask the hon. member what he thinks of clause 9. How can he justify that the federal government has unilaterally declared itself the referee, when nobody was consulted, when nobody mandated the federal government to take on this role, and on top of this and perhaps most importantly, when the bill goes against the spirit of the agreement which provided for conflict resolution mechanisms based on the good will of each party, and not on judicial mechanisms?

• (1735)

Now, the federal government is bringing in a judicial mechanism, announcing to everybody that, in the future, its actions will be based on the spirit and the letter of clause 9 of Bill C–88. It will issue orders and ultimately will take all of the measures in paragraph 9*d*), do everything it deems appropriate to bring any province it feels is reluctant in line.

Can our colleague explain to us how the position that the federal government has taken on this issue in clause 9 of Bill C–88 is justified?

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada within its own area of responsibility clearly feels if there is a dispute settling mechanism and the dispute is settled but a province is stubborn and decides after one year of going through the two bodies, the joint co–operative committee and the processes outlined and agreed to by all 13 parties, that it will not to be party to the dispute settlement mechanism finding, to the resolution, and still refuses to act in compliance with the agreement, the government will take some actions.

Those actions are extremely limited by the very section of the bill. It does not say the Government of Canada can take straight retaliatory action. It outlines clearly the actions that can be taken and the actions that cannot be taken.

I understand the member opposite would be worried that the federal government can use its heavy hand to impose a settlement. Clearly after 10 provinces, two territories and the federal government agree on a dispute settling mechanism and a province or territory refused to adhere to the rules of the game, the government believes it is justified to use within its jurisdiction certain economic means.

I do not think it is unjustified. It is like telling my children over and over again there are rules but if they violate the rules there will not be any penalty. If my children violate the rules there is a penalty. It is a penalty of last resort after consultation, after communication and after dispute settling in my house.

At the end of the day if they continue to violate the agreements in our house—it would be the same in the federal House—I reserve the right, as would the federal government, to take reasonable means in response to that.

Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on the agreement on internal trade which will come into effect on July 1.

The agreement may not be perfect, in response to the Reform Party's comments, but it represents an improvement from where we were before that agreement. Bill C–88 is intended to make it possible for the federal government to comply fully with its obligations under the agreement.

It is important the House proceed expeditiously in its consideration of Bill C–88. For years businesses and private sector groups have complained to both the federal and provincial governments about domestic trade barriers and impediments to a free and open internal market.

We have had numerous studies going back as far as the 1937 Rowell–Sirois commission which recognized the issue and documented the broad scope of the problem.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association in 1991 estimated the cost associated with barriers and economic inefficiencies to be approximately $6.5 billion annually. The most recent statistics indicate interprovincial exports of goods and services in 1990 were worth $141 billion annually and responsible, directly or indirectly, for 1.7 million jobs.

A recent study by the chamber of commerce underlined that the Canadian internal market is the most interdependent of any area in the world today.

In agreeing to negotiate the agreement, Canadian governments recognize how well our domestic economy works. It is key to how we will prosper as a nation and how we will compete in the international economy.

• (1740)

An open domestic market and economy will allow Canadians and Canadian companies to strengthen their internal competitiveness and develop new opportunities for growth and prosperity. The alternative offers only and ultimately self–destructive protectionism which benefits only special interests at the cost of the country as a whole.

When they agreed to negotiate the agreement on internal trade the federal, provincial and territorial governments all recognised and accepted the importance of working together in the national interest. In concluding the agreement Canadian governments have demonstrated they are prepared to work together both now and in the future.

As my colleague, the Minister of Industry, has said in the House, the agreement is a consensual agreement. Some members opposite have criticized the agreement as inadequate and insufficient. As I said before, the agreement may not be perfect but it is an improvement over where we were. It reflects a consensus on the principle of an open and efficient national economy. It establishes a detailed rules framework for internal trade. It provides a consistent and defined process for preventing and resolving disputes which may arise over specific issues or measures.

All the parties have accepted, to a greater or lesser degree, disciplines which in the sectors covered will improve how the national economy functions in the future. It will be possible and it is the government's intention to work to improve the agreement in the future and to expand its scope and coverage.

I call on all colleagues in the House to work together with us as we proceed into the future to expand the scope and coverage of the agreement. For the moment this is a start, a point from which to work. We can and should build on that.

Some members have also criticized the government for not exercising its constitutional authority over interprovincial trade to open the internal market more forcibly. The national economy has become considerably more complex than it was when the constitutional powers of the different levels of government were agreed on in 1867. In the context of today's economy and modern Canadian federalism the views of those critics, frankly speaking, are simplistic.

If anything is clear it is that the country operates most successfully when all levels of government work co–operatively in the national interest, not unilaterally and certainly not by fiat. Governments were not negotiating constitutional changes in the agreement on internal trade; rather, they were developing the basis for working together with their respective powers and responsibilities to make the national economy operate more efficiently and effectively.

Unilateral action may be a theoretically possible method to achieve the same ends. Some of us may consider it to be a desirable way of proceeding. However it is simply not an effective or acceptable way to make Canada's federal system work.

Some members opposite have suggested the government has a hidden agenda in Bill C–88, that it conceals a power grab and that it is intended to provide a means to force provinces over to the will of the federal government. That is purely and simply wrong. My colleague, the Minister of Industry, has responded at length and in detail to those allegations.

Bill C–88 does not deal with the responsibilities of provinces or provincial measures, only federal responsibilities and measures. It is intended to make it possible for the federal government to comply fully with its own obligations under the agreement and to play its part in making the agreement work.

Bill C–88 gives the government specific authority to make changes to certain parts of legislation to enable it to act in accordance with its obligations. It also changes some existing legislation to make it easier for provinces to comply with some of their specific obligations under the agreements.

• (1745)

We should be clear in our understanding that Bill C–88 does not by itself legislate or give life to the agreement on internal trade. The agreement has been signed by all its parties: the federal, provincial and territorial governments. When it comes into effect, as agreed on July 1, all those governments will be bound by the obligations of the agreement. Each government is responsible for complying with its obligations and for living up to its responsibilities under the agreement.

Two provinces, Alberta and Newfoundland, have already passed their implemented legislation. As I said earlier, it is important that we proceed expeditiously in our consideration of this legislation. The federal government has played a leading role in getting all governments to work together in the interests of all Canadians on internal trade issues.

Bill C–88 does what is necessary to ensure the federal level of government will be able to continue to play its role in the co–operative intergovernmental process.

We should not delay this further. I call on all colleagues to join with us in ensuring that Bill C–88 gets swift passage through this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, a bit as I did with my colleague earlier, how she can justify the government's action in this regard. She knows very well indeed that the federal government cannot legitimately take this action, since it has neither the mandate nor an invitation to take it and it consulted no one in its action. It is giving itself powers of arbitration so it can act as a disciplinarian, without anyone having asked it to intervene. It has led, and here the seriousness

of the situation and the all the scheming behind the bill become apparent, the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Parizeau, to denounce the bill as a trade war measure.

I would like further explanation. Oddly, and this is in keeping with the way the government works, nobody is referring to clause 9, the keystone, the source of friction, the heart of the bill. To us, this is indicative of the government's desire to meddle in a number of areas of jurisdiction in the operations of the future Canada where the Government of Canada will be the sole government. Canada will be a unitary country, a centralized country. Bit by bit, in this House, the government is giving itself what it needs to ensure that, increasingly, governments that claimed to be, were seen to be and considered themselves provincial will become regional, because bills like this one are being adopted.

I would ask my hon. colleague to talk more about clause 9 of this bill, which is exceedingly pernicious.

[*English*]

Ms. Augustine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is presuming quite a lot in his interpretation of section 9. Perhaps he has misread the section. In that section there is a principle underlying the concept of retaliation. My colleague spoke quite clearly to this by giving some real life examples within his own family situation.

It has to be understood that subsections 9(a) to (d) do not give the government greater freedom of action. To suggest that it does ignores the headnote of the section. I would ask the hon. member to go back to the headnote which limits the degree of possible action pursuant to article 1710 of the agreement. Article 1710 would limit retaliatory action only to cases where a province has been found to have an impartial panel which violated the agreement and has refused to comply within the period of a year or more.

• (1750)

It spells out quite clearly that the government would have to discuss whatever it proposes to do with the committee on internal trade which is composed of representatives of all the parties to the agreement. Any action to be taken has to be equivalent to the economic impact which led to the original violation.

There is much within the section which must be read with article 17(10) in mind.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate as the official opposition critic on regional development. I want to show very clearly that, with this interprovincial trade agreement, the Canadian government is indeed giving itself powers which largely exceed what is provided in the agreement reached by the parties.

We just heard the hon. member explain clause 9, in reference to articles 1705 and 1710. I intend to show unequivocally that, in this agreement, the federal government is giving itself extensive third party powers, without informing those involved.

What is the purpose of this bill? It is simply to implement the provisions of the Agreement on Internal Trade, which was signed by the provinces last summer. To that end, the federal government must pass the required legislative provisions before July 1, 1995, when the agreement will take effect. This is basically the purpose of the legislation.

First, I want to show that, with Bill C–88, the Liberal government is assuming powers which were never mentioned when the agreement was negotiated or signed, thus showing a very centralizing attitude which is also noticeable in relation to several other bills, and which is part of an overall centralizing legislative strategy.

I also want to show some elements of the current international trade dynamics which point to the need for the political autonomy of the regions, as well as the establishment of economic unions, rather than large federations with a rigid and centralizing constitution, such as the Canadian federation.

The clauses of the agreement to which Bill C–88 refers essentially deal with the dispute resolution process, as if the federal government could do anything but regulate. I want to point out to this House the context in which the interprovincial agreement will operate, by going over a few provisions of the Agreement on Internal Trade.

Articles 1601 to 1604 deal with the establishment of an internal trade committee and its secretariat. That committee will supervise the implementation of the agreement and facilitate the resolution of disputes. Article 1705 deals with the setting up of a panel, following a request by the parties involved in a dispute. The panel is composed of five members who will decide on the validity of the request and on the retaliatory action which may be taken by the aggrieved party. We are talking here about a dispute involving two parties.

Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of article 1710 provide that, if the matter has not been resolved within one year of issuance of the panel report, the complaining party may request a meeting of the committee. The committee shall convene within 30 days to discuss with the complaining party the option of taking retaliatory action in respect of the party complained against.

So, the complaining party may, until such time as a mutually satisfactory resolution of the dispute is achieved, impose retaliatory measures of equivalent effect against the party complained against. This is important: the retaliatory measures must be of equivalent effect.

• (1755)

We must understand that the panel's decisions are not binding, which implies that the committee governing the interprovincial trade agreement has no power. If the party complained against does not comply with the panel's recommendations, article 1710 applies. As we saw, article 1710 deals with retaliatory action that the complaining party may take in respect of the party that did not comply with the agreement.

The main purpose of this bill, as we said earlier, is to implement the agreement on internal trade. The Bloc Quebecois has always been in favour of freer trade, which is the context in which states do business today. We support the principle of the agreement.

However, what we understand is that, if the federal government is the aggrieved party under a trade agreement referred to in the agreement, it can impose retaliatory measures that are unprecedented.

However, that is not what is said in Bill C–88. In fact, clause 9 goes well beyond the spirit of the agreement reached by the provinces last summer. Clause 9 reads as follows: "For the purpose of suspending benefits or imposing retaliatory measures of equivalent effect against a province pursuant to Article 1710 of the Agreement, the Governor in Council may, by order—" By order, no less.

This is a method commonly used by a totalitarian government. This bill clearly shows that the Liberal government wants to govern by order. Are we again facing Liberal totalitarianism? In fact, clause 9 means that if a party is at fault pursuant to article 1710 of the agreement, then the federal government, whether or not it is party to the dispute, assumes the right to impose retaliatory measures against all the provinces without distinction.

The parties were agreed that it was a matter between two parties: the injured party and the party at fault. The government however, assumes the rights of all parties so it can interfere in the dispute. Bill C–88 clearly indicates that the federal government intends to interfere in interprovincial trade and be both judge and judged, to provide through this agreement the power to act by order, a power it alone can exercise, and to extend the application of any federal law to the provinces, as mentioned in clause 9*(c)*.

Governing by order in council, setting oneself up as the arbiter of interprovincial trade, are measures that go way beyond the spirit of the agreement signed with the provinces last summer and are an indication of the clearcut centralist strategy of the federal Liberals.

Nowhere in the 13 paragraphs of article 1710 of the agreement is there mentioned any right of the federal government to intervene in a trade dispute when it is not itself one of the parties to the dispute, contrary to the retaliatory measures described in clause 9 of Bill C–88, which it may impose, by order, on any of the parties concerned.

The range of retaliatory measures that the federal government has given itself in this clause is too broad. The attitude reflected in recent federal bills concerned with regional economic development, such as C–46, to establish the Department of Industry; C–88 on interprovincial trade; C–91, to redefine the Federal Business Development Bank; C–76 on certain provisions concerning transfers to the provinces is a clear indication of the ultra–centralist strategy of the present Liberal government.

As the official opposition critic for regional development, I want to warn provincial governments against interference by the present federal government in matters concerning regional economic development. I urge them to be extremely vigilant. They must not downplay their autonomy and jurisdictions or give up certain responsibilities, just because of an impending referendum.

I say to Canada's provincial governments that supporting Quebec's demands means supporting the development of the regions.

• (1800)

Among other things, the 1982 Constitution, the famous Canada Bill, instituted provincial egalitarianism, an egalitarianism which denied the Canadian duality and the existence of the Quebecois people. The current face of Canadian nationalism was formed on the basis of this egalitarianism. Do not forget that, at the end of the 1960s, Pierre Elliott Trudeau came to power with a vision for the nation in which he persisted despite the sharp criticism it drew. He set out to build a more closely integrated Canadian economy by rationalizing the government's activities and by centralizing power.

In June 1978, during the unilateral patriation of the constitution, the federal government published a detailed statement by Pierre Trudeau, called "Time for Action". It was in fact an elaborate constitutional reform proposal. Under that proposal, even though Canada is a patchwork of different sociological and historical influences, for example aboriginal peoples whose legitimate rights we must respect, the two main linguistic communities, the many different multicultural communities, the federal Liberals' approach to the constitution has always been based on the primacy of the citizen and of the rights of the individual. I would like to quote a passage from the publication: "The unity of Canada must transcend the identification Canadians have with provinces, regions and linguistic or other differences—Each must feel that Canada, and the federal Parliament and government acting on his or her behalf, are the best guarantors of the security—"

Such was Pierre Elliott Trudeau's grand statement on centralization. This is the federal Liberals' grand statement on centralization.

As a Bloc member, I say to my fellow Quebecers that such a statement of intentions significantly threatens the existence of a Quebec state, a Quebec nation and the means it needs to develop economically. Ottawa is counting on the marginalization of the provinces. This same objective is reflected in the federal position in all other matters of importance to do with shared jurisdiction. This unitary state spirit of centralizing federalism, which opposes provincial peculiarities, is an obstacle to the development of the people of Quebec and is also the spirit of Bill C–46.

We must remember that this enabling legislation of the Department of Industry increases duplication and overlap in Quebec and denies its government the complete control over regional development it has so long sought.

In the same centralizing vein, under clause 8 of this bill, the Minister of Industry is responsible for regional development in Ontario and Quebec. This bill simply confirms regional development overlaps, because it confirms federal government and Department of Industry intervention in an area of jurisdiction Quebec has long sought as its own.

Quebecers have a very different view of regional development requirements. Decentralization of funds and powers advocated by the Parti Quebecois are what the regions have long waited for in order to take charge. This is a democratic vision of regional development that has nothing to do with the centralist vision of the Liberal government in Ottawa.

In Quebec City, we do not want the development of the province's 16 administrative regions to be driven by the purely sectoral vision of the federal Minister of Industry. Regional development is the cornerstone of a vision of society that requires the intimate understanding of all the needs of the various environments that only regional stakeholders have.

I say to my fellow Quebecers that when, in the referendum, they are asked to decide on the political autonomy of Quebec, a no to the Quebec government's proposal will signify acceptance of Canadian federalism as defined by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and the death of Quebec. Bill C–91 is another example of the denial of the State of Quebec. In this bill, the government's stated objective is to streamline and modernize the Federal Business Development Bank. The vocabulary is undoubtedly meant to reflect the reality of late twentieth century markets, but nobody is in any doubt about the federal government's real objective, which is to meddle further in the regional development of Quebec and increase its presence in the most important mechanisms of Quebec's economic development.

• (1805)

The state of Quebec exists. It is trying to develop its own tools of economic development in spite of the federal government's intrusive presence in regional development. And the Federal Business Development Bank remains a parallel structure, an unacceptable administrative duplication.

Finally, I would like to remind this House, by way of illustration, of some of the extremely centralizing and anti–Quebec provisions of Bill C–76. This bill, which concerns the implementation of provisions of the 1995–96 budget, sets its sights much further than that fiscal year. In fact, clause 48, which requires no prior negotiation with the provinces, would result in a shortfall of $2.5 billion, $650 million of it in Quebec alone. Furthermore, implementation of the Canada social transfer for health care and social programs will result in a shortfall of $4.5 billion for the provinces in 1997–98. The Bloc Quebecois also condemns this bill because it introduces a mechanism that the federal government, which according to the constitution has no jurisdiction over social programs, will use to intervene to a greater extent in this area and impose national standards on Quebec.

Bill C–76 maintains national standards for health care and provides for adding new national standards for social assistance and post–secondary education. If the provinces fail to abide by these standards, funding will be cut accordingly under C–76. This arrogant federalism bears not the slightest resemblance to decentralization. These national standards will limit the provinces' autonomy within their own jurisdictions. Furthermore, distinct as they are, the people of Quebec will not see their demands reflected in the new national standards applied from coast to coast in an area that is crucial to its cultural identity: education.

As for Bill C–88, it is eminently centralist. It reflects a retrograde view of trade relations between the regions of one and the same continent. Today, the trend is towards globalization, removing tariff and non–tariff barriers and free trade, not using orders in council to regulate a continental market led by a unitary state like Canada.

The decisive levels at which we can be competitive are increasingly located at the local, regional and provincial levels, all of which does not fit Ottawa's centralist mould. The new international model for regional economic development reflects the globalization of our economies which, in turn, means that regional economic spaces are gradually becoming absorbed into a single global economic space.

Fernand Martin, of the Faculty of Economic Science at the University of Montreal, is very emphatic about this international regional reality, and I quote: "Local businesses now realize that they are not only competing with domestic competitors but all the others as well, without the benefit of the protection afforded by national borders". This new reality of international

markets gives rise to a second economic phenomenon: economic concentration by businesses to remain competitive. As a result, regional economies are becoming an important part of the overall strategy.

In this context, intervention through a national government structure is no longer required. The State of Quebec, by giving the regions unprecedented powers in its blueprint for society, has shown it has a very sure grasp of the new problems it faces as a result of international trade, unlike the Canadian federal government. NAFTA would help to further diminish the federal government's power to intervene in economic matters. Where international trade is concerned, agreements like GATT already prevent Canada from imposing tariffs and subsidizing exporters. These international agreements tend to accelerate the globalization of our economy and, like the dynamics of regional economics, to diminish the federal government's control over the national economy.

In the nineteenth century, globalization of trade was sparked first of all by the new multinationals. It was the multinationals which initially caused countries to shift towards a new economic space like NAFTA. Today, their ability to restructure an economic space has been illustrated many times over. In fact, they confer international status on the cities or regions where they are located.

• (1810)

In conclusion, we are not opposed to this bill because we do not care about the globalization of markets and international trade. We oppose this bill simply because, to the detriment of all other parties, the federal government granted itself the ultimate power, the power to govern by order without making any agreement with any of the parties beforehand.

I say to my fellow Quebecers that a vote for a sovereign Quebec is a vote for the elimination of the federal government's interference in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction and for the elimination of many overlaps and duplications, which will result in real savings. A yes vote for a sovereign Quebec would permit Quebec to put job creation, labour force training, education, health and social assistance policies in place which meet its needs and are geared to its priorities.

In addition, a yes vote would help protect Quebec from being the victim of federal manoeuvres like the 1982 constitutional patriation and would help put an end to the federal government's unilateral cuts to transfer payments.

To sum it up, it would be a yes to adulthood, to confidence, and to the open–mindedness and pride of the people we already are.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague for Richmond—Wolfe right off for his excellent and edifying speech, which rattled the Minister of Transport so much he was forced to leave the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. We must remember that we never draw attention to the presence, and, more particularly, the absence of anyone in the House. We are all familiar enough with the requirements of our work on the Hill or in committee.

Mr. Rocheleau: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that this was the Minister of Transport's way of standing out.

All those who have carefully examined Bill C–88, and in particular clause 9, can see that the legitimacy of the government's action is seriously in doubt. There was no consultation, and the government was given no mandate to act this way. The legitimacy of its action is questionable.

We must also ask what was the intent—and this question is for my colleague—of the federal government in striking such a blow against all the provinces, particularly Quebec, which has reacted strongly. All the provinces, however, are reacting similarly. What is going on in people's heads in Ottawa? What is going on in people's heads in the Langevin building? What is this Canada of tomorrow to be? I will let my colleague for Richmond—Wolfe elaborate on this.

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. First, I want to put clause 9 in perspective as regards Articles 1705 and 1710 of the agreement, so as to show how the federal government, with this legislation and other bills, is giving itself very centralizing tools. It is giving itself instruments which, since Pierre Elliott Trudeau, have been part of the Canadian political philosophy, whereby the Canadian constitution is a document which the federal uses to make its partners toe the line, instead of using it to promote co–operation and sharing.

Originally, an agreement was reached between various parties to open up interprovincial trade as much as possible. All the parties involved approved and signed the agreement, which provides that, if there is a trade dispute, a panel with non–binding authority will be set up to hear the aggrieved party.

• (1815)

That party will submit the issue to the five–member panel. These five people hear the aggrieved party and decide that, if there is no redress of the injury, the aggrieved party can take retaliatory measures. Everybody agrees on that. One party takes retaliatory action against another.

Everybody agrees and the agreement is signed. Then the federal government arrives on the scene. It drafts a bill to give concrete form to the agreement but, surprise, it decides, in the legislation, that it is not subject to the rules agreed to. As far as the federal government is concerned, these rules simply do not exist. The federal government feels it is the central power, the

leader, the "Canadian". It must look after the interests of all the smaller entities in Canada and, if some of them are too strong compared to the others, it must hit them on the head.

This is why, through this legislation, the federal government is giving itself a power, not just any power but a power by order, to take retaliatory measures against any party. With this bill, and even though it is not a party to the dispute, even though it is not an aggrieved party, the federal government is giving itself the right to hit on the head those it identifies as the culprits.

When the government member referred to her government, she chose her words carefully but, at the same time, she described this centralizing reality by saying that the government of Canada must fulfill its obligations. The federal government must be the one running the show, the one taking action to make this country go in the right direction, that is toward the development of national standards. In order to do so, that government must give itself extraordinary tools.

The hon. member even referred to a specific authority. She alluded to a specific authority to even make changes to the legislation. In order to meet its responsibilities and fulfill its obligations, the federal government must, at the expense of its partners, be the one which calls the others to order, even though all its partners negotiated in good faith, agreed that everyone would be on an equal footing, and approved the process provided in article 1710, whereby a five–member panel with non–binding authority would hear the complaints of the two parties involved and allow one of them, after 12 months, to take retaliatory measures.

The parties were never advised. This is a very significant demonstration of what the federal government is all about and an indication of the federal Liberals' ultimate goal in playing the part of a centralized government: to make laws without telling anybody and to adopt laws one after the other giving themselves exceptional centralized powers.

Where does this all lead? I wanted to talk about the issue you raised regarding this mechanism because this same mechanism comes up in other bills. For example, in the act to amend the Department of Industry, the minister unilaterally gives himself the power to directly intervene in all of the provinces.

He can enter into agreements with anybody whatsoever in each province: individuals, organizations, municipalities, etc. My colleague for Trois–Rivières was right. This position is strictly constitutional because it has to do with recognized jurisdictions. But in this case, this government, which is an extension of the Trudeau government, is furtively, law by law, arming itself with small, very centralized mechanisms in preparation for the post–referendum period—because they think that Quebec will vote no in the referendum even though we know that Quebec will vote yes—in preparation for a time when they think that they will be able to impose on Canada a vision similar to the one prevailing in 1982, but more centralized, more dictatorial, more controlling.

That, dear colleague, is where this government is going with the bills that we have been careful to describe in the minutest detail. You will note that the government members who rose to speak about this bill never went into detail regarding clause 9 or the mechanism in the provisions we identified, articles 1705 and 1710.

• (1820)

[*English*]

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate Bill C–88, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade.

The issue of internal trade should be a priority for this government. However it has taken almost one year to introduce this legislation after the deal was struck between the federal government and the provinces. We as a country trade almost as much between provinces as we do with foreign countries. To put it another way, this agreement should mean as much as if not more than GATT and NAFTA. However we hardly hear it discussed.

As we have already heard from our colleague opposite, interprovincial trade barriers cost Canadians $6.5 billion annually. Because of these internal barriers it is easier to trade with Mexico and the United States than within our own boundaries. The elimination of these barriers will only strengthen our economy, which would enable us to get the unemployed employed. It would provide greater freedom for Canadians to work where they choose. It would also create a single economic market in Canada, giving us economies of scale. It would also help counter our nation's current regional drift.

With that said, the internal trade agreement, which C–88 would implement, does little else for free trade. The signing of the document almost went unnoticed. Perhaps that is because it is an agreement that can best be described as a political facade. This agreement among provinces did a little to break down a few barriers but it has left much undone. The federal government and the provinces had a chance to solve what is perhaps one of Canada's most solvable economic problems and for the most part unfortunately failed.

Internal restrictions on trade are not imposed on us by foreign governments; they are self–imposed. In a nutshell, we are shooting ourselves in the foot. Since these restrictions are self–imposed, they should be relatively easy to remove. That is not always the case, as this agreement clearly illustrates. Instead of removing the barriers and stopping the economic war that has developed between the provinces, they agreed in essence to reinforce the status quo.

The removal of interprovincial trade barriers can be accomplished without any monetary expense. It simply requires those involved to have the political will to remove them. It is obvious that we lack this will. Canadian politicians have to stop protecting interest groups such as big business which will suffer from free trade between provinces. They must start looking out for the interests of ordinary Canadians.

A survey of businesses done by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce states that only 5 per cent of businesses benefit from these barriers while 95 per cent do not. Need I say more? Apparently I do because it is clear this government has not gotten the message.

I would now like to speak briefly to a few of the specifics of the internal trade agreement. I will start with the positives, and there are positives. This agreement prohibits provinces from using subsidies to entice businesses to set up local shops. It forbids preferential government procurement and improves the mobility of labour, particularly in the trucking sector.

• (1825)

However the essence of the agreement seems to have forgotten agriculture, energy or the financial sector. In other words consumers will still have to pay too much for electricity, eggs, milk and many other products. It also has loopholes the size of our national debt that would allow any determined government to drive through them.

As mentioned earlier, these 500 or so internal trade barriers cost Canadians nearly $6.5 billion each year, which can be broken down into approximately $3,500 a year for the average Canadian family, according to the Fraser Institute. I cannot speak for everyone, but I can say that I would love to have an additional $3,500 in my pocket each year.

According to a recent Fraser Institute article, and I quote: "The public debate has ignored that when a market grows several things happen. Costs fall and producers become more competitive. Japan is a fierce international competitor because it has a large internal market. This market is like a school where students learn from each other. Efficient producers pass into the world market while bad producers fall into mediocrity or even bankruptcy." I could not agree with this statement more.

If we look at Canada's world competitiveness, we ranked third in 1987, sixth in 1991 and eleventh in 1992 out of the 22 OECD countries. These numbers are not surprising when we look at the amount of trade that is done between provinces rather than out of the country. Over half of all provinces' interprovincial trade is more than their international trade. Perhaps more to the point, over one–third of Canadian businesses encountered barriers when attempting to do business in another province. This is according to a Canadian Chamber of Commerce study.

According to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, eight out of ten construction companies encounter interprovincial barriers. Some provincial governments are willing to pay local firms as much as 10 per cent more than non–local firms for procurement contracts. This must stop. Hopefully the bill will allow us to move in that direction.

This agreement reached among the provinces does nothing to put an end to the protectionist policies of the past. In relation to C–88, clause 9 of the agreement is a cause of particular concern, as was mentioned by my Bloc colleagues. It simply states that for the purpose of spending benefits or imposing regulatory measures, cabinet may take any measure that the governor in council considers necessary. Not Parliament—cabinet.

Where is the openness? Where is the transparency this government claims to be adhering to? Specifically, clause 9 confers on the cabinet a blank cheque for retaliatory measures taken against a province, including the modification or suspension of the application of any federal law.

Mr. Schmidt: You mean any law?

Mr. Hanrahan: That is what it says.

Cabinet should be accountable to Parliament in relation to any decision concerning a change in federal law. While this agreement does contain a code of conduct that restricts the tax breaks and grants a province can use to attract business from another province, it also provides a number of exceptions to the code for the provinces and the federal government. The most significant of these are the provisions that establish barriers based on "legitimate objectives".

• (1830)

Most people agree that a determined province will find a way around the intent of the agreement based on the so–called legitimate objective. Other exemptions from the agreement include agriculture, alcohol, energy, natural resources, culture, regional development and, of course, crown corporation procurement.

It is for this reason that the Reform Party believes that the overall intent of the agreement does nothing more than reinforce the status quo. In other words, the agreement is like a toothless tiger, lots of noise and no bite.

A perfect example is how the premier of New Brunswick recently lured UPS to his province from Newfoundland through tax relief exemption plans. However there was an outcry from the other provinces that claimed New Brunswick was breaking the deal, even though the deal was not in effect as New Brunswick so rightly pointed out, and was in fact poaching jobs from other sectors of the country. These cries, of course, fell on deaf ears.

Reformers want to see the elimination of all interprovincial trade barriers. We want to see economies of scale. We have confidence that our country can compete with the best for the benefit of all Canadians, especially in the global economy. We feel this can be achieved by two methods: first, through provincial agreement and, second, by constitutional challenges.

The agreement in Bill C–88 does not eliminate barriers. It only reinforces barriers which already exist. The federal government has the power under section 121 of the BNA Act to eliminate these trade barriers. Section 121 states clearly that "all articles of growth, produce, manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union, be admitted free into each of the other provinces". This power can and should be used unilaterally if necessary.

The federal government could enforce section 121 by striking down any provincial laws which impede interprovincial trade. Our colleague from Dartmouth mentioned that Nova Scotia, when it came into Confederation, was an economically strong province. It has been waiting 125 years for changes in the trade barriers. This will not be what it wants. It must go farther. It must go back to the original of section 121.

To enforce this the federal government could simply withhold all transfer payments to those unco–operative provinces until they have removed all barriers to interprovincial trade. The process is there. We have it.

Bill C–88 is moving in a direction but not nearly far enough. I hope that provinces such as Nova Scotia do not have to wait another 125 years before it gets any movement.

The central question from the Reform Party point of view is the speed at which the movement is occurring. I understand the Bloc's position. It is a philosophically different position, but ours is in terms of speed and process.

In conclusion, I think a quote from the book titled *Common Ground for the Canadian Common Market* is quite relevant as it states that:

> If one province plays the restrictive game, it can do better than free trade, but if they all play it, they do worse.

It is like one individual who stands up at a football game to see better. When everybody does it nobody sees better.

This power can be used unilaterally and should be used if necessary. The federal government could enforce section 121 by striking down any provincial law which impedes interprovincial trade or by simply withholding all transfer payments to those unco–operative provinces until they have removed all barriers to interprovincial trade. Therefore let us work to ensure an agreement which will remove these trade barriers rather than settle on one which simply reinforces the status quo.

• (1835)

It is for these reasons that the Reform Party will not be supporting Bill C–88.

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am really amazed that the Reform member, in speaking to Bill C–68, said he would not be supporting the bill. At the beginning of his speech he indicated that this issue should have been a priority for the government and lamented that it had taken one year. Immediately thereafter he said it was a political facade.

I do not believe the member who just spoke really knows where he stands on the issue.

The government has fulfilled its constitutional responsibilities very carefully. It has shown that the best way to govern Canada is through consensus building, by bringing all the parties together. It is an approach that ensures acceptance and implementation of the agreement to its fullest degree.

It was only during the last 128 years of Confederation that these barriers to interprovincial trade had emerged. Therefore, we cannot expect by one stroke of a pen we can undo overnight what happened over the last 128 years of Confederation.

The Reform Party has to recognize that the government has demonstrated the triumph of practical statecraft that it is able to achieve agreement not through constitutional confrontation but through consensus building which truly will be more lasting in its effect.

In conclusion and by way of comment, I would really like the Reform Party to reconsider its position and support Bill C–88 which allows the freer movement of goods, services, capital and people. We have to recognize that Canada is a history of successive steps and this is an important one. We must build one at a time on a solid basis.

Mr. Hanrahan: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Winnipeg for his comment. It is a fair question. I do not really see this as a political question to make points.

What we are arguing is the speed of the process. The member has mentioned, as have I, the length of time Nova Scotia has been trying to get agreement and the effect it has had on them. That is also true of the other Atlantic provinces. As well, other provinces at various times have been affected.

However, it cannot be done overnight. One of the previous speakers stated that the government plans to expand the scope and improve more. The question Canadians want to ask, when it is costing us jobs and money, is when and what is the government's overall plan. This is what we would like to see. If we had something in that regard then you might find that there is more co–operation from this side.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I can appreciate that under these circumstances at this time, the disagreement is on a rather cordial note. However, we well know that sometimes there are more heated discussions and that is why we ask for all interventions to be made through the Chair.

Mr. Hanrahan: Mr. Speaker, I have completed my point. I do apologize for not directing it through you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the Reform Party for refusing to support Bill C–88.

• (1840)

I myself worked hard for free trade with the United States. I can tell you that the Free Trade Agreement with the United States is much more open than the agreement we are trying to establish at the moment. As far as the rules are concerned, the tribunal established to resolve disputes is composed of the same number of representatives from the United States and Canada—the two countries are equally matched.

In this case, however, the federal government will unilaterally decide on and dictate the resolution of disputes. It alone will establish the rules. This is completely unacceptable, particularly for Quebec.

In the past, the federal government has decided on its own to promote one region over another. We have just seen this. Two, maybe three years ago, huge sums of money were spent to promote oil production in the great Hibernia project. As we know, the experts say Hibernia will always be a money loser. For Hibernia to make money, they say, oil would have to sell at $30 a barrel; it currently sells for $20. As you can imagine, the federal government will have to make up the difference between losses and revenues.

Once again, with regard to this bill the federal government is giving itself all the power, namely the power to decide. It is not giving the provinces any power to negotiate or to resolve differences. This is totally unacceptable. We have seen similar examples in the past and we will see others in the future. For example, the federal government has provided considerable assistance in the development of uranium, by doing research with the CANDU systems on atomic energy. We all know that uranium is powerful and worth a fortune, however, it is located in Ontario. Not a penny was spent in Quebec to help develop hydro–electricity.

And now the federal government is going to decide on its own, unilaterally, how certain areas of activity, how certain energy sectors in the country are going to be promoted.

I agree completely with the Reform Party in saying that the provinces and the regions must have a say in the resolution of trade disputes in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Hanrahan: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and I will try to avoid the use of the word, you.

I understand where my colleague is coming from. I understand where the Reform Party is coming from and I realize that it is a philosophical difference.

The free trade agreement was between two nations. This is an agreement between 13 individual groups and that can be very complex. The one area we agree on is section 9. Decisions regarding trade should be debated in Parliament at least. They should not be finalized in an order in council. They should not be finalized by cabinet. I am sure my colleagues from the Bloc would agree with that.

Where we disagree is that they look at a separate Quebec and a separate English speaking Canada. We see it as 10 equal provinces. That is not something we are going to decide in this debate. That is something that will be decided, I understand, according to the Bloc's agenda, by the end of this year. We have to wait until that decision is made and then perhaps we can discuss this question further.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, overtaxed, hampered by political red tape, our private sector is much beleaguered, especially nowadays in the era of economic uncertainty. Wherever they turn, the private sector finds very little recourse and no succour whatsoever.

With options limited, they have to cut jobs, decrease expenditures and infrastructure. Ultimately they find themselves pushed to the wall with very few options, one of which is to fold completely and go bankrupt. The other is to move to the United States. One only needs to look at Ottawa and Toronto, eastern Canada, and to a lesser extent western Canada to see the number of businesses which have been run by families for generations that are now closed and boarded up. It is very sad for me when I go home to Toronto and see businesses which have been operating for generations closing up.

• (1845)

Trade barriers hamper small businesses and the ability of the private sector to be competitive. They function to relocate scarce resources away from the efficient areas to inefficient areas of the economy. They cost business, they cost the consumer in increased prices and they cost the entire country. They impede the free movement of goods, services, people and capital all over this great country of ours.

Who are they supported by? They are supported by a small number of businesses, perhaps 5 per cent to 10 per cent, yet they

are paid for by the majority of the people in Canada. That is the cost of having internal trade barriers.

Section 121 of the Constitution states that all articles of the growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall, from and after the union, be admitted free into each and every other province. That means that internal trade barriers are illegal. They are contrary to our Constitution. I find it amazing that we have not had a constitutional challenge, a judicial challenge in our Supreme Court to the internal trade barriers which exist in Canada. Clearly, if we try to abide by the Constitution we will find that the trade barriers transgress it. It is only a matter of time before that challenge is brought before the Supreme Court.

The cost of trade barriers is extreme. My colleague from the Reform Party mentioned that they cost $6.5 billion. The Treasury Board has mentioned it is costing us at least $50 billion a year to have these trade barriers, barriers which are benefiting a very small number of groups in our country, which are in existence only because successive governments have not been willing to go against the wrath of a very small number of companies. They have not been prepared to do that for the benefit of the majority because they do not want to create conflict. I would challenge the government to remove the trade barriers. If it does, clearly it will get the support of the majority of Canadians.

I find it passing strange that we have successfully managed to be a leader in removing the barriers to international trade. We have been a leader in bringing together the countries of the world in the World Trade Organization. It is truly a magnificent agreement and one which will clearly benefit our country, a country which relies so heavily on exports for its well–being. We did it with the WTO, with the FTA, with the NAFTA, and we are continually pursuing an aggressive export market and rightly so. Wherever we can we are trying to remove the barriers to external trade.

We are doing that on the one hand yet on the other hand we are not removing the internal barriers to trade. I find it absolutely ludicrous. While we are decreasing the barriers to external trade and supporting the persistence of internal barriers to trade, we are hamstringing the industrial complex within our country. I would submit that the government should take up the challenge and aggressively try to decrease the barriers which exist between the provinces.

• (1850)

In the eastern bloc with the iron curtain coming down we saw with our own eyes what barriers to trade do to countries. We saw what this did to Russia, Romania, Albania. We have seen that when trade barriers are put up it only seeks to restrict, hamstring and compromise the very economy they were intended to help. This type of behaviour, the persistent pursuit of barriers to trade, can only harm an economy regardless of whether we are speaking about Canada, Russia, the United States or Chile.

This government bill, so–called to remove internal barriers to trade, to decrease interprovincial trade barriers, has been a flop to put it mildly. It is just window dressing. It does not touch any of the major sections, such as alcohol, agriculture and many of the other innumerable barriers to trade which exist within our country.

The government should have taken the bull by the horns to capture the moment to make the substantive and substantial changes that are required to give our economy, our producers, our exporters and our manufacturers the leg up they require. Instead of doing this and significantly decreasing these internal barriers to trade, the government has only sought to nibble pathetically around the edges. Once again as we have seen in other bills, it is an opportunity lost.

The Reform Party advocates a much stronger position to decreasing the trade barriers in order to benefit this country and in order to maximize the economies of scale that we can have within Canada. By doing so we would decrease marketing costs, increase efficiency, decrease management costs, improve the speed and efficiency of the movement of goods, increase employment opportunities for all Canadians and decrease public procurement costs. In effect we would have a well needed benefit to our economy from coast to coast. I suggest therefore that post haste this government take it upon itself to rapidly eliminate all interprovincial trade barriers. The Reform Party would be glad to help the government if it needs any advice in this area.

We also need to create common standards across the provinces in licensing, certification and education. We need to focus on some very important factors in competitiveness that our country has failed to do, from provincial governments to the federal government. In order for us to increase our competitiveness there are a few things we must take hold of and address right away. One of those is education.

We need to vastly improve our educational system and we need to do it now. We need to turn out a student who is self–sufficient, educated, competent, self–assured and well versed in those skills that are going to be needed in the 21st century. In many areas our public school systems fail to do this. They are not all bad but certainly many of them are. That is evidenced by the huge exodus we are seeing of people desirous of putting their children into private schools. Why? Because they are not finding that their children are getting the education they deserve in this great country of ours.

A greater emphasis must be put on the basic sciences, reading, arithmetic, the basic skills that are required. We need to build on those the more technical skills that are going to be of value in the coming century.

Against this backdrop is a world that is becoming increasingly competitive. The mindset now in the schools is often to shield and to insulate the student from competitiveness. Competitiveness has a dirty name now. The reality in this globalized world is that competitiveness is the name of the game. It does our students a great disservice. It prevents them from actually coming to terms with how to cope and deal with competitiveness

themselves and how to develop the coping mechanisms that are going to be required in an ever increasing, ever more competitive world.

That is also evidenced in some very interesting and sad statistics that have come out of the OECD. Back in 1987 we were the third most competitive country of the 22 nations in the OECD. Sadly in 1992 we dropped to 11th. That is a telling statistic and one we are not proud of. It is one we need to address now if we are to give the students the opportunity they need to provide for themselves, their children and their grandchildren and to continue to build this great country. It is imperative that we continue to invest in education. It is the single most important determining factor for employability in the 21st century.

• (1855)

The government in its haste to try to balance its budget, which we certainly agree on and will try to help it do, unfortunately has decreased expenditures for education to the provinces. It can be done if it is prepared to give the provinces tax credits which would enable them to raise the money necessary to invest in education. Unfortunately that did not occur. I would implore the government, if it is going to take money away from the provinces to give them the opportunity to raise the money themselves to build the strong educational infrastructure needed to train students to build a strong provincial economy.

In my riding of Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Royal Roads Military College was cut in the last budget. That is fine if we can make a better college and the opportunity is there. It has enormous potential in terms of faculty, staff and the infrastructure to train students in highly technical skills in which Canada is a leader. Unfortunately it was given over to the province and the province made it a dumping ground for Camosun College and the University of Victoria.

Furthermore, the federal government has removed the physical infrastructures. For example, the oceanographic training vessel that belonged to the university was removed. This basically guts and pillages the ability of the institution to train students in the oceanographic skills in which Canada is a known leader and which other countries desperately require. That is but one example of the shortsightedness.

I also implore the government to aggressively pursue international free trade agreements but again give our manufacturers the ability to be competitive in the future. Germany is an example of a country that has a very intriguing relationship with the private and public sectors and the banks.

I am neither a banker nor an economist but I know there are very bright people in this country who are well versed in this and who could advise us on how to learn from some of the interesting experiments in Germany. In particular, we could learn how to get seed capital from the banks and provide it to small and medium sized businesses that could aggressively capitalize on trade options in international markets.

There are great opportunities within our manufacturing and services sectors to capitalize on external trade opportunities. However they are not getting the intelligence and information necessary for them to capitalize on this. I put this idea forward to the government to work with the internal trade ministry to look at it as an area where we need improvement to give our exporters a leg up.

In closing I would like to continue to support the government in decreasing external trade barriers. However, I would implore it to decrease and rapidly eliminate the internal trade barriers that only seek to benefit a minority of businesses within the country and seek to hamper and penalize the majority of Canadians.

The government should take courage that by doing so it may have to succumb to the wrath of a small number of vocal businesses but I know it will have our support in doing this. The government will have the support of the majority of Canadians in pursuing this laudable goal. In doing so it will give exporters and manufacturers within our country the necessary wherewithal to pursue an aggressive economic and manufacturing policy that will benefit Canadians from coast to coast.

• (1900)

I would also lastly ask this government to please get our economic house in order and learn from our zero and three program. By doing so we will be able to provide the tax relief necessary for our companies in this country to again be competitive.

One of the things that hamstring companies in this country greatly is the overbearing tax burden that exists on their shoulders. They find it almost impossible to be competitive on the international stage with the tax burdens we have today.

I would again implore the government to get our economic house in order, decrease the tax burden on companies and Canadians and decrease the GST. Then we would not be 11th in the world in competitiveness, but we would improve our competitiveness in the world order to again regain the powerful position we can in the first world nations.

Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made a number of comments and I would like to respond to some of them.

He clearly stated we have to invest more in education. When he stated that I hope he did not mean we have to put more money into education because that is not what is needed. The reality is that Canada invests more than any other country in the world in the area of education. We spend close to $50 billion annually in the area of education. What we have to do is spend wisely when it comes to the resources we are putting into education. We have to look at the educational system as a whole and bring all three levels of government together so they can better manage the resources they have at their disposal.

I quite agree with the hon. member that we have deficiencies in terms of the number of people who are going into the area of science and technology. We need to see more people going into the area of science and technology. We have to involve the industry more, that is true. We have to do all of that. We have to embark on co–operative programs. We have to get the parents involved. This is exactly what the minister responsible for human resources is doing in terms of his initiative. In the area of literacy, for example, this government has reintroduced the literacy program. It has put back into the program the $20 million that was supposedly going to be taken out of the program.

I also wanted to say for the record that this government has not only addressed the issue of interprovincial barriers but it has moved many steps forward in that area. On the external front, the government is on record as being on the leading edge when it comes to opening trade barriers and signing trade agreements with other countries.

In fairness to this government and to the Minister for International Trade, perhaps we have a Minister for International Trade who has travelled the world more than any other minister for international trade anywhere in the world. I would say it has paid dividends. If we were to look at the results, it has put Canada on the map internationally. The figures speak for themselves. Canada in 1993–94 has been on the leading edge. It has more economic growth than any industrialized country.

Would my colleague not want to correct the record and clearly state that this government has put Canada back on track in terms of its economic growth? Would he not want to give this government credit for making sure Canada is the leading country in the industrialized world since we took office in 1993?

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his intervention. He certainly made some good points, but I would like to correct him.

Why do we now have an economy where our interest rates have essentially doubled since this government came into power? Why is that? Why has Moody's downgraded our bonds? The reason is that our economy right now is in the worst state of affairs it has ever been in. In point of fact, we are on a steep, slippery slope to economic dislocation and economic disaster.

• (1905)

Three years from now, if we pursue the economic principles of this government, we will have $100 billion more on our debt, our interest payments will climb from $40 billion to $50 billion and our expenditures for government programs will decline from $120 billion to $102 billion, an $18 billion shortfall.

What are we going to say to the Canadian public? What are we going to say to people who are sick and who need their health care? What are we going to say to the elderly who need their old age security and cannot take care of themselves? What are we going to say to needy people who through no fault of their own need welfare? What are we going to say to them in the future when that money is not there? That is the reality of the economic plan this government has put forth.

I correct the hon. member that our situation economically is a lot worse. However, the hon. member did put some good points forth on education. I agree with him that we do not need more money in education. The Reform Party has never supported that. If the government is going to decrease money to the provinces, which is what we said, then do it. However, it has to give the provinces the ability to raise funds themselves by giving them the tax points to do it.

This government has said: "We are taking money away from you, but we are not going to give you the ability to raise money without penalizing you". That is fundamentally and morally wrong.

The hon. member did make a couple of good points on the co–operative activities of education and how we should indeed bring forth and use our education dollar to more efficient standards to increase the standards within our schools today. We do not need to spend more. In fact we can spend less because there is a lot of money that is wasted within education.

He brought forth some interesting points about bringing parents into the educational circle, something I have spoken about on a number of occasions within this House. I would be very interested at some time in the future in listening to what the hon. member says this government is doing in this regard. It is very important and I would be more than happy to help them with this.

We in the Reform Party are very much in support of improving the standards of education within this country without spending more, making sure that our students in this country have the skills that are necessary in the future to become competitive in the 21st century. Many of our schools are failing to do this. The tragedy for the students in this country is when they get out in the working world and find out that when they are competing against students from the Pacific Rim countries they are up against some very hardnosed, highly competitive individuals.

I hope we will be able to change our system somewhat and give our students the information and skills necessary to be competitive for them to be employed in the future and for them to build the strong economy we need in this country.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the occasion earlier this afternoon to compliment the member on a well thought out and logical speech, but I have to rise at this time and challenge him on what I thought was in many ways a rather incoherent speech.

He kept talking about the need to do more to remove internal barriers to trade within Canada. We on this side of the House agree entirely with that. That is what the bill before the House is currently about.

He went on to talk about the education system. I wondered if he thought he was in a legislature at the same time as sitting in the House of Parliament. He talked about the huge exodus to private schools. That is a little bit of an exaggeration and not worthy of the member. Clearly the vast majority of youngsters in this country still attend a very high quality but still needing improvement public system. I really would encourage him to avoid that kind of hyperbole in the future.

I would like to talk so that people who have been listening to the debate will know what this bill is about. We concede that it is only a beginning, but we are trying to undo over a century and a quarter of barriers that have been built up between the provinces of this Confederation.

• (1910)

This agreement and this bill before us is only part of the success to date because it only reflects the federal government's obligations under the agreement, not the obligations other governments provincially have undertaken to implement. It does deal with the procurement of goods, services, construction, labour mobility, consumer related measures, agriculture and food goods, alcoholic beverages, natural resources processing and so on.

We want to see faster progress as well but let me just ask the member a question. This is a Confederation that was formed by agreement, by consensus. It has always progressed by consensus and agreement. This agreement has been achieved by consensus among the parties. Is the member now in fact suggesting that the federal government should dictate to the provinces the removal of those internal barriers?

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brought up some very good points.

What we are saying in this party is that the government cannot keep taking tentative little baby steps forward with respect to internal trade barriers while the penalty is being paid for by 90 per cent of Canadians.

Furthermore, while we pursue the aggressive elimination of external barriers to trade while continuing to keep our internal barriers to trade, we are in effect significantly hamstringing our manufacturing, industrial and service sector within our country.

So, yes, what we are saying is that you must be much more aggressive in eliminating these internal barriers to trade. There are many more that need to be addressed. In point of fact, Bill C–88, which the hon. member is quite correct in saying is intended to decrease and eliminate the barriers to internal trade, when one looks at the bill one finds it is full of intent and very short on substance.

I hope that when this bill goes to committee stage the government, in co–operation with the official opposition and our party, will in fact pursue a more aggressive role in eliminating these internal barriers to trade, while speaking to the provinces in doing so. She is right that these must come in collusion with the provinces.

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to say a few words on this bill.

Trade is an important issue when it comes to agriculture. The time has come that we have to get freer trade because we see it happening with other countries. I think it is important that this bill get some serious consideration and maybe move on.

I think exactly like my colleagues in the Reform Party. This thing is going too slow, but then we are used to having this House not proceed too fast. We would not want to set too many records for speed. It could be dangerous.

It is only fair to say the position of our party is very clear: we want to do away with trade barriers. We want to make freer trade. We do not just want to trade between provinces. We want to also trade more with foreign countries.

When I look at the cost of these trade barriers of $6.5 billion to the economy of Canada, I wonder what we could do with $6.5 billion. One thing for sure is we in Manitoba could definitely afford the Winnipeg Jets. It would really buy some Liberal votes. However that does not seem to be happening too fast with this bill.

When I look at $6.5 billion it also tells me that is about the same price the infrastructure program costs and we would not have to finance one cent of that. Six and a half billion dollars less of interest a year would make quite a dint in the dollars we do spend.

Canada's domestic market is seriously fragmented by these provincial barriers. We support the removal of these interpro-

vincial barriers through a negotiated process. I do not think it can be done just by unilateral action. I think the provinces have to have some input into it. If there is co–operation among all the players this could be speeded up tremendously.

• (1915)

An interprovincial trade agreement should include a domestic trade dispute settlement mechanism to resolve future domestic trade disputes. Dispute settlement mechanisms work in international trade. Certainly it should also work in interprovincial trade.

The dispute settlement mechanism provided in the bill is very toothless. It reminds me a bit of a very soft hairbrush. One does not want to stir up the fuzz too much but wants to brush it aside a bit. That is one of the problems with the settlement mechanism in the bill.

If the provinces fail to co–operate in the removal of interprovincial trade barriers, the legitimacy of the obstacles should be challenged under the Constitution wherever possible. It could be quite a situation, enacting some of the constitutional powers, but if that is the only way to do away with trade barriers it would probably be worth its weight in gold.

Unfortunately we have seen over the last 100 years trade barriers being set up between provinces because they wanted little territories. Provincial premiers probably had a little more power than they should have had and eventually after three or four years could say to their electorate that they were going to protect their territory by throwing up another trade barrier. They could say: "Vote for us and things are going to improve".

So many trade barriers have been set up that we hardly know we are a country any more. We try to resolve our disputes. We try to more or less console each other by saying that one of these days we will do away with barriers but that does not take place.

The former Tory government claimed to support the removal of interprovincial trade barriers but it never used its power to remove the barriers where possible. When the Conservatives came into power in 1984 they had a lot of promises like the ones we see in the government's red book. They were to clean up the corruption and change the country.

We can see what has happened. Not only have more trade barriers probably been thrown up, but we also had an almost unbelievable debt put on us of another $400 billion or very close to it while the Conservatives were in power.

We hope the Liberals will have learned from the mistakes of the former government and will eliminate these problems. We hope they will throw away trade barriers and start making use of the $6.5 billion we could save.

It is important not to throw up trade barriers between members on one side of the House and the other. Sometimes we have some good advice for our friends across the way. Some day they will acknowledge that maybe we were right on occasion and that they could have learned from us as well as we could learn from them. The trade barrier problem is one that we should work on together to eliminate barriers as quickly as possible.

What did the Liberals say in the last Parliament? They made big promises that they were to do away with trade barriers. As we have seen the red book has quite a few promises that are very slow in coming. I hope they do not forget it. In the next election we might use that red book as flags to the provinces to prevent the Liberals from entering into power. Manitoba has almost eliminated all of them. It is important they take some notice and know what is going on. They better start honouring some of the promises.

It amazes me with the new opportunities in the global community how we can improve trade capabilities. The possibilities are there and we fail to realize them in our own country.

We can look at a $6.5 billion bill that could be cut very easily. We could make use of the interest on it to help us rejuvenate our industry and our economy.

• (1920)

We have to realize that we are human and things take some time. As I said the other day, when I look at the pace the Liberal government is going maybe we should go back to the horse and buggy. That is about the pace it has been doing things.

I sometimes feel a little frustrated on the committees and in the House that things do not get done the way we do it on the farm. We have three weeks to put in the crop and if we do not we are in big trouble. We have three weeks to take off the crop and if we do not we are in trouble. There are a time limits and that is exactly how I feel the bill should proceed. There should be a time limit to get the bill passed. There should be time to make amendments so that the bill is at least of some value.

The agreement does not represent a new vision for Canada that is required in this area. We have to do away with barriers faster. It is merely a rehashing of the status quo. If members want an example of how far into the future the document attempts to bring Canada's internal trade environment, they can compare it with section 121 of the British North American Act which states:

> All articles of growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall be admitted free into each of the other provinces.

I was just reminded of this when I was at home during the last break. I was walking across the fields looking at the mud and the puddles. I was very close to the border and I saw ducks going back and forth from the United States to Canada free as birds, with no problems; feathers were in the same order when they came back. I said to myself: "If birds can access boundaries with no problem, why shouldn't we as humans be able to do the same?" We always feel we are much superior when it comes to brain power, imagination and getting things done.

Article 101 of the interprovincial trade agreement states that the objective of the agreement is to reduce and eliminate to the extent possible barriers to the free movement of goods and services. I do not think the article has been fulfilled. We can still improve a lot on it and maybe speed it up. Here we have an agreement that is actually more restrictive and backward than the BNA Act from the time of Confederation.

When I look at the problem of the Liberals in Parliament climbing uphill on the debt problem, it reminds me a lot of a slippery hill that I drive through most winters. I spin my wheels a lot but I seem to go backward sometimes. If I do not get a push from somebody I do not make it to the top. That is what we in the Reform Party are trying to do. We are trying to nudge the government along to act a little faster and maybe to make a few decisions that will benefit the country.

Why do we continue to more or less reprimand, admonish or encourage the Liberals? We want a federal government that is working toward a clear and concise agreement. So far the bill is kind of muddy. As I said in a speech the other day in my constituency, we have to pay some attention to the Liberal government. Its vision is very cloudy in some of these bills. If it could get a clearer perspective things might work a little faster.

I am getting to the age where I have to use my spectacles at times. I hate them. I wish my vision was more clear without them, but as age creeps up I find that this is reality. That is what I would like to say to the government. As it gets older and if it does not start acting very quickly its vision will get more blurred. By the time the next election rolls around it probably will not even know what are the issues. I encourage the government to pay heed to some of the Reform Party advice because it has a clear vision and will keep reminding the House what it is all about.

The agreement fails to meet all the goals we hoped it would meet. We think it is ambiguous and it leaves areas untouched. When a flour mill in Manitoba cannot export its flour into a different province it makes me very sad. It is unbelievable that I can process my wheat but I cannot ship it to another province as flour. The wheat board can take my wheat and export it to foreign countries without a problem. However as a farmer I cannot process or value add and distribute it to another province. If that is not hindrance, I do not know what it is.

• (1925)

We have come of age in the country. We should start realizing that if we are to have free trade with foreign countries it has to happen here, or we will defeat the purpose, the time and the effort spent negotiating free trade agreements with other provinces.

The failure to obtain a ban on interprovincial barriers to agricultural products ensures that all costs associated with the barriers will continue. When I look at the cost of $6.5 billion, a lot of which is in agriculture, I am sad to see that farmers are going bankrupt. Their incomes are such that they can use every cent available. If we had freer trade it would make quite a difference. It would encourage younger farmers to be more aggressive and probably more entrepreneurial and to help further develop the country.

Agriculture has always driven the economy, especially in the western provinces. Any hindrance to agriculture is a hindrance to the whole country. If we can speed up the process and break down the trade barriers, we will be complimented for years and years to come.

There are many powerful forces currently affecting Canadian agriculture. Recent budgets have slashed the departments of agriculture and transport. The western farmer has to bear the cost of approximately $30 an acre in extra transportation costs. Any savings created by doing away with trade barriers would be very beneficial.

I talked to a farmer the other day who told me: "You know, Jake, it is amazing. I can own three sections of land anywhere between the provinces, but if I want to farm half a section on one side of the border and another half section on the other I run into problems with delivery to elevators, with permit books and with contracts. It is confusing".

This is a why we need free trade. We need to more or less dissolve the borders between provinces and make it a country, not a nation of 10 little countries such as we have right now. It is very important for future generations that we accomplish it very shortly and do not let it pass on to the next Parliament.

I was encouraged to hear my colleagues in the Bloc agree with us that trade barriers should be done away with. By doing away with the trade barriers between provinces it might even encourage people in Quebec and the Bloc to change their attitude about being a part of Canada. A freer country, a country destined to work and destined to remove inefficiencies, will make things happen that will be beneficial not just for us in our lifetime but for future generations.

We have to be encouraged that some progress has been made in the House. We want to continue on that route. The bill could be made valuable if it were given the benefit of some good amendments. There are some being proposed. I would support anything that would make the bill better, do away with the trade barriers faster and give us a chance in the future to operate as one nation, not as a nation with 10 little nations inside of it.

Every day on the news we hear what is happening in the former Yugoslavia. It does not work when a country is broken up and there are more rights for individual groups. When barriers are thrown up between people we run into problems. We create hard feelings and we will eventually wind up with some disastrous results.

• (1930)

Agriculture is one of the occupations with the most trade barriers. It is of the utmost importance that they be removed. I encourage every member of the House to work toward that end, to work together to make the country run, to do away with trade barriers and to use every dollar wasted to build up the economy so we can again have a healthy and prosperous country. When I think of paying $1 billion of interest every week by 1997 it scares me. That is why it is so tremendously important that we save every dime we can. It is so simple to remove the barriers, to increase production and to make things flow more easily.

I listened to my hon. colleagues speak about the oil issue. That is a product every province needs. It flows freely in a pipeline. There are no trade barriers. We do not always agree on the price but we know it is beneficial to the country.

I urge Parliament to improve Bill C–88 with amendments, to do away with trade barriers faster and to make the country work again and make this a nation in which our children and our grandchildren will be proud to live.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to stand in the House of Commons today to address Bill C–88. I cannot say I am opposed to Bill C–88. That would be like saying I am opposed to good intentions. Bill C–88 embodies the good intentions of governments, even if it does not really address the major problems facing the country with respect to interprovincial trade.

It would be very instructive to take a moment to review the red book promise with respect to free trade within the country. It is found on page 22:

> Interprovincial trade within Canada is hampered by as many as 500 trade barriers, according to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. These range from preferential procurement to non-harmonization of environmental regulations. The CMA has estimated that savings from the elimination of these barriers could be as high as $6 billion, just under 1 per cent of GDP. A Liberal government will be committed to the elimination of interprovincial trade barriers within Canada and will address the issue urgently.

To compare what I have just read from the red book with Bill C–88 we will find there is a bit of a discrepancy. Bill C–88 represents the good intentions of the government on this issue and the good intentions of some of the provinces but it does not meet the red book promise. I mark this as one more broken promise of the government.

The government made a fundamental mistake when it laid out this red book promise. I do not believe right from the outset it was completely sincere when it put those words into the red book. Although everyone would like to have interprovincial trade barriers eliminated, the government was simply not prepared in the end to do the things it should have done and needed to do to bring about a more meaningful resolution to this very important problem.

Like my hon. friend from Lisgar—Marquette, I am distressed when I hear farmers cannot move their value added product across borders.

• (1935)

We have talked many times about the need to diversify on the prairies to allow people to go beyond being producers of primary products and shipping them around the world in that form. We need to move them about as value added products within Canada. To me that is fairly obvious and it is very important we start to move toward that by eliminating interprovincial barriers.

Tradesmen also have similar problems not being able to cross over boundaries and have their qualifications apply. Professionals are another example, lawyers and doctors and accountants who have to write exams in each province in many cases if they want to practise in a certain province.

I will talk for a moment about some of the specific problems with Bill C–88 and where we see some of the huge loopholes or some of the ways provinces can escape from being bound by Bill C–88.

When we look at the agreement fairly closely it really does not represent any kind of a new vision for Canada. The agreement is mostly a written text of the status quo. Compared with the Constitution and section 121 of the BNA Act, it is quite a bit weaker than what is already in the Constitution. Section 121 of the BNA Act states:

> All articles of growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall be admitted free into each of the other provinces.

That is the Constitution. Let me compare it to article 101 of the provincial trade agreement which the government negotiated last summer. The objective of the agreement is to reduce and eliminate to the extent possible barriers to the free movement of goods and services.

Let us compare that with what the minister set out in his press release of March 31, 1994: "The federal government is committed to working toward an agreement which is clear and concise; has a set of rules that will eliminate protective measures; includes an effective and enforceable dispute settlement mechanism".

This agreement really fails in all of those criteria. If people look at it they will agree it is ambiguous. It leaves entire areas untouched—agriculture, certain government procurement and regional government, to name some. It does not undertake really

to eliminate trade barriers, only to the extent possible. There are all kinds of loopholes and I will touch on those in a moment. The dispute settlement mechanism is not enforceable and therefore not effective.

Let me talk specifically about some of our major concerns with the loopholes in the agreement. From part III, chapter 4, general rules, the agreement allows for a party to exempt itself from most of the constraints of articles 401, 402, 403 on the grounds of legitimate objectives. Articles 401 through 403 really are the essence of that agreement.

It is very important that those articles have some teeth. Here is what we find out. Under the agreement, legitimate objective is defined on pages 6 and 7 as the following objectives: public security and safety; public order; protection of human, animal or plant life or health; protection of the environment; consumer protection; protection of the health, safety and well-being of workers; affirmative action programs for disadvantaged groups considering, among other things, where appropriate fundamental climatic or other geographical factors, technological or infrastructure factors, or scientific justification.

We have listed almost every possible excuse under the sun for allowing people to opt out of this agreement. That is the huge fundamental flaw of the bill. I understand the government's good intentions but it simply did not come anywhere near meeting its red book promise of addressing this problem with urgency, implying it would bring about an agreement as quickly as possible. This comes nowhere near that.

• (1940)

Our party does not want to be completely negative. We would like to offer some constructive alternatives. One of the things the government can do, which it has not done and for which there is a growing body of evidence that it should, is bring about a court challenge and use its standing in the Constitution to actually be more in charge of interprovincial trade barriers.

Section 121 gives the federal government control over barriers within provinces. There is no reason that could not happen. I heard some hon. members from across the way talking about whether it might be preferable to get consensus, et cetera. Of course it is. We want to work with the provinces. That is very important in this day and age when our friends from Quebec, the Bloc Quebecois, are saying they want to break up the country and that kind of thing.

At the end of the day are we here to please certain special interests in different provinces which make a tremendous amount of noise and get the government's attention in those provinces or are we here for everybody, for the common good? I say we are here for the common good, to do the things we need to do of the most benefit to every man and woman in the country, not just to few who make a big noise when it looks like their little area will be jeopardized and they will no longer enjoy protection from the government.

The free market has to decide these things. If we let the free market decide we end up in a situation in which we have the cheapest possible services and goods being provided to consumers and levels of government which means more money in the pockets of consumers so they can spend on other things, which means there is money for productivity, for the economy to expand, et cetera. It is absolutely the best way to go.

That the federal government has finally come on board on the whole idea of free trade underlines it is understanding that. It fought against free trade in 1988 during the election but has now come around and we are happy to have it on our side. The government did not show the same change of heart in this bill or at least it did not show a real will to bring about the demise of interprovincial trade barriers. Unfortunately Bill C-88 has been dramatically watered down from where it should be.

Some people may ask if this is something we really want to do in the courts. I remind people listening, the government has shown no hesitation to go to court on things like enforcing the gag law legislation. It has shown no hesitation in taking extraordinary measures to cancel deals like the Pearson airport deal. I think it should show the same will when it comes to Bill C-88.

Bill C-88 is for the benefit of all Canadians; if it would only pound down interprovincial trade barriers. It has good intentions, absolutely, but we have to ask "where's the beef?" It is simply not in there.

I want to talk about how important an issue this really is. It is a huge issue that is extremely important to the country. A good article came out in the August edition of *Fraser Forum* by Filip Palda. He talks about a study done in British Columbia about interprovincial trade barriers:

> The B.C. study is right, however, in pointing out that the CMA's estimate of the benefits of free internal trade only focuses on three areas of the economy: agriculture; alcohol and government procurement.
>
> Somehow the $6.5 billion gain from liberating a few sectors of the Canadian economy has become entrenched in the media as an upper boundary on the benefits of free trade in all sectors. The public debate has ignored that when a market grows several things happen: costs fall and producers become more competitive. Japan is a fierce international competitor because it has a large internal market. This market is like a school where students learn from each other. Efficient producers pass into the world market while bad producers fall into mediocrity or bankruptcy. The benefit of these intangibles is hard to put a number on but the number is probably larger than the commonly cited $6.5 billion. Studies of the entire economy suggest that the annual gains could be between 6 per cent and 9.5 per cent of GNP. This translates into gains in the range of $44 billion.

• (1945)

Many hon. members have spoken about the $6.5 billion that came out in the CMA study. I was amazed when I first heard it. I could not believe how much money that was. I did not realize at that time, and maybe other members did not either, that it was only the CMA looking at the effects that dropping interprovincial trade barriers would have on those three sectors.

If we extend it to the full economy, $44 billion is what this gentleman is suggesting could be the benefit to Canadians. That is a tremendous amount of money. When it is realized how big that amount is and what it could do for the economy it gives us an idea of how important this issue should be to the government.

I feel the government has failed us in Bill C–88. It has not shown any urgency. It did not get the Prime Minister involved to make this happen. It did not use its ability to push this through the courts. Therefore the agreement is very much watered down. Canada is no further ahead than it was before except that the government can say it has dealt with the issue. However when I look at this I have to say where is the beef.

I want to talk about the larger scope of competitiveness and why it is important to have interprovincial trade barriers dealt with. It affects our competitiveness in the world. The economist I have just quoted, Filip Palda, pointed to that when he talked about Japan and how its internal market is so large that it really prepares people for selling around the world. That is only one thing that comes out of knocking down trade barriers.

My hon. friend from Lisgar—Marquette mentioned this a few minutes ago. The economy has problems. He talked a bit about grain producers and people who would like to add some value to the product they produce. If value added products cannot be moved between provinces there is no way that producers will be ready for the world. It is critical to be able to trade between provinces freely so that a competitive edge can be developed.

This is only one in a long legacy of areas where the government has failed to help provide that competitive edge to Canadians. The most obvious one and the one that will follow the government to its grave is the fact that it has never really dealt with the debt and the deficit. That is what is taking the competitive edge off for a lot of businesses that want to sell around the world.

The debt at $553 billion and a deficit of around $32 billion, if the projections do not go all out of whack because of a possible coming recession, have led to all kinds of problems that make it extremely difficult for businesses to get out into the world and compete. With that debt and deficit come high taxes. High taxes mean that costs go up. It also means that employees are the ones who are bearing a lot of those taxes. Will they demand higher wages? All of a sudden we have that burden to contend with. It makes it extremely difficult to deal with other countries when we have those burdens.

Another thing that happens with a big debt and deficit is all that competition for money. Canada is in a situation where it has to offer higher interest rates relative to the rest of the world. It is a problem with our main trading partner, the United States. It causes costs to go up for producers and businesses cannot be nearly as competitive as they would like to be.

The government has failed people who want to export their products, whether it is within Canada or without, on a couple of fronts. First it has failed to knock down trade barriers. By not dealing with the debt and deficit it has also caused us to be in a situation where costs are such that it is hard to compete in the world.

Another point I want to touch on briefly is the idea of training. The government and the Minister of Human Resources Development have gone to great lengths to talk about and hold studies into training and what can be done to make us more competitive in the world. The minister has created plans such as the Atlantic groundfish strategy. We all know where that has gone. There are whole towns in Newfoundland where the entire population is training to be hairdressers. That is not going to work.

• (1950)

The problem is that there are no jobs there. The reason there are no jobs is that the economy is so burdened with interprovincial trade barriers, so burdened with debt and taxes and interest rates that are higher than those in the U.S. for instance, relative to some of our trading partners, that we do not have jobs. Instead of worrying so much about government programs to train people, let us start providing jobs by scaling back the debt and deficit and scaling back the interest rates and taxes.

Industry and small business will create the jobs. Do not worry about the government creating them. Small business can do that better than anybody.

Let me conclude by saying that I think the government had good intentions when it brought in Bill C–88. It wanted to eliminate interprovincial trade barriers. However that is all it is, an ode to a good intention. It is something like teaching children about ethics and morals by telling them: "Never make a promise you cannot keep". The government made a promise in the red book and I do not think it kept it.

I ask hon. members to improve the bill. I ask the government to make another effort in the very near future to bring about a meaningful interprovincial trade agreement.

Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the member talking in circles.

If he were to make suggestions on how the bill could be amended and not just by going around what he thinks is in the bill, what specific recommendation would he make to ensure that we would have some internal agreements between the provinces and territories in order to facilitate trade?

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. member missed what I said in my speech. The key thing that has to be done is the federal government has to use its constitutional authority and demand at some time if a consensus cannot be reached for the greater good of all Canadians, as opposed to the special interest groups who like being protected by some of the interprovincial trade barriers, that section 121 of the Constitution be used. It has the authority. It is time to go to court to determine that is the case.

While it is good to try and reach a consensus because it is absolutely the route to go, in the end instead of thinking about provincial politicians and special interests, we have to think about Canadians. Let us do what is right for them. If it means that commerce needs to reside in the federal area let us do that. Our party has always championed decentralization. We have always been in the forefront on that because in general it works best.

However on some issues, and I would say commerce is one of them, the authority more properly rests at the federal level. That is why section 121 of the Constitution needs to reign supreme.

I believe there is growing support that this should be challenged in the courts the next time the provinces try and assert their authority in this area. I know I personally would speak very strongly in favour of pushing the issue in the courts if it comes to it.

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify if the hon. member said that provincial politicians were special interests. That is the first point on which I would like him to elaborate.

Second, did I hear him correctly when he suggested that the federal government should impose a solution on the provinces with respect to interprovincial trade rather than negotiate a solution?

• (1955)

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, unless I made a mistake when speaking, I really did not mean to say that provinces were special interest groups. I am saying that people in those provinces very often do constitute special interests and they do want to protect their own areas.

I guess it is whether we allow the special interest groups to impose their conditions on the rest of Canadians by making them pay a higher price for goods and services or whether the federal government uses the authority granted it under the Constitution simply to bring everybody into line and play by the rules that were laid out when the Constitution was set.

Therefore I do not think we are really imposing anything on the provinces. We are simply asking them to play by the rules that were agreed to when the Constitution was established.

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague whether he might want to make a comment about the difference between governing and leading. Is it the role of the government to make sure that the laws of the land are obeyed and enforced or is there a need to provide some leadership, to create a vision so that the country can grow and develop and the economy can become more innovative?

Would the hon. member make a comment about those two aspects?

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. friend for the question.

He has hit the nail on the head. We need to have some leadership in the country. First of all the Prime Minister has to enunciate his vision of the country. Maybe he can talk about competitiveness, interprovincial trade barriers and that kind of thing.

He has to say that at the end of the day whatever we do has to be for the greater good. It has to be something that benefits the average taxpayer, the average consumer, not something that protects a group that happens to be noisy.

We have to be consistent when we follow that plan. It should be a theme that flows through all the things the government addresses, all the legislation so we do not give into noisy interests, complainers and whiners. At the end of the day, we say: "Let's do what is right for the greater good".

My friend has really hit the nail on the head. We did cave in this time to noisy special interests in many instances in Bill C–88.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is good to speak in the House over the supper hour. I see that we have more Liberals out than usual, therefore I appreciate the opportunity to be able to actually speak to members in the House on the other side.

I would like to speak to the motion and the amendment that we have presented which reads as follows:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:
>
> This House declines to give second reading to Bill C–88, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade because it fails to eliminate all interprovincial trade barriers.

Approximately one year ago, the Canadian people witnessed the signing of a so–called and I use that term very loosely, historical agreement on internal trade. The signing of the agreement between the Prime Minister and the premiers of the 10 provinces and the leaders of the two territories was to "reduce and eliminate to the extent possible barriers to free movement of persons, goods, services and investments within Canada and to establish an open, efficient and stable domestic market".

The Prime Minister called the signing significant, suggesting that the provincial, territorial and federal governments have taken a large step toward reducing internal trade barriers. A large step is the same as a small step if one is on a treadmill. That person is still in the same place. Likewise, we are not any closer to freer trade within Canada with this agreement than we were before.

Canada has signed the NAFTA trade agreement and the World Trade Agreement. NAFTA will possibly be including Chile. However we have failed to bring down the barriers within Canada.

A study done by John McCallum, chief economist of the Royal Bank and John Helliwell of the University of British Columbia suggests that the value of the interprovincial trade exceeds the value of trade with the United States, Mexico and Chile combined. That is astounding. The trade within Canada exceeds the trade we have in the North American continent and Chile. According to McCallum and Helliwell, "as a generator of trade, the Canadian economic union is orders of magnitude more powerful than either NAFTA or the European Union". Canada has entered into agreements with these countries to provide greater access to their markets, while we are promoting protectionism in the provinces and territories.

• (2000)

The agreement on internal trade does nothing to break down the walls of protectionism and allow the freeing up of interprovincial markets for companies right across the country. A study by the GATT published last year criticized the federal government and the provinces for not moving far enough in bringing down the interprovincial trade barriers. These trade barriers are inhibiting economic growth and job creation.

The bottom line is, Canadian companies are losing their competitive edge. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and other business organizations are telling the government to get rid of these barriers. We may be able to hide under the shroud of protectionism in the short term, but the long term prospects are dim for this type of trade policy.

Reformers are calling out clearly to Liberals saying it is time to wake up and smell the coffee. Now is the time to bring down domestic trade barriers. It should have happened yesterday because as we know, tomorrow never comes. It is like preaching democracy abroad and practising dictatorship at home.

I say to the House that we are no closer to free trade with Bill C–88 than we are to having freer votes in the House of Commons. The word freedom and the Liberals do not seem to get along. The Liberals promised free votes but they reneged on that promise. Now they are trying to imply that we are moving toward freer trade in the country. However, when we look at the bill it is not really there. It is an illusion. It is not true.

As already stated, the Reform Party does not like the trade agreement, nor does the business community like this trade agreement. It is a bad agreement which will continue to hurt consumers' pocketbooks.

Let us talk about some examples. Within the supply managed sector of agriculture we have seen arrangements which do not make sense. For example, the province of British Columbia has approximately 13 per cent of the population but it is restricted to producing only 4.4 per cent of the industrial milk in the country. It must rely on Ontario and Quebec to supply processed milk products to consumers. Consumers of course must bear the extra cost of transporting these products to British Columbia. I am sure that dairy farmers in British Columbia would be quite open to producing larger quantities of industrial milk. This is not a level playing field and agreements such as the provisions contained in Bill C–88 do not fix the problem.

The government is further deluding farmers by suggesting that they will be able to maintain protectionist enclaves. Can the government be open and honest with farmers? Under chapter nine of the internal trade agreement the ministers have agreed to "undertake a comprehensive review of the framework governing supply managed commodities and implement an action plan toward the development of sustainable orderly marketing systems in the Canadian dairy, poultry and egg industry".

Do we need another comprehensive review of supply managed commodities? The answer is an unequivocal no. Reviews do little to prepare farmers for what they will be facing in the next few years. The time is now to move and prepare farmers for an open and more competitive market economy. Farmers may reap the benefits of this myopic thinking in the short term, but they will have to pay the price down the road if we do not correct the situation soon.

Removing the restrictions on the movement of agricultural products may be painful initially, but it will prepare farmers for the increased competition from south of the border. It will also make our domestic agricultural industry stronger rather than weaker.

I would also like to talk about a couple of other consumer products that are exempt from this trade agreement namely, alcoholic beverages and electricity. I am not much of a beer

drinker but beer drinkers will continue to be stifled when it comes to buying beer from other provinces. What if a Saskatchewan ex–patriot living in Ottawa would like a case of beer from a microbrewery in Saskatchewan? Chances are he would not be able to purchase the beer because of the trade barriers that are in place.

This brings to mind a rather interesting incident that occurred to a brewery located in my home province a couple of years ago. The brewery wanted to market its beer in Alberta. However, Alberta had placed restrictions on beers from outside the province. Even Ralph Klein's Alberta wanted to implement some trade barriers which I do not think was very good of Mr. Klein. I think he ought to review these types of policies. It does not speak well for his administration.

• (2005)

The brewery in Saskatchewan was forced to sell its beer at a higher price than that of the Alberta beer. To get around this, the Saskatchewan brewery placed a $2 bill inside each case of beer to offset the higher price it had to charge. Needless to say, the company was told to stop placing the money in the cases. It was a rather creative effort to market a product that was nipped in the bud and not allowed to be competitive.

Our trade arrangements are preventing companies from developing a competitive advantage by continuing this absolutely disgraceful form of protectionism.

I also want to briefly touch on electricity. It was also a product that was exempt from the agreement between the federal government and the provinces, the agreement that is embodied here in Bill C–88. The provinces and the federal government were unable to make headway on this one as well. As a result what happens? Consumers in Ontario will still be unable to use the cheaper electricity from Quebec or Manitoba which in many cases is available to them. In addition, higher rates for electricity for manufacturers are passed down by the manufacturers to the consumers in the products they produce.

Why should consumers and manufacturers be held hostage to utility companies when less expensive sources are available? Maybe such shortsightedness on the part of the Ontario government concerning interprovincial trade barriers is part of the reason that Bob Rae got dumped the other day and the people of Ontario chose another government. People are not dumb. They realize they are paying for these foolish trading practices within Canada out of their own pockets. It is not the manufacturers that pay in the long run. It is not the governments that reap the benefits of these trade barriers. It is the consumers across Canada in every province who end up being hit right in the wallet, right where it counts the most.

I want to talk about my own province. The government in the province of Saskatchewan has entered this agreement with the largest number of exemptions. I am ashamed at the number of exempt agencies in this agreement. The following government entities will be exempt from the internal trade agreement. Fasten your seat belt, Madam Speaker, because the list is long.

Treasury Board crowns include: the Agricultural Credit Corporation, Agricultural Development Fund Corporation, the Energy Conservation and Development Authority, Municipal Financing Corporation, New Careers Corporation, Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation, Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Printing Company, Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, Saskatchewan Municipal Board, Saskatchewan Research Council and Saskatchewan Wetland Conservation Corporation.

We then go on to the government enterprises, the crown investment corporations themselves. We have the encompassing CIC, the Crown Investment Corporation which is exempt from the internal trade agreement. The Saskatchewan Government Growth Fund Management Corporation is also exempt. Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation; SaskEnergy Incorporated, which provides us with our natural gas; Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation; Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation; Saskatchewan Government Insurance, which provides us with insurance for our cars and homes; Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation; Saskatchewan Power Corporation; Saskatchewan Telecommunications; Saskatchewan Transportation Company; and the Saskatchewan Water Corporation are all exempt. This is a long list.

There are other boards, agencies and commissions which include: the Board of Internal Economy, the Electoral Office, the Liquor Board Superannuation Commission, the Liquor and Gaming Licensing Commission, the Saskatchewan Arts Board, the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Superannuation Board, the Western Development Museum Board, the Workers' Compensation Board of Saskatchewan and the Workers' Compensation Superannuation Board. These are all exempt from Bill C–88 which is supposed to restrict interprovincial trade barriers.

The Saskatchewan government will continue to be able to procure products from local producers. The provincial government argues that preferential procurement helps local producers and lowers unemployment in the provinces. Essentially the provincial governments are taking away money from the taxpayers and returning it to local producers. Most of the time the government ends up paying the local producers more money than it would pay for the product from neighbouring provinces.

• (2010)

Companies outside of Saskatchewan will not have access to all the government agencies listed as exempt from the internal trade agreement. We ask the question. Will those companies lobby their provincial governments to use retaliatory measures against Saskatchewan companies competing for government contracts? This type of policy precipitates the building of trade barriers, not free trade.

I want to give another example. Just a few months before the last election I was at a trade fair in my province of Saskatchewan. I was talking to people about the Reform Party's policies and of course they were quite excited about that. They were buying memberships and were enthusiastic about Reform. They were saying that they certainly would not vote Liberal when they compared Liberals with Reformers.

I was talking to one gentleman who told me he designed security systems. He said he had been able to design a security system for a customer in the province of Alberta. I thought that was wonderful. It was good to see some entrepreneurial spirit in my province of Saskatchewan. It was good to see that this person had been able to do some work for a neighbouring province. He said that his customer had been able to buy his expertise. He also sells the equipment but he was not allowed to even put a tender in on the contract for the security system. There is a trade barrier between Alberta and Saskatchewan and his products cannot even cross the border into Alberta.

I thought, my goodness what is wrong with our province? Saskatchewan is putting up barriers not to let competitors from outside Saskatchewan deal in the province. Other provinces for example, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia are doing likewise and we are getting into a spitting war. Who is being hurt? Of course it is you and I, Madam Speaker. The Canadian citizens who have to pay the bills and pay for the product are getting the short end of the stick.

Most individuals in my province agree that discriminatory trade practices and protectionism are harmful to the province in the long run. We may win the odd little battle in this trade war but in the long run we all lose.

The current provincial government is of the opinion that it must cushion the shock of external competition by continuing the practice of preferential procurement. This will not help the people of Saskatchewan in the future when the pressures of the global community end the enclaves of protectionism. The Saskatchewan government and this Liberal government must realize that short term trends quickly become permanent policies. The time is now to prepare companies and the workforce for new opportunities.

What is the solution to the problems I have outlined? I have been very critical. I think my criticism is fair and just. It is also incumbent upon us on the opposition side to suggest some solutions. We are saying that we should eliminate all interprovincial trade barriers. It is absolutely ridiculous that it is easier to trade internationally than it is within the borders of this country.

It is insane that our trade barriers from province to province are costing consumers $6 billion to $8 billion every year. They are increasing our costs of surviving in this country. We are making more progress with Chile, the United States and our European trading partners than we are between our own provinces.

Closed systems such as the one we have in Canada fly in the face of recently signed international trade agreements. Modest estimates as I said place the cost of these trade barriers around $6 billion to $8 billion. One figure I ran across came to $6.5 billion per year.

Freeing up that amount of capital will result in market growth which will in turn result in lower prices for consumers and greater competition for producers. As I already mentioned, greater competition will prepare Canadian companies for the onslaught of freer international trade.

Reformers believe that a trade agreement can, and I want to emphasize can, be brought to fruition preferably through an agreement between the federal government and the provinces but failing that through constitutional challenges. The federal government has the power under the current Constitution to eliminate the trade barriers. I want to read section 12 of the BNA Act which states: "All articles of growth, produce or manufacture of any one of the provinces shall be admitted free into each of the other provinces". That is in our BNA Act. When will this government be prepared to take the big step off of the treadmill that is taking us nowhere and move toward freer trade in this country?

I want to close with a challenge. I challenge this government to not continue giving us nonsense like Bill C–88 which is just window dressing and no substance. I am going to ask government members to get off their hands. They have been sitting on their hands on a lot of issues.

• (2015)

They are sitting on their hands on this interprovincial barrier situation. I challenge the government members. They should get off their hands, and do something about the problem, really get down to brass tacks with the provincial governments. Should they refuse to bring down these trade barriers that are hurting us all, they are costing families in this country thousands of dollars in increased costs. Get down to business. And if they cannot come to an agreement with the provinces, then use some of the constitutional clout they have in the BNA Act to get the job

done. That is why we are here. We are here to work for Canadians, not to sit on our hands and complain and bring weak-kneed legislation like Bill C-88 before the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): At the request of the government whip, the vote has been deferred until 11.30 p.m.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MANGANESE-BASED FUEL ADDITIVES ACT

Hon. David Anderson (for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment) moved that Bill C-94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese-based substances, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very happy to start off this debate on a bill concerning a fuel additive called manganese.

[*English*]

In English it is referred to in technical terms as MMT, nevertheless implying that we are dealing here with a substance called according to a technical name, MMT. It contains a chemical substance called manganese. It is well known in chemistry as well as in geology and in the mineral disciplines as being one that can be dangerous to human health.

• (2020)

This bill aims very simply at bringing about a decision in Canada that was launched and concluded successfully south of the border well over 16 years ago, more precisely in 1978. At the time the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington concluded as a result of studies conducted there that it was essential in the public interest to do away with manganese as an additive to gasoline.

This bill attempts today to bring to the attention of members and the public the importance to do the same now in Canada, not just for environmental reasons but also for technical reasons, not just for public health reasons but also because the automotive industry has by virtue of technological change reached a level where it actually depends on the elimination of manganese from gasoline.

It must be said for the record that Canada is probably the only country in the world that is still using manganese. As a result of that, for the reasons I have just outlined, the situation has reached a point where it is absolutely essential that we move on this issue and deal with it.

The engineers in the automotive industry are telling us that manganese impairs the performance of pollution control equipment in cars and trucks. The automakers in Canada and in the United States are now producing cars with systems that can tell the driver how well and whether the pollution control equipment is working.

Manganese in gasoline does not permit automakers to give the driver of the vehicle the benefit of using the pollution control equipment because manganese is incompatible with this kind of equipment. I am told that automakers will have to disconnect this kind of equipment in Canada if gasoline continues to contain manganese.

The consequences for consumers are manifold. First the warranty of the engine will be affected. It will not be extended as far as it could be extended with this kind of equipment to the benefit of the consumer. Second the performance of the engine could be affected because of the inability of the driver to know whether certain parts of the equipment are functioning. The third consequence is complementary to the second point: the driver will not know whether the catalytic converter is working or not, whether the anti-pollution devices in the car are properly functioning and therefore the driver will not know whether the equipment installed in the car is working in the manner it is supposed to in terms of pollution controls.

The scientists in our community are also informing us that manganese in gasoline means risking greater pollution in the form of smog, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.

Automakers in Canada have told the government they want the elimination of manganese in gasoline. They are technologically ready for it. Actually they are well beyond this point. They all say that manganese adversely affects the onboard diagnostic

systems, which is a fancy word for indicating the types of devices that inform the driver whether the anti–pollution equipment is working or not. In other words, the driver will not have the ability to tell whether or not the pollution control equipment installed in the car is working or not.

• (2025)

Members will quickly realize therefore the importance in the public interest of this measure proposed by the Minister of the Environment, who has been working on this initiative for some time already and who has been behind the scenes pushing the interested industries, petroleum on the one hand and the automakers on the other—and the latter is being quite keen and cooperative—to bring this matter to a solution without legislation.

It is only fair to say that the federal government has waited for the automotive and the petroleum industries to resolve this problem without legislation. Unfortunately, the problem has not been resolved.

The automakers at the very moment as we have this debate are now manufacturing the diagnostic system for the 1996 models. We are now debating this matter at the eleventh hour, and the government finds it necessary to present and pass this legislation in the speediest manner possible.

The government is doing this with three purposes in mind: number one, as I mentioned earlier, to protect human health; number two, to protect the warranty of the car to the benefit of the consumer; and number three, to take advantage of technological change and reap the benefits offered by these diagnostic systems, which are higher efficiency for the engine, lower consumption, and of course, quite important, pollution prevention.

The question might arise as to who is opposed to this bill. Obviously the only opposition at this stage can be identified among those who are the suppliers of manganese, some multinational companies, which do not really have at heart the public interest.

Remember that MMT, the substance that contains manganese, was banned already in 1978 and for very precise health reasons. This issue has been on the agenda of publicly concerned legislators for some time.

Members remember leaded gasoline. Lead is one of the most poisonous substances which poses a danger to human health, particularly to children. It has been removed therefore from gasoline, from toys, from paints. Who was opposed at the time when lead was to be removed from these products? It was the very same people who now oppose the removal of manganese from gasoline.

It can be said in conclusion that in Canada there are 18 automobile companies that view this bill as needed and desirable. They see it of course from their perspective as being involved in the motor vehicle production centre. As a Parliament we have to take a view also to include health considerations and consumer protection considerations. It is therefore for these three reasons put together that we think this is a bill that commands the attention and positive reception on the part of colleagues and members of this House in the hope that they will consider it in a favourable manner tonight and give it speedy consideration so it can be passed and put at work for the benefit of Canadians from coast to coast.

• (2030)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Madam Speaker, today we start second reading of Bill C–94, an act to regulate the provincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese–based substances. More specifically, Bill C–94 is aimed at banning the addition of a substance called MMT to unleaded gasoline in Canada. This bill would allow the Minister of the Environment to rid Canada of MMT, a substance which, I would like to remind you, has been added to our gasoline since 1977.

The minister is tabling this bill as the session is drawing to a close, and she appears eager to have it passed as quickly as possible. The minister's approach denotes a certain uneasiness in this matter, an uneasiness that may be due to pressure from automotive manufacturers who, coincidentally, are concentrated in her region. Far be it from me to think that the minister has decided to ban MMT in Canada for the sole purpose of addressing the automotive industry's concerns. I am convinced that she is acting in the public interest and that her first concern in making decisions is for the environment. At least, that is what we should expect from the minister.

However, in the case of MMT, the minister's intentions are not clear and she appears unwilling to disclose the real motivation behind this decision. Her arguments seem lame and questionable. The minister also acts in similar fashion in several other matters. What she is saying in this and other cases and the information she spreads are not likely to reassure the public, let alone environmental groups.

Her knowledge of the issues appears deficient and inadequate, robbing her of the credibility that is needed if not essential in such a position. This, incidentally, reminds me of the raising of the *Irving Whale*, the barge belonging to the Irving company, which has been lying at the bottom of the Gulf of St. Lawrence since 1970 with 3,100 tonnes of bunker C fuel oil on board. In this matter, the minister has said all kinds of things on how the barge will be removed. Recently, the minister and her press secretary even came up with their own raising technique, which is not mentioned anywhere in the bidding documents.

I listened to a recording of an interview with the minister on this subject on CBGA, a CBC radio station in the Magdalen Islands. What I heard was utterly ludicrous. Informed people must have shuddered when they heard the minister talk about using something like a rubber dinghy, a sort of enormous condom to enclose the barge 200 feet under water. That is totally ridiculous. Who will tell the minister to stop saying the first thing that comes to mind? Who will tell the minister to familiar-

ize herself with the issues, to look at them before spewing out incorrect information? Who from the cabinet or her department will ask the minister to be more careful in her rhetorical outbursts which are so nefarious for the environment?

I will now close my comments on the Irving Whale with my sincere wishes that its salvaging, which will take place this summer, will not turn into an ecological catastrophe. The devastating effects would be felt for years to come and, by and large, the minister would be held personally responsible. There are similarities between the Irving Whale, the MMT issue and many others. The links between all of these cases and decisions are haste and a lackadaisical approach.

Add to that a rather murky transparency and a lack of will to provide pertinent information, and we find ourselves in very worrisome situations and we find that the Minister of the Environment is increasingly challenged by specialists in the field.

• (2035)

Judging from the minister's actions, one would almost conclude that she is in a leadership race and that she is feeling ignored by the media. One would almost believe that she is suddenly suffering from a lack of visibility and that it was absolutely necessary for her to present us with something: statements from the minister, bills and new policies unexpectedly introduced in the House with no rhyme or reason. They are presented to us piecemeal with no real indication of any will on the part of the minister to draw up a game plan or to create a cohesive environmental policy.

Why is the minister acting this way? Why does she always want to introduce initiatives as if she were pulling a rabbit out of a hat? The answer is simple: the environment is not on the Liberals' list of priorities. The evidence is clear. Since the Grits came to power, important environmental issues have not been dealt with. The promises in the red bible have been thrown out in the garbage, hardly appropriate in this case.

In fact, this comes as no surprise, since the whole red bible has been shelved. The abdication of responsibility is deplorable. The Liberals, starting with the Deputy Prime Minister, have not done much to improve, preserve and protect our environment.

However, some hon. members opposite are very concerned about the environment. We know them well. The hon. member for Davenport, himself a former minister of the environment; the hon. member for York—Simcoe; and the Quebec member for Lachine—Lac–Saint–Louis, former minister of PCBs in Quebec, are all great environmentalists. Like us, they must be aware of their government's abdication of its responsibilities. But what can they do if their hands are tied and they do not have the ear of the minister and the cabinet?

Yes, the minister did shout right and left, and she did spout some high sounding ideas here and there. The minister even went so far as to believe and to say out loud that Canada was a world leader on environmental issues. Now that was rather unfortunate, because when we consider the Liberals' record in this area, it is clear all this is just window dressing. The minister creates a diversion to camouflage the government's lack of commitment.

For instance, the Sierra Club published its environmental report card at the beginning of this month. The result: The minister got a B+, the threesome consisting of the ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance and Industry got an F, for failing, and finally, the Prime Minister got a D with a reprimand that he had failed to instruct his cabinet to achieve the red book's objective to reduce greenhouse gases 20 per cent by the year 2005.

All this confirms what we in the Bloc have maintained since the very beginning, which is that the Liberals are all talk but no action. The cabinet's strategy consists merely in putting the minister on stage to make a lot of high sounding promises. The cabinet has no compunction in sacrificing the minister and, what is worse, the environment as well.

The minister should feel somewhat embarrassed about playing this role at the behest of cabinet. In playing this role, which suits her very well given her verbal facility—she might be called a motor mouth—, the minister is losing a certain credibility, however.

In addition, however, given the rather mixed results in environmental matters, it is clear the minister is no cabinet heavy weight. The ministers who got an "F" from the Sierra Club are the uncontested leaders establishing the environmental agenda. The environmental cause is certainly not advanced by those with the lowest mark.

This inaction and lack of environmental will leads in the end to trivialities, essentially no results. It started off well enough with actions being chosen that required the government itself to carry out internal measures, if I can put it that way, but we have seen no external measures, which would have greater benefit.

Our government therefore shows little interest in the environment and lacks an overall vision and policy. We have a government and a minister that can act only within the system and, on a few occasions, outside it, as in the case of the bill before us today.

• (2040)

The Liberals are favouring a piecemeal environment policy, which is a definite step backwards and a shameful reduction on their part. The best example of their throwing in the towel is undoubtedly their dropping the green plan. This plan, which was introduced in 1990, was an overall action plan. It was spearheaded by the Department of the Environment, which was responsible for various aspects of its implementation, and inspired by an environmental philosophy. The dropping of this plan represents an unprecedented withdrawal. We are going back many years because of the lack of sensitivity and will on the part of decision makers who deal with the environment as if it were a fashionable issue. Polls reveal that the environment is no longer a hot topic. Decision makers react stupidly, putting this issue on the back burner and withdrawing from initiatives already under way.

By dropping the Green Plan, they are definitely saying no to a co–ordinated approach. The minister is replacing a coherent plan, which was spearheaded by a department with a specific budget, by a system which leaves every department free to do what it wants. It is as if someone had decided to scatter pieces from a puzzle all over the place. There would no longer be any relationship between them, and the final objective would become unattainable. This is what the government is doing now, it is dividing up the environment, much to its detriment.

I will remind you that the Green Plan, for which the initial budget was supposed to be around $3.5 billion over five years, never amounted to more than $800 million. This is far short of the initial goal. Those responsible for backing away from this ecological commitment are the people on the other side and the Conservatives who preceded them. The ministers, whether blue or red, did not have the will to pursue this innovative plan, to modify it and to perfect it, to make it responsive to the needs of the environment. Therefore, the budget melted like new snow in May, without anybody paying any attention. What a pity. What irresponsibility and lack of respect towards our environment. Sincerely, I do not believe that this is the way to proceed if we want to leave our children a sound and natural environment capable of answering their needs. The nice sounding principles of sustainable development, biodiversity, and ecosystemic approach people use when they talk about environment, are far from reaching the decision makers and therefore very far from having a chance of being implemented.

The bill we are considering today deals with something that will take place outside of government. With this bill, the government will be able to prohibit the importation and interprovincial trade of certain substances containing manganese. The first targeted product is MMT, a chemical added to unleaded gasoline to increase its octane rating. For a start, the bill raises a number of questions as to its appropriateness and timing.

Let us remember that on April 5 of this year, the Minister of the Environment announced in a press release her intention of introducing this bill as soon as possible. Indeed, it received first reading on May 19 of this year. In her press release, the minister said and I quote: "This initiative will allow Canadians to continue to enjoy the benefits of technical advances in the area of car emission control, and to receive a protection equal to the one received by citizens in the United States".

With this bill, it is obvious that the minister is specifically responding to auto makers who claim that MMT additive clogs up the pollution control equipment. And to bring more pressure to bear, auto makers said that if MMT was not banned, it could cost $3,000 more to buy a car, warranties could be reduced and the pollution control system could even be disconnected. We might see in this some sort of blackmailing by the industry but, according to the minister, it seems to be serious.

• (2045)

The Minister of the Environment then decides to take this prohibiting measure, not because of the polluting or toxic effects of MMT, but because of its effects on an anti–pollution system that will be incorporated into cars in 1996.

The proof that MMT in itself is not recognized as a toxic or dangerous product is that the minister cannot regulate this product under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the CEPA, which applies specifically to toxic products. So, she has no other alternative than to pass separate legislation.

In her press release of April 5, the minister indicated that this decision was taken after almost two years of discussions with the petroleum and automobile industries. We could question the relevance and value of these discussions, since the minister told the parties at the outset that failure to reach an agreement would result in legislation to ban MMT.

By disclosing this intention, did the minister not introduce a significant bias in the discussions? Had she not just told the automotive industry: It is not necessary to discuss everything at length, since I already support you and intend to introduce a bill. The minister showed her clear bias in favour of the automotive industry, which wants to get rid of MMT and all other additives. In that regard, I wonder what will happen to ethanol, a star additive for which the government has just launched a $70 million investment program.

If the automotive industry does not want any additives, why does the government want to develop this product? Is there not a flagrant inconsistency in the decision to ban an additive and the intention of developing a different one, when the automotive industry does not want any additives? Who can assure us that the automotive industry will not soon ask the government to ban

ethanol because of its negative effects on car parts and equipment? I think that prudence is called for in the development of ethanol.

Ethyl, the maker of this additive, has responded to the automotive industry's arguments on MMT with its own arguments, which seem quite valid. Let us have a look at them.

Removing MMT from gasoline would aggravate the urban smog problem by increasing nitrogen dioxide emissions by 20 per cent. According to Health Canada studies, MMT presents no notable danger to human health. Independent lab tests show that, contrary to statements made by auto industry officials, the MMT used in Canada is perfectly compatible with the new anti–pollution devices, including the OBD–II diagnostic system.

Again, according to Ethyl, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is about to reintroduce MMT in that country, following a decision made on April 14, 1995, by the U.S. Court of Appeal for the district of Columbia, which instructed the American agency to lift the MMT ban and allow its use in lead–free gasoline. The use of MMT at the refining stage results in fewer emissions of some pollutants. Replacing MMT will cost refineries about $100 million in capital costs, as well as tens of millions in operating costs.

These are the arguments put forth by the producer of MMT and the oil industry. Given all this, it is not easy to make a decision in favour of one party or the other. The arguments used by both sides seem valid. However, they are also hard to evaluate and verify.

These arguments give rise to a series of questions, and the answers to these questions are not obvious. This is why Bill C–94 generates so much ambivalence and reservations.

The first question we must ask ourselves, and this is very important, is whether or not the automobile industry will indeed go ahead and increase the cost of cars, reduce the guarantees provided, and disconnect the monitoring system and other anti–pollution devices as early as August 1996, if MMT is not removed from lead–free gas.

• (2050)

You can imagine the harmful effects of such a decision on Canadian consumers. That possibility is based on the position of auto manufacturers, who feel that the MMT clogs their systems and makes them less efficient. This malfunctioning of the anti–pollution systems is said to result in more pollutants being released, thus affecting air quality.

This is certainly not what we hope for, after making encouraging progress regarding exhaust emissions. According to a recent study sponsored by the Canadian Automobile Association, the new emission standards helped to significantly improve air quality. This study also showed that, over a distance of 1 kilometre, a 1970 car caused more pollution than twenty 1995 cars.

The credit for part of the progress made must go to the automotive industry. Through R and D, it has improved its pollution control devices. The industry knows everything there is to know about the devices installed on their products. So, if it tells us that MMT is bad for its systems, then, we must certainly agree with them or at least give them the benefit of the doubt.

But there is a snag. Ethyl Corporation indicates that some independent tests performed on cars have shown that MMT is not harmful to pollution control devices, despite what the automotive industry has said.

In fact, the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States has recognized that the automobile industry's concerns over the fouling of the devices were groundless. So, what should we make of the allegations made by the motor vehicle manufacturers? To the question, does MMT make the pollution control devices defective, the answer, Madam Speaker, is not that obvious.

We should also ask ourselves the following question. Is MMT a pollutant in itself and will its elimination from gasoline sold in Canada increase smog in urban areas, as the Ethyl Corporation would have us believe? First of all, according to a Health Canada study, dated December 6, 1994, MMT does not have any adverse health effect. Second, experts say that there is no evidence that the elimination of MMT from gasoline would increase urban smog. It seems that, in Canada, conditions contributing to urban smog, including sunshine and temperature, are not combined often enough for the elimination of MMT to cause an increase in this phenomenon.

According to Ethyl, MMT reduces by 20 per cent nitrous oxide emissions that contribute to the formation of smog. But here, in Canada, it is not clear that increased nitrous oxide emissions meet the necessary conditions to contribute to the formation of urban smog.

If MMT is so effective in reducing smog, why is it banned in large American cities where smog is much more of a problem than in Canadian cities? I think we should ask ourselves this question. Why would the United States ban a product that would be beneficial?

On the issue of increased nitrous oxide emissions, it seems that, thanks to a more sophisticated system, 1996 car models will help further reduce exhaust gas emissions, which, according to some people, would compensate largely for the increased

nitrous oxide emissions caused by the elimination of MMT, but this has yet to be proven.

It must be noted that all these arguments are put forward by the concerned parties. Therefore, it is not easy to make a fair evaluation of them since it is in the best interest of the parties to present them to us in a favourable light.

I mentioned earlier that urban smog is not a problem in Canadian cities, but the temperatures we have had these past few days certainly prove me wrong. Because of the heat wave, there has been a smog advisory in effect in Toronto for the last two days. The Montreal area has also been suffering from an increase in air pollution. The present situation in these two large cities is certainly food for thought.

If it were true that MMT reduces nitrous oxide emissions by 20 per cent, what would be the air pollution level in these large cities if this additive was not present in gasoline?

• (2055)

If Ethyl's argument turns out to be right, can we knowingly and legally allow the quality of the air we breathe to be adversely affected? Another important question is whether the Environmental Protection Agency is going to reintroduce MMT into gasoline in the United States in the very near future, as Ethyl claims? Preliminary indications are that the EPA may indeed allow MMT back on the market. In fact, the United States court of appeal for the District of Columbia has issued a mandate ordering the EPA to grant a waiver permitting the use of MMT.

However, certain sources tell us that concrete action is still far off and that, for a number of years now, Ethyl has been returning regularly to the charge with the EPA. Until now, Ethyl's demands were always turned down. This time, however, it seems that the chances are much better. Ethyl conducted a battery of tests on a significant number of automobiles and met the EPA requirements. According to Ethyl, the tests carried out prove that MMT does not clog the spark plugs, catalytic converters, or exhaust gas oxygen probes, nor is it dangerous to public health. It will be interesting to see where our neighbours to the south go with this issue.

The impact on the petroleum industry raises another important question. According to this industry, removing MMT from their unleaded gas will result in relatively high conversion costs. Furthermore, the industry claims that MMT is a good additive which is easily mixed with gas and is making no bones about its support for the additive.

Therefore, if we do away with MMT, what kind of additive will take its place? This is another interesting avenue of inquiry to consider. If we drop MMT, a very good additive according to the oil industry, we will have to replace it with something else. Currently, it appears that the Liberal government favours ethanol as the replacement. We know, in fact, that a big plant is being built in Chatham, in southern Ontario. This plant, which will be built in two phases at a cost of $270 million, would have a production capacity of 300 million litres of ethanol from corn annually.

It would appear that this construction project is just waiting for the go ahead from Treasury Board. An article which appeared in the *London Free Press* on June 14 clearly said the following: "The paperwork sealing the federal government's ethanol policy, essential for the construction of a massive ethanol plant here, is expected to be signed imminently".

There you have it. The ethanol plant in Chatham is waiting for federal assistance. But is this plant which will produce ethanol, an additive, connected in any way to the bill prohibiting MMT, another additive? Is the government favouring ethanol produced from corn grown in Ontario, the very red Liberal province in this Parliament? Please note that producing ethanol from corn is financially and ecologically costly. The government is cutting taxes associated with ethanol and is considerably reducing the production capacity of our land, all the while increasing pollution, given the fertilizers and pesticides used to grow corn. It is therefore most desirable that the Liberals make the right choice when opting for ethanol.

After thoroughly analyzing all of the arguments regarding MMT and all of the related issues, it is clear that we have to shed more light on the whole issue. I firmly believe that all hon. members who are evaluating this bill need more information, more details from all of the parties concerned and also from all concerned parties who have no stake in the issue. We would then be in a better position to weigh the pros and the cons. At this stage in the debate, despite everything, we look favourably upon this bill. However, we have many serious reservations which will have to be laid to rest when the bill is studied in committee.

• (2100)

In concluding, I would like to add, after having spoken to the hon. member for Davenport, that it is imperative that the chairman of the committee, assisted by his clerk make every effort to hear as many witnesses as possible, whether they are for or against the bill, and to give us enough time with them so that we can really find out what the best solution is from the environmental point of view.

Should we use MMT? Should we ban MMT? Should we use ethanol? Should we concentrate on another product? We need clarification. I ask that we be given enough time to meet all the witnesses concerned.

From what I have heard, it seems we will proceed with third reading very soon. I do not think we will be ready to start third reading unless we have shed some light on these issues and until we are really convinced that banning MMT in Canada—the United States may do so six months from now—is the right decision and that we are not merely putting the oil companies or

other businesses to additional expense just to pass a bill that looks good to the public.

[*English*]

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order to inquire whether you are permitting questions and comments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The first three speakers will have a maximum of 40 minutes with no questions and comments.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Madam Speaker, balance is needed and I hope this is what I can represent as I respond to the government on Bill C–94.

It is amazing how quickly the bill got to this stage. I take it the environment minister feels this bill is more important than Bill C–83, an act to amend the Auditor General Act, which was a red book promise. I suppose large companies like General Motors, Ford and Chrysler are not pushing to pass a bill that would create a commissioner to the auditor general's office like Bill C–83 would do.

Every Canadian knows of the power of the big three auto manufacturers. What they want they seem to get from the minister. In this case they wanted the help of the minister to ban the octane enhancer MMT from Canadian gasoline, and help is exactly what they got.

When the minister held her press conference on May 19 she said that the data the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association presented to her clearly convinced her that MMT was bad for automobiles and for Canadians. She did not comment on the evidence presented to her by Ethyl Corporation. When the minister was asked to comment on that she simply stated that she did not need to see Ethyl's data because what the MVMA presented was correct and there was no refuting it. Essentially what the minister was saying was that Ethyl's data was wrong and the data from the MVMA was correct, but she would not fully admit it.

The minister knows very well what the best solution would be to this entire debate. She knows that a series of independent third party tests are needed but she will not initiate it or facilitate it happening.

As members of the House and more important as representatives of all Canadians, it is important that we weigh and pursue every available option to come up with an accurate conclusion before we create any legislation. The Liberal government calls itself responsible but I ask what is really meant by the term responsible in view of Bill C–94. In these technical matters it certainly does not hurt to demonstrate and then legislate.

Some important questions should be asked on the banning of this substance. First, was the evidence brought forward based on accurate data and was it performed by independent testers? Second, who paid for the evaluators and who are they accountable to? Third, what will be the cost implications to consumers both in financial and in environmental terms? I think it is who pays is at the bottom of the government's capitulation to the MVMA lobby.

I want to deal with how the minister came to the decision to ban MMT. Apparently on September 12 last year representatives from General Motors, Ford and Chrysler met with the minister to discuss the banning of MMT.

• (2105)

They told her that if MMT was still in gasoline in August 1995, a time when all new model cars were released, they would do one of maybe three things. First they would raise the price of each automobile by about $3,000. Second they would void sections of their cars warranties and/or close down some high tech Canadian manufacturing facilities.

The minister got spooked in a big way. This was the big three as well as a few other importer tag–alongs telling her what to do. They threatened to close up automotive plants and most of the plants are located not too far from her constituency of Hamilton East and certainly in southwestern Ontario.

The political decision apparently was not too difficult: ban MMT. About a month following the meeting the minister told a reporter that unless the fuel industry moved MMT from its products voluntarily the government was going to impose a ban.

The MVMA could not have been happier: no more dealing with Ethyl and let the federal government work the whole thing out for itself. There was no need for a third party to come in to do testing. Negotiations and industry collaboration went out the window. This is where the minister failed.

There are two sides to the issue and she picked the one that seemed politically friendly. The decision was not based on science. It was based on short term political interest and money, certainly not because there would be any gains for the environment.

Both the MVMA and Ethyl have conducted tests. Both had apparent credible statistics and yet they were contrary to each other. Both sides were adamant that the tests they had brought forward were accurate. I am not a scientist and the environment minister has admitted the same in her background. I have seen the detailed test data and the chemical charts and tables. I am not going to stand here today to convince with a technical argument. All I am trying to do is to provide a reasonable solution like any responsible environment minister would do.

The solution should have been, and for that matter still can be, an independent third party series of tests to determine if MMT actually causes a problem to onboard diagnostic systems in cars. Certainly MMT is not hazardous to our environment as it greatly reduces knocks. Both sides were close to coming to a decision. Both sides were about to approve a third party evaluation. Ford

Motor Company recently did a test with MMT flavoured gasoline to see how it would affect its onboard diagnostic systems.

The minister has been touting the MVMA to be the expert and most accurate in its data collection. Ford conducted an in house fleet test composed of twenty 1994 Thunderbirds. Ten went to Toronto and were driven for about 50,000 miles of city driving. Five went to Florida and five to Nevada. Similar to the testing in Toronto, the ten U.S. cars were also driven about 50,000 miles each and were also kept to city driving. In the interim report Ford asserted that catalyst monitoring ratios generated by the OBD–II system in the vehicles were different in Canada and the U.S. mainly because of MMT.

Ford claims that this was the only difference between Canadian and U.S. vehicles. The U.S. EPA, on the other hand, concluded "it is difficult to distinguish small losses in catalyst activity" using existing OBT technology. The smallest change in emissions which is technologically feasible to detect for current production vehicles equipped with the OBD–II system is a hydrocarbon emission increase or decrease of about .4 grams per mile. Ford tests show an HE emission of only .02 grams per mile. Apparently Ford has not released any data that would verify if the OBD–II systems actually have the ability to measure such small changes in emission performance.

The testing that Ford did was in three very distinct areas: Toronto, Florida and Nevada. We are all aware that the composition of fuel will vary from region to region. With data provided by the National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research, the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute and Environment Canada, basic differences in the gasoline between the three test sites were rather considerable.

Let us use for example summer gasoline in Toronto. The amount of sulphur in parts per million is about 400 and the percentage of ether is about zero per cent. On the other hand in U.S. gasoline sulphur content is about 248 parts per million in Florida and about 80 parts per million in the west southwest. As for ether, in Florida it is 1.8 per cent and in the west southwest it is 1.6 per cent.

The reason for my explanation of these data is to show that test parameters can vary significantly from city to city.

• (2110)

Why did Ford use these two U.S. cities to conduct its testing when it knew full well of the differences in the composition of gasoline? As politicians we are all very familiar with polls and the use of polls. One poll says this and another poll says something else. If one wants a polling company to get a favourable answer it is possible to do so by the way one words the questions.

I would assume the same was also true for the way testing was done on MMT. On one side Ethyl wanted to see tests which showed that MMT was not responsible for malfunctions with the onboard diagnostic systems in cars. On the other side the MVMA wanted to prove how MMT was hurting or interfering with its systems. Essentially each party got the results it wanted. How accurate are the tests and what are the implications for public policy?

The bill bans MMT in Canada. The way I read it there is no reference to Nevada or Florida in the bill, if the minister wants to believe the data provided to her of tests that were not even performed in this country on comparable fuels.

Some proponents of the bill will ask me for a better way of doing the tests. I can only think of one logical way. The ban is in Canada. Take cars and pair them up. Choose independent locations across the country. Use two cars in each location. In one car use gasoline added with MMT and in the other car use the same type of gasoline without the addition of MMT. Drive each car for the same distance and over the same terrain and in the same climate. For instance, if one of the two cars is driven in the city, the same should apply to the other. A wide variety of car models should be used in varied Canadian climates and conditions. This would seem to be the only available solution.

When people are charged with crimes and they know in their hearts they are innocent, they agree to any test, any independent investigation, lie detectors, DNA and so on. They are confident and therefore they have nothing to be afraid of, nothing to hide.

Since the beginning the Ethyl Corporation has wanted to settle the entire dispute using a comprehensive series of industry wide, third party tests. It was confident in the outcome. The same was not true for the MVMA. As soon as there was a hint that the minister would back it up all future talks were cancelled. Now it balks at the idea of independent testing. I guess its lobbying paid off.

Early last week the United States Court of Appeals issued a mandate ordering the EPA to grant a waiver to permit the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline in the U.S. The court found that MMT does not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system. It evaluated the evidence placed before it. I realize this does not mean that MMT will be in U.S. gasoline tomorrow but it does mean one large step closer.

Ethyl Corporation still has a hearing before the same court in September of this year to confirm final registration of MMT, which would then allow for the sale of the additive. It is interesting to note that in the above decision by the appeals court

neither the auto industry nor the Environmental Protection Agency appealed the court decision. Why? There was likely no grounds for appeal.

On Friday I received material from the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute that has been following the issue with great interest. The CPPI official who was in attendance in Washington for the decision stated:

> EPA officials made it clear that, assuming Ethyl does win, the burden of proof for any future attempts to have MMT banned will shift from Ethyl to the auto makers. This is leading the auto makers in the U.S. to all of a sudden start talking about a joint testing program. This is what CPPI has been proposing for the last two years in Canada and what the auto makers have continually refused to support.

Maybe the auto manufacturers' lobbyists are not so confident of their position.

Even before Bill C–94 was introduced Reformers asked the environment minister to conduct independent tests. She has adamantly refused. Somehow the minister at least could have facilitated it. The MVMA knew it had the inside track with the minister. All it had to do was stall with Ethyl.

In the early stages I think the minister believed the U.S. courts would maybe side with the EPA. The bill will become the environment minister's legacy. There is a good chance that the bill will pass through the House about the same time that the U.S. begins using MMT in its gasoline again. What will the minister do then? Will she stick to her legislation and continue with the ban or will she flip–flop or succumb to some international pressure?

• (2115)

The industry minister has also said on numerous occasions that the key to banning MMT in Canada is to create a uniformity of standards between the U.S. and Canada so costs to the auto makers rather than environmental concerns are behind this move. According to this statement Canada will go back and forth like a lost puppy or maybe a lapdog.

The minister introduced this legislation with hopes it would get quick passage before the summer. She is on a deadline set by the MVMA. The 1996 cars were about to be shipped and they wanted to ship them with the OBD–II systems all hooked up.

It is clear now the bill will not get through all stages. The bill will wait until the fall to be reopened for debate. Even if the bill is passed before the end of the year manufacturers will have already shipped their cars. The 1996 cars will not have gone up in price and the warranties will not have been reduced, since all the warranty manuals will already have been printed and shipped with the cars. This is a perfect opportunity for the environment minister since she knows the passage of the bill is irrelevant to the timing of production for the 1996 cars.

It was once said the Liberal philosophy holds that enduring governments must be accountable to someone besides themselves, that a government responsible only to its own conscience is not for long tolerable. This is befitting of the government which occupies the benches today; to whom is it accountable?

Before the government goes through with this legislation I draw to its attention some of the information I have come across during the last several weeks. I raise it for the sake of discussion.

On several occasions the minister stated in the House and at the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development that if we do not curb global warming much of Prince Edward Island will be completely under water. The minister has stated that if action is not taken immediately thousands upon thousands of jobs could be lost.

I still have a lot of questions on the whole issue of global warming in relation to greenhouse gases, as do many Canadians. In the reading I have done on the topic lately I have discovered that according to scientists the biggest contributors to greenhouse gases are carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxides, NOx.

Since we are dealing specifically with MMT we should concentrate on the NOx emissions. I do not believe anyone will deny that the additive MMT does reduce NOx emissions. However, I suppose the only argument may come as to how much NOx emissions are reduced with MMT in gasoline. It may also be important to point out that at the 1988 international treaty Canada committed itself to freezing NOx emissions at the 1988 level. This was all part of Environment Canada's NOx VOC_2 management plan.

Since the minister's own department feels it is necessary to reduce these emissions it would be important for us to better understand how much MMT actually reduces NOx emissions and helps the environment.

This past June a month long cleaner air campaign was launched in Toronto after results showed the outrageous levels of smog in certain Canadian centres. The campaign was put together by pollution probe and included some major sponsors: Canadian Tire Corporation, Consumers Gas, Petro–Canada, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Environment Canada, to name a few.

B.C.'s lower mainland, where I come from, parts of New Brunswick and the Windsor–Quebec corridor were found to be the three worst areas in the country for smog pollution. The people of Hamilton East, part of the Windsor–Quebec corridor, need to know their member of Parliament, who happens to be the Minister of the Environment, is banning a substance which would help to reduce urban smog. The minister needs to be

accountable to the well–being of Canada's environment. She should also be accountable to those who elected her to office.

Ethyl Canada claims that removing MMT from Canadian gasoline would increase NOx emission levels by up to 20 per cent. The CPPI has added to this and made the claim that removing MMT would be the equivalent of adding over a million cars to Canadian roads. Those are pretty substantial numbers for the environment.

On the other hand, Environment Canada did its own testing on MMT and found that removing it from gasoline would increase NOx emissions by only 5 per cent; again, two evaluations, two substantially different numbers. Which one is correct?

I want to look at how Environment Canada came to its conclusion of 5 per cent. Environment Canada used an EPA NOx benefit of .08 grams per mile, based on John Holly's 1994 analysis of all Ethyl and Ford testing data. Therefore the .08 grams per mile was divided by the average of summer and winter predicted emissions for a typical Canadian gasoline without MMT.

• (2120)

I point out something very important. John Holly's analysis is based on MMT testing data for late model passenger cars only, with vehicles accruing no more than 75,000 miles. Again Environment Canada is taking data based on U.S. gasoline which has completely different properties, most of which will affect NOx emissions. This was something I explained earlier when I referred to the testing done by the MVMA. We are relatively clear that our gasoline is different than that in the U.S. and that this would no doubt skew the results.

I am not a technical expert and so reading scientific data and making interpretations could only be general in nature. When we look at some of the ways MMT was tested it is clear there are many intervening factors and uncontrolled variables, the number one factor being the type of gasoline used in each of the tests.

Each side has an argument about what the other side did wrong, how its test design was inadequate or how unwarranted conclusions were made from the available evidence. I am sure if we were to bring both the MVMA and Ethyl together to debate their individual cases each would have no problem finding fault with each other's data and making circular arguments.

I now bring another player into this whole debate. All we have heard about so far are the auto makers and Ethyl. However, another key component to the equation is the refineries. Studies show the removal of MMT would significantly add to refinery costs for reformulating gasoline and increase the cost of the refining processes.

Refineries are required to achieve cleaner burning fuels but removal of MMT will cause refineries to increase refinery emissions and consume a greater amount of fuel which would require an expensive retrofitting process.

The Saskatchewan Ministry of the Environment and Resource Management stated in a May 1995 letter to Environment Canada:

> We are also concerned with the impact this decision will have on Consumers' Co–Operative Refineries Limited in Regina. CCRL has Advised us that refining costs will increase in the order of $500,000 annually if MMT is banned. We have difficulty rationalizing this cost with no identifiable benefit to air quality by this action.

This is a dollar amount from only one refinery. If we take into account other refineries the number would be extremely high. In the recent Kilborn study, which I understand the environment department has still not released, it is estimated the cost to refiners of replacing MMT in Canada would be approximately $100,000 million in capital and tens of millions of dollars for operating. Perhaps the minister will release this report as soon as possible so all Canadians can see the real cost of the implication of this legislation.

The Canadian Petroleum Products Institute, which represents the majority of the petroleum refining and marketing industry in Canada in the same way that the MVMA represents the Canadian Automobile Manufacturers, states:

> The MMT controversy is a technical issue between the auto industry and the petroleum industry that should be decided on the basis of science—The CPPI has repeatedly offered to participate in either a joint testing program or an independent scientific evaluation program, and to abide by the results, but all offers have been rebuffed.

Why should they when there is the appearance that the minister is in the pocket of the MVMA?

I learned on Friday that the American Automobile Manufacturers' Association is considering doing third party testing. Apparently the recent decision by the U.S. court of appeals has made it think twice. The Minister of the Environment should put an immediate stop to her legislation and let the key players work this out among themselves. I do not believe anyone would consider the Minister of the Environment a key player. Putting it simply, she appears to be an all too willing politician at the behest of the MVMA.

I want to point out to the minister there is still time left before she may become rather embarrassed. If all goes well for Ethyl the United States may have MMT included in its gasoline by the fall. If the minister decides to scrap the bill in the fall, she will appear as the minister who has been hasty and not on top of her responsibility to protect the public interest rather than the interest of those who contribute to her election campaigns. There will be no way of making amends at that time.

My suggestion is for the government to scrap this legislation and begin immediately with independent third party testing. The Reform Party would support the minister if she decided to do this and would support subsequent government regulations when science so indicates.

• (2125)

It is time for the minister to be wise. However if the minister continues the stubborn course and proceeds with Bill C–94 we will have no choice but to oppose this legislation.

If the bill passes second reading the House standing committee must hear witnesses and provide a public forum for the scientific evidence to be displayed, not inside arguments made within ministries but out in the open. The merits of the bill must stand on their own. The bill must not be rammed through to respond to the government's friends and against available scientific evidence.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate tonight but I am dismayed with what I heard from the Reform Party and from the BQ. The fact they are not supporting our current producers of ethanol is very sad.

Both members accused our minister of not doing a proper job. I will probably clarify a lot of incorrect inferences they made about our minister. I will speak to the BQ critic of the environment from Laurentides. Are any cars produced in Quebec?

She talked about the lack of consistency with ethanol. Ethanol is a hydrocarbon. Petroleum comes from the Latin word petra, which means rock, and oleum, oil. These substances are extracted from the ground and cracked in refineries. My colleagues from the west would know all about that since they produce energy.

It has been said that one gallon of gasoline could actually take an automobile 460 miles if all the energy were utilized during that combustion process. We are moving closer to that kind of situation as on board diagnostic equipment kicks in, knowing how much fuel is coming in, exactly how to time the spark and exactly how to control the combustion in the engine.

With reference to ethanol discussed by the member for Laurentides, she was confusing an octane enhancer with a fuel. The member accused the Minister of the Environment of not acting in the best interest of the environment, which is exactly the opposite of what the minister is doing. The minister is protecting the environment. She is actually protecting customers. She is protecting humans from contaminants.

Contaminants from automobiles in places like Los Angeles, California, which is in a valley, are noticeable when there is a temperature inversion that causes photochemical smog. Photochemical smog is caused by an interaction of NOx gases from automobile tailpipes and certain atmospheric conditions with some sunlight.

If members opposite want to ask me a question I will be glad to answer any and all, including technical questions. I would be glad to tell them how a car works or exactly what the banning of MMT means.

I will explain to the House why we are taking action against MMT. It is a manganese based fuel additive used to increase the octane rating of gasoline. It has been used in Canada since 1977 as a replacement for lead in unleaded gasolines. The lead was phased out in virtually all Canadian gasoline engines by 1990. Octane rating is a unit of measurement established by the automative industry to determine the antiknock quality of a fuel.

When we talk about compression ratios in race cars it may be up to 10:1 or 11:1. In diesels it is about 20:1. In a diesel the air is compressed until it gets extremely hot, about 1000 degrees Fahrenheit, then fuel is introduced into that engine. In an automotive engine a spark plug is used to ignite fuel. In the case of a high compression engine the fuel becomes very unstable and will self–ignite.

• (2130)

If a car engine continues to run after the ignition has been turned off, it is called dieseling. The reason it diesels is that maybe a spark other than the gasoline in the combustion chamber triggers it and allows it to run. It becomes very unpredictable. In order to stop the unpredictability an octane enhancer is used. That is partially what an octane enhancer does.

Who uses MMT? Just about every Canadian motorist does because Canadian refineries use it. The exact amount of MMT used may vary depending on the batch of gasoline. However, premium grade gasolines generally contain a higher dosage than regular grade gasoline. Canada is the only country that uses MMT. The United States for example banned it from unleaded gasoline in 1978.

The automobile industry is convinced that gasoline containing MMT adversely impacts the operation of sophisticated on board diagnostic systems. These OBD systems are important because they monitor the performance of emission control components in vehicles.

The automotive industry has made the decision that it will not accept the risk of increased warranty repair costs caused by MMT related damage. Some companies have even indicated they will disconnect the OBD systems in whole or in part and may reduce Canadian vehicle warranty coverage starting in the 1996 model year if MMT continues to be used in Canadian gasoline.

The cost of maintaining these systems are to be passed directly on to Canadian consumers. This is where the federal government comes in. Last October the Minister of the Environment urged both industries to voluntarily resolve the issue of MMT in Canada by the end of 1994 otherwise the government would take action. This deadline was subsequently extended into February of this year to review the automobile petroleum industry proposals.

The matter was not resolved so the federal government had to step in. This action is Bill C–94. The MMT issue is no longer an industry dispute. Its outcome can affect the vehicle emission programs we are putting into place. In the long term it could also negatively impact the automotive sector.

Successful resolution of the MMT issue will ensure that the environmental benefits are realized through the use of the most advanced emission control technologies. It will ensure that Canadians are offered the same warranty coverage as in the United States and will ensure that Canadian motor vehicle emissions control programs do not diverge from those in the United States.

This means that Canadians continue to benefit from the cost and technological advances in North American harmonized fleets. It means good news to Canadians and jobs for Canadians in the Canadian automotive sector. That is because diverging emission standards and differing anti–pollution equipment on Canadian cars will negatively impact the marketplace and decrease the competitiveness of the automotive sector.

We would also be faced with a situation where cars built in Canada that go south of the border could have more advanced equipment than those sold in Canada with better pollution controls on them giving better atmospheric conditions. That clearly is not acceptable.

Let us be clear about the economic impact of removing MMT. It will be small for the entire petroleum industry. Estimates for the cost of MMT removal provided by the industry range from $50 million to $83 million per year. Yes, it costs a little bit of money to clean up the environment. It means an additional .1 or .24 cents per litre increase at the pump. I may add that the on board diagnostic equipment gives better mileage so that may not necessarily affect the car. In fact the car may give better mileage because the systems are designed to do that.

Permit me now to take a few moments to explain some key highlights of the bill. Bill C–94 would prohibit the import or interprovincial trade for a commercial purpose of MMT or anything containing MMT. It will give the minister the power to authorize exceptions for MMT that would not be used in unleaded gasoline, subject to the monitoring requirement.

Coverage of the act can be expanded by an order in council to cover other manganese based substances. The act is binding on all persons and entities, including the federal and provincial governments. The enforcement tools are similar to the ones in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

• (2135)

The penalties are strict. For the unauthorized import or interprovincial trade of MMT, the maximum penalty on summary conviction is a $300,000 fine and/or six months in jail and on indictment the maximum fine is $1 million and/or three years in jail. For knowingly providing false or misleading information on the importation or interprovincial trade of MMT, the penalties are the same but with a maximum of five years in jail instead of three on indictment. On conviction, as in the CEPA, a court can also order an additional fine equal to the monetary benefits resulting from the offence, prohibit conduct that may lead to a repeat offence and direct the offender to notify third parties about the contravention.

That gives members of the House an idea of what the government is proposing in Bill C–94. What does all this mean to our constituents?

I do not mind saying that I come from one of the most beautiful parts of Canada, the riding of Bruce—Grey. Thousands of others have said they enjoy driving up to beautiful Georgian Bay and visiting Owen Sound, Wiarton, Hanover, Walkerton, Flesherton or going across to South Baymouth on the *Chi–cheemaun* throughout the year. As happy as we are with the tourism that our region attracts, we are also very concerned with the toll increasing motor traffic is having on the fragile environment.

The people of Bruce—Grey want the government and the industry to take all necessary measures to make sure the thousands and thousands of cars and trucks that travel our highways and roads are operating as cleanly as possible. They want us to make sure that increased tourism and increased vehicular activity does not lead to an increase in environmental degradation. In Bruce—Grey we want to protect all we have, not just for our children but for their children, our economy and future generations of Canadian visitors.

The views and concerns of my constituents are no different from those expressed by other Canadians in all parts of Canada. Canadians expect us to do what we can to preserve the environment. They also expect us to protect jobs, consumers and Canadian automotive technology. That is what Bill C–94 does.

I would be glad and willing to answer any questions. There are no dumb questions on this subject because I know we are right to protect the environment. We are protecting our plants and animals. We are providing jobs in a sector that is extremely important to us and we are protecting the environment. We are protecting the air we breathe.

In California weather forecasting they talk about temperature inversions and harmful emissions from automobiles. In many forecasts people are told to stay off the streets because they could

actually suffer from eye irritation. This will not happen here if we allow these new technologies to be fed into the computer.

Just to recap, when we go into our modern cars and turn on the ignition we have these on board diagnostic systems that function. We have exhaust gas recirculation and a charcoal container that captures the hydrocarbons. At a gas station when someone puts the hose in the gas tank and drops of gas fall out, that is hydrocarbon emission. In the old cars there was a vent so they had to put in charcoal to stop it from getting into the atmosphere. They have PCV valves. They have catalytic converters. A catalyst is a device that will change the substances so we can manipulate what comes out of the tailpipe.

We are trying to protect the environment with the best technologies possible. We are trying to protect Canadian jobs. That is what the minister is trying to do.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to give notice that with respect to the consideration of Senate amendments stage of Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries, at the next sitting of the House I shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that the debate be not further adjourned.

* * *

• (2140)

MANGANESE BASED FUEL ADDITIVES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain managese based substances, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the member gave a very eloquent dialogue on MMT. He based most of his discussion on the environmental aspects of MMT and said that it was banned in the United States.

Last week the United States district court of appeals issued its mandate ordering the Environmental Protection Agency to grant a waiver to permit the use of MMT in unleaded gas in the United States because it is clearly not an environmental hazard. What does the member for Bruce—Grey have to say about that?

Mr. Jackson: Madam Speaker, I am not a lawyer and lawyers have fun with these topics. This will be in the courts forever.

I do know that in the United States the EPA reasons are that MMT will cause certain medical problems. That is the major thing it is going with now. We have to understand that billions of dollars are involved. I am sure there will be campaigns, full page ads and what have you. It is the scientific community that has to deal with this. Sure there will be things going back and forth. The jury is still out on it. This dispute has been around for a long time. It is a legal one and I do not have an answer to it. I am sure that in the end the United States EPA will win out.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the member for Bruce—Grey talked about a number of issues. He talked about standards and harmonization. He talked about MMT being banned. I think he also touched on the issue that Canada is the only country that uses it.

Our industry minister said in April: "The member will know that MMT is not permitted in the United States by legislation. It is crucial that we have uniformity of standards". The U.S. court of appeals has now ordered the U.S. EPA to grant Ethyl Corporation's application for a waiver, paving the way for the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline in the United States. Several U.S. refiners have provided written notice of their intention to use MMT. Uniformity of gasoline additives within North America would now require Canada to maintain rather than restrict MMT.

The member also talked about it being banned. The environment minister on May 5, 1995 said: "The United States Environmental Protection Agency banned MMT in 1977 and since that time Ethyl Corporation has consistently tried to turn around the ban by court case after court case in which it continues to fail".

MMT was not banned by the EPA. It is still used in the United States in leaded gasoline and after market products. It was used in unleaded gasoline during the crude oil shortages of the 1970s. In 1977 the U.S. Clean Air Act established a process requiring new fuel additives not substantially similar to gasoline to obtain a waiver by demonstrating compatibility with vehicle emission systems.

Ethyl of course undertook the largest fuel additives testing program in history which resulted in the EPA's conclusion in December 1993 that MMT will not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system. Contrary to the minister's statements in May the U.S. court of appeals ordered the EPA to grant a waiver approval to Ethyl Corporation on April 14, 1995. The minister was fully informed of this decision but did not say anything to this House.

Another comment was made by an Environment Canada news release on May 19: "Canada is currently the only country in the world tht permits the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline". MMT is approved for use in Canada, Argentina, Bulgaria and Ukraine. It is being actively considered for introduction in Australia, New Zealand and other countries in southeast Asia and around the world. These countries have closely monitored Ethyl's EPA fleet testing program and have noted the U.S. court of appeals ruling ordering the U.S. EPA to grant Ethyl's waiver application. Several U.S. refiners have confirmed their interest in using MMT in the United States.

If MMT is considered bad for automobiles and the environment, why then does the minister not ban the substance under the schedule in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act? Why can we not use CEPA to ban MMT?

• (2145)

Mr. Jackson: Madam Speaker, first I would like to make a point of clarification. I forgot that I was sharing my time with the member for Simcoe North.

Some of the comments by the member for New Westminster—Burnaby were contradictory. He said that in the United States there is a court case going on with regard to the banning of MMT, yet he says that MMT is used. If MMT is used then we do not have a problem. I suspect that there are times when we would have to do that. There probably are old fashioned cars that do not use the highways as much. Certain facilities are made in order for those people to operate their vehicles. That may be one of the reasons they are using MMT.

The basic thing we are looking at here is as the member for Davenport explained, there are 18 automotive manufacturers that say that MMT will foul up the onboard diagnostic equipment. We are talking about Canadian consumers, and we must understand that the on board diagnostic equipment sends messages to the computer. These are all little electronic devices. If they become plugged and turn on the on board diagnostic lights, it will cause these cars to be taken in for repair. The manufacturer is going to get fed up with it and pull the plug, which they said they would do, and stop using the light, which is so important for these vehicles as the technology advances to the stage where you know when your car is starting to pollute the environment.

In the United States they have stickers and at certain times cars go in to be fixed. But the on board diagnostics show right away when there is a problem. The MMT will foul them up and render them useless. By doing that it impairs the pollution device it impairs the fuel economy of the car sputter, and it makes the car sputter and not function properly. It takes away that protection from the consumer.

That is what we are trying to do. The hon. member does not want to spend any money. If the manufacturers of MMT want to push this product and make it acceptable to the automobile manufactuers then let them get their scientists to make sure it works in a way that it does not do that. Let them do that, but the Government of Canada should not be spending money for that kind of stuff.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member for Bruce—Grey to comment on the fact that in 1991 auto research laboratories did a study on various fuel formulations and tests showed that an addition of a small amount of MMT to a 10 per cent ethanol blend will significantly enhance environmental benefits by reducing emissions that contribute to ground level ozone and urban smog. The test demonstrated that with an industry average fuel MMT and the 10 per cent ethanol it reduced NOx emissions by more than 30 per cent. How would the member respond to that piece of evidence?

Mr. Jackson: Madam Speaker, basically by using exhaust gas recirculation. NOx emissions are caused by high combustion chamber temperatures. Therefore by using exhaust gas recirculation, which is triggered by the computer, it drops the temperature in the combustion chamber and we can regulate NOx that way through the standards that EPA expects.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-94, as most of my colleagues have already well pointed out, is intended to prohibit the use of the product MMT in the production of gasoline. This product is a manganese-based additive used in practically all unleaded gasolines in Canada since 1977.

Before I start, I think I should point out that the research done by Health Canada indicates that the fears expressed by a number of groups regarding the harmful effects MMT may have on health are unfounded. On its own, this product does not harm the environment. However, and this is the crux of the matter and the reason the minister is putting Bill C-94 before us today, automobile manufacturers claim that MMT in gasoline clogs the anti-pollution devices, impeding their effectiveness and thus, indirectly, of course, harming the environment.

I listened earlier to my colleague for Davenport say that the only people with any interest in opposing the bill were MMT producers or distributors. This, however, is not quite the case. The major oil producers also have an interest in opposing it, and we will see why in due course.

• (2150)

The oil producers claim in response to the automobile manufacturers that MMT means gasoline can be produced at a considerably lower cost in environmental terms at the refining stage. MMT requires less intensive processing and this means

less carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide from the smokestacks of gasoline manufacturing plants.

In addition, MMT allows refineries to reduce the aromatic cycles in gas and thus benzene emissions. Caught between these two industry giants, the automobile manufacturers and the big oil companies, which are fighting each other, is the product distributor, Ethyl Canada, which, according to several analyses, has passed all the required tests and is said to be ready to put its product on the market in the United States where it was, as my hon. colleague from the Reform Party put it, partly banned.

In fact, on April 14, 1995, the United States of America Court of Appeal for the district of Columbia, rendered its decision in the case involving Ethyl Corporation and the Environmental Protection Agency, in which Ethyl contested the refusal of the agency, on July 13, 1994, to meet its request to put an end to the banning of MMT in unleaded gas.

The court decided and I quote: "The administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has broken the clearly stipulated conditions of clause 211 by rejecting the request of Ethyl to put an end to the banning of MMT for public health reasons". The court added that since Congress had given the agency the mandate to evaluate, only in terms of emissions, what is implied by some of the requests to stop banning a product, and since Ethyl had met the requirements concerning the emissions, the administrator of the agency had exceeded his powers by rejecting the request made by Ethyl. Because of these facts, the court sent a direct order to the agency which will, as the court said, have to grant Ethyl its request to remove the ban on its additive.

Therefore we can see that, in any event, the United States is getting ready to put MMT back in circulation in a few months. The court's explanation was as follows: "As regards the arguments made by the American Automobile Manufacturers Association against the opinion of the Environmental Protection Agency according to which MMT does not affect in whole or in part the proper operation of the emission control system in vehicles, the American court ruled that those arguments had no value at all. First of all, the court emphasized that the agency had established that ethyl used as an additive had easily passed tests required in all the most stringent studies ever conducted". The court is referring here to statistics.

The court also noted that "the Environment Protection Agency has examined, using more restrictive criteria, Ethyl's data on the use of the additive in more technologically advanced vehicles", and the court found that the agency had detected no significant emission increase, that is no increase which could reasonably be attributed to a sampling error.

As for the allegation by automotive manufacturers that MMT interferes with the operation of OBD–II systems, the court said in its ruling that "the EPA had reasonably refuted the doubts of the three automotive manufacturers concerning the effect of MMT on these systems". The court went on to say that "under the Clean Air Act, the EPA still has the authority needed to establish these facts".

• (2155)

As a result, Ethyl intends to reintroduce MMT on the U.S. market very soon, once registration matters have been settled.

Faced with this, the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute has recommended—as have the hon. member from Davenport and my colleague from the Reform Party—that a committee of independent experts be asked to settle the issue.

Not too long ago, Claude Brouillard, president of the institute, said, and I quote: "We have solid scientific and technical data supporting MMT and its use in Canada". However, as some players question these facts, we are prepared to submit this issue to an independent committee of experts and to abide by their decision. We hope that the federal government, the automakers and the product manufacturer will endorse this proposal". This comes from the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute. Therefore, the manufacturer of MMT is not the only one dissatisfied with the decisions which are being made.

As well, Mr. Fisher, chairman of the board of this institute, sent the following letter to the Prime Minister. I will read some paragraphs in English. Mr. Fisher wrote this:

[*English*]

"The Canadian Petroleum Products Institute, which represents the vast majority of the petroleum refining and marketing industry in Canada, is strongly opposed to the announced plan of the government to legislate a ban on imports of the gasoline additive MMT."

"We understand that the proposed legislation will be presented to Cabinet soon. This proposal is being justified under the banner of harmonization with the United States, but actions currently under way in the U.S. are leading towards the probable reintroduction of MMT into unleaded gasolines."

"The MMT controversy is a technical issue between the auto industry and the petroleum industry"—he is quite right—"an issue that should be decided on the basis of sound science. It does not require a legislative solution and it is not appropriate for your government"—the letter was addressed to the Prime Minister—"to be taking the action at this time. We submit that the process followed by your government has been seriously flawed." So wrote the petroleum producers, not the company producing MMT.

"When the Minister of Environment first spoke publicly on the issue, she prbably stated that the issue should be resolved by the two industries. The minister then went on, however, to declare that in the absence of an agreement she would legislate MMT out of gasoline. By declaring the outcome, any incentive for the auto industry to cooperate in a joint scientifically based testing program was removed."

"The CPPI has repeatedly offered to participate in either a joint testing program or independent scientific evaluation program and to abide by the results".

The chairman went on as follows:

"There are demonstrated environmental, economic, and energy efficiency benefits from the use of MMT. We do not believe these benefits should be lost to Canada without a sound database on information to demonstrate that the allegations of the automakers against MMT are valid. To date, this information has not been forthcoming. Indeed, as the U.S. Court of Appeals recently decided, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has accepted that automakers have not demonstrated their case against MMT."

"Given the probability of MMT being reintroduced in the U.S., the lack of a sound scientific case against MMT, the benefits of the additive and the flawed process of political development, we strongly urge the government to not proceed with the proposed legislation to ban imports of MMT."

• (2200)

[*Translation*]

Clearly, it is not only refining and marketing companies that find this bill premature, at least in its present state, as is now being submitted to us today.

In spite of all the adverse opinions, the minister is still presenting her bill which settles, or tries to settle the question by banning MMT. I think, as my colleague the member for Laurentides said earlier, that they want to give a chance to the ethanol program.

On December 21, 1994, the federal government announced a new program that would promote the extraction of ethanol from biomass. According to the Minister of the Environment, in accordance with her policy on agriculture and with the government's will to develop an innovative economy, the government will implement the national program on biomass ethanol to promote private sector investment in that industry.

Again according to the environment minister, the national program on biomass ethanol shows that the government is quite determined to encourage the production and the utilization of renewable fuels wherever it is advantageous from an environmental and an economical standpoint. Apparently, that would be a step forward in setting up, in Canada, a renewable energy industry. The program provides for the establishment of a reimbursable line of credit guaranteed by the federal government, to which a limited number of eligible applicants would have access. A total amount of $70 million would then be offered under certain specific conditions between the years 1999 and 2005. We can see that there is a real desire on the government's part to promote ethanol in any way possible.

However, my colleague from the Laurentides asked a very relevant question. What would be the point of banning MMT if we are to spend money to use ethanol as a new gasoline additive? I think that question deserves to be studied in committee. Indeed, this little bill, apparently quite simple and quite insignificant, might have an extremely serious and complex impact.

I was listening to my hon. colleague opposite who was telling us about technical considerations behind this project. The fact is that there is a complex technical problem with various consequences. My colleague was remarking that "there are billions behind this", and he is absolutely right. When billions of dollars are at stake, we should at least think about the reason why the bill is put forward.

The Bloc will reluctantly support this bill at second reading, with so many reservations that it will not be real support. We hope to review it thoroughly in committee.

I hope the committee, both the staff and the members, will take the time to make a careful study of this issue, as my colleague from the Reform Party was asking for.

We will conduct a study that will be as exhaustive as the government will allow, because there are too many different interests at stake in addition to technical points about which decisions must be made. To do so, we will need complete explanations from some players who are independent, in some way, in the analysis itself, because they are not part of it.

But during the whole time this bill is studied in committee, we will keep in mind that Quebec as a whole has often been a loser to date, in terms of investment in the energy sector, and in all possible ways.

I would like to give the establishment of the Borden line as an example. Those who sat in the House, or were interested in politics at the time, remember very clearly that, in the early 1960s, international oil prices dropped so dramatically after worldwide overproduction, that western Canadian oil prices far exceeded oil prices on foreign markets. Refineries in the east end of Montreal, almost all of which are in my riding or very close to it, refused to buy oil from western Canada because it was so expensive.

• (2205)

At that point, western oil producers complained and asked the federal government to find a solution to their problem. The government appointed the Borden commission. That commission, which had no representative from Quebec, decided that a line would be set, the Borden line, giving western Canada a captive market, that is the region west of the Ottawa River, and that a pipeline would come to Sarnia. It also decided that eastern refiners, that is Quebec refiners, would have to get their oil from that pipeline. Consequently, within a few years, the whole petrochemical industry was transferred from eastern Montreal to Ontario. Quebecers, who were refiners and sellers of finished oil products, became buyers of refined products from Ontario.

This is a clear case, in the energy sector, of Quebec being deprived of an economic activity which it had developed.

This morning, I was listening to the hon. member for Longueuil. He was quite right when he said that all the major investments made in recent years in the energy sector, including CANDU research, amount to about $12 billion. Indeed, billions of dollars are invested in projects such as Hibernia, but not one penny was ever spent on hydro projects in Quebec.

Before concluding, I want to remind this House that 23 per cent of the money invested elsewhere than Quebec comes from Quebecers. We want to look at every side of the issue, and we hope that the committee will give us the opportunity to meet all those concerned with this issue.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member made reference to the District of Columbia circuit court decision, as have previous speakers.

I have a fax statement I would like to read and ask the member a question. It is fax from the EPA to Environment Canada that reads:

> EPA has just learned of the D.C. circuit's decision requiring the agency to grant a fuel additive waiver for the manganese–based gasoline additive MMT. The agency is disappointed in the court's decision that EPA cannot consider health effects in deciding whether or not to grant these waivers.
>
> This decision does not mean that unleaded gasoline containing MMT can now be sold. The Clean Air Act also requires that all new fuel additives, including MMT, must be tested and their health effects studied before they can be registered for use.
>
> In 1994 EPA issued rules implementing this requirement that will govern the testing of MMT. MMT is not currently registered for use in unleaded gasoline. The agency will therefore require the testing concerning potential health effects of MMT be completed prior to its approval for this use.

[*Translation*]

I would like to know whether the hon. member is aware that tests will have to be completed before MMT can be used in the United States.

Mr. Pomerleau: Madam Speaker, I was not aware of that. A Health Canada study showed that MMT is not a threat to health and the environment. We will find that report for my colleague. Mind you, reports coming out of Health Canada are not always reliable.

For example, UFFI was supposed to be fabulous. People had to spend billions of dollars to remove the stuff from their homes. Let us remember also the thalidomide and silicone breast implant problems. I always take what comes out of Health Canada with a grain of salt. Health Canada tells us that MMT is not a health hazard.

My colleague's question underscores an obvious fact. We are dealing here with an extremely complex issue that has implications in health, technology, and chemistry. Those who will examine this issue in committee will have to rely on experts to understand all the aspects of it.

• (2210)

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to mention a rather interesting phenomenon. Listening to this discussion in the House concerning additives to the gas used in cars is a reminder of where the federal government is at compared to Quebec. In Quebec the electric car has been invented. An inventor in Montreal by the name of Couture has reinvented the wheel.

He has developed an electrical system by equipping each wheel with a motor, making this car the car of the future. Pollutants will be eliminated because, as we know, the whole discussion around MMT involves whether or not it pollutes, whether or not it is detrimental to health. In Quebec, we will eliminate pollutants. We will eliminate exhaust pipes. This will be a car without an engine. This electronic car is a major step forward for the entire world, and it began in Quebec.

Once again, this shows how Quebec has made progress in this field, as it has in many others, in trying to come up with the best, environmentally friendly solution for a healthier society. I was curious to know if the hon. member agreed with me that Quebec is already a frontrunner in the search for a solution to all these questions of gas and pollutants.

Mr. Pomerleau: Madam Speaker, I found my colleague's remarks most interesting, as I was just speaking about this this morning. In fact, whenever we look at gas and additives to it such as MMT, ethanol or whatever, we are looking at chemical roducts, all of which, in one way or another, pollute. Take ethanol, which is not supposed to be a pollutant. Its manufacture from corn and fertilizers will damage the soil.

So the electric car, which needs no gas or other fuel, is an unprecedented opportunity for Quebec to take the lead in technology that does not exist anywhere else. I think that the people who are asking us for our vision of society see this as part of that vision. We could very well decide to electrify all our public transportation in Quebec, the buses travelling between cities and, gradually, all cars, and develop our own technology, which we could eventually export, especially now that we are the largest producers of electricity.

So I think my colleague is right, it is a key to the future, one which, in our case, will mean that in a few years we will no longer be wondering about chemical products, with their inevitable repercussions.

[*English*]

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Anjou—Rivière–des–Prairies poses an interesting question. I would like to ask him a question.

It is said that energy cannot be created or destroyed, it can only be changed from one form to the next. Nothing is free. Electric technology is still in its infancy. Battery technology is getting better but only for short runs. However, when we build hydro dams there is environmental damage. If we move to nuclear, there are costs as well. There are no free rides. We cannot say that electric cars are a panacea. They may become part of the mix of transportation systems but there are costs.

For instance, in the 1960s the demand for hydro power was doubling every 10 years. There are costs. Nothing is free. The automobile will still be there and we will still have to contend with the way it performs and try to improve it.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this bill today. Bill C–94 proposes to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese based substances.

• (2215)

Before I go any further, let me clarify for the House what MMT is. MMT or methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl is a fuel additive. I am really pleased I had my two years of organic chemistry in order to be able to fumble through that. I will be using MMT for the rest of my speech.

MMT is a fuel additive which boosts the octane of gasoline and increases its efficiency. It has been used since 1977 in almost all Canadian unleaded gasoline.

MMT was introduced as an additive to gasoline when lead was banned and its addition has proven to enhance the effectiveness of fuel and has shown environmental benefits. This bill is designed to eliminate the use of MMT which is a lead replacement in unleaded fuels.

Bill C–94 allows the minister to authorize an exception for MMT. It will not be used in unleaded gasoline subject to monitoring requirements. Coverage of the bill can also be expanded by order in council to cover other manganese based substances and the bill will be binding on all persons, including the federal and provincial governments.

The penalties for unauthorized import or interprovincial trade of MMT are harsh and range from a $300,000 to $1 million fine and six months to three years in jail. That is pretty stiff.

I have several concerns with the bill. I am concerned about the government initiative in this matter in the first place. The government should not be interfering into private disputes between businesses. That is what this is. It should be resolved between the concerned parties and not by government legislation.

I am also concerned about the lack of research behind the bill. The government has refused to conduct an independent technical reviews to address the issues in dispute, as suggested by several provinces, gasoline refiners and the manufacturers of MMT. Instead the government is legislating a ban on a product without any proper investigation.

This is a technical industry issue which can only be resolved through an independent technical review, not by subjective government action. Reform has been very clear that it does not want to take sides on the issue. It has met with both sides, Ethyl and the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Associations, MVMA, and both sides appear to have credible arguments. Both sides have run exhaustive tests and come up with two different and contradictory results. This is why Reform feels that there is a need to run a third party independent test on the product before any conclusions are reached.

I am concerned that the bill is going ahead despite the fact that government does not have any conclusive evidence that MMT has an adverse effect on the environment. The minister's claim that MMT has been linked to increasing vehicle repair costs to the engine and emission control systems are unfounded. There is no external evidence to support any claim that the removal of MMT will decrease repair costs to the motorists.

The minister also claims that MMT causes on board diagnostic units to malfunction in the new 1996 cars. There is no evidence to support this either. The MVMA claims to have data to support this claim, but Ethyl says that test results from the largest EPA approved fuel additives testing program in history demonstrate that contrary to claims by the MVMA, MMT in Canadian gasoline is fully compatible with the new on board diagnostic catalyst monitoring systems.

Again, no independent third party testing has been conducted in Canada on MMT and the 1996 on board diagnostics. There is also no evidence to support claims that MMT damages the life of

emission control equipment or that the use of MMT in gas increases fuel consumption or pollution.

This legislatio is based solely on the evidence developed and put forward by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, one of the parties directly involved in the dispute. Again, none of the evidence has been subject to third party analysis.

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Associations has not made their evidence available to the general public. One has to ask why. Of what are they afraid?

• (2220)

When asked in the House of Commons for evidence to support this legislation, the minister side stepped the issue, refusing to bring the evidence into the open. Why? Clearly because the minister does not have sufficient evidence.

In fact there is evidence that appears to point to the contrary. Health Canada conducted a study in December 1994 which concluded that the current use of MMT does not harm Canadians. The report stated: "All analyses indicate that the combustion products of MMT in gasoline do not represent an added health risk to the Canadian population". Evidence provided by Ethyl Corporation, the manufacturer of MMT, also contradicts the conclusions of the MVMA.

It is important to note the method the government is using to implement this ban. The legislation proposes to ban MMT through a trade restriction, not an environmental ban. It is important. Why? Because the government has no legislative grounds to remove MMT for health, environmental or technical reasons. If there is something environmentally wrong with MMT then use the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. Do not use a trade ban. There is something wrong with this picture. If the government is going to ban a substance it should have conclusive evidence that will support the ban which it does not have.

I am concerned about the precedent set by this bill of government interfering in business. The two concerned parties, industry and Ethyl, are both making contradictory claims and have been unable to smooth out their differences on their own.

Before the environment minister stepped in, the two sides were close to negotiating an understanding to bring in third party testing, which is what we want. However, the minister's interference in this issue has brought matters to a standstill. As soon as one side felt the minister was on its side, all talks were broken off. Rather than helping the situation the minister's interference hindered the course of events.

I am also concerned that Bill C–94 sets a precedent for business to drive the government agenda. The MVMA has threatened to raise automobile prices and to withdraw automobile manufacturers across the border if these companies do not get their way. This bill is clearly the response.

Government should not be responding to unfounded threats from the business community with legislation. This is no way to run the country, although it may now be the new way of Liberals doing business.

My concern with Bill C–94 is not who is right or wrong. I do not feel I can take a position on the issue because at this point there is not enough evidence to support one side or the other. My concern with the bill is the manner in which decisions are being made by government. Government should not be making decisions until there is clear third party, unbiased evidence on the table. There needs to be a fair and independent technical review of the facts.

Given that most automobile manufacturers are based in Ontario it is clear why the government has chosen to support the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association in this dispute. Lobbying is the issue here, not MMT.

Government should not base its legislative decisions on lobbying or on where it feels its election interests may lie. MMT is the only gasoline additive available in Canada that is capable of reducing nitrogen oxide emissions by as much as 20 per cent. Nitrogen oxide emissions cause urban smog. A ban on MMT could have the equivalent effect of adding one million cars to Canadian roads by the year 2000 if we do not have an equivalent replacement.

If a replacement for MMT is not identified, its removal from gasoline will prove to be more environmentally detrimental than leaving it there in the first place. This should be of concern because it appears that environment department officials do not know what will replace MMT. This bill only allows six months for its ban to be effective. Six months does not allow enough time for industry to adjust.

Canadians should also be concerned about the cost of the legislation on the individual consumer. It is estimated that taking MMT out of gasoline will cost an estimated $109 million in capital costs and tens of millions of dollars for operating costs. These costs will be dumped on the consumer which will mean an increase in gas prices.

• (2225)

Several provinces have voiced their opposition to this bill. I wonder how the government justifies the restriction of import and interprovincial trade of MMT with Bill C–88 which proposes to remove interprovincial barriers to trade. Again it does not fit.

The spirit and intent of Bill C–94 represents a unilateral interference into provincial affairs. The province of Alberta has stated that Bill C–94 contradicts the energy chapter of the agreement on internal trade. Article 1209, section 1 states that

no party shall restrict, prohibit or hinder access to its petroleum markets or its petroleum products markets.

Alberta has questioned the environmental benefits of removing MMT and has demanded a fair and timely process to resolve the dispute. Saskatchewan's deputy minister of environment has stated the MVMA has not convinced Saskatchewan and the majority of provinces that there is any evidence to show MMT has an adverse effect on the on board diagnostic systems.

Why is the Minister of the Environment ignoring these concerns shared by Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? Could it be that perhaps she is in the pocket of the auto industry?

I am also concerned that the environment minister's actions directly contradict what is currently taking place in the United States. The Americans have recently overturned the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association's evidence, the same evidence on which the proposed legislation is based.

Let me repeat that because it is important. The Americans have recently overturned the MVMA evidence, the same evidence on which the proposed legislation is based. The 19–year prohibition of MMT was recently lifted by an U.S. appeals court because the evidence of its effect on the environment has been shown to be inconclusive. Last week the United States district court of appeals issued its mandate ordering the Environmental Protection Agency to grant a waiver to permit the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline in the United States.

This reaffirms the findings that MMT does not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control system or damage the environment. The order to grant a waiver follows from extensive program testing of the fuel additive.

I am concerned that the minister is jumping the gun with the bill. It appears that MMT will probably be reintroduced into the United States this fall. At the same time, the minister is taking action to ban the product in Canada. It simply does not make any sense.

Actions in the United States put a large question mark on the efforts of the environment minister to ban MMT in Canada. We have to ask again, why?

In conclusion, I would like to make it clear that I do not support this legislation. I do not support legislation based on lobbying and threats, and I do not support legislation that fails to obtain a fair and independent technical review of the facts.

If this legislation is to go forward, I agree with my colleague that it must go to the environment committee. Extensive witnesses from both sides should be called. The only way that this can be solved is a clear third party independent study to find out what are the basics.

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. The hon. member for Westminster—Burnaby before him made the allegation that the minister is in the pocket of the motor vehicle manufacturers.

If that is the case, I would like to ask the hon. member why it is that MMT has been disallowed for use in leaded gasoline in the United States since 1978? Was the EPA in the pocket of the motor vehicle manufacturers as well?

Did he not hear the statement that was read containing the facts from the EPA to the effect that the granting of the waiver does not permit the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline? It was simply a technical decision made by the District of Columbia circuit court to the effect that the EPA could not consider health effects in deciding whether or not to grant these waivers. The issue of using MMT still will be the subject matter of extensive testing on health effects.

• (2230)

Mr. Gilmour: Madam Speaker, on the first point, about the minister being in the automakers' pocket, clearly this whole process is coming forth through pressure from the automakers, many of whom are in southern Ontario. The pressure is there. The minister has bowed to the pressure, and that is unfortunate.

In terms of the waiver, the minister is making my point, in that what we require is a third party independent look at this situation. I will go back to my former life and use 2,4–D as an example. The member for Davenport will understand the background. No matter which side of the issue, whether the banning of 2,4–D or the use of it, either side could get as big a pile as they wanted of the evidence. It was very difficult to get a clear, independent, middle of the road decision. This is what is required. I believe this is what the Americans are fighting for on this waiver. Again they are just bowing to saying this is exactly what we want.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, to the hon. member for Comox—Alberni, for whom I have the greatest respect, no matter where the automotive industry is located, the industry serves Canadians from coast to coast, regardless of their location.

Here we are talking, among other things, of meeting the requirements of the customers in terms of warranty and in terms of the ability of the car owner to determine whether through the diagnostic system the anti–pollution devices can work or not.

The hon. member is shaking his head, but that is a fact. If he has more information to add, I would be glad to listen to him in this debate.

The member for Comox—Alberni spoke about the importance of independent testing. I am told that independent testing has been carried out by both sides of the debate, by the car manufacturers as well as by the petroleum industry. How much more independent testing does the member for Comox—Alberni want? Does he realize that testing is expensive, that it takes

time? And while further tests are taking place, as proposed by him, the manufacturing industry is in the process of producing the diagnostic devices, which will then not be switched on or connected if the MMT additive is not removed from gasoline. Therefore everybody will be losing in the process.

Has the member for Comox—Alberni given any thought to all the consequences of his suggestion flowing from further independent testing?

Mr. Gilmour: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Davenport. We are on the same committee and I have a great amount of respect for the member.

In terms of the diagnostics and the unit that is already being made, I view this as industrial blackmail in that the automakers are saying they already have it on board and since it is already made we have to change the legislation. That is just absolutely wrong. We cannot have the automakers or any industry in Canada ruling the government which is what they are attempting to do here.

Again I will go back to my independent study. The member says that both sides have their studies. I agree but where is the independent study that is in the middle?

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if some months ago someone had come to me saying that a political party in this House with a strong rural base is going to be advocating a position in favour of prolonging the use of MMT in Canada, I would have said to such a person that obviously they were wrong, that could not possibly be true.

• (2235)

Tonight we have in this debate something rather unusual happening. I submit this to the House and invite my colleague to respond.

I represent an agricultural constituency where corn is produced. With the use of ethanol there is little or no need for MMT. I understand there are other substitutes as well that produce octane enhancement.

The member opposite was challenging the hon. member for Davenport a moment ago in advocating that we need further independent tests. What kind of a reason do we have to prolong this product, which is largely if not totally made outside of the country, banned in the country where it is manufactured, used in this country principally because it is banned where it comes from, and furthermore damages motor vehicles, the health of Canadians, and does no good for the agricultural industry in Canada on top of that? With that kind of evidence, how much more independent testing do we need before we realize there is damage being done to cars, the health of Canadians and the agricultural industry? Why is the member supporting it given that kind of evidence?

Mr. Gilmour: Madam Speaker, the member simply backs up my point. There is a U.S. ban that has been overturned by the court of appeal and members on the other side fail to recognize that. They just seem to think that it will go away, and here we have an industry that is pushing forward.

The member was pushing the ethanol industry. Ethanol is fine. It is one of the additions, but it is not the answer. It takes more energy to make ethanol than it does to make gasoline. It is certainly part of the formula, but it is not the answer.

The hon. member was saying that he was surprised to see a member opposite stand up with this point of view. Again, it simply shows that the other side knows very little about where the Reform Party is coming from. They are going to see an awful lot more of the Reform Party. I am putting them on notice.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, if there is still time I want the hon. member to respond to the following.

Last year I was forced to replace my car. As part of the new car warranty I was told by the dealer that in Canada the oil in that particular model has to be changed every 6,000 kilometres, versus every 18,000 in the United States. I asked the dealer why. The only reason I was given was that the gasoline additives we use in Canada cause damage to motor vehicles.

I ask the hon. member how he could possibly be promoting and supporting the production and sale of a product that has been banned in the United States and somehow is still legal in Canada, given the damage it does to cars as well as to all the other things I mentioned previously? Does he not see that this product is not desirable for our environment, for motor vehicles, or for the health of Canadians? It does all this harm and the member opposite, for reasons I do not understand, says that all of this does not matter. It has not been used for years and years in the United States, and now, just because there has been a recent court decision, notwithstanding the fact that it has not been used in heaven knows how long, all of a sudden he takes a position in favour of this particular product which was banned south of the border.

• (2240)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): A very brief answer, the hon. member for Comox—Alberni. Your time has expired.

Mr. Gilmour: Very briefly, Madam Speaker, I will just sum up. What can we expect from a member who is going to take his advice from a used car salesman?

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the privilege to speak to this Chamber about Bill C–94, the Manganese–based Fuel Additives Act.

[*Translation*]

Before addressing specific elements of Bill C–94, I would like to say a few words about some environmental concerns of mine regarding what the government has already done and, more importantly, what it is going to do in this area.

Allow me to underline a few facts supporting my concerns. World population is increasing at the rate of about 90 million people every year. In the last 150 years, it has climbed from 1 billion to 6 billion. According to projections, it will reach between 10 billion and 14 billion in the years 2000 to 2050. From 1960 to 1990, economic activity grew at a compounded annual rate of 3.8 per cent. The growth rate in any given year exceeded in absolute terms the global economic activity in Europe in 1939.

[*English*]

Clearly at the heart of our environmental concerns lies the historical trend of unprecedented expansion and acceleration of human activities that now threaten vital components of the earth's ecology. Major impacts include forests vanishing at the rate of 17 million hectares per year, 6 million hectares of productive dry land turning to desert each year, 140 plant and animal species becoming extinct each day, and air and water quality on a global scale is declining at an equally alarming rate.

The bottom line of all this is that the combined impacts of population and these other pressures cause environmental capacity limits to be exceeded locally, regionally, and globally. It is now clear that without some major shifts in policies and practices a continuation of these trends is ecologically unsustainable.

Clearly with our current transportation practices we are not winning the war. Canada has launched a number of initiatives to limit pollution from motor vehicles. We have eliminated the use of lead additives in gasoline. No longer will we have to worry about the potential threat to health, especially to the health of our young children, that the presence of lead in gasoline posed.

As of last fall we have reduced the sulphur content of diesel fuel, which when used with more technologically advanced engines will reduce the emission of particulates and black smoke emanating from large trucks and buses.

[*Translation*]

In the red book, the Prime Minister supported the development of renewable energy technologies. To this end, the government has launched the national bio–ethanol program. Announced last December, this program will support the development of ethanol production through a refundable line of credit to qualified candidates who want to establish bio–ethanol fuel production plants in Canada.

The program, which will be managed by the Farm Credit Corporation, will guarantee up to $70 million in loans between 1999 and 2005. In other words, the government will help only those renewable energy companies that initially invest their own capital and resources. There will be no subsidy, no megaproject. The government will lend its assistance only after the private sector has invested its own capital for five years.

[*English*]

This is the fiscally responsible way to help turn wood chips, straw, grain, and other biomass waste into energy that can be used to fuel our vehicles.

Properly blended ethanol gasoline can reduce carbon monoxide emissions, which degrade urban air quality, can reduce carbon dioxide emissions, which are the primary source of greenhouse gases, and can also reduce benzene emissions, a substance declared toxic under CEPA, into the atmosphere. The program is targeted to encourage ethanol production in every region of the country.

• (2245)

This is a sound example of the concept of sustainable development. We can deal with an environmental problem and create jobs at the same time.

Our standards for exhaust coming out of the tailpipes of our cars and trucks are among the most stringent in the world. These standards set strict limits of nitrogen oxides which contribute to acid rain and are a key component in the formation of smog. They also set limits on the amount of hydrocarbons, another major contributor to smog, cars can emit and on carbon monoxide.

[*Translation*]

While pollution created by individual cars and trucks has gone down significantly, these vehicles are still a major source of air pollution, since their number has increased considerably. They are said to be responsible for 60 per cent of carbon monoxide emissions in Canada, 35 per cent of nitrogen oxide emissions, and 20 per cent of emissions of carbon dioxide, the greenhouse gas primarily responsible for climatic changes.

This is why my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, is going ahead with a number of initiatives, including a comprehensive program designed to control pollution caused by motor vehicles. To that end, the federal government is pursuing a strategy to control motor vehicle emissions. That strategy includes, among other measures, the implementation of more rigorous standards to control exhaust emissions. This requires advanced technology, such as the sophisticated systems developed by Diagnostic Inc.

[*English*]

However there remains one obstacle to the introduction in Canada of the next generation of emission control technologies, the continued presence of MMT, an octane enhancer presently used in unleaded gasoline. Bill C–94 calls for a ban on the import and interprovincial trade of MMT. MMT is not manufactured in Canada but imported from the U.S.

In Canada the use of MMT as an octane enhancer is allowed in unleaded gasoline up to the maximum of 18 milligrams of manganese per litre. In the United States the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline has not been allowed since 1978. We have heard much discussion this evening about the case in the District of Columbia where the waiver has been ordered to be issued by the EPA to the manufacturers of MMT, but this does not allow the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline in the United States.

The automobile industry is convinced MMT adversely affects the operation of these advanced emission control technologies. All the domestic manufacturers and automobile importers agree that MMT adversely affects their sophisticated on board diagnostic systems.

These systems are planned for introduction on new Canadian vehicles starting in the 1996 model year vehicles. On board diagnostic systems will monitor the emission control components and alert the driver to a malfunction. This equipment could ensure that automobiles are properly maintained, resulting in decreased tailpipe emissions and improved fuel economy. In other words this is one more important tool to help us address pollution, including urban smog and climate change.

[*Translation*]

Clearly, reducing motor vehicle pollution requires a concerted effort on two fronts: first, improvements in motor vehicle emission control technology such as those allowed by the advanced systems used by Diagnostic Incorporated, and second, improvements in the composition and properties of fuels.

[*English*]

Therefore the government cannot allow MMT to compromise the ability of Canada's auto industry to design and deliver vehicles to Canadians that can achieve important pollution reductions. Canada's environment and Canadian consumers have the right to the latest emission control technology available. This is especially apparent when this same technology will be offered to American consumers starting with the 1996 model year because the United States presently has MMT free fuel.

• (2250)

[*Translation*]

To repeat what the Deputy Prime Minister stated, we cannot wait any longer. It is now time for action. Any additional delay would threaten the federal emission control programs.

[*English*]

In summary, this action is pro–consumer, pro–business and pro–environment. Therefore, I urge all members to support this action.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have listened to a number of speakers from the government side and to their rationalizations and explanations. I want to further respond because a lot of questions remain unanswered. In my questions and comments I will put some more questions and maybe we will get some answers. I have a dozen questions.

Why has the government refused to conduct an independent technical review to address issues in dispute as suggested by Ethyl, Canada's gasoline refiners and several provinces?

Having refused an independent technical review, how can the government justify removing MMT when the claims and concerns of the MVMA about MMT and vehicle emission systems, including the new OBD systems, have been considered and rejected by the U.S. EPA and the U.S. court of appeals?

Why would Canada ban the import of MMT as it is about to be reintroduced into unleaded gasoline in the United States? Why would the environment minister have chosen to address this issue by restricting trade?

How does the government square the restrictions of import and interprovincial trade of MMT with legislation currently before the House of Commons to remove interprovincial trade barriers?

Why is the government ignoring opposition and concerns expressed about this unilateral federal action by the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

How can the Minister of the Environment support an action which studies conclude will result in an annual 50,000 to 60,000 tonne increase in smog causing NOx from Canadian vehicles?

If MMT is replaced, what will the replacement be and what will the cost to consumers and refiners be? What are the environmental and health impacts of potential replacements? Why have the Minister of the Environment and all major automobile manufacturers refused to meet with Ethyl Canada?

What pre–1996 models have been impacted by these alleged MMT related problems and what specific MMT related warranty claims have been made and why have the manufacturers not notified consumers before?

Why did the MVMA turn down a specific proposal for a technical review of alleged MMT related problems made by key executives representing petroleum refiners and automobile makers at the joint industry task force in 1993?

How can the Minister of the Environment explain her statement if vehicle manufacturers carry through on threats to remove OBD systems? This would result in a tenfold increase in vehicle emissions; lots of questions and no answers.

Mr. DeVillers: Madam Speaker, the hon. member is correct, there are lots of questions. I will give him several answers. I do not think I will be able to list them all because I could not write them down quickly enough.

In answer to the first question about the government's not ordering independent testing, for a party constantly telling us there should not be government intervention in the business affairs of the country, I find it very difficult to understand. This is an issue motor vehicle manufacturers and petroleum producers have been working on for quite some time. They have not been able to come to an agreement or to an understanding on it. Consequently the government is forced to act and I think that is appropriate.

The hon. member asks why the ministry is acting on a trade basis. It is not. It is on a consumer protection basis. CEPA is not being used. The hon. member is a member of the environment committee and knows the environment committee is completing and will be tabling tomorrow its report on the five year review of CEPA so that it is seen by many to be inadequate for the purpose and a very long and protracted reason. That is why the minister has chosen to take the course she has taken here.

Reference was made to the court case in the District of Columbia, and several speakers have referred to it this evening. The case does not guarantee or permit the reuse of MMT in the United States. That was a decision on a technical basis as it was read from the fax sent from the EPA on the technicality that the EPA could not use health considerations. It could use only the testing of the equipment in refusing to issue that waiver. Under the Clean Air Act there is still much testing to be done on the health issue. It is far from a given that MMT will pass all those tests.

• (2255)

On the question of substitutes, ethanol is a very acceptable substitute to MMT. The government has taken the initiative to assist with some tax considerations with the establishment of ethanol plants throughout the country, including in areas represented by our hon. friends in the Reform Party. That is a very reasonable substitute and the government is acting properly in allowing it.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have four questions which I was able to jot down while the member for New Westminster—Burnaby made his intervention. If MMT is replaced, what will happen then? Nothing different than what happened—

Mr. Hermanson: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I believe it was the hon. member from the government side who was speaking. The hon. member for Davenport is asking the hon. member from—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster is correct. The person we should be asking our questions of or making our comments to is the hon. member for Simcoe North.

Mr. Caccia: I would be glad to ask the member for Simcoe North whether he would agree that the answer to the question posed to him by the member for New Westminster—Burnaby in relation to the removal of MMT has not been answered already in the United States by the fact that it has happily functioned in a very responsible way since 1978, the date when MMT was removed. Therefore there would be no difference in Canada to the pattern already established south of the border.

The question was also raised, and I ask again my hon. colleague whether he would agree, as to CEPA. That is a very legitimate question. The member for New Westminster—Burnaby is a member of our committee. The CEPA legislation does not permit at the present time to deal with substances like MMT. An amendment would be required to CEPA. He may want to take that initiative.

The other question was why move now when MMT is being reintroduced. This is the strange notion tonight that has emerged as a result of various interventions across the aisle. MMT is not being reintroduced. There is only a technical procedure in the courts that has been somehow upheld by way of a waiver. It has nothing to do with reintroducing MMT.

It was asked why the Ethyl corporation was refused a hearing by the government or by the minister. I can understand very well why Ethyl would not be given an interview. It is one of the most regressive and litigious corporations in North America. It has never taken to heart public interest or public health. In that respect Ethyl is out of luck with any good government.

Mr. DeVillers: Madam Speaker, out of deference and respect for the hon. member for Davenport, I agree with all of his statements.

• (2300)

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, despite the late hour of 11 p.m., it is somewhat of a pleasure to rise to address Bill C–94, the Manganese based Fuel Additives Act.

For those members who have been told they must vote for this bill and have therefore decided that they do not need to understand the whole issue, I would like to give them a few of the facts surrounding this lobby effort by the powerful auto industry.

MMT has been used in Canada in unleaded fuel since 1977. Contrary to some disinformation in the papers, MMT has also been used in the United States since 1978 in leaded gas. Congress passed laws that said that all additives for unleaded fuels had to get a waiver from the Environmental Protection Agency before they could be used—all additives, not just MMT.

In their previous applications to use MMT, petroleum companies were unable to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that MMT should be given a waiver. In the last application the EPA reviewed evidence from both sides. Auto manufacturers contend that MMT should be banned because they believe that MMT gums up the new anti–pollution systems mandated for all cars in 1996. The onboard diagnostic systems, or OBD as they are called, apparently get coated with manganese and the car companies claim this results in inaccurate readings. They state: "Manganese based additives precipitate the degradation and failure of vehicle emission systems".

The petroleum companies ran their own tests and did not find MMT adversely affected the performance of the OBDs. Further, they point out that the auto companies' own tests prove that MMT does not adversely affect the detection of emission failures. When the system detected a problem, the failure light went on.

This finding is important, because now Canadian auto manufacturers are threatening to disable the dashboard light that signals the control system is not operating at optimum. By disabling the detection system, the car companies are deliberately, and spitefully I might add, preventing Canada from achieving pollution and emission targets.

The EPA, with its very strict standards, reviewed the evidence from both sides. It found no reason to refuse a waiver for MMT based on its effects on the emissions control equipment. The EPA administrator first noted that "use of Ethol's product in unleaded gasoline at the specified concentration will not cause or contribute to a failure to achieve compliance with vehicle emission standards".

However, she went on to cover other factors beyond her mandate with respect to the waiver application. She found that "there is a reasonable basis for concern about the effects on public health that could result if EPA were to approve the use of MMT in unleaded gasoline". On those grounds the administrator again denied the waiver. However, on April 14 the U.S. Court of Appeals overturned this decision, noting that the reasonable basis for concern that she applied was not consistent with section 211(c) of the act, which deals with health factors. Specifically there must be "significant risk to public health", which was not found in this case.

I would like to know why the Minister of the Environment has not addressed this aspect of MMT. It would seem to be her duty to protect Canadians against airborne pollutants, which will negatively impact on their health. Instead of pursuing this, the main objection by the EPA administrator, she is passing legislation to ban the importation or movement of MMT across borders.

Why does the government not have the gumption to stand up to blatant threats by the auto industry? It has warned that it would slap an extra $3,000 on the price of all 1996 model cars, void all exhaust system warranties and simply disconnect the new anti–pollution devices if Ottawa did not act by August. I want to know what the $3,000 would be used for. Is it going to research and development to make slightly different pollution control systems for Canada? Or, is it a fearmongering tactic by the car companies?

We have had MMT additives since 1977 in Canada. Why were the effects of MMT not built into the OBD tests over the last several years?

Another reason the auto industry has given for its position is to harmonize the North American market. It does not want to invest in technology to meet Canada's requirements, only those of the U.S.

• (2305)

Harmonizing the North American market sounds like a great plan during this age of NAFTA and free trade, except for one thing: the EPA has been ordered to give a waiver to American petroleum producers to start using MMT in unleaded gas. The appeal date on that decision expired last week without an appeal by the auto manufacturers or the EPA. If they felt their facts were so solid, why did they not appeal?

Mr. Forseth: No evidence.

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Even more important for Canada, it appears that as a result auto manufacturers are now considering a joint testing program between the U.S. and Canada because MMT may be on the U.S. unleaded gas market within the year. And note I said "may be".

What will Canada be doing as MMT fills gas stations across the border? Preventing its movement to appease the current whims of the auto industry. While the government commits itself to eliminating internal trade barriers in Bill C–88, the

Minister of the Environment is busy erecting them in Bill C–94. Not only does this demonstrate the hypocrisy of the Liberal commitment to freer trade between the provinces. It also demonstrates the inability of the Minister of the Environment to act decisively and responsibly on an important issue. Lacking the hard evidence to defend the outright elimination of MMT in fuels, she is caving in to the lobbying efforts of one group. Instead of making her decision based on technical information regarding the problems with the use of MMT, she is completely sidestepping the issue.

Bill C–94 means MMT can still be sold and used wherever it is produced. So petroleum producers could produce MMT in southern Ontario, where most cars are driven, and they would not be prohibited from selling it at the pumps. Somehow I do not see how this addresses the real issue of whether or not MMT contributes to pollution or should be used at all in Canada. This merely prevents the transport of MMT across borders but does not prevent its use.

If I were a suspicious and cynical westerner I might question the regional economic impacts of this bill, which seem to far outweigh any environmental concerns the minister might have. I might wonder why the minister refuses to consider studies by petroleum producers in western Canada or the United States. I might wonder if she represents the interests of all Canadians in all industries or merely a select few in Liberal territory in central Canada.

If I were really cynical I might wonder at the timing of the introduction of this bill, during the Ontario election campaign, in the province most dependent on the auto industry. When faced with an ultimatum by the auto companies to ban MMT use by August, what did the government do? Did it get tough and try to determine what the truth is regarding its effects? No, that would be too much to expect.

The government has a very bad track record when it comes to standing up for Canadians in the face of pressure from big industry. Remember the powerful tobacco lobby last year, when the government refused to look at a real solution to the smuggling problem. Instead of raising export tariffs or beefing up our anti–smuggling patrols, it gave the tobacco companies what they wanted: lower taxes to add new teenage smokers to their growing list of the addicted.

Instead of finding out the truth about MMT, the government is acceding to the demands of the car lobby without independent proof of its claims. What is more, possibly because they cannot prove the harmful effects of MMT, the environment minister is not actually banning it, just restricting its movement.

Something is not quite right here. Why is the Minister of the Environment championing a bill that says and does absolutely nothing about protecting the environment? Until we have an independent study, the only things being protected here are the interests of the auto industry.

What will some of the consequences of this legislation be? For one thing, increased pollution from sulphur emissions in western Canada, where the refineries must change their processing. If MMT cannot be moved interprovincially, producers will spend an additional $100 million to switch over to another fuel additive and will have to refine the gas more for higher octane levels, thereby increasing sulphur emissions. Is that increase in pollution included in the minister's calculations?

There will be up to a 20 per cent increase in nitrogen oxide levels emitted by cars if we ban MMT. Of course now the car manufacturers dispute the 20 per cent figure because of the changes they have been forced to make with the new pollution controls.

• (2310)

Kicking and screaming, the auto industry finally started to invest some research and development dollars into eliminating pollution. Suddenly it has found that it can reduce nitrogen oxide levels substantially. It does not dispute that MMT would decrease nitrogen oxide levels further, only that it will not be as much as 20 per cent because it has finally started producing more efficient cars. However, no one has calculated how much nitrogen oxide levels will go up once a final balance is reached between more efficient cars and less efficient alternate fuel additives.

Let us look at the other side of the equation. How much would it cost auto manufacturers to develop a flushing system or technology to deal with the effects of MMT? I think $100 million seems a little steep, but I am not a scientist or a chemist. I do not pretend to understand why research to solve the problem would cost more than $100 million. Either way, it is the Canadian driver who is going to lose.

MMT has been in use in Canada for 18 years. There is no guarantee that it will not be around for another 18 years. If the auto industry had such grave concern about the effect of MMT on emission systems, why was that not built into the original R and D? Why should the federal government legislate a ban on the movement of MMT because the auto industry did not deem the Canadian fuel market important enough to consider it while it was developing its OBD systems?

On the one hand, if we do not use MMT we have the potential for increasing hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, and other smog ingredients, with their various negative health effects. On the other hand, if we keep MMT no one will know if or when the emission systems fail because the detection systems will be disabled.

I want to turn now to the second part of the debate, which seems to have been buried in Canada but was the reason the EPA initially denied the waiver for MMT in unleaded gas in the U.S. That is the issue of airborne manganese and its effects on the health of Canadians.

We have known for more than a hundred years that airborne manganese is harmful and results in neurological disorders similar to Parkinson's disease. It has been an occupational hazard in manganese mines, where workers breathe in an extremely high level of manganese dust.

One would think that the Minister of the Environment would want to ban MMT if it contributed to unsafe manganese levels in our air. In light of the EPA statements, one would think she would want to conduct tests to see whether Canada should control airborne manganese. Why does she not? Why instead does she go through a ridiculous loop to ban the interprovincial trade of manganese based substances? Should she not as Minister of the Environment be more concerned about emissions?

Although Environment Canada has not conducted studies on this issue, Health Canada has. Its findings are very interesting and refute the EPA administrator's reasonable concerns about the health risks of MMT with hard evidence. The Health Canada study attempted to determine a safe daily intake of airborne manganese. Our bodies can handle ingested manganese much better than airborne manganese. It is an essential part of our diet. However excessive intake of manganese can result in an accumulation in the brain, which will cause the neurological problems I mentioned. Infants and older people are particularly susceptible to the negative effects.

What did Health Canada discover? After establishing a safe daily intake level it studied airborne manganese, particularly that related to MMT. Even garage mechanics fell well inside the acceptable range of manganese inhalation. The major findings regarding MMT are as follows, and I quote from the study:

> Levels of respirable manganese in major Canadian urban centres have remained constant or decreased from 1986 to 1992, and do not reflect major changes in MMT use during that time, suggesting that MMT does not contribute substantially to manganese concentrations.

The part of the study I found most enlightening was with respect to why the minister might be reluctant to initiate a study on the effects of MMT related specifically to airborne manganese in particular industrial towns. The study reads:

> Inhalation exposure to manganese has been assessed for residents of cities with large manganese–emitting industries such as steel mills. Current mean ambient air manganese levels are at, or substantially above, the acceptable daily intake. Inhalation uptake from all age groups approaches or exceeds the total daily uptake. This raises concern regarding chronic exposure to manganese for residents in these cities and recommendations are made regarding this issue.

• (2315)

If we had an environment minister truly concerned about the effect of emissions on Canadian health one she would be right on top of trying to control manganese emissions from steel plants in towns like Hamilton. Perhaps that is expecting a bit too much.

Obviously we need an independent review or study to determine the truth. Each side has studies supporting its particular view. The petroleum industry has been pushing for such an independent study but the auto industry has balked. I wonder why that would be. Why has the Minister of the Environment not proposed an independent study? A number of reasons come to mind.

One reason might be the power of the auto industry in southern Ontario, a veritable Liberal stronghold. Maybe she does not think we need an independent study because she only believes the studies by the auto industry and not the ones by the petroleum producers.

Before putting this ban in place, the Minister of the Environment must act responsibly and commission an independent investigation into the environmental effects of MMT and its use in cars. This must include pollutants such as the expected increase in sulphur and other emissions at refineries and the increase in nitrogen oxide levels estimated at the equivalent of one million additional cars on the road.

Then it should look at the other side of the equation that might result from the removal of MMT, at the increase in airborne manganese levels, verification of a Health Canada study which indicated there was not a health risk linked to MMT use, the failure of emission control systems and the overall failure rate. Car manufacturers have not provided such numbers to my knowledge.

When all these factors are considered perhaps the government could make a rational decision based on hard evidence rather than just cave in to the auto industry and the jobs and votes they represent in Liberal ridings.

The main objective of the car companies appears to be to standardize fuels in North America. They could not care less about pollution or emissions in Canada. Because they cannot change the American market, they will get their wish by coercing the Canadian government. Do we not have a right to our own standards in this country? Why should any industry be able to dictate terms to us?

In conclusion, the Minister of the Environment by passing this bill to block the interprovincial trade of MMT is not acting in the best interests of the Canadian people. If there are significant health risks and pollution problems associated with the use of MMT, I would be the first to stand behind her, back her up and support her. However she refuses to conduct an independent study.

A reduction in nitrogen oxide levels for every car may far outstrip any potential pollution from a few failed OBD systems. It is time the minister starts acting like the Minister of the Environment for Canada, not the minister of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association.

The minister should do the right thing and order an independent study.

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member, as did the other two speakers on behalf of the Reform Party, called for an independent study. I am a little bit at a loss to understand what is going to be accomplished by this independent study.

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association issues warranties. It is to the benefit of consumers that we have warranties with our motor vehicles when they are purchased. If an independent study was done and the petroleum industry was proven right, what would that do toward compelling the auto industry to change its opinion and issue warranties? As far as I am aware, this is done strictly as a business decision by the manufacturers. There is no legislation compelling them.

What would be accomplished by the result of an independent study favouring the opinion of the petroleum industry?

• (2320)

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

It is my understanding that the OBD systems on these vehicles were requested by the American government, obviously to control pollution.

One of the biggest problems with the whole issue has been the inability of the petroleum industry on one side and the car manufacturers on the other side to get together and develop something that would benefit both industries and all Canadians and Americans. I hope that would be the outcome of an independent study. If the two sides could agree who should conduct the study and to abide by the results of the study, that is the kind of thing Canadians are looking for.

Suffice it to say that the two sides should be brought together, which has not been the case in the past. We have been getting these constantly conflicting statements from one side versus the other.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I imagine that the Reform Party had the same experience as us last week. The Minister of the Environment came to our offices to brief us on MMT.

As the official opposition critic on environmental issues, I asked to see the studies conducted by car makers to find out why they oppose the use of MMT. We were told that these studies were not available because they were secret.

It is very difficult to take a stand on an issue when we cannot have access to documents and when we are not informed. It is true that the department's position was explained to us and that officials from Ethyl Canada also came to present their own position. Yet, we cannot get a clear picture of the real situation.

I certainly understand the position of the member for Simcoe, as well as that of the chairman of my committee, who are environmentalists, but they are also members of the Liberal government. What we are asking for—and I agree with Reform Party members, this is a rare event, but it sometimes happens—is a clear, independent study, conducted according to the rules of ethics.

I want to ask the hon. member if he agrees with that and if he had access to the studies by auto manufacturers to the effect that MMT is really harmful to the anti–pollution system in cars?

[*English*]

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Mr. Speaker, it is quite an occasion for me to completely agree with a member from the Bloc Quebecois. I thank her for the kind comments on this subject.

It is indicative of the difficulty that Canadians and industries have trying to deal with the issue. We agree that we require a neutral third party to look at the issue rather than forge ahead based on the information on one side of the argument.

It is interesting to note her comments about the studies the automobile industry says it has done and yet these studies are a secret. If the studies support their side of the argument, why would they not bring them forward? To me that would be obvious.

I support the position of the Reform member for Comox—Alberni who earlier said that at the very least if the government is intent on forging ahead and ramming through the legislation as it has done with so many others in the past month. I would hope, following the vote at second reading, that the issue would be referred to the environment committee with a mandate to do a very intensive study and hear the various sides.

• (2325)

I certainly prefer, as does the Bloc obviously, to see an independent neutral study done but at the very least the environment committee should be given the mandate to look at this issue.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to hear the member for Prince George—Peace River insisting on this question of an independent study.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member on questions and comments or is this on debate?

The Speaker: It is questions and comments.

Mr. Caccia: I will make it short. The member admits that there are conflicting opinions on this matter. They are conflicting because these are industries with diverging if not conflicting interests. Therefore the study would have to be carried out by an independent source.

Is the hon. member willing to have these studies, which are rather expensive, conducted by the government at the expense of the taxpayer? That is my first question.

My second question has to do with the statement he made earlier about the cars costing $3,000 extra. This is a cost, assuming the figure is correct, that would be levied on the Canadian consumer in his riding as well. Would it not make sense to the hon. member to support a measure that would prevent an additional cost being charged to the consumers in his own riding?

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I feel the premise is that we just assume this $3,000 figure. I have not seen evidence to support it. That is fear mongering on the part of the auto industry to get its way with the government.

I have not seen the evidence that would support the $3,000. I used it because it was a threat that the automobile industry used to get its way with the government and the government bowed to that pressure.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know we are running out of time, but I cannot stand by when threats such as these are made. I must say these threats that we would have to pay an additional $3,000 in insurance are somewhat ludicrous when we are talking about the environment. Quite frankly, a great environmentalist like the hon. member for Davenport should not even mention things like that.

I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Davenport, because I think he has done some excellent work on our committee, but if it is a matter of politics, and I have a feeling this is strictly political, a conflict between the industry and the auto makers. It involves Ethyl Canada and the new ethanol plants in which the minister is about to invest $70 million. A number of levels are involved here, and it is very political.

Now, I want to see this matter discussed at the environmental level, starting today, and for heaven's sake, let us get serious and start considering the environment, once and for all. The government got rid of the Green Plan, and in its stead, we got a commissioner for the environment. The government eliminated a number of things that were very important for the environment.

We should stop digging in our heels about a matter that is purely political. I would like to see this referred to committee, with as many witnesses as possible, so that we can get a really clear picture of what is at stake here. Right now, the amount of lobbying going on is incredible. I have never seen this with other bills, especially not on the environment.

I think the environment comes first. I hope all members in this House who work on environmental issues will get together and make an environmental decision, not a political one just because the minister has decided to invest in a certain issue.

• (2330)

[*English*]

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the Bloc is quite right: We have to depoliticize the whole process and get it back on sound technical grounds. That is what the opposition in unity is calling for.

On who should pay for the independent review, the two conflicting positions should equally pay for the independent review.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries; and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North relating to Senate amendments to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

Call in the members.

• (2345)

And the bells having rung:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the division on Bill S–7 and Bill C–295 be taken after the other votes we will be proceeding with; in other words that they be taken out of sequence and at the completion of other votes.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 300*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Benoit
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)

Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—49

Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Malhi
Manley

Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchand

Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —193

Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

● (2355)

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

* * *

CN COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage on Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public.

● (2400)

We will now vote on Group No. 1. The first question is on Motion No. 4.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that all members of Parliament who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House and in the following manner. Liberal MPs will be voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Bloc Quebecois members will vote yea, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members will vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP will vote yes, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 301*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Asselin
Bergeron
Blaikie
Brien
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)—50

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Ablonczy
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duncan
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Richardson
Ringma
Robichaud
Schmidt
Serré
Sheridan
Simmons
Speller
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Irwin
Johnston
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
St. Denis

Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Williams
Young—192

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois
Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 lost.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to co–operate and perhaps accelerate things here, you might find unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 17. For Motions Nos. 14 and 15 you might find that same consent, but I understand that New Democratic Party members might be voting otherwise on Motions Nos. 14 and 15.

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, we would give unanimous consent to applying the vote just taken to Motions 8, 9, 10 and 17. On Motions Nos. 14 and 15 the NDP votes no. On Motion No. 11 we vote yes.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 301.*]

Mr. Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 lost.

We have it all straightened out. The only thing we had not talked about in the last series was Motion No. 11. The question is on Motion No. 11.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is unanimous consent for applying the result of the vote just taken on the previous motion to the motion now before the House. Members of the Liberal Party will vote against Motion No. 11.

Mr. Duceppe: Bloc Quebecois members will vote in favour of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yea, with the exception of members who wish to vote otherwise.

• (2405)

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yea on this motion.

Mrs. Maheu: I would like to add my vote to that of the Liberal members on Motion No. 11.

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 302*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond–Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
St–Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West)
Ablonczy
Asselin
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Kerpan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Williams—96

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall

Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —147

Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 303)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeron
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)—47

Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duncan
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger

Ablonczy
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanrahan

Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette–Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Williams
Young—195

Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Irwin
Johnston
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Richardson
Ringma
Robichaud
Schmidt
Serré
Sheridan
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 lost.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 303*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 301*]

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17 lost.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find consent to apply the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 4 in reverse to the motion now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, there will be a recorded division.

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

(*Division No. 304*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duncan
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)

Ablonczy
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)

Grose
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Williams
Young—193

Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Irwin
Johnston
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Richardson
Ringma
Robichaud
Schmidt
Serré
Sheridan
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond

Asselin
Bergeron
Blaikie
Brien
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob

Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefferd)
Marchand
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pommerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Sallaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Woolfe)
Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rosemont)—50

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

● (2415)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried and the bill read the second time.

* * *

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision.

We are dealing with Group No. 1. The first question is on Motion No. 1.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find there is unanimous consent that members who have just voted be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members will vote nay.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members will vote in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote yea, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP will be abstaining on all the report stage motions on Bill C–85.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 305*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Williams—93

Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Kerpan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling

Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert

DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —147

Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 1 lost.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the same result to report stage Motions Nos. 6 and 40.

● (2420)

Mr. Duceppe: Oui.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

The Speaker: I understand the New Democratic Party will be abstaining.

Mr. Blaikie: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 305*]

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 6 and 40 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

I believe the same result could also be applied to Motions Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 35 and 39.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members will vote against this motion and agree to have the votes apply to the motions mentioned by the government whip.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party will vote yea to all the report stage motions as outlined by the government whip.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 306*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—46

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau

Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)

Serré
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood
Shepherd
Simmons
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —194

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois
Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 2 and 3 lost.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 306*]

The Speaker: I also declare Motions Nos. 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 35 and 39 lost.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(*Division No. 307*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —193
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—47

Ablonczy
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

● (2430)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related acts, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at the third reading stage of Bill C–70.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 11 of Bill C–89 be applied in reverse to the motion now before the House.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 308)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Richardson
Ringuette–Maltais
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —147

Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Frazer
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Jacob
Johnston	Kerpan
Lalonde	Landry
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Manning	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Silye	Solberg
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams—96

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Gaffney
Langlois	Patry

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

● (2435)

CODE OF CONDUCT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Gray under Government Business No. 24.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members oppose the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. I would like to be recorded as voting yea on this motion.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yea on this motion.

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

(*Division No. 309*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley

Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Young —153

Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Wood

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Kerpan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Williams—90

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the deferred division at report stage of Bill C–86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

The question is on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members will be voting nay on this motion.

• (2440)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members oppose the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members will be voting yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP will vote yea on this.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 310*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Mills (Red Deer)

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison

Penson
Ringma
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—49

Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin

Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken

Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —194

Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

The Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 1 lost.

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time? By unanimous consent now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, are you asking for consent for third reading of Bill C-86?

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, we support this bill. However, we feel that the next few days should provide ample time for third reading. Our critic on agricultural issues would like to speak in support of the bill.

The Speaker: Now?

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: At the next sitting of the House.

* * *

[*English*]

AGREEMENT ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–88, an act to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of the member for Simcoe Centre to Bill C–88, an act to implement the Agreement on Internal Trade.

The question is on the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motions be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members are opposed to the motion.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members will vote yes, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes no.

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

(Division No. 311)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—46

NAYS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau

Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St–Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young —197

Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

• (2445)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ALTERNATIVE FUELS ACT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Speaker: This vote will be a bit different and I will tell you why. It is on Bill S–7 and we are going to be voting by row.

Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the deferred divisions at report stage on Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles.

The question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions 3, 5, and 6.

As is the practice, the division will be taken row by row, as I said, starting with the mover and then proceeding with those in favour of the motion sitting on the same side of the House as the mover. Then those in favour of the motion sitting on the other side of the House will be called. Those opposed to the motion will be called in the same order.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:)

Private Members' Business

(*Division No. 312*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Gallaway
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Morrison
Ramsay
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—42

NAYS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Crête
Dalphond–Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins

Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Frazer
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Hart
Hickey
Hubbard

Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Reed	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young —196

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Gaffney
Langlois	Patry

• (2455)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 5 and 6 lost.

Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request that you ask the House to consider applying the vote just taken in reverse on concurrence.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, most members of the Reform Party will vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

The Speaker: Those in the Reform Party who are going to vote please stand. We have Mr. McClelland and the clerk will record the following: Mr. White, Mr. Ringma, Mr. Frazer and Mr. Hart will vote yea.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party votes yes on concurrence at report stage.

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

(Division No. 313)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Frazer
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney

Mercier
Mifflin
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Serré
Sheridan
St-Laurent
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Wells
Wood
Meredith
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Richardson
Ringma
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Young —196

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Schmidt
Solberg
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Gallaway
Gouk
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Morrison
Ramsay
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—42

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois
Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

• (2500)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mrs. Stewart (Brant) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that you take the vote just taken and apply it to the motion for third reading.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Mr. Boudria: Agreed.

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find the vote we just had can be applied in the same way. If members of the party agree, I agree.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 313*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

PEACEKEEPING ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof, as amended, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made Friday, June 16, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Bill C–295, an act to provide for the control of Canadian peacekeeping activities by Parliament and to amend the National Defence Act in consequence thereof.

As this is a private member's motion, we will proceed as we did with the other private member's motion. We will begin on my left.

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

(*Division No. 314*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Ablonczy
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)

Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Williams—93

Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Kerpan
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick

Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé

McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Murray
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wells
Wood

McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Minna
Murphy
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Whelan
Young —145

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Langlois

Bertrand
Canuel
Gaffney
Patry

• (2510)

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have paid close attention to the number of votes taken tonight with members of the House participating and I want to check with the Chair to see if we could be informed why the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada has not participated in the voting tonight.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

POSTAL SERVICES

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1995, I put a question to the Minister of Canadian Heritage about budget cuts affecting a program designed to subsidize the distribution of magazines and publications. At the time the minister told me he would check with his officials and find out how effective the cuts were.

However, I may recall for the benefit of the minister that cutting a job in the cultural sector has a more significant impact than it would in other sectors. For instance, it is said it costs about $20,000 to create a job in the cultural sector. Reducing subsidies for magazines and publications would have a far more significant impact in terms of jobs lost than similar cuts in other sectors.

The cultural sector is very sensitive to reductions in subsidies. In the current context it is clear the government must make cuts. However, one always wonders whether the cuts are appropriate and if it would have been possible to avoid them by raising additional taxes in some way, to avoid having to cut this kind of program.

In this particular case the current government's decision is not one with which we can feel comfortable, considering the impact this decision will have on cultural industries. Furthermore, this decision adversely affects the dissemination of Canadian and Quebec culture. The publications and magazines that receive these subsidies tend to have a fairly low circulation and may as a result of this decision be forced to stop publishing, which is a far more drastic impact than what the minister had in mind.

I would like to know whether since my question was put, the government received additional information it could use to analyse the situation or perhaps find alternatives so that the cultural sector would not be penalized by the government's decision.

Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the concerns of the hon. member.

As announced in the finance minister's February budget, the postal subsidy will be reduced. This cut follows earlier cuts already announced in the previous government's December 1992 economic statement and in the finance minister's April 1994 budget.

These cuts have been planned as follows: 10 per cent in 1993–94; 10 per cent in 1994–95; 15 per cent in 1995–96; and 20 per cent in 1996–97.

This breakdown explains the difference between the 8 per cent reduction reported in the latest budget and a 24 per cent reduction mentioned in some newspaper articles.

Despite the extent of these cuts, we are happy to point out once again that the postal rate increases for 1995–96 have been restricted to 5 per cent for paid circulation periodicals and to 10 per cent for small community weekly newspapers.

Also, we have successfully participated in the effort to reduce the deficit while protecting minority language weekly newspapers and ethnic newspapers. It is a success that deserves special recognition.

With regard to the overall evolution of the budget for the postal subsidy, it was first reduced from $220 million to $110 million by the previous government by excluding certain categories of beneficiaries and by moderately increasing the rates for the existing beneficiaries.

The previous government had decided to eliminate all foreign publications, periodicals distributed free of charge and dailies from the program. In April 1993, $25 million was devoted to the creation of a replacement program for the Canadian book trade. Access to the postal subsidy is now reserved for paid circulation periodicals, for library books and for small community weeklies.

I hope this response will reassure the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup regarding the short and medium term future of the postal subsidy.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1.19 a.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 20, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian section of the Assemblée internationale des parlementaires de langue française (AIPLF), as well as the financial report concerning the meeting of that organization's political and general administration committee, held in Beirut, Lebanon, on March 20 and 21, 1995.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation to the 36th annual meeting of the Canada–United States interparliamentary group which was held this past May.

The meeting, like many before, has once again demonstrated the very valuable conference between Canada and the United States and reflected those areas on which we agree and those on which we disagree. I am happy to report the conference was very successful once again.

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, on the statutory review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

The report, entitled *It's About Our Health! Towards Pollution Prevention* in English and *Notre santé en dépend! Vers la prévention de la pollution* in French, contains 141 recommendations and is the result of 12 months of lengthy hearings held in Ottawa and all parts of the country.

[*English*]

The report perhaps could be summarized as urging Parliament and the government to adhere to the fact that the protection of humans and ecosystems requires strong federal leadership, including national standards and mirror legislation in close co–operation with provinces and territories.

I thank the members of all parties for their co–operation and full commitment in the production of this report. I thank the witnesses who appeared before us and in particular the staff which was very helpful during the entire procedure.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI–FOOD

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri–Food which deals with Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, without amendment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BANK ACT

Hon. Douglas Peters (on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development— Quebec, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–100, an act to amend, enact and repeal certain laws relating to financial institutions.

(Motion deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA TRANSPORTATION ACT

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–101, an act to continue the National Transportation Agency as the Canadian Transportation Agency, to consolidate and revise the National Transportation Act, 1987 and the Railway Act, and to amend or repeal other acts as a consequence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I move for referral of the bill to committee before second reading.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

SOCIAL INSURANCE NUMBERS ACT

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–335, an act respecting the use of social insurance numbers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I stand today to introduce a private member's bill entitled an act respecting social insurance numbers.

In introducing this bill, I would like members of the House to note the federal government has never placed controls on the use of the social insurance numbers by other levels of government or by the private sector. The private sector may currently deny a service to an individual who refuses to divulge his or her social insurance number.

This bill would require other levels of government and the private sector to state exactly why this information is needed and will give an individual an opportunity to refuse to divulge his or her social insurance number unless required by federal statute to do so.

The bill would also impose penalties on groups, individuals, agencies or businesses which divulge another person's social insurance number without that person's consent.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

• (1010)

TAXPAYERS BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–336, an act to appoint to a taxation ombudsman and to amend the Income Tax Act to establish certain rights of taxpayers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce this private member's bill which I have called the taxpayers bill of rights. The actions of Revenue Canada are often consistent and fair but from time to time the administrative practices get out of hand, so much so that one of my constituents actually suffered a heart attack over some of the actions taken by Revenue Canada. Things like rights of seizure without proper notice and arbitrary change of collection arrangements are only some of the aspects which the bill deals with.

Most important, it creates an ombudsman who will act as a buffer between taxpayers and Revenue Canada.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–337, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (warning on alcoholic beverage containers).

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the health of all Canadians we often use warning labels on items such as cigarettes, antihistamines, cleaners, bags and other items which may affect the health of Canadians. This does not apply to alcoholic beverages and this bill seeks to have a warning label, particularly with relation to the problem of foetal alcohol syndrome and the ability of all of us to operate machines and cars while under the influence of alcohol.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

PETITIONS

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have one petition to present from residents of my riding, pursuant to Standing Order 36. It has been duly certified by the clerk of petitions.

The petitioners state that since the Bloc Quebecois has publicly dedicated itself to a disloyal objective, since it is comprised solely of members elected from one province and since the Reform Party represents constituencies in five provinces and has constituency associations in every province of Canada, the current situation is a travesty on the institution of Parliament. The petitioners therefore call on Parliament to preserve Canadian unity, parliamentary tradition and protect the rights of all Canadians by prevailing on the Speaker of the House to recognize the Reform Party of Canada as the official opposition.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting today petitions on behalf of the constituents of Prince George—Peace River.

The first petition asks Parliament to recognize the Reform Party of Canada as the official opposition during the remainder of the 35th Parliament. The petitioners feel the rights and interests of all Canadian citizens cannot be adequately protected by the Bloc Quebecois.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second and third petitions ask Parliament not to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or homosexuality by amending legislation to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

● (1015)

JUSTICE

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre.

The first petition concerns the use of the legal defence that has become known as the drunk offence. The petitioners believe that in committing the act of choosing to consume alcohol, the individual must also accept all the responsibility for his or her actions while under the influence.

THE FAMILY

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): The second petition is about the subject of the family.

The petitioners request that Parliament oppose any legislation that would redefine family, including the provision of marriage and family benefits to those who are not related by ties of blood, marriage or adoption where marriage is defined as the legal union between a man and a woman.

BILL C–41

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition involves section 718.2 of Bill C–41. The petitioners are extremely concerned about including the phrase sexual orientation for the first time in federal legislation.

They believe that this sets a very dangerous precedent for society.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the final petition is on the subject of sexual orientation. The petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and privileges as married people.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition that is circulating across Canada.

This petition comes from Alberta and also from Windsor, Ontario. The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession that has not been recognized for its value to society.

They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that make the choice to provide care in the home to preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families that decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions this morning. The first reads: "We, the undersigned residents of Canada draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following: That members of Parliament have recently made hateful comments which contribute to a climate of intolerance, fear and violence for the lesbian, gay and bisexual community.

Therefore, your petitioners call upon Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation".

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my second petition indicates that the undersigned residents of Canada draw the attention of the House to the following: Whereas law–abiding citizens deserve protection, especially the most vulnerable in our society, therefore we, the petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to recognize the public threat of dangerous offenders and to amend the Criminal Code to have such offenders detained indefinitely on warrant expiry when it is believe that they may cause serious physical or psychological harm or death to the person.

TERRY FOX

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition from a number of young Canadians, constituents of mine, students at the White Oaks Public School in the riding of London—Middlesex.

These young petitioners call on Parliament to have the image of Terry Fox running his marathon on the new $2 coin. I am very pleased to present this petition to the House on their behalf.

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that all questions stand?

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Douglas Peters (for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.) moved that Bill C–86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take a few minutes this morning to add some final thoughts to the consideration by the House to Bill C–86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act, and reaffirm my support and the support of the government for this industry driven initiative. I am pleased to say that the bill reaffirms the support of the House of an industry driven initiative.

• (1020)

As my colleagues from all sides of the House have acknowledged, the Canadian dairy industry will not be untouched by the global market transformation under way. The Canadian dairy, egg and poultry industries or the supply managed industries are evolving in ways that are necessary to meet the global market transformation that is in progress. I am proud and pleased in the way in which they are doing that. They have shown in the past they can roll with the punches. They can evolve as necessary to maintain economically viable industries that provide safe food in sufficient quantities to the Canadian consumer.

Major changes are now reverberating throughout the economic sectors of the world's major trading nations. That is not an exaggeration. Competition is and will be fierce. However, opportunities for success are at hand. In order to take advantage of those opportunities, changes will be required in the way we do business.

Bill C–86 represents one of the best of these changes. The new milk pricing and pooling of returns approach enabled by these legislative amendments evolved from within the industry itself. That is what it is all about.

The new system was developed as a result of intense consultations with a good deal of give and take. These give and take negotiations among the dairy stakeholders took place from coast to coast. These discussions remain ongoing as the dairy sector fine tunes and reshapes the way milk and milk components are sold both within and outside of our borders over the next five years and beyond.

The administration of pricing and the pooling of milk marketing returns by the Canadian Dairy Commission and provincial authorities offers significant advantages. It will permit retention of the equity currently offered by levies while allowing us to keep and possibly expand important domestic and export markets in the face of strict new rules under GATT and the World Trade Organization.

While the possibility of a trade challenge by the United States can never be categorically ruled out, Canadian trade officials have advised that as long as Canada does not use producer financed assistance to support exports of Canadian dairy products to the United States, as long as Canada does not use levies beyond the levels of gradual reduction for export of commodity specific groups, our system will then conform with the provisions of the international agreements we have signed. August 1 is the date of implementation of Canada's dairy commitment under GATT and the WTO arrangements.

It is important to emphasize again that this is an industry driven initiative which is shaping its future on this key issue. While governments will continue to have an important role to play, that role is facilitative. The shaping process is an ongoing one and the passage of the amendments now before us will assist the process. It will not define the process. It will not limit the process nor will it hinder the process with over–regulation

This bill provides the necessary legislative authority to permit the Canadian Dairy Commission, in close co–operation with the provincial milk marketing authorities, to implement a new milk pricing system with the pooling and market returns from different classes of milk.

I wish to remind all members that under the pooling arrangements, the Canadian Dairy Commission will simply be administering a pool of producer moneys on behalf of the producers. No government financing is involved.

Bill C–86 is enabling legislation which does not specifically define the extent or timing of a particular milk pooling system or systems. The dairy industry will do this for itself in the weeks and the months ahead.

With the passage of the bill most aspects of the new dairy approach will be implemented on a national basis within the next two months. Negotiations remain ongoing in all nine provinces. It is only nine provinces because Newfoundland is

not part of the national milk supply management system as it produces only a limited amount of industrial milk. The other nine provinces have agreed to a national pooling of market returns from special classes of milk as of August 1 of this year.

• (1025)

These nine provinces have also agreed to a harmonized milk classification system and all nine provinces have agreed to implement uniform pricing for special classes of milk destined for United States export and for certain domestic products containing diary ingredients.

Six of the nine provinces, namely Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have decided to proceed more immediately to the pooling of market returns for all classes of milk. British Columbia may join this broader pooling arrangement as well and it is still considering the option.

Alberta and Saskatchewan have indicated that they wish to implement pooling arrangements on a more limited scale. At the outset nothing precludes their joining the all milk pool at any point in the future.

Again, I urge my fellow members to fully support and expedite the passage of Bill C–86. Such action will clearly demonstrate our recognition of the dairy sector's commendable initiatives. As well, it will demonstrate our willingness to facilitate this industry driven means of successfully competing in the post–GATT environment.

We look forward to the support of the House in expediting this bill for the good of the industry.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honour for me to speak this morning on a bill that is extremely important to Quebec farmers, particularly dairy producers.

It is also an honour to speak immediately after the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, the member for Prince Edward—Hastings, who really is quite familiar with agriculture.

As you know, Quebec alone produces 47.5 per cent of industrial milk. Furthermore, Quebec has always played a leading role in Canada's dairy industry. Quebec does a very good job of carrying out its responsibility as a leader among the other provinces where milk is still produced in Canada.

Canada's present dairy product supply management system was initiated by Quebec residents. Without the determination of Quebec dairy producers in the 1970s, we would not have supply management in this industry and, let me tell you, it would be an indescribable mess.

I am therefore especially pleased to note that the constituency of Frontenac has over 15 per cent of farm producers, the vast majority of whom are dairy producers.

Since we have been discussing Bill C–86 in this House, we have addressed the possibility of changing the Canadian Dairy Commission to a standing committee. Recently, on June 8, we had a chance to hear people who have worked very hard to ensure that this proposed change does benefit the dairy industry in Quebec and Canada, particularly our dairy producers. So it was that we met Claude Richard, president of the Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec; his counterpart from Ontario, John Cor; and Richard Doyle of the Dairy Farmers of Canada.

I also visited a great many dairy producers in the Saint–Hyacinthe area: the Martins, the St Laurents, the Gouins, the Vigneaults, the Barils, the Pellerins, the Lessards, the Poulins and the Loiselles.

• (1030)

These farmers explained to us once again the ins and outs of Bill C–86 that will allow the six provinces to come to an agreement.

In light of that information and the answers we have obtained to our questions, I am able today to reiterate to my colleague opposite that the Bloc Quebecois supports Bill C–86.

Without rereading Bill C–86 in detail or clause by clause, I do want to explain what the change consists of, and note that the dairy industry has been required to adjust rapidly to the context of the free trade agreements. The GATT negotiations in Geneva, and the campaign to defend article XI, as well as the discussions about the relevance of maintaining a supply management system, have indicated major upheavals to come in the dairy industry. Clearly, Canada's dairy producers had to find a solution quickly if they were to be competitive in the context of free trade and the globalization of markets. The challenge was a big one.

Bill C–86 will make it possible to implement the agreement signed by the six provinces—Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba—, which, I remind you, produce over 82 per cent of all milk in Canada. This agreement is a solution that will maintain our system and comply with the new requirements of the GATT and NAFTA.

Pursuant to the GATT definition of an export subsidy, under the free trade agreement, dairy producers must eliminate their system of export levies by August 1. That is the problem Bill C–86 solves by making changes to the Canadian Dairy Commission Act.

At present, producers of industrial milk pay a levy of approximately three dollars per hectolitre of industrial milk that is to be exported, mainly in the form of butter and skim milk powder. If we make a quick calculation, three dollars per hectolitre is three cents per litre, which represents approximately 7.5 per cent of the value of the milk and which each producer of industrial milk used to pay in order to promote exports.

Even though it comes out of the producers' pockets, not out of public funds, under the GATT and the free trade agreement, that levy is an export subsidy and, as such, illegal. Starting on August 1, GATT and our partners in the free trade agreement would not have accepted our continuing to operate in that way.

More specifically, this bill implements a national system for pooling market returns that will be used to support the export of dairy products. The pooling permitted under Bill C–86 will comply with the international agreements, while allowing producers to maintain the advantages of the present system.

• (1035)

However, we must be aware that there is a possibility that the United States, which is challenging anything and everything these days, may decide to challenge this two–price policy for milk: one price for milk for the domestic market, and one price for milk destined for export. In that case, the dairy industry in Quebec and Canada could be accused of dumping.

In order to be successful, however, the United States or the country that considered its interests harmed would have to prove that exports from Canada were harming its market. Since our exports are relatively small, and since we export an increasing proportion of value–added processed products, that harm may be very difficult to prove. Bill C–86, which we are discussing today on third reading, is the solution that will enable producers to face the upheavals in their industry resulting from the new international context.

We, the MPs of the Bloc Quebecois, therefore support Bill C–86, since it meets the needs of producers who want to adjust to the requirements of the international trade agreements signed by Canada. Of course there are certain shortcomings in this bill; in–depth discussions are going on, in Quebec at least. Apparently the bill is creating a bit of a problem for processors. The discussions are not sticking on dozens of points, only on a few specific ones, and in a few days there should be—at least we hope there will be—an agreement between the Quebec department of agriculture, the UPA, the federation, and the Canadian Dairy Commission.

At present, the dairy industry is managed partly by the provinces and partly by the federal government, as are many industries that appear to have two heads. In these cases, of course, two heads are often not better than one. At present, the provinces have jurisdiction over fluid milk, and the Canadian Dairy Commission has jurisdiction over industrial milk only. The bill provides for a delegation of powers between the Commission and the provinces in order to administer the pooled market returns. If the agreement were not signed, the Commission would administer the pooled market returns for industrial milk only.

Those, then, are the technical changes made to the Canadian Dairy Commission by Bill C–86; I call them technical changes because they are regulations that will allow dairy producers to achieve their objective of adjusting the system as we now know it to the new standards of our international commitments, such as the GATT and NAFTA.

Mainly, we must remember that six provinces have signed an agreement in principle to pool their entire milk supply system. The initiative comes from the dairy industry; that point must be emphasized. The initative comes from the dairy industry, whose producers decided that they had to take the necessary action in order to make the most of the resources available to the dairy industry. The distinction made between industrial milk and fluid milk will be eliminated; the provinces' present quotas will not be changed.

• (1040)

I am particularly proud to state in this House that the concept of single–price milk was initiated in my region, the Eastern Townships, and that the then president of the federation in Sherbrooke was Jacques Blais.

I remember very clearly indeed the initial meetings, at which people wanted very serious discussion of a future single price for fluid milk and industrial milk. Those discussions were lively—and sometimes even physical. I attended one of those meetings and I certainly was not at ease. Those farmers had some powerful arguments. The Eastern Townships played a pioneering role in this debate.

It should be noted that, at the time, there was a difference of more than 10 per cent between the prices for fluid milk and industrial milk. It was practically the same milk. At the time, the farmers were told: streamline your operations; become more productive and more competitive; lower your production costs. And they did.

At the time, you could encounter three tank trucks on the same concession road, which might have only three dairy producers along it. You could see a truck for fluid milk, a second truck for industrial milk belonging to the Coopérative fédérée, and a third truck that might belong to an independent company like Lactantia, for example.

Today on that concession road, there are still only three dairy producers, but only one truck. So we have managed to reduce transportation costs. Fluid milk, the price of which, as I was saying, was 10 per cent higher, is now carried in the same truck. I can even tell you that the same cows, the same milk, and the same consumers are involved, and so, 13 or 14 months from now, the price should be exactly the same.

I have here a document showing Quebec's dairy production, from 1950 to 1994, in fact. In 1994, there were 11,763 dairy producers in Quebec. These 11,000 dairy producers produce pretty well the same volume of milk as was produced in 1970. But wait a minute. In 1970 there were 43,669 dairy producers. That means that, with one quarter of the number of dairy producers, we are producing practically the same volume of

milk. Better yet. If I take one cow as an example—I am sure the member for Drummond will be pleased—, in 1970, the average cow in our herds in Quebec produced 3,324 litres of milk per year—and without hormomes, without being shot up, just through improved breeding and better livestock feed. Look at this: in 24 years, the average cow in Quebec has gone from producing 3,324 litres of milk to producing 5,336 litres. The figure has not doubled, but it is at least 75 per cent higher.

• (1045)

I was reading in *La terre de chez nous*, the magazine for Quebec farmers, that a 3 per cent production increase was anticipated for the current year. So it is possible to up the quantity of milk given by our dairy cows each year without "boosting" or shooting them up, without altering the milk, without risking animal and human health.

I would remind you that the milk produced in Quebec and in Canada is a credit to us. We have some of the cleanest, freshest milk in the world. Within minutes of leaving the cow's udder it has already been refrigerated to a temperature where it can be properly kept. We are proud of that. Our facilities prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that without exaggeration we can increase milk production by 3 per cent without increasing the size of our herds.

The farmers in my riding tell me that if their milk quotas could be upped by 10 per cent per year, they could meet the demand without having to struggle.

What would give me the greatest pleasure would be if all our farmers in Quebec could have a chance to read the text, or a part of the text, that we received a copy of on June 2, 1995, signed by an Assistant Deputy Minister at the federal Department of Agriculture and Agri–Food. It was a copy of a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri–Food, Bob Speller; it is signed by J.B. Morrissey.

A question had been raised by my colleague, the honourable member for Champlain, Réjean Lefebvre of the Bloc Quebecois, and I'm going to read you a sentence from it: " —with respect to expenditures on primary agricultural research relative to research into finished agrifood products, for a period going from 1990 to roughly 1998, the projections, as Table I shows—"

Quebec's farmers are responsible, in terms of Canada as a whole, for about 18 to 19 per cent of agricultural production. Quebec has about 24 per cent of the population and it pays between 23 and 24 per cent of Canada's income taxes.

And at this point I would hope that the farmers in my riding are listening closely, when I talk about the share that this government—and when I say "this government" I do not necessarily mean the party currently in power. Quebec agriculture has always been shafted by the federal system and I have another egregious case here, where Quebec has been cheated year after year.

For instance, in terms of the resources allocated to full–time equivalents in research and development, Quebec in 1990–91 received 12.4 per cent of the total research and development budget allocated among all the provinces by Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada. In 1991–92 we got even less, and that was under the Conservatives, which is why I say that it is not necessarily the current government. In 1991–92 the Conservatives gave us 12.04 per cent of the total, or let us say 12 per cent.

• (1050)

I would remind you that Quebec's relative participation in this Department's activities is from 17 to 19 per cent, so we are being cheated out of 5 per cent every year. The pattern is the same right up to 1995–96, the current year, where Quebec's share is 13 per cent. At 13 per cent, we are still having a minimum of 4 per cent in research and development resources stolen from us.

It is not the sovereignists, the Pequistes, the Bloquistes, who are inventing these figures. This is an official document. I see here the logo of Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada and it is signed by an Assistant Deputy Minister of that department.

In October 1993, when I was campaigning during the last election, I said to the people of my riding, "Send us to Ottawa. We will audit the books and we will come back and tell you what we find. If they are giving us too much money, we will tell you that and we will give it back to them. We will be honest with the rest of the country". This document from Agriculture and Agri–Food Canada that I have just read to you has its equivalents in all the departments.

Quebec's farmers have to understand that the federal government is not necessarily the modern Messiah. The federal government serves western agriculture well, but when the time comes for it to serve agriculture in Quebec and the Maritimes, there is nothing left in the coffers.

Here is another example. In the Magdalen Islands, the UPA arranged for a special quota so that the Islands could be self–sufficient in egg production. A special quota was awarded to an egg producer in Etang–du–Nord. Now that assistance to eastern grain transportation is being abolished, the price that this egg producer will have to pay for meal will shoot up by over $50 a tonne. Is it going to be more cost–effective for the Magdalen Islanders to import eggs from the mainland or to continue to import meal?

Many more crazy situations like that can be found in Quebec. No, the federal government is not a Messiah, and when Quebecers want information or help they head first for the Quebec Ministry of Agriculture. Last week I just asked a number of farmers whether they knew the name of Quebec's Minister of

Agriculture. Eight out of ten of them could name him, but not one out of ten could name the federal Minister—he is completely unknown. When people do know his name, they massacre it so that if you did not know it yourself you would not be able to decipher it.

It is a pity to have two Ministers of Agriculture for the same farmer, the same cows. One of those ministers is very expensive to keep and never, ever, gives Quebec the share to which it is entitled.

• (1055)

Whether you look at it in terms of Quebec's proportion of the population, which is 24 per cent of the Canadian total, or in terms of the percentage of income tax we pay to Ottawa, or in terms of GDP directly related to agriculture, Quebec is not getting its fair share.

Worse still, it is the taxes Quebecers are paying to the federal government that are paying, compensating, the western grain producers so that they can diversify and compete against us in our own province, and we are paying with our money for the privilege of getting booted on the backside. You all know that 80 per cent of Quebec's farmers are in livestock production. When I say livestock production, of course I include eggs and dairy production, because to get eggs you have to raise hens.

The opposite holds true in the west. There it is grain production that predominates. But diversification is changing the stakes. Obviously it is easier to work six or seven months a year and then to garage the machinery and wait for spring to start work again, crops and seed—if you raise livestock, it is not five days a week, it is seven out of seven, 365 days a year. It would be unthinkable for any of our dairy farmers or egg producers in Quebec to treat themselves to vacations in the south the way some of those western grain farmers can, for two or three months, you will agree with me on that.

So it is a choice, and the choice has been entirely decided by successive governments in Ottawa. Eastern Canada, Quebec, Ontario and the Maritimes, were directed into livestock production while the west grew grain; that was the arrangement and it was accepted. The building of the railway that tied the country together was of course done to satisfy the farmers.

So the dairy farmers know what a fair deal is, and in the budget and in Bill C–76, which passed a couple of days ago, we identified unfairnesses and we criticized them in this House on more than one occasion, such as the way the industrial milk subsidy is being cut by 30 per cent, in two 15 per cent cuts. The budget makes it clear that the remaining 70 per cent will be done away with sooner or later. No compensation is provided for, no $300 or $400 million is going into an adjustment fund for our farmers, to help them change direction.

In August our farmers will be going on a pilgrimage to the Canadian Dairy Commission to request an increase to compensate for the subsidy cuts. The result will be that you the consumers will be paying more for milk, butter, cheese, yoghurt, ice cream. Just as with gasoline, the increase will be greater than the increase in the cost of living. The government is washing its hands of the whole affair and saying, "Oh, we are not raising taxes. The prices of butter and cheese and yogurt and ice cream are going up, and gasoline taxes are pushing up the cost of gasoline". And it proudly announces, "We have not raised anything". The consumer price index is going up by 2.9 per cent. There has not been an increase like it in four years.

• (1100)

We are very comfortably installed in this House or elsewhere in Canada discussing the benefits of the pooling arrangement agreement reached by six provinces, but the negotiations that led to the agreement should not be left unmentioned. I want once again to emphasize the hard work done by people from my region, as Quebec had a strong voice in the negotiations, particularly the Fédération des producteurs de lait du Québec and its president, Claude Rivard, its vice–president, Jean Grégoire, and their senior economist, Guylaine Gosselin.

One question came up repeatedly during the committee's hearings, and that was: why have only six provinces joined the pooling agreement? We were told that certain provinces were taking advantage of the opportunity to get the CDC to review the way it treats them, that others did not operate the same way at the provincial level and that the jump involved in pooling all their milk with the other provinces was too great. But the most interesting thing to emerge from the discussions was that these six provinces are powerful enough without the rest, because they represent, as I mentioned earlier, 82 per cent of total milk production. So the other provinces can always join later, and their abstaining, at the moment, will not jeopardize the success of the agreement as it now stands.

This historic agreement will have a much more far–reaching impact than appears at first glance. If we take the example of Quebec, in 1996 the dairy producers should enjoy an increase in income varying from 60 to 70 cents per hectolitre. And because of GATT, Canada will have to accept imports of butter this year, which will probably affect quotas.

Since the six provinces will be spreading out the market variations over all the milk produced, the impact will not be felt too strongly, because it will not be just one province that has to absorb the costs. More clearly, if there were to be more butter or cheese imported into Canada from other GATT members, each of the provinces could see its quota drop by, say, 1 per cent. It

would not be just one province that was affected. The same thing would happen if, for example, consumption, or our exports, went up: it would not be just one province that saw its quota increase but all the provinces.

I could perhaps remind you that under this agreement dairy quotas will no longer be confined to one province. A dairy farmer in Quebec could buy an Ontario quota, or a Nova Scotia quota, or he could sell his quota in Alberta. And if ever too great a proportion of our quota were to go outside the province, the province could withdraw for a year or for the current year, as soon as 1 per cent was reached. So no province could have more than 1 per cent of its quota siphoned off, unless it was willing to sell its quota to other provinces.

• (1105)

In conclusion, I want to recall the political context that underlay the signing of this agreement. This kind of arrangement may well turn out to be a prototype for similar agreements in other sectors, since its basis is the one that is likely to predominate in the years to come. Why? Because it is an economic agreement.

The agreement banks on the advantages that all partners will derive from working as a team. With a referendum coming up this very year, the producers in many provinces have not hesitated to enter into an association with Quebec, because it is in their best interests. When it comes down to reality, not some hypothetical disaster situation, it is clear that logic counts for more than political considerations.

Rest assured that our prize cow in the Plessisville region will still be a prize cow, even after a "Yes" vote in the referendum. There are those who would like to frighten people by saying, "Your quotas will not be worth anything, your cows will get mastitis, they will injure themselves grazing, they will have more trouble calving in the spring". These are scare tactics, and increasingly our dairy farmers realize this.

One scare tactic the federalists use a lot is saying that if Quebec becomes sovereign, its producers will immediately lose their sale quotas in Canada: that is not true.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Bloc Quebecois is proud to be associated with Quebec's dairy producers and to endorse Bill C–86 in this vote at third reading, for the good of all dairy producers everywhere in Canada. And I hope that Canada will give Quebec more of a share in research and development funding. The people who will not go beyond 12 per cent and who laugh at our farmers should be ashamed of themselves, especially when they visit our farmers or turn up at auctions, Encan Lafaille for example, and swagger around trying to impress people and then come back here and make fun of them. They laugh at them and will not go beyond a miserable 12 per cent.

[*English*]

Mr. Vanclief: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, toward the end of the speech by the hon. member for Frontenac he made the statement that in the 1995 budget the support to the industrial milk producers was cut 30 per cent twice over. I wonder if the hon. member would like to take the opportunity to correct the record. It was 15 per cent each year for two years, not 30 per cent twice over.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary will know that was not a point of order as much as it was a question of debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, what I said was that over the next two years 30 per cent is going to be cut from the subsidies to industrial milk producers: 15 per cent in the 1995–96 budget and 15 per cent in next year's budget. Fifteen plus fifteen equals thirty. The subsidies are being cut by 30 per cent. If the honourable member can prove me wrong, I will apologize to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not pleased to be interrupting that interesting exchange, but I am here today to speak on Bill C–86, an act to amend the Dairy Commission Act.

This bill is significant. It provides for the replacement of the existing system of levies with a system of pooling market returns for different classes of milk.

• (1110)

The government claims the move to a pooling system will maintain equity among producers and will be consistent with Canada's international trade agreements, namely NAFTA and the GATT. Changes are needed to supply management to continue while meeting the requirements of our trade agreements. Dairy farmers I have talked to and others in the industry have told me they feel this legislation is necessary to allow supply management to continue under the GATT and the NAFTA. For this reason, I support the stated intent of this legislation.

However, I do have a major concern with clause 2, which affects section 9 of the Dairy Commission Act. The bill extends the powers of the Canadian Dairy Commission and will diminish the authority given to the provinces under the present act. Therefore, to guard against this possible erosion I proposed an amendment that would have affected section 9 of the Dairy Commission Act. Last night my amendment was voted down in this House, which is very unfortunate.

Once again the Liberal government has shown its desire to intrude in areas of provincial jurisdiction. This is one more move of many we have seen over the years. It is a revolt against this intrusion on the part of the federal government into areas of provincial jurisdiction that led to the existence of the Bloc

Quebecois in this Parliament. We need to move in the other direction and return some of the powers that belong rightfully to the provinces under our Constitution. This is one more move in the opposite direction, the wrong direction. It is another example of wrong thinking on the part of this Liberal government.

I will take a few minutes to talk about what Bill C–86 is and what it does. C–86 is an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act to provide for the replacement of the existing system of levies with a system of pooling market returns from different classes of milk. The government claims the switch to a pooling system will maintain equity among producers and is consistent with Canada's international trade agreements.

As part of Canada's system of supply management, the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee, which is chaired by the Canadian Dairy Commission, oversees the application of the national milk marketing plan. The Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee sets national production targets, establishes each province's share of the national quota, and exports surplus milk through planned marketing programs. The orderly export of surplus production is an essential element of ensuring the integrity of the supply management system; without it the system would falter.

Currently producers assume the cost of exporting dairy products that are not consumed in Canada through a system of levies collected by provincial marketing boards and agencies as deductions from payments to milk producers. Once remitted to the commission, these levies are used to finance special programs intended to increase the domestic use of dairy products and to cover the commission's administrative costs. During the 1993–94 year a total of $141.5 million was collected from the industrial and fluid milk sectors. Such levies, however, are now considered to be a form of export subsidy under the new GATT deal and must be reduced or modified.

I have a few observations on Bill C–86. Through this bill Canada's dairy industry would abandon this established system of producer levies on industrial milk. The levies would be replaced by a system of national pooling, which allows all stakeholders—the farmers, the processors, and the commission—to equitably share the costs and benefits of pooling revenues and the effects of fluctuations in market size for both fluid and industrial milk.

Through a system of pooling the producers who export milk into the U.S. would receive smaller returns for their milk, but the burden would still be shared by all dairy farmers across the country. Instead of a levy being taken off the farmers' cheques to subsidize exports, a national pool would achieve the same end since the net return to farmers would be identical. For its part, the processing industry would still pay a lower price for industrial milk than consumers pay for fluid milk.

• (1115)

These amendments to the Canadian Dairy Commission Act add a certain amount of new pricing and funding distribution authority to the CDC, the Canadian Dairy Commission. Although the new pricing and pooling approach for milk has received agreement from all provinces in principle, negotiations are ongoing as to whether there will actually be one national pool, which at the moment appears very unlikely, or two separate pools, one for B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan together and the other for the other six provinces that are covered by the act.

Ontario dairy farmers who supply most of the industrial milk to further processors and Quebec farmers who are the biggest exporters would receive less than other dairy farmers unless there was some form of national pooling. On the other hand, under a national pooling system, producers in the non–exporting provinces subsidize those who are exporting. It really amounts to a form of equalization payment from one sector of the industry to the other or from one province to the other. This is perhaps the biggest obstacle to achieving an agreement which will include all provinces for the pooling regime for all classes of milk.

I would like to speak briefly about the relationship between Bill C–86 and the Reform Party policy and position on supply management and various particulars.

Reform policy in this area has been and still is that all producers should be able to structure and manage their organizations in any manner which they believe will best serve their interests. The matter of regulating production and setting prices for products under the organization's jurisdiction is a producer issue which should be dealt with by farmers.

Reformers acknowledge that the agriculture industry, including the supply managed sector, is moving toward a more competitive market driven system. We have proposed tough, positive measures to ensure fair competition, such as tougher anti–combines legislation which would help reduce the input costs to farmers.

The anti–combines measures have been demonstrated in agriculture over the years, particularly in the fertilizer industry where there have been court challenges by farmers against companies which appeared to be price fixing. Unfortunately these cases drag on in court until they are eventually dropped. I know the last case dragged on for about 10 years and then eventually died.

That is not the kind of anti–combines legislation and fair trade legislation we need. We need tougher action by government in this area. We need tougher laws first and then we need tougher enforcement. Canada has some of the weakest anti–combines

legislation in the developed world. A stronger approach needs to be taken and some new policies made in this area.

In terms of trying to reduce input costs we need fair trade policies which would help protect against dumping by other countries and which would guard against unfair subsidies in other countries, for example, the United States. I will speak a little more about this later in my presentation.

Too often when politicians and others involved in supply managed industries talk about the fact that the industry is moving toward a more competitive type of industry—by competitive I mean more products will be coming in from other countries to compete—we forget to say that it is absolutely critical that the products coming in are under a fair trade environment. This means that where there is unfair subsidy in other countries, as there is in the United States in this industry, our government must protect against these products coming into our markets. Again, it is an area where government has to strengthen its resolve and be tougher when it comes to unfair trade, particularly dumping.

Another area of Reform policy regarding this industry relates to general changes which will reduce government overspending and which will lead to lower taxes and lower input costs in the future. I am thinking in particular of a plan we presented in the taxpayers budget. I will talk about that later.

• (1120)

With respect to supply management, I believe change is inevitable. The fact is dairy farmers will be forced to compete more and more with American farmers. The odds are that this competition will come sooner than this government is willing to admit. I am not saying this is what I necessarily want, but it is the way I see it. This is what is most likely to happen.

The rules are changing and dairy farmers will need transition time in order to adapt to the more open trade of the future. This bill will allow a supply managed system to continue for some time but there is some doubt about the reality of border protection continuing over the long run.

Members of the dairy commission claim this bill properly reflects the changes affecting dairy farmers. What the bill actually does is maintain the status quo. Given the fact that a change to supply management is inevitable, I see this as a problem over the long run.

The method this government has been presenting along with this legislation is an area of real concern to me. Yesterday in debate on report stage of this bill the parliamentary secretary to the agriculture minister made some disparaging remarks about my knowledge of the dairy industry.

I fully acknowledge that I am not a real expert in the dairy industry, but I am starting to realize that maybe I know a lot more than the parliamentary secretary does when it comes to acknowledging that this industry will change and that there will be more competition. It is important to acknowledge this so that farmers do get a reasonable transition time from the protection they have today to the reality of a more open market in the not too distant future. While the parliamentary secretary made some comments about my lack of knowledge, I believe his lack of publicly acknowledging the move to more open competition is wrong because farmers need forewarning of what is to come.

My main concerns regarding Bill C–86 do come from the discussions surrounding the whole supply management area. They revolve around talk I have heard from the minister of agriculture, the parliamentary secretary, leaders of farm groups and farmers themselves. This discussion has generally said that this legislation will allow supply management in the dairy industry to continue in a form quite similar to the present form indefinitely into the future.

This legislation would allow that, it is true, but this does not mean that supply management will continue in a form that is similar to the present system well into the future. There are several trade issues in particular which may lead to a lot more direct competition from the United States by allowing more access to dairy products from the Americans.

Before I start discussing these trade issues which will have a substantial impact on our present supply management system I would like to make one thing clear. I am not talking about these issues because I want to see the demise of supply management or because Reform wants to see the demise of supply management. I will discuss these issues because they will have a dramatic impact on the dairy industry in the future.

This discussion will provide an important service to dairy farmers and others in the industry. Even though this is a difficult message to deliver and the reaction is not always favourable, especially the immediate reaction, it is something that should be done. Reform will continue to do this and I hope this Liberal government will start to do it.

Reformers have had the courage to talk about probable change, while the minister, the parliamentary secretary and even the leaders of some farm groups have publicly pretended that the present system will exist indefinitely. This seems a dangerous message to send to dairy farmers, that they will be protected against further competition, in particular from the American dairy farmers.

• (1125)

Publicly they hide what they privately and in small groups acknowledge. Change is inevitable; it is a question of how much and when. That is what we have to talk about. I will take a little

time now to talk about why I believe change is inevitable and why it may be sooner rather than later.

The first reason is that the new GATT negotiations start in the year 2000. That is only five years from now. In the agreement there will be a lot of pressure from the Americans in particular to allow their products more free access to the Canadian market. There will be a lot of pressure, as there has been already, on our government to accept the freer access on the part of the American government. The GATT agreement and the negotiations starting in the year 2000 certainly will put pressure on the industry. Seven or eight years from now, considering the GATT alone, we will see an industry which will be competing against a lot more imported products, in particular from the United States.

The more immediate threat comes from the NAFTA. The most immediate concern under the NAFTA agreement has to do with the panel decision which will be coming down within a year. If the panel determines that the NAFTA takes precedence over the GATT with respect to supply management and trade between Canada and the United States, then the borders will be open much sooner than they would be under the GATT agreement.

In two to three years if the panel rules that the NAFTA takes precedence over the GATT, we could see a lot more free access from the United States with respect to dairy products. That is a much more immediate threat. It is very important for the government to start acknowledging it publicly in order that farmers get the proper transition time which they need to prepare for the change.

Another possible threat under the NAFTA will come with the inclusion of Chile in the NAFTA group. Our Prime Minister and the President of the United States have said it will probably happen within a year. That leads me to believe that there probably will not be significant negotiations taking place which would allow Chile into the NAFTA group. There just is not time in a year to carry out meaningful negotiations. Therefore, I believe that Chile will come in under the current agreement with very little negotiation. Maybe that threat is not quite as imminent as it was a few months ago.

There are several things which the government can do for the sake of dairy farmers in the dairy industry. I will talk about five.

First, the government can acknowledge that there is a high probability of more access from American products and therefore a move to more competition. I have stated this many times already in my presentation today and I will continue to state it.

Second, the government can help to ease the dairy farmers' legitimate fear that the Americans will not compete fairly unless they are forced to by tough action on the part of the Canadian government.

Third, the government should start working toward levelling the playing field between Canada and the United States before more competition occurs.

Fourth, the government must recognize that there are different concerns about change to the supply management system within different groups of dairy farmers. Each group must be listened to and asked for its recommendations as to how it can deal with its particular problems which will result from the move to more competition from imported products.

Fifth, the government must talk about the positive side of opening the borders. There is a huge American market there for the taking and it will take a healthy attitude on the part of dairy farmers to ensure they take full advantage of the available market.

I would like to take a few minutes now to talk about each of the different areas which government should be discussing with dairy farmers.

• (1130)

First, they must acknowledge that there is a high probability of more access for American dairy products and therefore a move toward more competition. It is critical to allow or even encourage dairy farmers to prepare for the change, because that will be necessary. There will be a transition time that will be necessary to allow dairy farmers to compete with the Americans. There is no doubt that the Canadian dairy farmer can compete very well with the American farmer if they are given a level playing field to work within.

Second, help ease the dairy farmers' legitimate fear that the Americans will not compete fairly unless they are forced to by tough action. I hear this all the time. They are afraid that dairy farmers who recognize—there are many now—that change is coming are really quite concerned that the Americans will not compete fairly. They say they can compete with anybody in the world if they are given a fair chance, but Americans do not have a good record of competing fairly. This is what dairy farmers tell me. They tell me that the American industry is highly subsidized, which it is, and that many of these subsidies are not acknowledged by the Americans themselves as subsidies, which is true. Some of these are the school milk program, the farm bill set aside program, irrigation subsidies, and on and on. There are an awful lot of subsidies that give the Americans an advantage, or will in an open border situation between Canada and the United States, and are not fair. These have to be dealt with.

Third, start working toward levelling the playing field between Canada and the United States before more competition occurs. An example of this is pesticides, which are used in all sectors of agriculture. Over the past months, as I have been travelling around in southern Ontario, there is a common theme I have heard from farmers from the dairy industry and from other industries. That theme is that if we are going to compete we need access to pesticides and drugs very soon after the

Americans have access, or even before the Americans have access. To accommodate this, why can we not have a reciprocal agreement? If a pesticide or drug is given approval through the regulatory system of one country, then why can that not be all that is necessary for this product to be used in the other country?

Both Canada and the United States have a very trusted regulatory system. I see absolutely no practical reason we cannot have an agreement between the two countries so that when a product is approved in one country it can be approved almost immediately in the other country when it is being used in a similar environment and for the same purpose.

This is a common theme. This and other moves have to be made to level the playing field so that the Americans do not have access to these pesticides or drugs years before Canadian farmers can take advantage of these products. In the agriculture industry this is absolutely a critical area, which must be dealt with.

Another way in which the playing field must be levelled has to do with the broader economic considerations. I am talking about, for example, tax levels. Tax levels in Canada are substantially higher than tax levels in the United States. This means that Canadian farmers are competing in an unfair way with American farmers because of the higher tax component of every dollar they earn.

The only way, of course, this can be dealt with, that taxes can be lowered, is by lowering government spending and eliminating completely government overspending.

• (1135)

Reform did present in February the taxpayers' budget, which was a detailed three–year plan that would eliminate government overspending. This plan is still a valid and sound plan. This Liberal government has to move toward this plan, the taxpayers' budget, or a similar budget over the next year so that we can move over the next several years toward the lowering of taxes so that tax levels become very similar in Canada and the United States and so that labour costs come into line. One of the reasons labour costs are higher in Canada than in the United States is because the tax level is so high, such a large portion of the paycheque goes to the taxman, the Government of Canada.

There are these broad economic considerations that must be dealt with to level the playing field so that Americans are competing fairly with Canadians.

The fourth area government must talk about and must deal with is to recognize that there are different concerns about change to the supply management system within different groups of dairy farmers. Each group must be listened to and asked for their recommendations.

I would like to spend a little time now to talk about these different groups I have been able to identify as I met with dairy farmers around southern Ontario, in Alberta, and other places across the country. The first group I will call the older dairy farmers, dairy farmers who are fairly close to retirement. They want to hold on to their quotas. In many cases their retirement fund is in quota value. They know that as soon as the border starts to open and the Americans can send more of their product into the Canadian market their quota values will start to decline rapidly. They know that their quotas could be worth nothing in the not too distant future. They are concerned about that.

I can understand that completely. Their retirement was built in large part on quota value, which can so quickly disappear and for which they have paid dearly throughout their expansion phase in the industry. It is a problem that will be very difficult to deal with, but it has to be dealt with and it has to be talked about.

The second group I will call the middle group. They are still expanding in many cases. This group has in many cases borrowed a lot of money to buy a quota. They have a couple of concerns about the possible loss in quota value. The first is that as quota value drops, while it does mean on the positive side that any new expansion they bring into their business will be less costly, it does mean that the value of quota they may have financed right now will drop in value dramatically. Their concern is that this will make them become insolvent in their businesses. In some cases it will.

Will they be undersecured by lenders? Will they because of lower equity levels not be able to borrow the money they need for expansion? These are questions that have to be dealt with and answered. Certainly it is different in every different dairy farmer's operation, but this is a common concern I have heard from this middle group.

As well, this middle group will be losing some of the value, some of the equity they have been counting on to use in their retirement and indeed to help with the transition of the farm from this generation to the next. That concern is there with the middle group as well.

In one of my past lives I worked as a farm economist. I worked with farmers in the business management area. I worked with 100, 200 and 300 farmers who were in severe financial difficulty. Each case is gutwrenching and very difficult to deal with. I had to learn to separate myself from the emotional impact this was having on each of those families.

So often in the dairy industry the difficulty started with paying a lot of money for quota, which provides nothing of productive value. It just does not improve productivity in any way. I saw so often where that led to the downfall of these operations.

• (1140)

I also worked in times when there was no value to quota. In Alberta in the late seventies and early eighties quota had no value. Farmers could get into the industry. They had to buy their cows, their buildings, their feed, and everything else that goes along with the industry, but at least they did not have to buy quota.

I have presented that so dairy farmers can remember that change has occurred in the past. Quota has lost and gained value in the past. In most cases dairy farmers have been able to deal with that, but in some cases they have not and it has led to their downfall.

There is a third group of dairy farmers that is important for government to work with or at least listen to: the people who are just getting into the business. Many of them have told me they would be all too happy to see the supply management system completely disappear. In some cases the people that message is coming from have quite shocked me. I have been surprised because often their parents are in the industry and they are just getting in. They know this quota is a very fragile thing in terms of value. They know that in many cases they will not even be able to get into the industry because lenders know there is a real risk to them with a reduction in quota values.

These young producers have said they do not want to have to pay for quota, something that may have no value in the not too distant future, and ask how they can get around that. That is the concern of the third group.

I do not pretend to know how we can ever deal with the varying concerns of these three groups. We have to start talking about it and it has to be dealt with. By ignoring the problem and by pretending change is not going to come quickly, the government is putting these farmers at an unnecessary disadvantage. By acknowledging the problem and giving the transition time they can deal with the change.

It is so important that the farmers in all three of these groups—break the groups down any way you like—start talking about some possible solutions to their problems. We need to know from them how we as parliamentarians can facilitate their solution, what we can do to help them accommodate the change they will be facing. That is the fourth area politicians and the government actually have to talk about and start dealing with.

The fifth area is to talk about the positive side of opening the borders and opening competition. There is a huge American market there for the taking. So seldom in this discussion is that positive side talked about. We are always defensive. How is it going to hurt us? We allow the Americans to bring their products in to compete with ours. How are we ever going to deal with it? We know the Americans are not fair traders. These are the comments I hear from dairy farmers, and they are legitimate concerns, but what about the opportunity that comes with this change? There is an absolutely incredible opportunity and the possibilities are mindboggling.

If members think that is just some talk that is not based on what has happened in the past, let us talk a little about the beef cattle industry in Alberta. When there were problems, as there always are problems when moving cattle back and forth across that border, the cattle industry went through some rough times. With the signing of the first free trade agreement, western Canadian farmers saw the opportunity and the cattlemen saw the opportunity. The attitude they have is that they can compete with the best. And they are absolutely right.

We have seen an industry grow in Alberta beyond what I would even have believed would be in the realm of possibility 10 years ago. I would not have dreamed it. I was really concerned about the future of the beef industry ten years ago. Cattlemen said they have the opportunity, mostly it is fair trade but there are still some things that have to be dealt with but they are doing great.

• (1145)

When we hear cattlemen say they are doing great, things are going very well. One thing farmers are not very good at is looking on the positive side. They like to talk about the negative a little more. They are very positive people but they like to talk and dwell a little more on the negative. I am also like that. It is built into me by my life as a farmer.

I acknowledge that change is difficult. Very few people like change especially when it affects them directly in their lives and in their business. Change is a lot easier when it affects someone else. The change in supply management will be particularly difficult because it will reduce the protection that has been in the industry for some years, protection which has been available to very few businesses besides supply management.

In the whole supply management question and in the dairy industry we have to talk a lot more about the positives of change and how we can take advantage of change. We have to talk about how farmers in different situations can deal with and prosper from change. I know, as many dairy farmers know, if farmers are given a fair chance to compete, which is all they ask, they will compete successfully.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to speak to Bill C–86. I will use the opportunity to pay tribute to the good dairy farmers of my own region, Fraser Valley. I will talk about the bill and some of the solutions the Reform Party sees to the ever changing and

evolving world of supply managed agricultural industries in Canada.

Farmers in the Fraser Valley are among the best in the world not only in the diary industry but also in the poultry industry. We now have an ever expanding greenhouse industry.

Instead of going into a decline as many people had predicted some years ago, our agriculture industry has a very bright future and has shown to be very innovative, creative and very willing to change, which is what they must be in order to survive in the 1990s and into the next century.

If dairy farmers in what is probably richest growing area in all of Canada, the Fraser Valley, are given an opportunity they will continue to be a major milk producer for British Columbia and in essence could be a major milk producer for areas around the world.

I will state for the record what the bill will do. It is a change that will allow Canada's dairy industry to abandon its established system of producer levies on industrial milk. The levies would be replaced with a system of national pooling which will allow all stakeholders to equitably share the costs and benefits of pooling revenues and the effects of fluctuations in market size for both fluid and industrial milk.

It is an evolving system from what was once allowed and acceptable, the idea of national levies, to a system more GATT sensitive into a national pooling system. That is an inevitable change and it can be a good thing.

It is important for producers to know what the Reform Party's policy is because there has been a lot of misinformation circulated about it.

• (1150)

The Reform policy, from our policy manual, states: "All producers should be able to structure and manage their organizations in any manner which they believe will best serve their interest. The matter of regulating production and setting prices for products under the organization's jurisdiction is a producer issue and should be dealt with by producers".

The second part of our policy, which the previous speaker elaborated on at considerable length and in great detail, states: "Reformers acknowledge that the agricultural industry, including the supply managed sector, is moving toward a more competitive market driven system".

Those are two truths I campaigned on during the 1993 election. We were up front with Canadian consumers and with producers about what we saw as the inevitable changes that would have to come to the milk production system in Canada.

For one farmer to produce a steady supply of milk takes a lot of care and planning. It is not a quick fix way of going into business. Cattle must be purchased, sheltered and fed and all the machinery required is bought. Farmers need to make sure the cows are impregnated at a certain cycle. They must have dry cows at some part of the year and fresh cows at the same time so that they have a steady supply of milk and so on. It takes all that planning. That I would even have to go through the lactation cycle of a cow shows the changing demographic face of Canada.

My father and a lot of our fathers grew up with dairy cows, helped to milk cows and understood that whole system. That was a big benefit for Canadian farmers. There is a residual understanding, even in the House, about what it takes to be a farmer, especially a dairy farmer.

It is unfortunate now, as our cities are growing and the number of farmers is shrinking, that more and more in the future it will be incumbent upon those of us who are concerned about the agricultural industry to take the time to explain to school children and to other politicians about the difficulties of farming and why one cannot suddenly increase milk production by 20 per cent or why one cannot be a miracle worker especially in the dairy industry. It takes some planning.

The government has to play a role in allowing for steady and incremental changes to occur so that cataclysmic changes do not have to happen overnight. It is the role of government to provide that. If it fails in that role, with the understanding in general society, then it will have failed Canadian farmers. Therefore we need to make sure the government does that.

I urge the government to not soft pedal inevitable change. It has to come. Those of us familiar with the agricultural industry want it to come in an organized fashion, not in a chaotic fashion.

I think of our call for a triple E Senate. People might ask how that affects the agricultural industry. However, there is a reason for that. One of the reasons is to give outlying and less populated regions more clout in our national decision making. It will be all too easy in the years to come, as more and more people move to the mega cities and we get one big city after another along the Great Lakes. Even in my area of Vancouver, which is now expanding and pushing out to become one big city, it is important we have the regions and agricultural producers represented with some strength in Ottawa.

One of the ways that could be done is through an elected Senate which would allow people from varied backgrounds to represent different regions.

• (1155)

It would be a pleasure to know that after the bill left the House it would go to an upper house where four or five members from Saskatchewan, four or five from Manitoba, and so on, had a keen interest in the agricultural future of the country. It would be a pleasure to know the bill would be under the scrutiny of people who want the best for agricultural producers. That is something I hope the upper place will do. However, it is more difficult because that area is not represented in the same way as it would

be under a triple E Senate. If it were properly handled it could give a better voice to Canadian agricultural producers.

It takes two years before a cow has a calf and freshens and supplies milk. The farmers therefore need to know they will have a market down the road for their product. A farmer can grow a broiler chicken in a few weeks but it takes two years to get the first bottle of milk in the dairy industry.

Fluctuating demand is a problem, especially in the period following the second world war when producers and farmers could not be sure of selling their milk. There was a problem with a glut on the market and then a shortage. Consumers saw prices going up and down. That resulted in unhappy producers and consumers alike.

Supply management was introduced, a uniquely Canadian version, and to its credit it has made the market very stable and has helped producers to prosper all over Canada, including in Quebec where 50 per cent of the industrial milk is produced. The industry has done well under the supply management system. I hope Bloc members are thinking of their dairy farmers when they talk about cutting off the borders from Canada.

In any supply managed system there is a tendency to become stuck in one group where it has worked. If it worked well in the 1960s and it has continued to work then it should stay the same. However, it cannot stay the same.

During the election campaign I am sorry to say there were candidates on the Liberal side who said that if Article XI 2.(c) of the GATT went ahead without being strengthened and clarified they would lay on the railroad tracks, they would resign their seats if they were elected, and so on. They did not get elected in my area. Weeks after the election the GATT was signed without a strengthened and clarified Article XI 2.(c).

The change was inevitable, as was noted in the Reform Party campaign. It was not an attack on the supply managed industry, it was an acknowledgement that change must happen and could be good. We went through the campaign and many of the innovative farmers in my area understood they would have to deal with the new trade realities of the 1990s.

Farmers still must be prepared for increasing market forces against the traditional system of supply management. The bill addresses that in a small way because it talks about why we must change to the pooling system as opposed to keeping the old levy. They will not be subjected to local pressures. They will not be worried about an influx of cheap milk from Alberta or about Washington state. We are now talking about a global shift in trade laws which will bring global pressure on the dairy industry. Fluctuations in demand and supply will mean stiff competition down the road.

• (1200)

There are many examples of how this global change is going to be a good one for the dairy industry. I envision a day when the producers of the Fraser valley will no longer make the bulk of their milk sales to the local consumer. However, I envision a day when the bulk of sales will be offshore, to markets throughout the developing world where our products can be marketed at a profit. The milk industry will expand outside our borders and take on the world.

There are many examples of that. In B.C. the grape growers were afraid their industry would be swallowed up. Remember a few years ago when the grape industry said that it was just a matter of time before it would be swallowed up by the cheap products from the states, the California wine makers and so on.

The growers grabbed the bull by the horns, if I can mix my metaphors a little, and asked themselves why they could not be innovative. They would be on the leading edge of the new grapes, the new technology, the new way of making wine. Now they are taking on the world.

Last year the wine producers from the Okanagan valley produced the world's best wine. I know there are some other good wines in Canada. I do not downplay them, but the B.C. wine producers were able to produce by not being afraid of the competition, the best wines in the world. My hat is off to them.

They did a good job. They took on the world. They can compete both price wise and especially in quality. They are among the best in the entire world. That is the way the agricultural industry is moving.

My own area is not known as an apple growing area, but an interesting phenomenon is happening. In British Columbia apple growers have always come from the Okanagan. In the Fraser valley an interesting thing has happened. The farmers are not growing apples in an orchard any more. They grow apples in straight rows four feet apart, with certain pruning techniques, certain pollination techniques and so on. They can produce as many apples on an acre as other growers do in 10 acres in a conventional orchard.

They are able to do that with innovation, by taking on the world, by exporting to Japan. They produce an excellent product at a good price. That allows them to make a living even in the Fraser valley where it was unheard of to even in a serious way grow apples just a few short years ago.

Innovation is coming and producers know they must change. There is evidence of that in my own riding. Recently the producers have agreed to allow some of their potential profit to go into the Agassiz Research Station as a joint venture project

with the federal government, producers and industry in general to find new and better ways to produce milk.

They are going to increase the herd size in Agassiz. The University of British Columbia is bringing its herd out to Agassiz. They will get them all together and have a good sized herd, a real production herd of a couple of hundred cows.

They have huge new manure handling facilities there. They are being innovative on how to handle manure storage, composting, injection and all the things that we are going to have to do. We cannot live in a society where the cities are encroaching on the farms and think that the old honey wagon is going to be able to do the same job it used to do just a few short years ago.

It has to change and it is not bad that it changes. In fact, farmers are finding as they change that not only can they handle manure storage, for example, in a way that does not offend the encroaching neighbours but also have a better yield and better crop production by being more careful and more innovative on how they handle manure.

Change is inevitable and it is not bad that change comes. Another example, if I can use a local example, is the B.C. AI centre, the artificial insemination centre. It has changed. It used to be that cows and especially bulls were rated on how much butterfat would be produced. Everything was rated on butterfat. One wanted a cow that produced a lot of butterfat and one wanted a bull whose offspring produced even more. Butterfat was the key to the future.

• (1205)

Times have changed. The AI centre now has realized that people want a low fat product. Fat is not considered something to be paid extra for. The centre is now tinkering with their next crop of bulls whose offspring will produce milk that has more protein and less butterfat. It is the wave of the future. There is no use sitting and crying over spilt milk. The hon. member for Vegreville enjoyed that comment.

Producers are saying that they have to plan. With a bull, it is not just a couple of years to see how it checks out. It takes the first crop of offspring, then the tests on those, making sure that the protein count and the butterfat is trending the right way and so on. It takes years and years to develop a good genetic program.

BCAI is one of many groups that has realized that changes must come. It does not look just to the lower Fraser valley, not to British Columbia where its roots are. It looks around the world to market its products, to market its bulls around the world. It has been very successful in being a leading example of what it is going to take to compete in the next century. It is not going to be the status quo. It must change and this change will be good.

Through the free trade agreements which the government has signed, both the GATT and the NAFTA agreements, tariffs will be reduced over the next few years. American products will be able to compete as time goes on more and more, head to head with Canadian products.

We have had a period of grace where the low Canadian dollar means that we have not had in the last year and a half to two years a lot of cross border shopping. We have not had a large influx from the United States as far as dairy products are concerned. We cannot plan a long term agricultural policy based on the fluctuations of the Canadian dollar. We must be competitive. We have to be competitive and ready to go head to head with the Americans over the next 10 years.

There is no sense saying that it is not going to happen. It will happen. The low Canadian dollar best not lull us into complacency. We have to be ready for the Americans when they start aggressively challenging us. They are doing that as we speak. They are challenging us hoping to prove to us that NAFTA will supersede GATT.

We can take on the Americans. We can take on the world. We will do it all if we are willing to change. This bill is a change. We will support it because it shows that change is inevitable. It can be a good thing and I am happy to support it.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech of the hon. member. He referred first to the length of my comments, by the way, which I really appreciated. I think he wanted me to expand on them a bit. Next time I will try to do that. As he was talking about being raised on a farm that had dairy cattle, I would like to ask him about the pastoral scene which must have surrounded milking time.

In his constituency over these past couple of years as he hears from dairy farmers, I would like him to relay some of the key concerns which he has heard from them.

I have had correspondence from the Mainland Dairymen's Association which is in the hon. member's riding. Its members were concerned with some of our comments on supply management. When I wrote them a letter responding to that they published the whole letter in their newsletter. I think they appreciated our point of view on it.

I would like to hear from the hon. member the comments he has been hearing.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to do that.

The hon. member would be right to call the Fraser valley area one of the more pastoral scenes in all of Canada but we will not get into that so much as we will to the comments that I hear from farmers in the Fraser valley.

• (1210)

I may have more milk producers in my riding than probably anywhere west of Ontario. There is a huge concentration of supply managed industries. Both poultry and dairy products are concentrated in the lower Fraser Valley for good reason, because of the weather and proximity to markets.

However, there are two or three things that farmers keep raising as major concerns as they head into the next century and try to plan their lives and plan for handing off the farm to the next generation.

First, they say they are willing to go head to head with the Americans or with anyone else as long as it is on a level playing field. Farmers keeping telling me: "If you make sure the Americans do not subsidize their product, if you make sure we have anti–combines legislation in place, if you can make sure the health standards are the same and so on, then we will compete with the Americans. But you have to help us in a couple of ways. The help we need is not just from the federal government but all levels of government, to make sure governments get their own houses in order. They have to get taxes down. They have to get regulation of bureaucracy in hand so that we do not have to fight both with the federal and provincial fisheries and the federal and the provincial environment offices as we go about our business".

They need to know that the changes coming are not just dumped on them overnight. They are willing to change. If they have to go bigger, they will go bigger. If they have to bring in new technology, they are happy to do that. However they cannot handle sudden cataclysmic change where they will wake up one morning and find sudden change, as the Canadian wheat farmers found that the Crow rate was gone. Government should have warned them.

If we do not warn the Canadian farmers and help them plan over the next few years during the reduction in tariffication they will come back and curse this Parliament and the government for not having raised the warning flags to show where they must inevitably go.

There is no sense saying that things will stay the same. Farmers want to change. They are, first of all, good business people. They use technology. They are using computers and innovative feed rations. They are using market analysis and playing to the consumer's choices. They can do all of that. Government must not pull the rug out from under them suddenly down the road and tell them they should have been told that something was coming.

The change that Bill C–86 proposes is good. It points the way to something that is GATT friendly. But the government must be honest with the farmers and say: This is the change and we must move this way.

There are also other changes. Let us be honest. The changes are here. Be forthright. The farmers just ask for the rules to the game and they will play. Do not change the rules suddenly 10 years from now.

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when we talk about dairy farmers I always have to take my hat off to these people. I realize how dedicated they are to their jobs. I grew up on a farm and my dad had about 20 milk cows. I know what milking is all about. I did it for about 15 years before I went out on my own.

I sometimes cursed those dairy cows. I did not know why God invented them because He said: "Work six days and rest one", but these dairy farmers never rest.

If we had a ball game planned for Saturday night or the middle of the week we knew we milked first. Six o'clock was milking time and the ball games were postponed. We also knew that if we came in late after the ball game at 5.30 we would be off to the pasture to fetch the cows and do the milking. There was no fooling around.

That continues today. The dairy farmer is on schedule. He cannot be five minutes late or five minutes early. Those cows have to be milked at the right time.

• (1215)

It sometimes amazes me when I look at another aspect of government legislation. Where is the overtime? Where is the triple time for working on holidays that these dairy farmers deserve? Everybody wants to have at least two days of the week off but the dairy farmer is dedicated. He is there seven days a week and probably 24 hours a day.

It is a real credit to the dairy farmer to see the product he has produced. There is no better product in the milk industry worldwide. The American milk products cannot compete in terms of quality. We as consumers must recognize that and reward the farmer for it somehow.

Yesterday when I heard the parliamentary secretary to the agriculture minister say we should give farmers the right to make decisions, I was wondering whether he had bought a Reform membership because that is exactly what we said throughout the election. The farmer should have the right to decide how to market his product and how it should be priced.

We have often been accused of being anti–marketing boards, anti–supply management. We have always said the farmer has the knowledge and expertise. He knows how to set the quotas, how to set the prices and what has to be done to keep up with the times.

During the election I experienced something surprising. I went through some of the Liberal propaganda saying that they would preserve article 11: "That has to stay. There is no other way. It will not be negotiated out of the World Trade Organization. Vote for the Liberals". The Conservatives said much the same thing, that they would negotiate supply management:

"You will have your quotas". I received a nice brochure in the mail from the Canadian dairy farmers saying: "Vote anything but Reform. These guys do not know what they are talking about when it comes to the dairy industry. Their saying we have to go to tariffication is a bunch of beans".

What has happened? Nobody in this House has taken off his or her hat to the Reform to say that we were right. We have it in black and white that we were right. We will say again to this House that the dairy farmer has to be protected and his livelihood has to be guaranteed. If we lose the dairy farmer we lose one of the most precious things this country has.

I must give credit to the Bloc members. When it comes to attending meetings where farm issues are being addressed they seem to give credit where credit is due. They are always concerned that agriculture is looked after, which is something we have failed to do in the west. We sometimes think we are independent and as farmers we will do everything on our own but it means working together. That is why I think these dairy farmers have to be complimented.

When I talk to dairy farmers now they are taking a different view of what Reform policy is. During the spring break I had a meeting with Manitoba's milk marketing board and a number of farmers. I was pleasantly surprised when they started talking about the problems of the high priced quotas. I was surprised when I heard someone say that something had to be done.

A quota of $3,000 per cow cannot work. We have to start realizing that financing a piece of paper at today's interest rates cannot be done. It is hurting us and we have to change. I must give the members on the Manitoba milk marketing board and the farmers who were present credit that they finally acknowledge this. Why do we have those huge quotas and the prices on those quotas? Because of government regulations. Because provinces tried to protect their territory. Innocently, without wanting to we got into a situation where this thing crept up into the system and the prices on these quotas became higher and higher.

Today we know that has to change. Consider a dairy quota of $3,000 per cow. That is $300 of interest a year that new farmers will have to pay. It is not feasible. They cannot do it and therefore the change will come. We can depend on the dairy farmers to make the right changes. They have the knowledge on how to restructure and to be competitive.

• (1220)

We are now in the 1990s but thinking back to the 1970s and 1980s, when it comes to dairy commissions, the government really is a dairy commission. It has been milking the public for so many years it has almost milked it dry. The consumers and taxpayers are getting very thin. If somehow the government does not use some of that BST on the taxpayers, they will all disappear. The BST that needs to be injected into consumers and taxpayers is that they have to pay less in taxes, produce a little more and become a little more competitive than some of the industries.

When talking of industries, I am talking about grain handling which is probably one of the main ones. I was surprised the other day when dairy farmers were before the subcommittee on transportation. They told us that they cannot survive as dairy farmers in Atlantic Canada because the feed costs are way too high. One gentleman told me that they were paying over $4 for a bushel of barley in Atlantic Canada. I asked how that could be because as a farmer in Manitoba, I barely get $2. Something is wrong somewhere.

Then I started to think about the hearings we had in Thunder Bay. The taxation on the grain handling system, the terminals, the property taxes alone are 25 times as high as down the road at Duluth. These costs are added onto the cost of a bushel of barley. I am wondering why the government does not realize this. When the National Transportation Agency told the minister a year ago that there should be no increase in pilotage fees, he overruled that. He gave the pilotage authority another 9 per cent increase.

Why, when we know that we have to start making things more efficient would that be done? Not only that but when the pilotage authority heard about that, it started charging these fees two months ahead of schedule. It ripped off the shippers another million dollars or so.

There might be a court case over it. The shippers want that money returned. What does the transportation minister say? The government will change the legislation and make it retroactive. The government will make the illegal thing legal. Is that the way we are going to build efficiencies into our system? Is that the way we want to run our country? If that is the way we are going to do it, then I am very sorry that we will not be able to compete with other countries. It is very important that the Liberal government along with the opposition start realizing that and keep on hammering with that.

It makes me wonder when I look at this bill whether everyone read the fine print. I hope they did because I know a number of red book promises were given to us during the election. One of them was the barley plebiscite that was supposed to be held to let farmers make decisions on how they wanted to market their barley.

It astounds me today when I read quotes in the paper that there will be a huge loss in the barley pool because we have been selling our grain to other countries at prices below the cost of production. When I see barley being shipped into the U.S. for about $60 a tonne less than we can deliver it to Atlantic Canada, I am wondering who it is we are really protecting. Are we doing

what we say we will, protecting our supply management, or are we really trying to destroy it?

If we are not going to look after our own producers, why worry about the others? It is astounding that we do not start realizing that we have to look at issues at home first before we start to address the problems of the rest of the world.

Looking at unfairness, a level playing field, the taxation, it is killing us. When I look at fuel taxes five miles away from where I farm and I can buy gasoline for almost half the price that I can in Canada and all of it is due to tax, something has to change.

• (1225)

The government said in the budget that it would cut back. What did it do? It put another 1.5 cents of tax on a litre of gasoline, which amounts to 6 cents a gallon. We are supposed to be having a level playing field. How can that be?

The issue which the Liberals do not seem to realize is that we have to solve our problems at home first before we can point our finger across the border at what the Americans are doing wrong. It does not make sense when I can pick up a bottle of propane in Hannah, North Dakota for half the price that I would pay two miles away in Snowflake, Manitoba. It just does not make sense. I do not know how the country will keep running with that kind of discrepancy.

It is not the production units which are bringing on the costs, it is taxation on taxation. When I look at the deficit and the fact that by 1997 we are going to be paying $1 billion a week in interest, how can we ever have a level playing field? Why has this come about? Because of mismanagement by previous governments and because previous governments would not listen to the grassroots people. They always told the grassroots people: "Vote for me. Everything is in order. We will make it better". Now we have ourselves in a mess which we do not know how to get out of, so we are starting to point fingers at other areas saying: "They are to blame".

I was in Saskatoon at the beginning of February when the dollar was plummeting. I talked to some financial people. That little town has about 180,000 people. Seventy million dollars went out of that little town into the U.S. for safe keeping because of the fear of our dropping dollar. How can our economy survive if that is the kind of fear we are instilling in the grassroots people of our communities, in the entrepreneurs and the developers? It just will not work. That is why I am concerned about dairy farmers. If something does not happen to provide them with a level playing field, whether it is supply management or free enterprise, they will never survive the same as grain farmers or other industries.

I met with some of the railway people during our subcommittee hearings. I heard them say that they pay $654 million more in fuel taxes, property taxes and sales taxes than their counterparts in the U.S. How can they compete? It all goes back to the primary producer. Eventually that is where the cost gets carried. That is why it is very important when we debate this bill that we really mean what we say, that we want to provide a level playing field. That is not to say that this farmer has to have the advantage of producing more or that he has to receive more for his product; it means that we have to bring the input costs down to what the input costs are in the competing areas.

When the American farmer travels on roads that cost half the taxation for fuel, when the American farmer has half the property taxes to pay and when the American farmer's income tax is 30 per cent lower than in Canada, how can we make a level playing field? Cut back government spending. Bring the deficit under control. Pay down the debt and let our farmers take control of their industries. I have never seen a farmer who could not handle his problems if he had a level playing field. That is what we have to work on.

When I look at the barley producers today taking a loss in their pool, if that is correct, how can we say we have a level playing field for the grain farmers? How can we say that they can produce a product for the dairy farmer so that he can survive? One goes hand in hand with the other. That is why it is so important that we provide a level playing field for the dairy farmer and the grain farmer.

It must also be there for the machinery salesmen, related industries and labour. Labour is a prime expense to everybody. When labour gets taxed to a point where it takes until the end of June to pay their income taxes and property taxes, they have to have a price to do it. This adds into the cost of production. This is what is creating an uneven playing field. I think that is what we have to address.

• (1230)

I am always amazed when we go to a store and pick up a product and say it is too expensive, it is unaffordable. I think this struck home to me a year or two ago when I was at an agricultural conference in Winnipeg. The head honcho from Cargill Grain was talking to us and he said: "You know, I never realized what is really going on in the food industry. I know what corn costs in the United States and I know what some of the other raw products cost. But my wife sent me shopping the other day and I picked up a box of corn flakes and went home and priced the corn that was in the box by the weight of it. Do you know what the farmer should have got if he had got the price? $1,800 a tonne. That was the price of the corn in the corn flakes box. Where did all the costs go? Not to the farmer. He is getting around $100. So eighteen times what the farmer got was added to the cost of that box of corn flakes."

How can people survive with those types of costs, even if you are a labourer? Something is wrong in our system. I look at the dairy farmer today, who is getting about 30 per cent out of a litre of milk for his costs. He has to produce a calf that has to grow for at least two and a half years before it starts producing milk. He has to build the barns, buy the equipment, do the work, and then get one–third of his costs just to ship the milk to the processor and to the shelf in the store.

Something is wrong and it has to be changed. I am wondering how we can do it. I do not mean to say that it has to just be done by the Liberal government. It also has to be pointed out by the opposition people that there is something wrong. If we do not do it we fail our commitment to this House. I am hoping we will take it seriously, especially when we look at the food products.

I was on a phone–in show one day with one of the agriculture people from Manitoba. They were complaining about a few things like the cost of fuel, which they thought should be brought down, and I agreed. One person said: "Well, as long as we have the production of fuel and hydro we will be all right". I asked the minister: "How are you going to keep on producing, Mr. Minister, if you do not have the farmer? How much oil can you drink to sustain life? Will it help you much?" I then asked the manager who was there from the Royal Bank: "How long can you chew on your silver coins and stay alive?"

These are the things we are forgetting. We have to start realizing where this country really comes from. It comes from the agricultural sector. This is why people came here, to earn a living, to raise a family, and to produce food for their neighbours. It is important that we start realizing that we have to supply our own needs and we have to be competitive on the world export markets because we are an exporting country. Once we can solve those problems and lower our cost of production, the price itself will determine how successful we are in foreign markets.

I appreciate this time to speak on these issues. I hope the hon. members have been listening, because when we fail to put food on our table we can see what happens in other countries. Two prime examples are the Soviet Union and the African countries. When agriculture gets abused and goes down the tubes, so does the country. I do not want to see that happen to this country. I hope this House can do something to provide level playing fields for the primary producers, whether dairy, grain, or one of the specialty products.

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C–86 today.

• (1235)

I certainly appreciated the comments from my seatmate, the member for Lisgar—Marquette, about the need for a healthy agricultural economy in Canada. Like him, I operate an active grain farm and know that we contribute very much to the economy of Canada in terms of providing a good food supply at a very reasonable cost.

I want to premise my remarks today on Bill C–86 by saying that what I am trying to do and our party is trying to do today is to outline what we think is the need for leadership to provide the environment for opportunities for those farm industries that operate under supply management, how they can make the change, how they can adapt to go into the 21st century and be productive members of our society, keep their farms and operate on a very sound economic basis.

Bill C–86 is an attempt by the government to change the present levy system for industrial milk by implementing a pooling system for all industrial milk among six provinces. This bill's purpose is to enact the obligations of the Uruguay round of the GATT.

The present levy system is considered an export subsidy under GATT and is not permitted under the agreement. The new system will pool all earnings for industrial milk and will take the cost for exporting excess milk from those earnings. The revenues the farmers receive will remain unchanged.

This bill simply keeps the present supply management system in place. The government openly acknowledges that this is the case. But supply management and free trade are very much opposing systems.

The last time I checked, the trend in the world economy was in the direction of a more open trade. Supply management is totally out of step with the times. It is like a horsedrawn buggy and it needs a redesign so we can move as quickly as the rest of the world.

Recently our quotas for products made with industrial milk ended due to GATT and were replaced with astronomically high tariffs, 351 per cent in the case of butter, which is the highest. They are all in that range of some 250 to 350 per cent.

Members will probably know that the United States is presently challenging our sky high dairy tariffs. They are viewed by the United States as a violation under NAFTA and the United States has called for a NAFTA panel to hear arguments on this issue during the summer. So the process has started.

A challenge under NAFTA takes between two and five years. If Canada loses the transition time for the elimination of tariffs, domestic quotas would have to be negotiated. The chances of Canada winning the present challenge to the new dairy tariffs are questionable, in my view. Our American sources are quite confident they can win this one.

Even if Canada feels it has a good case, the future for the pooling system cannot be ensured. Many would like to believe that the pooling system can solve all of our problems in this industry, that it can make supply management secure. That is not realistic. What we need is some realism here. The future of an

entire industry cannot be focused on such a weak system. The time has come to move on and to move this industry beyond supply management.

NAFTA negotiations to include Chile as a new partner have already begun. These new negotiations will be an opportunity to resolve old issues. Our partners in NAFTA want to finalize those old issues before admitting a new member and signing a new agreement. The supply management dairy issue is one of those.

The United States has good reason to push for an end to our present supply management system. The Americans want to have access to our markets for dairy products. On the other hand, Canada has a chance to end the notorious back door subsidies the U.S. hands out to its farmers. This is an opportunity, and I stress it is an opportunity that cannot be lost, to push for an end to all United States subsidies, which totalled over $10 billion U.S. per year in 1993.

We can also shape the time period for phasing out our present supply management system in Canada. We have to seize this opportunity to do some hardball negotiations where Canada says yes, we will give up some of our high tariffs on the supply managed industries, but only in exchange for you reducing your subsidies that you do through the back door. Then we would have the level playing field my colleague from Lisgar—Marquette spoke about, the need for this level playing field.

I believe that our farmers can compete with anyone as long as they have the same conditions. In fact, I believe that with the high population base in the United States and with most of our supply managed industry located within this 100–mile corridor we can function very well. I believe we can make the most of opportunities. We cannot lose this important opportunity that has been presented with the United States challenge to NAFTA to say yes, we are willing to give up something, but only in exchange for your backing off your subsidies.

• (1240)

I think we should work toward a continental free trade zone for dairy products, a sectoral approach. One sector may be able to move faster than others, and I believe this is one of them. This will place all dairy farmers on an even footing. No one farmer will have an unfair advantage based on the country in which he lives or produces. I believe that is to the advantage of our dairy farmers.

The world is moving to a new open market. There are 130 countries that signed the Uruguay round of the GATT agreement and there are more countries that want to get in. Canada is part of that free trade world. The time has come for government to recognize that a transition to a free market in this hemisphere is important to all of us. The government needs to help dairy farmers to make the necessary transition, not hold them back.

The industry needs time to adjust. Dairy farmers have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in their operations. The government must negotiate a new deal for farmers or all their hard work could be lost in the blink of an eye. I for one know of the hard work that is involved in running any type of farm operation, but in a dairy farm operation, as my colleague has just said, seven days a week is the norm. We must take this opportunity to give them some kind of a future, not one where we have the blinkers on and pretend the system will always be in place, but one where we can help them to move to this. Many of these farms have been handed down from generation to generation, and farmers want that to continue. It is a way of life they enjoy.

This industry needs to develop an economy of scale to compete with producers from other countries. The industry must develop into a system that increases efficiencies and lowers the cost of production. For example, the diversity of herd size and yield in Canada is not set up to meet that need. The same holds true for the United States. The average size of a cow herd in Canada is 47, and in the United States it is 45. But in British Columbia, the model province in the industry, the average herd size is larger, at 78 milking cows. They are starting to make the adjustment. As a result, the yield in B.C. is over 20 per cent higher than that in the rest of Canada or the United States. The industry in British Columbia is considered to be the most advanced in North America. But under the present system the industry cannot operate at full capacity. The B.C. quota is not high enough.

I believe it is ludicrous that the provinces that are the most efficient cannot benefit from this efficiency. The supply management system is only coddling the inefficient producers and hurting the industry as a whole.

The U.S. dairy industry is not making the transition to free trade either. Farmers in the U.S. are paid to keep their herd sizes down. This policy is meant to limit output. U.S. farmers receive more subsidies from the government than their Canadian counterparts. In fact, dairy farmers are the most highly subsidized in the United States.

In Canada, subsidies for industrial milk were decreased in the February budget by 30 per cent over two years. There is even a possibility that the entire system of direct government subsidies will end in the near future. The rebate to manufacturers using Canadian dairy products will end in August. This is due to our GATT commitments. We need to continue the trend.

I know that Canadian farmers need to stay one step ahead of their American counterparts. The phasing out of internal quota would be a next logical step. There has been discussion that one possible option would be a partial buyout of the quota. Farmers should be fully functioning members of a free enterprise system and should stay ahead of the competition. They would not lose all the time and money they have invested by taking this approach.

With the negotiation of a new deal for NAFTA they would be able to compete.

Canada needs to take this further in the next round of the GATT as well, in five years. But first we must start with the new opportunity I spoke of earlier that is presented by the NAFTA talks and any possible expansion to include other countries.

• (1245)

I understand the fear of the dairy industry and dairy farmers. Grain farmers went through about 15 tough years when there was a massive trade war on in agriculture. Trade rules have really helped. The World Trade Organization and the GATT have really helped. As long as we can phase down subsidies world-wide we can compete with anybody.

A new system would be open and entirely different. There would be no guaranteed price for their product but some farmers would not be able to adjust. They would have to go. As a whole, the industry would have to benefit.

The economy has changed and the way to do business must change as well. If the dairy industry does not change, I fear it will be harmed very substantially. This would hurt all Canadians regardless of which province they live in, regardless of the level of dairy production in their area.

We do have a very important example of an integrated economy in agriculture, the beef industry. It is a North American integrated market. The next logical step for Canada is to do the same thing with the supply managed industries, specifically the dairy industries.

If we can negotiate subsidies down in the United States and our tariffs, Canadian dairy farmers can compete. Members of Parliament have an obligation to ensure our dairy industry can compete. We need to help the industry to survive and prosper. The industry needs direction for the transition. If we do not lead in the Chamber, who will? We need to give guidance to the industry of intentions to negotiate a better solution.

To ignore the reality and lose it in the end makes no sense. The time for change is now before it is forced on this industry. I want to help dairy farmers make this adjustment for the future.

The government needs to broker a better deal during future negotiations. I want to see them be a success. Governments should want to see them succeed as well.

Let us not bury our heads in the sand and ignore reality. As a farmer and a believer in the free market system, I call on the government to lead dairy farmers and the supply managed industry into the 21st century.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CN COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Transport, Lib.): moved that Bill C–89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak in support of Bill C–89, an act to commercialize Canadian National at the third and final stage.

This undertaking is an important element in ensuring the continued success of the Canadian transportation system. The geographic nature of the country means the efficient transportation of goods is intrinsic to our producers and manufacturers' being competitive in the global marketplace.

Specifically, our exporters who use rail transportation to get their goods to market cannot compete on the global scale unless railways are cost efficient and effective in delivering their goods.

Commercialization of CN is one of the government's efforts to ensure a competitive and viable rail system in Canada.

• (1250)

We are also moving to reform the regulatory framework governing transportation to ensure it helps foster competition and serve shippers well, which is what the Minister of Transport did today. By putting CN on a level playing field and removing the often costly public policy demands it has faced as a crown corporation, the government is working to ensure we will have a healthy national railway to serve Canadians throughout the country into the future.

The bill before us aims to allow the government to sell all of its equity in Canadian National as a public share offering. In order to do so the government had to make sure enough capital would be available to absorb this issue, expected to be the largest initial public offering in Canadian history.

Recognizing the Canadian equity market could not absorb all the shares on its own, the government sought to structure the bill to allow for the maximum number of Canadians to take part as well as foreign investor participation. To this end we have not limited foreign investor share purchases any more than those of domestic investors. However, in trying to maximize the interest in this share issue we also recognize the desire to ensure CN will not be controlled by a single individual, whether Canadian or otherwise.

Therefore in order to ensure a broad distribution of these shares a limitation has been placed on the shares which any individual or associated group of individuals may own at a 15 per cent level. This level of restriction is both low enough to ensure no hostile takeover is possible and high enough to provide investors with some influence on management actions and decisions should they desire.

The government felt it was important to include this restriction. However, let me assure the House that recognizing the negative effect which restrictions could have on value, we were very careful not to include any limitations which would prevent us from maximizing the return to the taxpayers of Canada in this share sale.

The obligation for CN to retain its head offices in Montreal and to operate in both official languages will not affect the value. We could not include any sort of operating restrictions on CN's going forward because any sort of requirement in this legislation for CN to maintain a specific operation would have dampened investor interest in these shares given the possible effect on the railway's revenues.

It can be tempting for some to ask CN to maintain certain of its operations while it is still a crown corporation. However, CN can no longer be used as a tool of public policy if it is to serve Canadian shippers well. The government's objectives must be met through transparent and direct means, not through entities such as railways.

In committee Bloc members had originally indicated support and exemption from the bill for the Quebec bridge. The government has indicated in the past this is a perfect example of the government and CN's being committed to the maintenance of that bridge which is part of an important transportation corridor for Quebec, Quebec City and the area. Obviously it needs to have public participation by way of the provinces.

CN has already committed $1.5 million to the maintenance of that bridge, key to its rail network. Seventy–five per cent of the traffic on that Quebec bridge is vehicular traffic, which is the responsibility of the provincial government. The president of CN has invited the provincial government to participate more fully in a equitable sharing of those expenses. Hopefully Bloc Quebecois members will use their influence with the provincial government to ensure it pays its part in maintaining that historic bridge which serves Quebec City and its population and which is also a monument to what we have built in Canada together.

CN has already sold its exploration division, the proceeds of which will be applied to debt reduction. It is important that CN be privatized in an attractive way to investors. It has extensive real estate holdings and other non–rail assets, some of which have considerable value.

• (1255)

However, the government has been advised that investors will be looking for pure rail play and will not pay for CN's non–rail assets. Accordingly, these assets which have considerable value will be transferred to the government for subsequent sale.

Some of CN's property holdings are marketable in the near term and will be sold to reduce the debt. The CN commercialization act provides the Minister of Transport with the authority to transfer selected properties from CN to the government prior to the sale offering. CN will receive credit at fair market value for these properties.

One of the difficult aspects of reducing CN's debt will be to achieve a balance between what must be done to ensure the shares of CN are marketable, what CN must have at a minimum to start off on a financially viable footing and what impacts there may be on other players in the industry, notably CP.

The railways are an important part of the transportation system in Canada. Commercializing CN using the guidelines of Bill C–89 will put CN on a level playing field with its competitors. In conjunction with regulatory reform the government has introduced today, we will ensure a viable rail system up to the challenge of helping Canadian shippers compete in global markets of the future.

The government supports the bill and we encourage members on the other side to do likewise because it is an important moment in Canadian history, allowing one of our crown corporations to become a full player in the private sector and give the country what it needs, efficient, affordable and reliable rail service.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux–Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois agrees with the principle of the CN Commercialization Act, and, in particular, we appreciate the fact that provisions in it guarantee the bilingualism of the institution and the maintenance of its head office in Montreal. There are, however, six points on which we oppose the bill, and I will first list them for you, before I go on to examine them in detail point by point.

The six points are as follows. The first is the excessive power the bill gives the minister to use public funds to pay off part of

CN's debts and to give CN consideration for any assets outside the railway system the minister wishes to transfer.

Second, we do not agree with the fact that the bill does not protect the interests of CN workers once the company passes into private hands.

In the same vein, we disapprove of the fact that the bill makes no provision for the retirement fund of CN workers. We also cannot accept the lack of provisions preventing foreign takeover of the company.

Fifth, we object to the fact that, through clause 16, the SLRs, because of their connection with CN, could, in the future, come under federal jurisdiction, whereas they are generally under provincial jurisdiction.

Furthermore, we do not agree with the fact that there is no guarantee CN's successors will carry out their obligations to repair the Pont de Québec, which is an historical work and of economic interest. There is, moreover, no guarantee that CN's successors will do it any better than CN has done it itself since its acquisition by the federal government.

Here, then are the six points one after another. First, the bill accords the minister excessive power to use public funds in order to pay off part of CN's debts in order to make the company a more attractive buy and in order to give CN consideration for portions of assets the minister would like transferred.

• (1300)

We find these powers truly outrageous. They are to be found under clauses 6 and 12. I will not quote the whole clause, but only parts of it: "The Minister may, at any time, while CN is a Crown corporation, direct CN to transfer property, on such terms and conditions, including consideration, if any, as the Minister considers appropriate"—he is the one in charge—"and CN shall forthwith comply with the direction".

I will now read a short quote from clause 12, which goes along the same lines: "The Minister, with the approval of the Minister of Finance, may enter into an agreement or other arrangement with CN or any other person respecting the acquisition, holding, service, disposal or discharge of or other dealing with any debt or obligation incurred by CN", this is somewhat excessive, "and pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or from the proceeds of any sale of shares, amounts in respect of any agreement or arrangement referred to in paragraph (a) or (b)".

We were and are still very much opposed to these provisions, but our proposed amendments were defeated. Motion No. 8, which I drafted myself, was in opposition to them. It said that no such agreement regarding the disposal of debt or the transfer of property may be entered into unless the following conditions were met, and here are a few of the most important ones: not until the minister has laid before the House of Commons a proposal that the agreement be entered into, and the House has concurred in the committee report. This was aimed at giving the House, rather than the minister, the authority to approve this kind of transaction.

We also proposed that the transfer of assets be conditional on either the approval of the House or the favourable opinion of the auditor general to transfer to the minister assets with a value exceeding one million dollars, or to transfer to a third party assets with a value exceeding ten million dollars. These amendments were voted down. Therefore, the minister retains this outrageous power to use public funds as if they were his own.

The second point we take issue with is that there is no provision protecting the interests of workers in those corporations that would be purchased by the minister, or transferred to the minister to be sold later on. In the case of companies that have formed an organic bond with CN and receive orders from it in some cases, if that bond is severed, we will have to make sure they remain viable and the jobs are protected. Nothing of this sort is mentioned in the bill.

We do not want to presume the worst about buyers' intentions, but someone could buy a company just to close it in order to eliminate a competitor and then the jobs would be lost. To prevent this, my colleague, the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans presented the following motion which was defeated. Briefly it said that the minister could not sell any subsidiary or part of the operations of CN, unless CN and the purchaser had given the minister written undertakings, in terms satisfactory to the minister, that all reasonable steps had been taken to ensure that it would continue for a reasonable period as a viable operation and that the interests of the employees affected by the sale would, so far as is practicable, be maintained after the sale. That motion was defeated, therefore the workers have no protection whatsoever.

• (1305)

Third, on a similar issue, we see nothing here that would protect the CN employees' pension fund and on that point my colleague, the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, also presented Motion No. 11 which naturally was also defeated. It said that the pension plan for employees of CN known as the CN Pension Plan shall continue to exist and be funded and be administered by the CN Pension Board in accordance with the rules in existence immediately prior to the coming into force of this act. This amendment to protect the pension fund was defeated.

Fourth, we object to the fact that there are no provisions which will really prevent foreign interests from acquiring the majority of shares and therefore the control of CN. To support what I was saying, I am referring to clause 8 of the bill, from which I will quote.

"8.(1)The articles of continuance of CN shall contain

(*a*)provisions imposing constraints on the issue, transfer and ownership, [—]to prevent any one person, together with the associates of that person, from holding, beneficially owning or controlling [—]more than fifteen per cent of the votes—"

This provision is excellent, in principle, except that in the laudable intention of not reducing unduly the number of potential buyers in a market which is already rather limited, there is a provision that allows various persons, individuals or corporations, belonging to a group, to take less than 15 per cent each, even if the total for the group is over 15 per cent, provided that they submit a statutory declaration saying that they will not act in concert with respect to their interest in CN.

This is a good provision and we agree with it as far as Canadians are concerned. However, we disapprove of its application to foreign interests, because we are not convinced that CN directors will be able to make sure that foreign persons will abide by their declaration. We proposed, in an amendment, that this provision be restricted to Canadians. Of course our amendment was defeated.

Fifth, clause 16 which I will quote provides, intentionally I imagine, that a local railway created with a financial contribution from a CN buyer would come under federal jurisdiction, even though the others are under provincial jurisdiction. Here is what clause 16 says:

"The railway and other transportation works in Canada of CN, of every subsidiary of CN and of every corporation formed by any consolidation or amalgamation of any two or more of those corporations are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada."

We do not accept the principle of federal jurisdiction over a local railway created in partnership with CN. Against that we proposed Motion No. 15 from which I will quote. This provision concerning federal control does not apply to:

(a) any activity of CN within a province that operates under an agreement that subjects the activity to the jurisdiction of that province, or

(b) any work, subsidiary or corporation owned by CN that is situated or operates only within one province.

So, this provision putting short line railways under federal control could only apply to short line railways operating in more than one province. This amendment was rejected, just like the others.

• (1310)

The last provision concerns the Pont de Quebec, in Quebec City. You know that when it was first built, this bridge was considered the eighth wonder of the world and that it has not only an economic value, but it is also very interesting in terms of heritage. It seems to me that the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Public Works should show some concern. I saw photos of the bridge in its present condition. In fact, it does not put people at risk, but it is really regrettable to let an asset such as this one fall apart.

The federal government, which was the owner, was responsible for it, and then it transferred it to CN which should have taken all the necessary measures to repair this bridge as quickly as possible. It did not do so.

We would have liked the bill to stipulate explicitly that the buyer of the part of the assets of CN including this bridge would have the obligation to repair it urgently within a specified time frame. This is the purpose of motion No. 14 which says:

That Bill C–89 be amended by adding after line 3, on page 8, the following new Clause:

"15.1 The Minister shall, no later than January 1, 1996, conclude an agreement with CN providing for CN to repair, renovate and maintain the Pont de Quebec in Quebec City and to commence work under the agreement no later than May 1, 1996".

It will come as no surprise that this amendment was rejected. So they were all rejected, and we are left with legislation that allows the minister to use federal funds as he likes, to have assets transferred to him or to pay debts incurred by the CN.

The legislation does not protect the workers. It does not protect the CN pension plan. It does not give any real and verifiable protection against external control. It does not protect the future short line railways from an eventual take over by the federal government if ever there were joint ownership with the CN. The legislation does not give any guarantee at all respecting the Pont de Québec. It is an antisocial measure that totally disregards the rights of this House; it is insensitive to the fate of this historical bridge and would make short line railways come under two jurisdictions, some being under provincial jurisdiction and others, under federal jurisdiction.

In spite of what I mentioned earlier, in spite of the fact that it does guarantee bilingualism and keeps corporate headquarters in Montreal, we find that it is a bad bill and we will vote against it enthusiastically.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when Bill C–89 was first introduced, I stated that I supported the intent but not the content. Since that time the bill has been through committee, witnesses have appeared, amendments have been offered but very little has changed.

Speaking first of some of the restrictions in the bill, I cannot see any business reason for the insistence that CN's headquarters remain forevermore in any one city. Contrary to the Bloc's rhetoric, this is not a Quebec issue.

The concern on this clause is that a private company should not be restricted to any one location no matter where the location

is. I would have the exact same concern if the restricted location were elsewhere. The issue is the restriction, not the location.

During debate at report stage the Liberals stated that the headquarters are in Montreal, they have always been in Montreal and it is reasonable that they remain Montreal. Therefore, this is a good restriction. If the last part of the statement is true, then I would ask why they need the restriction placed into the legislation.

Likewise another restriction requires that CN maintain the federal official languages policy as if it were still a crown corporation. This is not necessary. Again, the Liberals used the illogical approach that CN is already following the Official Languages Act and therefore would continue to do so in any event. If this is practical to do, CN will likely continue to do so. If it is not, then it should not be required to continue it, at least not indefinitely.

• (1315)

An alternative which I offered on both of these clauses as well as the clause dealing with share restrictions was to include a sunset clause which would have provided that these restrictions would have been in place when the new company was formed initially but cancelled after a five–year period. CN would then be guided by market needs instead of political needs. This seems to me to be a reasonable compromise between Liberal needs and marketplace common sense. Unfortunately the words reasonable and compromise do not seem to be in the Liberal vocabulary.

The third restriction in the legislation is restricting the maximum number of shares in CN owned by any one person or company to 15 per cent. Most committee stage interveners from the financial sector stated that there was no particular advantage to this restriction but it would not cause a problem in the short term. The obvious implication is that this would cause problems in the long term.

The 15 per cent restriction prohibits shareholders from joining together to either ensure that directors will follow the will of the shareholders or to remove certain directors who are not acting in the best interests of the shareholders of that company. For example if a significant number of CN employees decided to buy into the company and the total number of shares held by various employees totalled more than 15 per cent, at any time they all voted the same way it could be ruled by the directors as collusion and their votes would not count. This serves to entrench management which hardly can be considered good long term policy.

This also inhibits some company which wishes to bring a new management style to what may be a very tired and inefficient company from buying in. If this company is able to buy a sufficient number of shares to ensure that its new management policies can be utilized and brought forward it would hope not only to get a return on its investment in terms of the share value but also appreciation of the capital value of the company itself through the innovative approach that it may be able to bring into the company and through ensuring that this comes to fruition.

There are those who will argue that some other companies have similar restrictions and therefore this one is okay. I would answer that by pointing out that over time many mistakes are made. For example we used to have autocratic Conservative rulers in Ottawa. Voters, the shareholders of Canada, partially corrected that mistake. Now we have autocratic Liberal rulers who are a transitional mistake that we must put up with until the next election. Only then will we have government representatives who write legislation based on the people's needs rather than political needs.

As in the case of the other two restrictions, I tried to find a reasonable compromise by amending this section with a five year sunset clause. Once again those words were not in the Liberal vocabulary.

The next section deals with Canadian ownership. Bill C–89 does not provide any restriction to foreign ownership, nor in my opinion should it. Financial experts have stated that it would likely take an international share offering to find enough investors for the CN shares. If that is the case, so be it.

What if there are enough investors in Canada who want to be involved in the ownership of a sector of Canadian heritage that it could in fact be sold here? Alternatively, what if there are a number of Canadians who wish to buy some portion of the shares but are scooped by foreign purchasers who are quicker off the mark when the share sales begin? Do we not have some obligation to Canadians?

I proposed a very simple solution which would have seen the shares available to Canadians and Canadian corporations only for the first 90 days. In terms of international sales all this would have done is delay the sales to the rest of the world by 90 days. This seemed to be a very reasonable approach to protect the rights of the people we represent without unduly restricting foreign sales. Of course I am again forgetting that the concept of representation is just as foreign to the Liberals as the words reasonable and compromise.

• (1320)

The next problem in the legislation that I tried to deal with is the period of continuation of the rail line to Atlantic Canada. I proposed an amendment that would require CN not to sell or abandon the rail line between Montreal and Halifax for a period of 10 years.

The Halifax Port Corporation testified before the standing committee pointing out that the new CN Sarnia tunnel gives Atlantic Canada excellent access to the American midwest. As such, it believes that by investing in upgraded port facilities it will secure handling of new high capacity, deep draft freighters

and thus the economic future of the marine industry in Atlantic Canada.

The same transport committee that rejected my Atlantic amendment recently tabled a marine study which recommends that ports such as Halifax should be commercialized and must obtain their financing on the open market without government guarantees. I happen to agree with this but once again the word reasonable comes into play.

For many years the government has interfered with the marketplace through government ownership, subsidies and regulations. It is obvious that the current government has looked at Reform policies and the popularity that those policies have generated. While anxious to try to adopt some of our ideas and policies, the Liberals always try to change things enough so they can call the ideas their own and in doing so lose much of the common sense that our original policies contained. The Atlantic Canada situation is a classic example.

If the Halifax Port Corporation goes to the private sector for financing without government backing, the private sector is going to want some assurance that the all important rail link to central Canada and the American midwest will remain for at least long enough to ensure a return on investment.

The purpose of the amendment is not to protect the rail line forever but to ensure its operation for a transitional period of 10 years. This should give Atlantic Canada the opportunity to develop its marine operations to a highly viable degree after which normal private sector determinations of future CN operations will rule. If nothing is done, Atlantic Canada will risk losing new freighter business to the American east coast ports and the cycle of Atlantic Canada's economic dependence on Ottawa will continue. Perhaps that is the government's real strategy.

I believe that this amendment is in keeping with my position on the other restrictions in that I can live with the other restrictions as long as they have a time limitation. My Atlantic Canada amendment did have that time limitation.

The government does not seem to mind restrictions dealing with shares, language and headquarters locations, so why this sudden rejection of one that will promote economic independence in Atlantic Canada? Perhaps consistency is yet another word that is not in the Liberal vocabulary.

I raised at committee another point of concern by way of an amendment. I tried to ensure that the sale of CN shares would not be prone to problems from insider trading. The argument from the Liberal side was that this was a wholly unnecessary amendment because the securities act covers insider trading. However, it only covers insider trading once the shares have been transferred to the stock exchange. If the government chose to sell any of those shares in advance of transferring all the shares to the securities commission, this would not be covered by the provincial regulations.

We do have an undertaking from the government that it does in fact intend to transfer 100 per cent of the shares. Thus they will be covered by the provincial securities regulations. We will certainly monitor that closely and see that the government lives up to its word on this.

The biggest concern I have about Bill C–89 is the minister's unlimited power to reduce or even eliminate CN's debt. CN currently owes $2.5 billion. Financial and industry experts have testified that in order to be able to sell the shares of CN they must have an investment grade bond rating of BBB. To ensure this, the debt will have to be reduced to about $1.5 billion.

• (1325)

I introduced an amendment in committee to restrict the amount of taxpayers' money that the minister could use for debt reduction to only the amount necessary to reduce the debt to $1.5 billion after first reducing it by all available CN funds on hand and excessive cash flow requirements along with the proceeds of sale of all non–rail real estate assets. The Liberals rejected this as too restrictive in that the exact figure to provide a BBB rating is not known for sure. Unlike the Liberals, the words reasonable and compromise are in my vocabulary.

I changed and reintroduced my committee amendment at report stage. This time instead of using the dollar amount of $1.5 billion that the Liberals had objected to, I restricted debt reduction to the amount necessary to produce an investment grade bond rating of BBB after following the other reduction steps in the original amendment. Even though this amendment followed the very line of logic offered by the Liberals, they turned it down. It seems that the Liberals are still enamoured with the concept of a blank cheque.

Bill C–89 is the first time I have been involved in the new process of sending a bill directly to committee after first reading. The rationale for this according to the Liberal government was that if a bill was dealt with in committee before real debate in the House, it would be much more amenable to amendments.

This has clearly not been the case. The amendments I proposed in committee were reasonable and had the support of many of the interveners. One of my amendments dealing with the preservation of the Atlantic Canada port viability even received the support of one of the Atlantic Canada Liberal MPs but was defeated in a tie breaking vote by the committee Chair.

One of the arguments I found really interesting was brought forward by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport on this part of the Atlantic amendment that I offered. It was the idea that what was I doing promoting a restriction on

private enterprise, my being one of these infamous free enterprise Reformers. As I stated earlier, I do not see this as a long term problem. It is a transitional thing from where the government has total manipulation of the marketplace through intervention, through government ownership, through subsidies, through special regulations.

I thought this was a very reasonable thing to bring forward. It was asked for by Atlantic Canada. It had the support certainly of the Atlantic members of Parliament I would think even on the Liberal side. It is extremely unfortunate that in raising this in committee I was not able to bring it up at report stage. It would have been very interesting to see the compromise struck with the Atlantic members of Parliament between serving their region or following the dictates of the Prime Minister.

It seems that the only reason for moving to committee after first reading, which is the new procedure that is now often being used and pushed, is to fast track Liberal legislation by eliminating much of the public debate. This is just another example of the current system of autocratic rule. It certainly does not seem to indicate that the new procedure really works the way it was meant to work.

This now leaves me to consider whether or not to support the overall intent of the legislation to privatize CN Rail, something I have spoken in favour of since before the last election.

The open ended restrictions dealing with share sales, the location of headquarters and language requirements are not insurmountable problems. After all, we are only two years away from the next election after which I am sure those problems can speedily be cleared up. I can adequately deal with the Atlantic port problem at that time also because we do not expect the Liberals to be in a position to block that any longer.

This then only leaves the problem of debt reduction. In an attempt to resolve this, I wrote to the Minister of Transport through the transport committee. What actually happened is that the minister appeared but he was only available for an hour and a half. When I asked him a 30–second question I got a five–minute answer which, very common to question period, did not answer the question at all.

• (1330)

I asked the minister if he would respond to written questions submitted to the committee while it was still sitting. He indicated that he would. I set out a list of 12 questions which I submitted through the committee and I received the answers while the bill was still under committee study. Therefore, those questions and the subsequent answers have become part of the record of the committee study on Bill C–89.

The response which I received from the minister indicates that he intends to pay off no more debt than is necessary to produce an investment grade bond rating of BBB. I do not know why the minister is prepared to commit to this on paper but not in legislation. I would have to guess that this is the Liberals' method of accepting reasonable measures from Reform while trying to hide what they are doing from the public.

On the basis of the minister's written, on record commitment I am prepared to support Bill C–89.

I would like to quote an excerpt from a letter. It reads:

> Without a doubt, Canada requires a first–rate transportation system that is able to service every region. The federal government must play a role in maintaining and developing that network, yet it remains to be seen whether the damage wrought by the Conservative's policies of massive deregulation of the transportation sector can be completely undone. Their continued tolerance of rail line abandonments and consideration of proposals for the privatization of CN Rail have done nothing to clean up this mess.

How these pre–election statements do keep coming back to embarrass their authors. The author of that letter is the current Prime Minister. He wrote it while he was Leader of the Opposition. It was written to the hon. member for Moncton only days before the last federal election.

Looking at some of the items which were in the letter, the Prime Minister stated that Canada has to have a first rate transportation system, able to serve every region of Canada. If that was his intent only days before the election, why when he walked across the floor did he suddenly decide that we did not need to ensure the transitional preservation of the CN Rail line to Atlantic Canada?

He also talked about the damage of the Conservative policies of massive deregulation. This is particularly interesting on the very day that we are having the introduction of a bill which will see massive deregulation of the transportation sector. He talked about the tolerance of rail line abandonments when the bill deals with improving, enhancing, speeding up and simplifying rail line abandonment.

It seems that the more reasonable position taken by the Reform Party finally got through to the Liberals. We have been on record since before the last election that privatization is not only a good idea, it is essential. More recently I testified before the all Liberal task force on CN Rail, reiterating that CN must be privatized. I am glad they are finally listening.

I hope that if the Liberals intend to use more Reform policies in the future that they come to us first so we can help them get it right the first time. Bill C–89, for all its flaws, is still a big change from the Liberal position at the beginning of this term of Parliament and I am pleased that we were able to show them the way.

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of Bill C–89, an act to commercialize the Canadian National Railway. This proposal is one part of the government's larger plan for ensuring a viable and competitive transportation system in Canada. It is also part of the government's intention to have the private sector operate in areas where it can do the job better than government. As the Minister of Finance said last February, our view is straightforward. If government does not need to run something it should not and in future it will not.

• (1335)

Under Bill C–89 all of the government's current shares in CN will be sold on the public market. All Canadians, including CN employees, will have the opportunity to buy shares of the railway.

During the hearings of the CN commercialization task force and of the Standing Committee on Transportation, concern was expressed by employees regarding their jobs and pensions. I am pleased to confirm that CN employees will continue in their current positions in the new CN and their pensions will be protected under the Pensions Benefits Standards Act.

Employees will also have a special opportunity to take a stake in CN through a standard stock savings plan which will be part of the share sale.

While we hope that many Canadians will be interested in buying a piece of CN to maintain its historical value, we cannot believe that the Canadian market is large enough to absorb the entire equity of CN. Therefore, recognizing the need for foreign participation in the share offering to ensure success, we have not limited the extent to which foreigners can participate any more than we have restricted Canadians.

The 15 per cent individual ownership restriction, which is included in the bill, treats all investors equally by limiting their ability to take over CN by putting a ceiling on how much stock they can own. This represents the balance between not jeopardizing the government's ability to sell all its shares which would be the case if foreigners could not buy the stock and ensuring that no individual will be able to take over CN.

The bill strikes a balance between the objective of maximizing return for the taxpayer by ensuring CN is viable into the future and the operating obligations some may wish to impose on the railway.

I am also pleased, contrary to the Reform Party, that the headquarters of CN will remain in Montreal and the Official Languages Act will continue to apply to CN employees. This is a bilingual, bicultural country. However, these are not changes from the way the railway currently operates and will not affect the saleability or price which will be received for CN shares because investors will expect CN to continue to operate in this manner.

We cannot, however, impose any serious obligations on CN that do not apply to its competitors if we are to ensure that CN can compete on a level footing with the other transportation sector players into the future, nor can we allow CN to become a private company without addressing its capital structure.

CN must be able to finance itself in the public markets in the future at a premium similar to what its competitors pay. For that reason CN is doing all it can prior to the public offering to reduce its debt. In addition, CN will transfer its real estate assets to the government for a fair consideration which will also pay down debts. Any further debt reduction will be the minimum necessary and will be undertaken with the goals of fairness and competitiveness in the rail industry and the transportation sector in mind.

I believe that Bill C–89 will enable the government to sell 100 per cent of its equity in CN, maximizing the return to the taxpayer and ensuring that CN can remain a viable, national railway serving Canadians long into the future from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is for me a pleasure to rise at third reading on Bill C–89, an act to privatize the Canadian National. We all know that transportation is essential to the economic prosperity and quality of life of Quebecers and Canadians.

Transportation networks are the lifeblood of industry in Quebec and Canada. The existence of a transportation infrastructure often is a critical factor in the prosperity of a region and, as such, can be viewed as the foundation of all regional economic development.

• (1340)

So in that context I am happy to rise this afternoon, since Canadian National has been, if we remember our Canadian history, a decisive factor in the development of this country, which is called Canada, from coast to coast.

The analogy of the lifeblood I just used can be applied as well to any means of transportation, by air, rail or water. Any infrastructure, whether it be a port, an airport or a railroad, must be considered first of all as a means of regional economic development.

Obviously, one does not need to be a rocket scientist to know that a serious shift in our rail policy is needed. The Canadian government has had for too long a narrow vision of the country's rail system and has sought no alternative to the abandonment of short lines. Large railway companies are not well equipped to operate short lines and do not possess the necessary flexibility to do so in a cost effective way.

The Bloc Quebecois believes that many short lines can be operated on a cost effective basis by local interest railroads which are called CFIL in Quebec and short lines by our English speaking colleagues.

The review of the railway regulations, as tabled this morning by the Minister of Transport, should contain measures which will pave the way for short line railroads to take over line portions that large railway companies no longer want to operate. The government should take measures to help the development of short line railroads, such as giving loan guarantees, to save as much as possible of Canadian railways, particularly in the regions.

It is easy to understand that, once CN is privatized, the whole matter may be called into question and the delicate balance that had been reached in Canada and Quebec could also be destroyed because a privatised CN would not have the same priorities in terms of regional economic development as a crown corporation. We know that in our capitalist system, the first priority is money; corporations must make profits. This is why I am not convinced that the new CN shareholders would be as responsive to social needs. I am not saying that they will not have any sensitivity, but you know what I mean. When a corporation is run by the state, its corporate mission is to promote regional economic development, whereas a private company is not in business to promote regional development, but to make profits. That is what the Americans call return on investment.

The Bloc Quebecois agrees in principle with privatizing the CN. However, it considers that it should remain under Canadian control, since this company was built with the Canadian taxpayers' money. Moreover, the Bloc Quebecois believes that the government is responsible for ensuring that CN subsidiaries, that are not directly related to railway transportation and that will be privatized, will be able to survive. To that effect, some measures should have been provided to ease their transition. Unfortunately, Bill C–89 does not respond to these expectations.

Our party submitted in committee a list of amendments that were unfortunately—of course, this is the game of democracy—defeated by the Liberal majority. Obviously, we would have liked our amendments to be accepted. We remain convinced that they were realistic, logical and not made with the sole purpose of annoying the government or getting on its nerves.

• (1345)

We believed and are still deeply convinced, this afternoon, just before the passing of this bill, that our amendments were reasonable and serious. In the time that I have left, I would like to look briefly at some of the amendments that were tabled and, of course, defeated by the Liberal majority in front of us.

At the same time, I will look back on some amendments that were moved by my colleague from Kootenay–West—Revelstoke, because some of them are very reasonable. I think they illustrate very well his concern with respect for democracy. However, as a Quebecer, there are some amendments there that I find totally absurd and, once again, this is a demonstration of what we call Quebec bashing on the part of some of our colleagues in the Reform Party.

I enjoy making comments like this, because it livens up the House a little. I was under the impression that, after lunch, my colleagues in front of me or beside me were sleeping. Deep down, I must be a troublemaker. Under clause 8, the government will leave the privatized CN's head office in the Montreal Urban Community. Once again, just to show that I am open–minded, I recognize that this is a good clause which reflects the strong presence of the rail industry in Montreal for over a century. This clause corresponds to other bills' provisions. For example, when Air Canada was privatized, in 1988, its head office was to remain in the Montreal Urban Community.

It is therefore unfortunate that my colleague from the Reform Party, in his Motion No. 2, proposed to limit the effect of this clause to five years, after which the matter could be re–examined. I was anxious to make that comment to the House about the Reform Party's amendment. We also proposed Motion No. 4, stating that subsidiaries not directly related to the railway sector, for example, CanCar, an engineering firm, could continue to operate. This amendment mainly concerned AMF Technotransport, a company located in Pointe–Saint–Charles, in Montreal. There are 1,300 jobs involved. We wanted the federal government to continue to assume its responsibilities, and to take sensible measures so that the subsidiary could keep operating for a while, long enough to recover its profitability and financial viability. Unfortunately, this amendment has also been defeated.

I also wanted to speak to amendment No. 8, proposed by my colleague for Blainville—Deux–Montagnes, and requiring the minister to obtain the House's agreement before arrangements are entered into in order to reduce CN's debt. As you know, there were increasingly persistent rumours that the minister would buy CN assets like the CN Tower or some other assets at a higher price than their real market value, in order to help CN bring its debt down to $1.5 billion. Obviously the Bloc Quebecois opposed such a buyout, which would amount to a subsidy to those buying CN.

• (1350)

In addition to Motion No. 8, dealing with operations concerning the debt, Motion No. 9, also put forward by my colleague for Blainville—Deux–Montagnes, dealt with operations concerning assets. In fact, with the latter amendment, we were asking that operations concerning CN assets be approved by the House.

As long as the government remains a majority shareholder in CN, any transfer to the government of CN assets with a value exceeding $1 million and any transaction between CN and a private party with a value exceeding $10 million must be approved by the House. This amendment would allow the House to assess the validity of the transaction and determine whether it is to the benefit of taxpayers.

It is first and foremost a matter of democracy. Unlike the members of the other place who are political appointees—I do not want to comment on people appointed by the previous government to the other House—we have been elected democratically and we do not have anything to learn from any member of the other place. Since ours is a democratic assembly, we are asking that the rules of democracy be adhered to and that the government come before the elected members to have its decision approved.

Another motion in amendment put forward by my colleague for Blainville—Deux–Montagnes, Motion No. 10, is an alternate motion to Motion No. 9. It would require that transactions with respect to assets be referred to the auditor general, and that his report be tabled in the House.

Once again, the purpose of this amendment is not to annoy or irritate anybody, but to have openness prevail, so that everything can be above board and out in the open. That is why we suggested that the Auditor General of Canada be involved, because he is a trustworthy official whose mandate is to protect public moneys, and because his credibility has never been questioned.

Another of my amendments, Motion No. 11, was meant to protect the CN employees' pension plan. Regrettably, Bill C–89 still does not contain provisions to prevent any changes in the CN pension plan after privatization.

Our party has already shown its commitment to workers at the time of the rail strike, when we sat over the weekend. We were the only ones in this House who fought for the rights of the workers. Therefore, it was important and crucial for us that CN employees get assurances concerning their pension plan. What will happen with this plan? Unfortunately, our amendment was defeated. The government did not see fit to accept our suggestion.

We also moved another amendment, Motion No. 14, concerning the Pont de Québec, an issue which is very important for me and my colleagues in the Quebec City area. Again, as I said the other evening, during the second reading stage, it is a shame that the Liberal members on the Standing Committee on Transport made light of the whole issue of the Pont de Québec. They really made it sound trivial.

I do not want to seem chauvinistic or presumptuous, but I am convinced that the hon. members who have visited the magnificent region of Quebec City and the surrounding area were able to realize that the Pont de Québec is really a world heritage jewel.

When the bridge was inaugurated by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it was obvious in the mind of Laurier that this fine example of architectural engineering should be preserved so that future generations would be able to admire it.

• (1355)

It is unfortunate that, because of CN's carelessness, this world–class jewel of architectural engineering is deteriorating. It is unfortunate that, in order to maintain this infrastructure in a safe and aesthetically pleasing manner, we need to invest between $41 million and $45 million. The Liberal members of the transport committee, as I said, made light of the whole issue. Here are some examples of the comments they made during the committee's hearings: "As the federal government, we will not start preserving just any old bridge at the end of some concession, in some village in Canada. We will not start preserving just any short line railway. We will not start preserving every old rail station about to fall down". We are talking about the privatization of CN.

In making this comment, I do not mean to insult Canadians and Quebecers who happen to have an old bridge at the end of their concession road, but I do want to put things in perspective. To compare the Pont de Québec to any part of a railroad line that is no longer in use is to show a lack of knowledge of this architectural jewel. What can I say? The bridge is located in Quebec City and spans the St. Lawrence River. I know that, for some people elsewhere in Canada, just thinking that this bridge is located in Quebec City sets their teeth on edge, but there is nothing we can do about it.

I see that my time is running out. I would just like to say that this coalition to save the Pont de Québec has many members. In other words, the member of the Bloc Quebecois is not the only defender of the bridge. There is also that member's regional caucus, the city of Quebec, the city of Sainte–Foy, the Fédération des caisses populaires, RCMs, the Chambers of Commerce, the Auto Club, and many more.

In conclusion, we are disappointed that Bill C–89 will be adopted in its present form even though we have put forward very realistic and feasible amendments.

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

COMMUNITIES IN BLOOM

Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we speak communities large and small right across the country are sprucing up, prettying up and greening up in hopes of being selected the most beautiful in the first annual Canadian communities in bloom competition.

The idea for a national beautification competition comes form Canadians in Quebec who want to share and celebrate the beauty of our towns and villages. Now with a board of directors and sponsors like the national capital commission, the competition is under way.

The city of Brantford in my riding has been selected to participate in the category of communities with a population under 100,000. The odds on favourite is Brantford because of the quality of our parks board, the involvement of local organizations and individual Brantfordtonians.

I know all hon. members will join with me in wishing all the participants well. We will see them in Ottawa in September when Canada's most beautiful bloom–in communities are selected under the first annual Canadian communities in bloom competition.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CULTURE

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, has the heritage minister been relieved of his duties or has he resigned from his position without informing the public and this House? There are several indications that this might be the case.

The minister was unable to attend the joint convention of the Canadian Museums Association and the Société des musées québécois at a time when the museums are waiting to hear about federal museum policy. For reasons that are a complete mystery, he did not delegate a replacement.

The cultural community is worried and offended by this silence on the part of the federal government. As far as culture at the federal level is concerned, it is the policy of the empty chair. Left vacant by a minister in name only, this chair is now occupied by the Minister for International Trade when it comes to film distribution, and by the Minister of Industry in the case of orders with respect to satellite broadcasting.

It is high time that the heritage minister handed the job over to someone really able to stand up for cultural issues. When will he be giving up his limousine?

[*English*]

CANADA POST

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the small community of Chilanko Forks in my riding of Cariboo—Chilcotin recently lost its general store and post office in a terrible fire. For most small towns, this would mean the end of mail service for weeks and even months, but not in Chilanko Forks, thanks to the bravery and ingenuity of postmistress Penny Chipman.

Mrs. Chipman entered the burning building four times to retrieve essential items at the post office desk. Then after the fire she went home and set up a new post office in her own travel trailer. The next day the mail went out from the makeshift post office without missing a beat, a letter, or a parcel.

For Mrs. Chipman's bravery and ingenuity, today here in Ottawa she is being awarded the prestigious Golden Postmark Award given to postal employees who make outstanding contributions to Canada Post or their communities.

Congratulations, Penny. All of Cariboo—Chilcotin is proud of you. As you receive this award, we salute your courageous spirit. Thank you for your dedicated service.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, the provinces are increasingly asking for greater latitude in the financing of health care. For example, they would like to be allowed to impose user fees. Yet, studies show that such fees would not help control health expenditures and could result in underuse of services by those who are really sick.

However, costs can be reduced by improving the efficiency of health care services. We all know that, all over the country, there are drug consumers, as well as some health care professionals, who abuse the system.

I hope that the government will launch an awareness campaign to ensure that Canadians are responsible consumers of the health services provided to them. Our health care system is the most generous in the world, but some profiteers make it extremely costly to the state. Moderation is the solution.

* * *

[*English*]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Peterborough and District Sports Hall of Fame officially opens this week as a major addition to the Memorial Centre, home of

the Peterborough Petes. The new hall is the result of 16 years of effort by many volunteers.

We already have over a hundred distinguished inductees and a wall of fame, which has generated a great deal of interest and pride, but until now we have lacked a real hall.

Since its earliest years Peterborough has been a major centre for sports at all levels. It is a community known for a high level of participation in sports, the quality of its athletes, and the extraordinary variety of sports practised by its citizens.

Our hall of fame will be a showcase for sports and will house the archives of sports history in the community. Since the history of Peterborough and the history of sports are inseparable, visitors to the new hall of fame, especially young people, will leave with a stronger sense of community identity and pride.

My thanks to all those who have given of their energy, talents, and money to bring this project to fruition. I am delighted that the Canada infrastructure program could help.

* * *

SENIORS MONTH

Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House that June is seniors month.

Seniors month offers an opportunity for Canadians to acknowledge the contributions seniors make to their families, their communities, and to society at large. It is also a time to reflect on the diversity of Canada's seniors.

The majority of seniors are healthy, physically and mentally active, involved in their communities, and are very satisfied with their lives. There are, however, seniors who are frail, who need support for daily living, or live in situations that put them at risk for depression, loneliness, and dependence. These seniors, who are most vulnerable for social, health, or economic reasons, need to know that our society will support them in their efforts to remain independent and contributing members of society.

As Canada is experiencing a dramatic growth in elders, the oldest seniors who require the most care and support are the fastest growing. It is in this context that I invite all Canadians and those seniors of tomorrow and today to take up the challenge—

* * *

PARTY DISCIPLINE

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beaver River has written to me and my Liberal colleagues on the issue of party discipline, but there are some important Reform promises missing from her letter.

The member for Beaver River has forgotten to invite Liberals to support the 130 per cent raise suggested by their party whip. She does not ask for support for the former justice critic removed by the Reform leader because of comments he made. She fails to ask for our support of a Reform suggestion that gun owners should break the law and not register their guns.

• (1405)

The Calgary *Herald* recently said of Reformers: "These aren't, as a whole, real cheery, happy people". Reformers enjoy bad news. They celebrate doom and gloom. However, there was something good to the letter: Liberal colleagues will not have to pay a 1–900 service to respond.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval–Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is once again looking for excuses to avoid assuming her responsibilities regarding new reproductive technologies.

Indeed, in spite of the promises made by the health minister and the justice minister, the government has still not deemed appropriate to follow up on the recommendations contained in the Baird report. Yet, last May, the health minister stated her intention to table in this House, before the summer recess, temporary measures to prohibit the sale of human embryos and ova, and to also prohibit genetic manipulations for commercial purposes.

However, the now legendary laxness and unconcern of the minister leave Canadian and Quebec women puzzled as regards the government's will to act as quickly as possible. The Minister of Health is once again missing an opportunity to act in a timely manner.

* * *

[*English*]

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on April 26 my office submitted access to information requests to 21 federal departments. The law requires the response to an access to information request within 30 days. Fifty–five days later, my office has only received five responses to our requests. This is barely a 20 per cent success rate.

In the red book the Liberals promised to do much better than the Conservatives on issues such as openness. The President of the Treasury Board himself has promised to initiate changes in the public service culture in order that items such as access to

information requests are not stonewalled. However, the annual report of the information commissioner has proven that the Liberals use words such as "openness" and "transparency" but they do not abide by the meaning of these words.

The result: Canadians are left with another in the long list of Liberal broken promises.

* * *

INTEGRITY

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in spite of red book promises to move our political leaders away from questionable behaviour and arrogance, arrogant political leaders are not a thing of the past, unhappily.

Case in point number one: Minister of Transport decides MPs are not qualified to review a restructured deal to automate the air traffic control system. Apparently the bureaucrats, who more than doubled the original cost of the program, are qualified.

Case in point number two: Minister of Agriculture tells the health committee that it does not know what it is doing when it recommends continuing the moratorium on the use of recombinant BST in milking herds due to consumer resistance and concerns about legal liabilities and so on.

Case in point number three: The Prime Minister says integrity and trust are needed in Canada. He tells western Canadians prior to the election that he will protect the Crow benefit better than the Conservatives. Instead of a Conservative cut of 10 per cent, he cuts it 100 per cent.

That is integrity, that is honesty. That is ridiculous.

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the key element of transparency and openness in government is the public release of information. I rise today to recognize steps taken by this administration to make the government more open and accessible.

One of our key moves toward openness was to set new guidelines on advertising and public opinion research introduced by the Minister of Public Works last May. These ensure that results of public opinion research studies commissioned by the federal government are now accessible to all Canadians through the Library of Parliament and the National Library of Canada.

Under this government Canadians no longer need to go through access to information to get this information. On June 1, 1994 the Minister of Public Works released approximately 200 reports covering past opinion research studies dating back to 1987.

Indeed, this government is delivering on its promises.

• (1410)

SUNSHINE FOUNDATION OF CANADA

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Sunshine Foundation of Canada makes dreams come true for special children who are challenged in Canada by severe physical disabilities or life threatening illnesses.

The Sunshine Foundation is privately funded, it is run by dedicated volunteers, its staff is the happiest I have ever seen, and it does marvellous work.

Tomorrow, on June 21, the sunshiners embark on a three–month caravan across Canada, starting in St. John's, Newfoundland, and ending in Vancouver, British Columbia, on September 21. Each community visited will have crowned a special child who will be selected as that Sunshine Foundation ambassador in that community.

It is symbolic that the Sunshine highway of dreams starts in the east where the sun rises and finishes in the west where the sun sets. In this long day of sunshine, the only goal of the foundation is to fulfil the dreams of Canada's very special children.

I invite you, Mr. Speaker, when they are in Ottawa and in St. Catharines, to attend when the caravan comes to those localities. And I invite all my colleagues and members of the House of Commons to attend when it comes to their communities.

* * *

ALGOMA

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the summer recess is just days away. Along with the students, teachers, and parents from Massey Public School in the gallery today, I want to take this opportunity to invite all members of the House to visit the beautiful riding of Algoma during the next few months.

Located in northern Ontario, in the northern area of Lake Huron, Algoma riding offers a wide variety of recreational and tourism opportunities, which will interest all kinds of visitors. Whether you enjoy fishing, boating, canoeing, biking, sightseeing, camping, or hiking, there is something for everyone in Algoma.

Cruise the North Channel waterway along the north shore of Lake Huron from Sault Ste. Marie and St. Joseph Island in the west to Manitoulin Island and Killarney in the east. Stop along the way in the many communities with docking facilities and services for pleasure boaters. There are festivals and fairs, pow–wows and people for all to appreciate.

On behalf of the over 50 municipalities and 15 First Nation communities of Algoma riding, I invite all hon. members to

spend some time in our beautiful area during the summer months and experience Algoma's warm hospitality firsthand.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PCB EXPORTS

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, questioned by the Bloc Quebecois, the Minister of the Environment stated that officials of her department had defended Canada's position on PCB exports before an American panel, but on checking, this could not be ascertained.

Cornered, the Deputy Prime Minister went on to state yesterday that she had written to the chief administrative officer of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Carol Browner. However, according to the chief of operations in charge of relations between the agency and the Canadian government, no letter was ever received for Mrs. Browner. Either the EPA does not pay much attention to letters from the minister and misplaces them or, contrary to what she said, the minister never sent the letter in question.

The Bloc Quebecois defies the minister to produce within the hour the letter she claims to have sent before June 9.

* * *

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has shown its true colours, confirming its position that stay at home parents are second class citizens in Canada.

In response to an Alberta government proposal for tax relief for stay at home families, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance answered no, stating that the aim of the tax system is to help people work, not stay at home. What an insult. This member obviously fails to recognize the contributions made by stay at home parents, who make both personal and professional sacrifices to raise their children.

The government is continuing with the policy that parents who choose to stay at home are second class citizens and contribute nothing to society. What hypocrisy. What a total lack of understanding. What a total lack of vision.

Reformers offered the Liberals a tax deduction for stay at home parents and they turned us down. The Alberta government has just offered the Liberals a tax credit for stay at home parents and they turned it down too.

The question that begs to be asked is what, if anything, have the Liberals turned up to recognize the plight of stay at home parents?

[*Translation*]

STUDIES ON SOVEREIGNTY OF QUEBEC

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec minister responsible for restructuring has not kept his word. On March 19, 1995, on the RDI show "Point de presse", he announced his plans concerning the release of his 40 studies on separation.

He said basically the following: "We were quite clear on the scheduling. The time frame was between March 15 and mid–June, approximately. The studies were released on March 13, so we met our deadline. I have no reason to believe at this time that we will not remain on schedule."

• (1415)

This is June 20, yet only eight of the propaganda minister's 40 costly studies have been released to date. Are we to understand that this costly partisan exercise is not producing the desired results and that this is why the minister is taking so long to publish the rest of the studies?

* * *

NUNATSIAQ

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

This past weekend the Prime Minister and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl were in my riding of Nunatsiaq to visit three beautiful communities: Iqaluit, Cape Dorset and Pangnirtung.

A warm and gracious welcome was extended to the Prime Minister and Chancellor Kohl by both young and old. The chancellor purchased local carvings and he saw firsthand that fur and hunting were integral parts of the Inuit traditional lifestyle and culture. He has returned home with a better understanding of how closely we are tied to the land.

I thank Chancellor Kohl for his interest in the north and its people. I thank as well the Prime Minister for defending the fur economy and supporting our northern way of life. I also thank my constituents for extending true northern hospitality to our distinguished guests.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

REFERENDUM ON QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs announced a new strategy for Ottawa as the referendum approaches. He said, and I quote: "There is no doubt that the

Parti Quebecois constitutes a threat to the country. And when there is a threat to the country's unity, you have to spend money to understand and respond to that threat".

My question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Does this sudden change in her government's strategy mean that the federal government is about to do what it did in 1980: spend millions of dollars and thus ignore the limits set by the Quebec referendum act?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we said before, we intend to respect the spirit of the referendum act. There is certainly no doubt about that.

The referendum campaign has yet to begin, and I must say there are some very clear signs, because I have here a list of referendum–related expenditures by the Parti Quebecois, including, for instance, what they sent in the way of propaganda to every household in Quebec, which cost $1.5 million; the advertising campaign targeted to cultural communities, which cost $1.2 million; and the commissions on the future of Quebec, which cost $7.5 million.

Since the Government of Quebec used taxpayers money to make these pre–referendum expenditures, it should look at the beam in its own eye instead of the mote in ours.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the minister told us that he was unable to estimate the cost of the referendum operation, an indication that the federal government has exceeded its spending limit. We have some concerns about the implications of the terms used yesterday by the minister, when he stigmatized the Parti Quebecois as a threat to Canada.

Since when can a country that calls itself a democracy be threatened by a party that was founded according to democratic rules and which intends to achieve its goal by purely democratic means?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I said the Parti Quebecois was a threat to the unity of the country, and I repeat that the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc Quebecois are a threat to the unity of the country.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Massé: It is clear that when a party is elected by democratic means and its purpose is to separate, that party is a clear threat to the unity of the country. As the people responsible for the unity of the country, it is our duty to explain what our country is about, to defend it and to take all necessary steps to show people the advantages of federalism, since both in Quebec and here in Ottawa, we have a party that is trying to show only the disadvantages.

• (1420)

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I may refer the minister to what he said yesterday: "The Parti Quebecois constitutes a threat to the country". Second, what he just said is not at all reassuring, since he tells us this government has a duty to take all necessary steps, which says it all.

Since the minister considers the Parti Quebecois to be a threat to Canada, I wonder whether he could tell us whether his intelligence service, CSIS, shares that opinion and, since CSIS is the department's intelligence branch, whether CSIS intends to treat the Government of Quebec as a threat and put the Quebec government's ministers under special surveillance?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I see the Leader of the Opposition is again trying to twist the meaning of what I said, although I made it quite clear that the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc Quebecois were a threat to the unity of the country. In this country, the vast majority of Canadians want to keep the country together, and in Quebec, more than 60 per cent of the population wants to keep Quebec as it is. In a democratic system, we have every right to defend the will of the vast majority of voters who do not want separation and want to stay in Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister has a short memory. The latest federal poll gave 54 per cent to the sovereignists in Quebec.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: It is just the beginning!

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, that is not even from the very latest polls, that they have decided not to leak.

The Quebec Referendum Act limits each party's spending, in order to uphold democracy. But, the Privy Council, which could almost be considered the office of the Prime Minister, is not governed by this act.

My question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Given the way the Privy Council's budget works, will the minister confirm what Jocelyne Bourgon told the Committee on Government Operations at the end of May, which was that any additional spending done by the Privy Council is approved after the money has been spent, because it is impossible to forecast what the total cost will actually be?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, firstly, I would like to point out that the poll to which the hon. member for Roberval referred was conducted in the month of March. In addition, the figure of 54 per cent is being interpreted in a specific way by the Bloc Quebecois and the Parti Quebecois. The statistic of 54 per cent refers to those who are in favour of sovereignty association; according to the latest poll, only 32 per cent of those polled are in favour of independence. Consequently, it is obvious that this important statistic has been distorted by the Bloc Quebecois to mislead people.

Regarding the Privy Council's budget, clearly it will cost us more to defend national unity if the referendum is delayed. This is true for the Province of Quebec, it is true for the Parti Quebecois and it is true for us. The figure approved in the estimates truly was what we believed we would spend on a referendum which we expected would be held in June. If the Parti Quebecois had kept its word, that is what would have happened.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I would like to ask you to keep both your questions and your answers brief.

• (1425)

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the minister that never at any time did he, the Prime Minister, or any of the ministers opposite have the courage to clearly answer the question would they refuse an economic association in the interest of the rest of Canada, yes or no?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: I invite him to stand up and to answer that question now.

The Speaker: The question please.

Mr. Gauthier: Since the spending of the Privy Council is only approved after the fact, will the minister confirm that his government could end up spending as much as it wants, without any control whatsoever, and that we would only find out the real cost several months after the referendum? In other words, will the minister confirm that the Privy Council is an open bar—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I just indicated the Government of Quebec, the Parti Quebecois, has already spent more than $11,130,000 on propaganda, pure propaganda for sovereignty.

The opposition should remember that more than 60 per cent of Quebecers are federalists and the great majority of them, more than 90 per cent, like Canada and do not want to leave it.

* * *

BOSNIA

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while we wrangle about Canadian unity and the relative safety of the Chamber, Canadian lives are at risk in the former Yugoslavia.

We have learned directly from the Canadian camp at Visoko that earlier today Bosnian Muslims placed five anti–tank mines and two rocket propelled grenade launchers across the entrance to our base there.

The Bosnian Muslims have reportedly told our forces that they may not leave the camp and to attempt to do so would invite military retaliation. This means that in effect 700 more Canadian soldiers are now the hostages of yet another warring faction in Bosnia.

Canadians are rightly concerned about the safety of our peacekeepers and disturbed by the escalating nature of the conflict.

Can the minister of defence confirm that this is the situation facing our peacekeepers in Visoko and update the House on the prospects for their release?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that for the past number of days access to our camp at Visoko has been restricted. This is something we deem to be totally unacceptable. We have conveyed our feelings to the Bosnian government and there are discussions now under way between the base commander and local military commanders.

I think all Canadians feel some anger at the fact that the base in Visoko has operated for three years with the acquiescence of the Muslim majority; the soldiers there have performed incredibly good tasks in bringing medical and other humanitarian aid to people largely of Muslim origin; and now, three years after the fact, the Bosnian government denies access to our camp. It is something that is unacceptable and is something that we as Canadians will not tolerate.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we share the minister's consternation but the question is: What are we going to do about it? We have gone from a dozen hostages to 700 and instead of delivering humanitarian aid our troops are now in need of food, water and supplies.

• (1430)

It is our understanding that 20 Canadians stationed at the two observation posts outside Visoko will run out of rations by Friday and the 700 soldiers held at the base have only enough food to last for two weeks.

What steps is the government taking to ensure the safe passage of supplies to our soldiers in and around Visoko and is the government taking any direct leadership role in this matter or merely leaving negotiations up to the local commander?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party and its leader seem to think solutions can be instant in the very difficult situation in the former Yugoslavia.

During the 20 days we had members of our armed forces detained all we heard from that party were not constructive suggestions but "why have you not done anything, why don't you have any results?" The way that situation turned out, the calm diplomacy using the appropriate channels to gain the release of our people at Ilijas and Captain Rechner and Captain LaPalm was the right way to go about it.

If hon. members of the Reform Party were directing Canada's defence policy, who knows what danger our troops would be in.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, no one is advocating instant solutions to this problem. We have been consistent on our position with respect to what should be done in that part of the world for the last year.

Due to the absence of a coherent government policy on peacekeeping in Yugoslavia, Canadians soldiers have been from one hostage crisis to another.

Since November last year Reform has been calling on the minister to consider the well–being of our peacekeepers and to develop specific criteria for their involvement or their disengagement in Bosnia. The government has steadfastly refused.

Given the increased use of UN soldiers as hostages and military pawns and their declining ability to fulfil their original humanitarian mandate, will the government make a commitment now to withdraw our soldiers from Bosnia as soon as possible?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made our position quite clear on this and the Prime Minister has stated the government's policy.

The hon. member from the Reform Party talks about the consistency of their policy. Two weeks ago at the height of the hostage crisis when Canadians were held in very precarious situations we had talk from that side about Canada retreating from the theatre. Then it said its policy was not one of retreat but one of withdrawal. When pressed further, withdrawal meant taking everybody out, only to go back in with even heavier equipment, including F–18 fighter planes.

Talk about consistency; it is not there on that side of the House.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CRTC

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Yesterday, the government asked the CRTC for its comments on the two draft orders relating to satellite broadcasting. The CRTC has until tomorrow to respond, although the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage is still reviewing the matter.

How can the Minister of Canadian Heritage justify the fact that the final versions of the orders have already been submitted to the CRTC for consultation, when the heritage committee has not finished discussing the recommendations it will make to the government regarding these orders?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wrong, as she very often is when making comments. We will continue to consult the CRTC about these orders, as we are required to do under the Broadcasting Act.

Furthermore, we already have before us the procedure followed by Senate and House of Commons committees. The order will not be final until cabinet makes a decision following 40 days of consultation with Parliament and the CRTC.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is really confusing. The government is consulting the CRTC, as it is required to do. Does this mean that it will have to consult the commission a second time, once the minister has taken into account the reports from the other House and from the committee?

• (1435)

Is this not ultimately some kind of masquerade trampling all parliamentary rights because, according to the memo from Power Corporation, this family business must be settled as quickly as possible?

[*English*]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to take seriously the protestations of the hon. member about wanting to be consulted when she follows them up with ridiculous accusations such as she has.

We have followed to the letter the requirements of the Broadcasting Act in order to consult with both Parliament and the CRTC.

Although we have heard these accusations repeated over and over, we have not once heard from the hon. member whether she agrees with the panel of experts, whose recommendations we

acted on in April, or whether she agrees with the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting, the Consumers Association of Canada or any of the groups that have supported the action the government has taken. Instead she makes these accusations.

I would like to know, since it is clear the government stands on behalf of competition and in favour of consumers, choice and lower prices, what does the Bloc Quebecois stand for except to stand with the proposed monopolies?

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned that in its haste to help out government friends and relatives of Power Corp. the heritage minister presented a draft final cabinet order on direct to home satellites to the CRTC before the parliamentary process was completed.

The heritage minister has allowed the process to be tainted from the outset. He had private meetings with Power Corp. and he is letting the CRTC now run amok and again he has violated procedure.

I respectfully request that the Minister of Canadian Heritage respond to this question. Why is the cabinet sending draft final orders which benefit Power Corp. to the CRTC before the parliamentary process is complete?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would really like to see this draft final order. It must be an interesting hybrid.

I call the member's attention to the provisions of the Broadcasting Act—

The Speaker: I am sure we all want to listen to the answer. I remind hon. members that questions are asked to the government and the government may choose to answer any way it likes.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made extreme allegations concerning the respect for process. I refer her to sections 7 and 8 of the Broadcasting Act. If she can identify in those provisions anywhere the government has failed to follow the provisions of the act, I would like to hear from her about that. In the meantime I would also like to hear from her as to the position of her party on the report the expert panel made to us with respect to satellite broadcasting in Canada.

We know the senior political adviser to the leader of the Reform Party has already admitted he has been retained by the Expressvu consortium. We would like to know what role he has played in deciding Reform Party policy on this issue?

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are focusing on this draft of final cabinet orders. That is the focus of the question.

Keith Spicer's office at the CRTC today confirmed the orders it received were the final orders.

The minister cannot hide behind the Broadcasting Act on this one. What we have here is yet another example of how the government and this minister are wishing to push aside Parliament, ethical standards and the ethics counsellor in order to further their own political agenda and benefit their own political friends.

• (1440)

Why is the minister fast tracking this directive and ignoring the parliamentary and Senate committees which he initially asked to review the directives?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the ethical question here is why the member persists on standing in the House and making false accusations. That is an ethical question.

The real question is where that party stands. We set in place the process. The process has been transparent and is provided for in the Broadcasting Act. We have followed it entirely, completely, openly and honestly.

This is not a draft final order if such a hybrid thing could exist. This is simply a process of consultation with the CRTC. We will follow it to its conclusion. There is no final order until cabinet makes a final order.

I can assure the hon. member that will only occur after the 40 days have been completed. If she has one, single, solitary, substantive suggestion I would be delighted to hear it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AMATEUR SPORT

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and ask the Minister of Cultural Heritage a question and I hope I will get an answer from him.

The Canadian Sport and Fitness Administration Centre has indicated in its report that it was unable to publish a French version of the summer edition of its guide to Canadian sports because of a cut in funding.

This was the justification given by the paragovernmental organization for publishing its guide in English only. I would point out too that Biathlon Canada did the same thing recently when it invited athletes to a training camp by letter in English only.

How can the Minister allow an organization subsidized by his department to so openly defy the provisions of the Official Languages Act?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the opportunity to express my viewpoint on the very important issue he raised.

We have guidelines on awarding funds to sports and other types of organizations. They require the recipients to provide

documents on activities, projects and programs intended to inform the public in both official languages.

These are important guidelines and I intend to apply them. My office has already been in contact with the organization in question to tell it about my concern and the possible consequences of its action.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is the minister sincerely aware that this incident is symptomatic of a much deeper malaise: Canadian amateur sports organizations have only one official language, and it is English. This situation penalizes athletes from Quebec.

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we definitely intend to have Canada's official languages respected. I therefore consider this an important matter and one we will act on.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the failure of the justice minister to face serious problems within the justice system is readily known by all Canadians. The fact that the justice minister is not capable of quickly solving problems that could cause violent law breakers to go free is legend.

• (1445)

The issue of the legitimacy of a court ordered DNA test that identified a positive match to DNA found when Tara Manning was raped, smothered and stabbed 47 times is still at question.

Will the justice minister do something immediately to legitimize court ordered DNA tests so Tara Manning's family can see justice being done?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the case to which the hon. member refers is before the courts. I think it is inappropriate for him and certainly for me to comment on it and I will not.

Let me address that part of the hon. member's question which is related to the policy issue of DNA testing. As the hon. member knows, we have said for some months that we have the intention of introducing amendments to the Criminal Code to provide for just such testing. Last September we produced an options paper and examined the question very closely.

It is our intention to introduce legislation to provide for DNA testing in the Criminal Code.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Tara Manning has been dead since May 1994. We are prepared to pass legislation submitted by the minister for DNA testing immediately.

If the minister does nothing and the DNA evidence identifying the positive match is not admissible in court, will the justice minister accept personal responsibility for allowing a murderer to go free?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a search warrant was obtained in that case. I do not think the hon. member should discuss that particular case. No one is suggesting that procedures already invoked in the code are not capable of producing admissible evidence.

On the question which the hon. member asks, I can tell him that the government is quite prepared to introduce legislation before the end of the session at the end of this week. If the hon. member is prepared to co–operate and the other parties are as well, I would be happy to discuss with hon. members opposite later this afternoon circumstances under which such legislation could be introduced before the end of the week for the purpose of adding DNA testing to the Criminal Code.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN FILM DISTRIBUTORS

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. On February 14, the President of the Motion Picture Association of America, Jack Valenti, wrote a letter to the Minister for International Trade in which he called into question the policy of Canadian programs and agencies favouring Canadian film distributors.

How can the Minister for International Trade guarantee that his discussions with the American majors will not, even to a small extent, lead to a loss of control over Canada's distribution system?

[*English*]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not have in mind the correspondence to which the hon. member refers. I will be glad to look into it and respond to her, but I do not know to what she refers.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage this time. How can the Minister of Canadian Heritage explain that his colleague from international trade is the government's spokesperson regarding film distribution in Canada, even though culture is the cornerstone of his department?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question hardly merits a reply, because the preamble would suggest that responsibility for the Minister of Canadian Heritage was in the Minister for

International Trade's hands. The Minister of Canadian Heritage is responsible for all aspects of our cultural industries.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Last week Nortel announced the elimination of 580 positions at its Brampton plant, bringing the total number of jobs lost since 1994 to 1,300. Meanwhile Nortel has continued to expand its global operations, most notably in China, where it will add 3,000 manufacturing jobs over the next three years.

How can the minister justify to Canadians that while he is trying to support job creation in Canada, the government is helping Nortel directly through export programs and indirectly through export credits to China to finance job creation abroad at the expense of Canadian jobs?

• (1450)

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure members share the hon. member's concern for the individuals in her constituency who have been impacted by this decision by Nortel and have lost their jobs. It is always an unfortunate consequence when corporations take decisions with respect to restructuring.

I would like to point out that there is some good news both for Bramalea in this decision where the Nortel is consolidating its head office functions. It will operate as the international head office for the corporation as well as for Brockville, Ontario where 400 new manufacturing jobs have been created.

On the broader question, I would like to point out this important fact so we understand exactly where our future lies in building international trade. Nortel's sales to Canadian customers have declined by 45 per cent since 1990. At the same time, its export sales are up from $784 million to $2.6 billion and Canadian manufacturing jobs have increased by over 1,000 in that time.

Export sales are the way we are going to succeed in the future.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration why he is ignoring the Immigration Act by issuing minister's permits to people who were refused entry to Canada.

This is no drop in the bucket. There were 7,000 last year. Among them were 11 who had been previously deported from Canada. First they are out and then the minister lets them back in.

What is the point of deporting people if the minister is just going to sneak them in again through the back door? Why has he kept this all a secret until now?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the report of ministerial permits is tabled in the House of Commons, I am not sure that is keeping anything a secret. Obviously he was asleep at the switch.

Second, the member failed to mention that out of the 7,000 ministerial permits only 141 were directed by this minister. He failed to mentioned that he and members of his party regularly approach me to ask for the issuance of ministerial permits for individuals who they think merit them.

The member failed to mention that ministerial permits have been used more judiciously. In 1990, 19,000 ministerial permits were issued. Last year at my direction that number fell to 7,000. The member has to be honest with the Canadian public and talk about the reasons why ministerial permits are used.

The majority of the exceptions are made for individuals who come to Canadian hospitals, pay for their medical treatment and leave. Some are for individuals on behalf of whom members have lobbied for family reunification. Some are for individuals who are not criminals but who may have a criminal record for a minor theft when they were 18. They have had a probation period of 10 years and need a ministerial permit to get into the country for the purposes of family reunification.

They are trying to paint an ugly picture that does not exist.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this minister refuses to use his authority to deport criminals but is not afraid to use his power to let them in. That is incredible.

Yesterday CTV reported that Canada is home to several confessed former members of death squads and the immigration department has been fully aware of their presence for almost 10 years.

Did the minister have personal knowledge of the presence of these death squad members? Is he going to give them minister's permits so that they can stay forever too?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, he talks about the 11 cases of individuals who were deported. We deported over 6,000 people last year.

The 11 cases happen to be, for example, individuals who failed refugee claims, left the country, subsequently married a Canadian and the Canadian has the right to sponsor the person in.

In other cases, people have overstayed their visits, then given a departure notice that turned into a deportation, left the country and then subsequently asked to come in on either a temporary basis or permanently.

• (1455)

There were 11 cases of that type versus 6,000 individuals we have deported and this member wants to base the record of deportation on those 11 exceptions.

With respect to the four cases from Honduras, the difficulty is those individuals came to Canada during the mid–1980s. It was not until the late eighties and early nineties that information about potential war criminal activity came to light. All four are being investigated by the RCMP. All four are being pursued by my department. One will come to an inquiry with respect to deportation so there will not be any minister's permit.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SINGER COMPANY

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint–Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

From 1946 to 1964, the federal government was a trustee of the pension fund set up for ex–employees of Singer. As trustee, the government paid into the account of the employer, the Singer Company, a total of $714,900 in 1964, which is the equivalent of $5 million in today's dollars.

Does the minister admit that the federal government, which was looking after the pension fund established for ex–employees of Singer, was a party to the terrible injustice done to them by unduly paying pension fund returns to the employer rather than the workers?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I share the hon. member's concern about the ex–employees of Singer.

However, I remind him that the Quebec Superior Court has already ruled the federal government is not a party to this particular transaction. The matter is presently being seized by the court. We expect to have a further ruling some time this summer and early fall. Therefore it is not appropriate for me to make a comment on the specific case until the courts have had an opportunity to dispense with it in their normal good judgment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint–Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the case now before the courts has to do with Quebec pensions. The question I am asking the minister relates to government annuities, for which he is responsible.

Can the minister confirm to us that his government has in its hands the legal opinions requested by his own department, which clearly recognize his responsibility and his mistake in the matter concerning the ex–employees of Singer?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the hon. member's question. On May 2 I wrote to the hon. member and indicated to him very clearly that if he or the ex–employees had any information concerning federal involvement they would like to present, I would be very pleased to receive it and review the case. I have yet to hear from the hon. member.

* * *

PENSIONS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have asked before about the fact that the MPs' expense allowances, travel expenses and salaries are all published in the public accounts but MP pension beneficiaries are not.

In fulfilling the red book promise of more open government, would the government agree to publish in the public accounts the list of MP pension beneficiaries, yes or no?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks a very legitimate question. The unfortunate part is that while the information commissioner suggests that we release this information, the privacy commissioner informs me that we should not.

The matter is presently under active consideration and is in the courts. There are some real competing issues on both sides.

I have to respect the law and, more important, the intent of the law.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how quickly the law can be changed when we want it to be changed.

The information commissioner is taking this to court and the government is going to court to have the court case held behind closed doors.

Would the government at least agree the court case should be open to the public so we can find out the government's real reasons for not wanting this information available?

• (1500)

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite is a very articulate individual. I would have thought that he would have had the courtesy of respecting the privacy rights of Canadians all across this country.

I do not find anything fundamentally wrong with having the matter adjudicated by the courts. When a decision is made in due course the government will then be in a position to release it to the hon. member.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

The Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development has reviewed the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and has made 141 recommendations. In congratulating the minister for launching such a review, I would like to ask her when the government will act on the committee's recommendations.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): First, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member who not only carried out his duties with great intelligence but also worked with colleagues on the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development to do the kind of job I think really reflects well on the whole of Parliament. In fact it is a very large task that he has undertaken along with his colleagues.

Some of the preliminary recommendations are very exciting. Bearing in mind that the usual time for responding to these reports is 150 days, I hope to be able to do that in less than half that time.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of two members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly, Gary Dickson and Adam Germain.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Colleagues, today we are honoured also to have another Nobel laureate with us. I refer to the 1990 Nobel laureate for physics, Dr. Richard Taylor.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CN COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public, be read the third time and passed.

• (1505)

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to discuss at third reading the bill concerning the privatization of the Canadian National Railway. Although Reform supports the government in this endeavour, there are some problems with this legislation that I feel must be addressed.

First, I would like to take a minute to look at the $96 billion that CN has cost the Canadian taxpayer over 70 years in combined losses and public subsidies in contrast to CP Rail which has cost the Canadian taxpayers zero in direct government subsidy.

Canada is $540 billion in debt, yet crown corporations like this one continue to run in the red without repercussions. Where can we find a deal like that in the private sector? We cannot. Companies go bankrupt and it is game over. Therefore, we support the government in getting out of the rail business.

Despite these massive losses, however, CN managed in the past year to earn a $245 million profit which is a drop in the bucket when we consider the overall picture. CN's debt is currently about $2.5 billion. Industry representatives say that the debt must be reduced to $1.5 billion to achieve a triple bond rating and be able to sell it.

I found an interesting article in *Alberta Report* dated May 29, 1995 which states: "CN's debt is unacceptable. Even if CN dumped its non–rail assets, its debt to capitalization ratio would be 45 per cent. The U.S. railway average is 30 per cent. In addition, U.S. railways have improved operating cost to revenue ratios from 90 per cent to as little as 75 per cent. CN is still at 90 per cent".

The transport minister has the power to reduce CN's debt to any amount he chooses which could mean an amount well below the amount for which taxpayers would see a return. How this debt is reduced is of great concern to companies like CP Rail, its main competitor whose president stated before the transport committee that CN would get an unfair advantage if Ottawa paid off some of its debt.

Moody's Investors Service issued a credit watch on CN's large debt in early May. I cannot believe how much we keep hearing the name Moody's these days in relation to finance with respect to this government. As we all know, a downgraded debt rating will make it more difficult and more expensive for CN to borrow the $2.53 billion it wants to buy new equipment by 1999.

I am going to dwell on another issue for a little bit longer than normal. It is an important issue. The bill requires that the headquarters of CN be located in Montreal permanently. I could understand placing a restriction to keep the headquarters in the city of purchase for a period of time, say five years, to see if that is the best place to keep it and the best place to run the business out of, but no, this has to be in perpetuity which is not the way to sell a company. In today's marketplace, the stipulation of the permanent location of a head office is absurd and makes a mockery of a bill that has a serious intent.

I respect the Minister of Transport. He has intestinal fortitude. Only a short year and a half ago the Prime Minister was against deregulation and privatization of the rail system but the minister has convinced him otherwise. Having said that and giving him that compliment, why is he placing this restriction on the sale? It is political.

I was reading an interesting article that represents the view from the west. It was written by Mr. Ted Byfield, the founder of *Western Report*, *Alberta Report* and *B.C. Report* magazines. He submitted the article to Saturday's *Financial Post*. I will quote from what he wrote. I will use the technique the chief government whip used all the time while in opposition of giving lengthy quotes and testimonials of key and intelligent people who add and shed some light on a subject. That is what Mr. Byfield does. The article states in part:

> Why, you have to ask, must the purchaser of Canadian National be required to maintain the head office in Montreal?
>
> Such is one of the conditions the federal government has attached to the sale and the reason is purely political.
>
> Something like 70 per cent of CN's business is done west of the lakehead and the western share has been increasing for the last quarter century. CN is, in other words, essentially a western Canadian company.

• (1510)

I will skip a little piece and go down a couple of paragraphs:

> Perhaps true, Ottawa would reply, yet from its inception 75 years ago CN has been headquartered in Montreal, and such historical associations matter more than where most of the business is actually done.
>
> How different is this case to the one made when it was proposed to move Trans–Canada Airlines, ancestor of Air Canada—

—a problem which the Prime Minister was very much involved in—

> —out of its traditional headquarters in Winnipeg.
>
> At that time, westerners argued that by tradition TCA was a Winnipeg based company, which indeed it was. Ah yes, said Ottawa, but we must face the fact that more and more of TCA's business is in eastern Canada. So piece by piece the company's head office operations were moved to Montreal.
>
> When tradition favours the west, tradition does not matter; what counts is where the business is done. But when tradition favours Quebec, where the business is done does not matter; what counts is tradition.

It is just the opposite. Mr. Byfield goes on to say that Montreal will not even be part of the same country in which CN does most of its business if the separation issue is settled by a yes vote.

Based on what I just read by Mr. Byfield, is the Liberal government forcing CN to stay in Montreal because it does not want to be seen as promoting the loss of a major Montreal head office on the eve of a vote on separation? Do the Liberals feel that Quebecers and Canadians outside of Quebec are that naive that they do not know it is a political move? Do they feel that Canadians are so ill informed that they would not see what this is?

Do the Liberals not see as a government that the best way to sell a company is to allow the potential owners to do what they want with that company once they make the capital investment to buy it and take the risk to run it, a company that has lost $96 billion since its inception? Does that not make sense?

Why in heaven's name would they impose these restrictions in light of the need to get out from under the continued government subsidy of the crown corporation? What are the Alberta Liberals doing to represent the interests of their constituents on this matter? What are the the Liberal members from Edmonton doing to exert any influence over the Minister of Transport, to try and talk some sense into the minister who, other than in two or three areas of the bill, is missing the boat? He is on the right track but why not do it 100 per cent right? Why jeopardize the potential sale of this asset which is so import to sell. In order to sell it the right factors have to be in play.

Let me get back to another comment made by Mr. Byfield in his article in the *Financial Post*:

> Then, too, you wonder about that select set, the four Liberal MPs from Alberta. All four are from Edmonton. And if the CN head office with maybe a thousand jobs attached were to move out of Montreal, where would it go? Where is the CN's centre of operations in the west? Edmonton, that is where. So why haven't these four, at least within caucus, protested against that provision? Maybe they have.

We do not know because we are not privy to the Liberal caucus meetings except what gets leaked on integrity and cracking the whip and voting the party line. We hear about those things. But no such objections have been reported.

And what about Edmonton city council members who tirelessly talk of their diligent labours to bring industry into their city and who wail so piteously every time another business departs for Calgary? What have they done? Delegation to Ottawa, maybe? Nope. Pressure on the Liberal MPs, perhaps? Nothing. For every buck CN makes in and around Montreal, it probably makes 20 in the Edmonton region.

I submit for that reason and that reason alone the person who will look at these assets and at the cash flow of this company is going to look at where the revenue is derived, where the business is. As I said earlier, I do not mind if they maintain the head office in the city of Montreal for a minimum period of five years, but after the owners should be given the flexibility to run the business the way they want to. A permanent location for their head office should not be imposed. That is completely ludicrous and ridiculous. Any business person would agree with that comment.

• (1515)

There will be no restrictions on foreign ownership of CN shares, but no individual shareholder either domestic or foreign will be able to own more than 15 per cent of the shares outstanding. Personally I think that is ridiculous.

I was in the business sector for about 25 years before I became a politician. I have purchased a lot of companies and I have looked at the assets of a lot of companies. One of the things that business people look at, the people who want to run successful corporations, is control. If they do not have control they cannot run a successful company. A corporation run by people who do not have a vested interest, a significant interest, and who do not have a lot at risk, at times do not care enough to pay attention to all the details to make proper decisions in the best interest of the corporation.

I have a suggestion rather than limiting ownership to 15 per cent. There are ways to help the Minister of Transport whom I truly respect. I am trying to make it a better bill or a better way to sell the company. This is serious. The corporation is for sale and we need to raise $2 billion. We must have the right ingredients at work or at play to achieve a quick and effective sale. The longer it drags out the worse it gets and the more it hinders the government and hurts Canadians, because we will have to continue to subsidize the rail line.

Why not offer the shares to Canadians first? Why not set a time limit of 60 days for an unlimited number of shares? Then we could put them on the global market. If the majority of shares are not picked up by Canadians or people from Canada, if less than 60 per cent are sold, Canadians have no right to come back on the government to complain.

I am giving the government a suggestion to satisfy Canadians, Canadian content, the right to buy Canadian, and the right to participate as Canadians. If Canadians do not step up to the plate, if they do not want to take the risk and if they do not want to invest, so be it. However they should be at least given the first opportunity in return for the $96 billion they have subsidized the company for over the last 70 years. They deserve at least that much. Wherever the percentage falls it should then be offered to the global market. If only 30 per cent or 40 per cent have been sold to Canadians, we should let other people buy control or control it. Canadians cannot then hold the government responsible or accountable for doing that.

We need to have many people available to purchase the corporation. We need to make it available to as many people as possible, but I maintain Canadians first and a lifting of the 15 per cent limit.

In all cases sell or make control available. However, by making the shares available and control available the government can still impose restrictions on the competition for making the shares available to the competition so a monopoly cannot be achieved. That can be done through government regulation.

That is what the purpose of government should be. It should pass good regulations to ensure fairness and competitiveness in the marketplace, to create an open and competitive marketplace, to have regulations in place that do not allow monopolies to exist in the business sector, and to allow the private sector to operate openly, freely and competitively but not in a family compact way where one corporation is allowed to buy up everything and there is no competition.

Any government on that side of the House must always protect the interest of all Canadians. It must always have competition as its first priority.

• (1520)

I should like to touch upon the Official Languages Act as well. It says in the bill that CN will remain subject to the Official Languages Act as if it were still a government agency. Will the people who want to buy the company, the eventual directors of the company, not know where to advertise in two languages, where to advertise in one language, or where to have people on the rail lines who are bilingual or unilingual? These people have enough intelligence, if they put that much money at risk, to know what is in the best interest of the corporation and how to increase sales and service.

To impose rules like these make it negative. The owners should be given the option. They will not be people who have never made a dollar before. They will not be people who do not know how to market. Obviously they will be people who know how to make a dollar and what it takes to make a dollar. They will satisfy the needs of the people they serve. Be they francophone or anglophone or a combination, they will be able to project and present their rates, their trips and their packages in the language they feel is necessary to offer the services. A rule like this one is a restriction. It is not something that helps, aids

and facilitates the sale. It restricts, hinders and hurts the potential sale.

Reform Party policy on privatization and corporations is that we support placing ownership and control in corporations in the private or public sector that can perform their functions most cost effectively with the greatest accountability to the owners and the least likelihood of incurring public debt.

If it is a public corporation the taxpayers own it and they entrust the government, the people they elect, to look after it. But it does not. Most of the crown corporations we have end up being arm's length, quasi–judicial or whatever claptrap they talk about where ministers will not take responsibility.

The minister of heritage will not take responsibility for the CRTC. The minister of immigration will not take responsibility for the IRB. I will find something the Minister of Justice will not take responsibility for; I have not thought of it yet. However I am sure there is something on which he can stand and say that it is not his fault because it is an arm's length body, and the taxpayers are the ones who are paying for it.

We have a situation where we believe the sector that can look after taxpayers' dollars the best and the sector that can achieve the highest profit and run the business the best could be the private sector. We believe 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the time it will be the private sector but not necessarily. Therefore we need some rules for crown corporations and some elements that ensure taxpayers' dollars are looked after.

The Reform Party compliments the Minister of Transport for recommending and convincing cabinet to go forward with Bill C–89 and the privatization of CN Rail. However, as I have outlined in my speech today, we would like to see some of the roadblocks removed from the legislation, just as was wanted with the bill of the Minister of Justice on gun control. We gave him innumerable recommendations. He could have been the most popular justice minister in the country if he had split the bill. It was a very simple recommendation. There could have been the bill on gun control, punishment for the criminal misuse of firearms, and a discussion on a national registration system. The Liberals never promised registration in their red book; they promised gun control. The minister delivered on half of his promise and introduced a completely brand new element.

I do not know how the minister drafted Bill C–89. Our transport critic has already mentioned that when the Prime Minister was on this side of the House he said that he was astonished at the Conservative recommendation of deregulation in the rail industry. How quickly they change colours. How quickly red becomes blue. How quickly the little fish in the bowl that are blue and red get together and suddenly become one colour when they are on that side of the House. It does not matter what they say on this side; they change when they go on that side. Unfortunately it will come back to haunt the government.

• (1525)

I wrap up by saying I compliment the government on its attempt to privatize. I hope it listens to the abolishment of the headquarters in Montreal and the 15 per cent rule. It should open it up to real business people and entrepreneurs.

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I should like to make a couple of quick comments and then ask the member some questions.

I have one comment about the Prime Minister's decision to allow CN to be privatized. It is pretty well known in this place, and the Prime Minister has said it publicly many times, that he does not always get his way. If cabinet makes a decision, like the rest of us who believe in the party process he will support the majority of opinion. That is difficult on that side over there where they try to play the smoke and mirrors game of their leader letting them do what they like when we all know he is probably the most draconian person in the place when it comes to not letting his members do what they want.

From a railroader's perspective and being the only railroader in the House, I have a bit of an advantage over my colleague from Calgary. He talked about the fact that there was problem with having Montreal designated as the place to keep CN headquarters.

Reformers continually tell us that they use the age old ability to find out what people think by going out and consulting. I was on the transport committee. My colleague opposite was also on the committee. We listened to many people talk about the effects of Montreal being the headquarters. We asked the investment bankers what they thought. The gentleman opposite being a business person would know that bankers are important people to ask. What did they say? They said that there would be no effect.

Let me tell the House why. What is in Montreal at head office? There is a central calling bureau for railroaders. For people out there who do not know, it is a huge enterprise where every railroader who works for CN is called. It is a major undertaking that cost CN some $30 million to put into place in the last few years. To have that completely changed and transferred to another system would cost millions of dollars. Also, at CN or CP there is a central power bureau where every locomotive in the country is designated for a particular train or a particular piece of track. One would think it was outer space with all the technology involved there. To move the whole process to Edmonton or Calgary would cost the corporation literally millions of dollars.

It would not cost a cent of the sale of CN to maintain the headquarters in Montreal. Quite frankly it is good business practice to do so. Therefore the investment bankers have said to us that there is no problem.

On the 15 per cent retention I want to comment that CP, a privately owned company, does not have a restriction. In fact the most of CP owned by an individual is 11 per cent.

Investment bankers are saying on the one hand that there is no cost effect to having Montreal designated as the headquarters. In fact it would be worse if we tried to leave it open and someone suggested for political reasons because of the sovereignist and separatist problems in Montreal that we should move it. It would hurt the company if someone suggested it for political reasons. Leaving it there for stability reasons is a much more appropriate process.

CP is a private corporation. It has never had anyone purchase more than 11 per cent of the company. Investment bankers do not believe the 15 per cent limitation will have any effect on the sale.

Why would the Reform Party be so adamant that they are impediments to the sale and getting a good price for CN when they are not by reason of sound investment bankers, consultations the government has made and what we have heard as a committee from witnesses? Is that not what the Reform Party says it is all about: if people tell us it makes good sense then do it? We have been told it makes good sense. Why is the Reform Party not supporting that when everyone we have talked to says that it makes good sense and it will not affect the sale price?

• (1530)

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's intervention and I respect what he said, because a lot of what he says has a lot of merit. Possibly even there could be two directors around the same table just having a difference of opinion on how to approach a problem.

I heard another comment. I promised I would never have rabbit ears, but there is a certain individual whose voice is so loud that I just have to say that when they tell me I do not understand, let me tell that hon. member that I do understand. I have been in business for a long time. I know what it takes to buy and sell businesses and how to make a profit and how to achieve a bottom line.

We have a railroader here debating with a businessman. Maybe he is the only railroader. I know I am not the only businessman, but along with the Minister of Finance and the member for Edmonton South I may be one of the few successful businessmen here whose comments are made in sincerity, not partisan politics. We are talking business here. We are talking privatization and how it should be done. I submit these suggestions on the basis that I feel that the government and the Minister of Transport should reconsider these issues.

On the question of Montreal, I did agree that there was some sense to keeping the headquarters in Montreal for the sake of stability. I would agree with that member that stability is important, that to allow a new purchaser to lift up, pull out, and do what they wanted initially would be a mistake. But that stability should have a time factor on it. It should not be in perpetuity. It should be long enough that the people who are running the company, the board of directors, can have five years. It could be three, it could be eight, it could be ten. I do not care about the number, but eliminate that forever clause.

They can try it and see whether leaving Montreal is in the best interests of the corporation. They can choose then where to move the corporation. Anybody who buys a company should have that freedom and flexibility. I believe that will attract and help those people who would be bothered by that and handicapped by that. It would eliminate that, which in the long run would be negative. In the short run it is a positive, but if you really want to attract investors you have to look at the long term, not the short term.

On the issue of control and the 15 per cent, I do not care what CP did. It does not matter to me whether there is 11 per cent or 10 per cent or 9 per cent. It does not matter. What I am suggesting here is that we have a quick and effective sale. The way to do that is to give Canadians the first opportunity. We know that the market is hot. The marketplace is hot right now. There are people willing to part with billions of dollars. There are investment funds, mutual funds, investors and dealers looking for places to place pension moneys. There is lots of money out there.

If there are individuals with an expertise in this area and they feel they could buy control and that 16 per cent would give them that control, let that sophisticated purchaser buy that 16 per cent, or whatever amount would be control.

By the very nature of how CP operates, nobody is going to buy 51 per cent. Nobody is going to buy that much. If they can figure out that by buying this amount they could get control, great. But let us give it first to Canadian corporations and give them an opportunity for a certain period of time and after that open it up. I will submit that at the end, if these suggestions were at least addressed and looked at, the sale would be quicker. The sale would come about. It would not be a bastardized deal like some of the other crown corporations we have tried to sell, where we only end up selling off half of it and not all of it. We end up in trouble and it lags there.

These are the things I am trying to recommend to the government. With respect, I tried to answer this as a businessman to a railroader who is also a businessman, businessman to businessman, to try to achieve a consensus. I still think we

should go after the Minister of Transport and get him to change his mind on a few of these issues.

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a short question if I could.

• (1535)

I respect this member as a business person too, but the effect of what he is suggesting would cause the exact reverse. His colleague put forward an amendment indicating that we should offer it to Canadians first. We agree that in order to effectively get the value of shares for Canadian taxpayers for CN we need to have a broadly based offer in North America. We know there is not enough capital in Canada. To suggest that Canadians are lining up to buy 15 per cent, which is worth at least $200 million, I do not know of many pension funds and individuals who can afford to pay 15 per cent.

The second thing is that if in fact we want to achieve a 100 per cent sale and maximum value for Canadians, we cannot impose restrictions to say let us sell it to Canadians first and then let somebody else buy the rest. It is impossible to achieve that. We agree. And we want to achieve the maximum value.

The board of directors for CP, a private corporation, have decided that Montreal should be its headquarters and 70 per cent of its business is also out west. How does he rationalize that?

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, the only comment I would make to the parliamentary secretary is that he underestimates the wealth in Canada. He underestimates the willingness of Canadians to take a risk and to invest. There is a lot of money in Canadian pocketbooks. The oil and gas industry has seen that in the past two years. Petro–Canada should be the next one on their plate. It should be done quickly. It should not be waited upon. The $1 billion or $2 billion that could get is all there—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, the time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Madam Speaker, since I represent the riding of Lévis, where 500 people work for CN in Charny, and since one of the main assets to be privatized under Bill C–89 is the Pont de Québec, one of whose supporting structures is located in my riding, it is quite easy to understand why I wish to participate in the third reading debate on this bill to privatize CN.

When this bill was tabled in the House, my first reaction was to consult with my constituents, with workers and their families, with the people who live with CN workers in Charny, to find out what they thought. The first comment I heard took me by surprise. These people were not against privatizing CN for the following reason: They thought it could not be any worse than the way CN has been managed in the last 10 years. Although they were not enthusiastic about privatization, they almost preferred this option to the way CN has been managed, especially in recent months.

In this context, the House will remember Bill C–77, which forced CN, VIA Rail and CP employees back to work, and the three unprecedented steps taken to cut off debate on this bill in the House, while Ogilvie workers have been waiting for two years for an anti–scab law that could speed up settlement of their dispute.

The reason why workers faced with a bludgeon law, with several years of mismanagement at CN, with CN management's failure to listen to them, are not against privatization is obviously because they figure that purgatory is better than hell.

• (1540)

I would also like to recall a point which was not emphasized much here. After the unprecedented promotional effort by CN's president, Paul Tellier, during the last election campaign, which took him to the U.S. for the World Congress of Railway Companies held in Louisiana, a colour picture was published in *Le Soleil*. I will never forget this, for Tellier had been advocating selling CN at reduced price and at any cost. He was telling everyone that the company was for sale because—what a great selling feature—of lack of productivity and the fact that the business was not doing well. It was so terrible; CN was unprofitable. He said it carried losses of about $80 million a year, adding that it was unacceptable and that CN should be sold as soon as possible.

That was during the election campaign and, at the time, the Liberals never said a word about privatizing CN. There is no mention of this in their red book.

In this context, a few weeks after Bill C–77 was passed "full steam ahead"—I am using this expression deliberately since we are dealing with railways—Bill C–89 was introduced. And this morning, as we get ready to vote in third reading on Bill C–89, there is a transport bill, whose number I do not know because I think it has not been given one yet.

What does this piece of legislation say in essence? Having attended the briefing session the officials delegated by the minister gave while he was tabling his bill in this House, I can tell you what it says. It says basically one thing: deregulation. In the neo–Liberal mind, this means eliminate as many regulations as possible and make things as easy as possible for the public sector.

However, my review of the history of Canada and Quebec shows that Canadian railways were almost at the origin of the Canadian Confederation. We all recall the fine speeches made by key political figures of the time, by Sir John A. Macdonald in particular, who insisted that the vast country of Canada should

have a public railway system linking every region and that railways were almost sacrosanct to this country.

So what is Bill C–89 doing? It is taking away this sacred value by privatizing the railway system. CN will become a private company like any other. However, the purpose of Bill C–89, and particularly that of the new transport legislation which was before the House this morning, is to make life for private companies even easier than was the case for Crown corporations. Let me relate something quite pertinent.

When CN was a public corporation, under the 1987 and 1902 acts, all agreed that the legislation was limiting, that it was harsh. However, we had a crown corporation under the control of the Minister of Transport, and we had some influence in that we could democratically express our dissatisfaction whenever an election was held.

But now, at the same time as the decision to sell CN is made, the government tables a bill to deregulate. Why? It is to be able to face U.S. competition by allowing CN's new shareholders and managers to compete with Americans.

• (1545)

At first glance, that decision may seem to make sense, but there is a danger. Indeed, the Bloc Quebecois feels, as the Reform Party pointed out, that Bill C–89 is dangerous because, while the government is deregulating in American fashion, in a free trade context, it leaves a former public corporation totally in the hands of the private sector. Moreover, the government gives Americans an opportunity to control that corporation. If the Americans have that possibility, they will look after their own interests, which is perfectly normal. This concerns us.

This is why, even using the approach proposed by the Reform Party, Canadians from all regions, including Quebecers, should have been given priority in terms of buying at least a majority of the shares. But no, the Liberal argues that there is not enough money, not enough assets, not enough people in the Canadian private sector who are interested in buying the corporation and that, consequently, it has to open the door to foreign investors.

We are told that the assets total some $2.5 billion. We are also told by a company hired by CN to evaluate these assets that Canadians represent a potential of only $750 million. So, the government privatizes, but admits from the outset that the former public corporation, which was set up to serve Canada's economic interests from east to west at the time the Canadian confederation was established, will now be under foreign control.

Quite frankly, I find it very hard to get enthusiastic about this change. Although I am a sovereignist, I cannot stand by and let the rest of Canada be dispossessed of one of its main legacies, the railways.

I cannot help but notice that Liberal members across the way are giving up their turns and becoming strangely silent on the subject of Canada's main railway company, which they want to privatize and risk leaving in American or foreign hands.

Although their silence may be due to discomfort, I get the impression that it is more likely caused by their desire to go on holiday as soon as possible and by this government's carelessness and lack of vision.

As I said at the beginning and as I reminded the House, the Bloc Quebecois is not necessarily against the principle of privatizing CN, but not under these conditions, which may lead to possible majority control by foreigners. We were against this. We expressed our position by tabling our amendment.

We also said that CN is evading its responsibilities by not giving adequate guarantees to CN employees, who have faced repeated cuts in recent years. These employees live in a climate of insecurity in which the top manager, Paul Tellier, was paid a huge salary—$345,000 per year, a home for which he received a no–interest loan, and handsome perks—to travel around the world promoting CN, although "depromoting" or demoting—if I may use these words—would be more adequate terms since he explained how terrible this company was.

• (1550)

As far as Bill C–77 is concerned, we listen to and watch the advertising, we read the CN report with its nice colours, and everything seems to be fine. Although we cannot show it, it is red but has nothing to do with the red book. It refers to a shift in policy.

The 1994 CN report, which I saw this morning at the briefing, says that everything is hunky–dory at CN. In a few months, we made $279 million in profits. That is quite something. Yet, CN must be sold as quickly as possible.

Can you imagine the effect of such an announcement on employees, on Canadians, on Quebecers? It took the incredible Mr. Tellier a year to accomplish the feat of making this supposedly money–losing company profitable. But he wants to sell it any way. I am trying to draw a parallel, in order to understand.

When the Liberals came to office, the Conservatives had decided to privatize Pearson airport in Toronto. The Liberals, with the Prime Minister in the lead, said that they would not stand for that. Why? For one thing, Pearson airport was said to be one of the only, if not the only airport in Canada to turn a profit. Not only was the main airport in terms of traffic, but it was also profitable. Why privatize this airport then if it can bring in revenue for the government?

In his report, Mr. Tellier says that CN is now a profitable business. After four or five years of making losses, now that the company is making a profit, it should be sold. Let us look to the future. This company must be sold at all costs as soon as possible; so, let us pass a bludgeon bill.

Under the terms of the mediator's report released on June 14 or 15, CN employees have to accept the conditions set, indirectly, by the government. There is this urgent need to sell CN before the fall regardless of the profits that can be made. I must confess that the Liberal government's logic eludes me at times. It is hard to see.

At the same time, we must look at something else. Small airports like the one in Sainte–Foy, Quebec, which while being called international apparently are not profitable, are also to be privatized. Unless the municipalities and regions take it over—I took this example and, in this particular case, activities would be commercialized without ownership being affected—but there is also Rimouski, Mont–Joli, Baie Comeau, all those are not turning profits.

The Minister of Transport is asking local communities to take over the operation of these airports, otherwise, after a while, they will be closed down. Where is the logic in that? You do not turn a profit, we close you down. CN is turning a profit, yet it is being sold. Why? It does not make any sense to me.

I am no expert in transport, but people ask me why this change in policy, why sell CN now that business is good after several bad years. They cannot understand this change, especially after the Chrétien government prevented the privatization of Pearson airport.

I do not know if I have much time remaining. Two minutes. That is just enough time to tell you about the two pillars of the Pont de Québec.

• (1555)

The other night, between 1.30 and 2 a.m., the hon. member for Louis–Hébert and myself raised the issue of the Pont de Québec to try to influence the government regarding the privatization of CN's assets. After all, this is a majority government and it can make any decision it wants. We mentioned the fact that Canadian railway companies are true symbols. The old Pont de Québec is also a symbol of federalism in our region.

However, the bridge is falling into decay, just like federalism, at least in the Quebec City region. The bridge is falling into ruins. On a more serious note, Madam Speaker, do you think that a private company will be interested in investing $40 million to restore the old bridge? Or will that company say: the federal government built the bridge, so it is its responsibility; if it wants us to repair it in the medium term, then it has to give us the $40 million required.

We tabled in this House an amendment which essentially said: we will support privatization, but will the government guarantee that the $40 million will be paid to CN, so that work on the bridge can start within a year? The government never gave us an answer. No answer. In that context, and given the social conditions of the employees, as well as the lack of respect shown for Canada's railway heritage, the official opposition will oppose this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member indicated a number of employees live in his riding. As well, in London, Ontario there are a number of CN employees.

We have through the CN privatization bill encouraged them to be involved in the ownership. We believe that will be good for the new corporation. Each employee will be able to buy shares in the company which will give them a more meaningful role in the affairs of Canadian National.

We wanted to ensure the employees knew their pensions would be protected in a number of ways. The Pensions Act and a number of safeguards Parliament has passed over the years will ensure each one of those pensioners and the people who work for CN now and in the future will have guaranteed pensions.

The hon. member is right, the privatization of Canadian National was not in our red book. What was in our red book was to build an efficient, affordable and integrated transportation system, be it in air, in marine or in rail.

We believe CN does not have to serve the public policy role. That is for governments to deal with in terms of regional economic development and so on. A railroad is a railroad and should be allowed to function as a railroad so it can provide the services it must to its customers.

We believe a privatized CN will be better for the country, better for its employees and better obviously for its clients. It will be stronger and able to manage a number of things without the encumbrances of government.

Therefore the deregulation package we put forward in the House today will ensure a viable rail industry for CP, CN and the creation of short line industries. Unless the country can move its goods and services in the most efficient and cost effective manner, we will not be able to deliver or export our goods and nobody will have a job. We need an efficient and affordable transportation system. That is what CN privatization is all about and that is what the deregulatory process is all about.

The member spent some time talking about the Quebec bridge. If he had spoken to his colleague he would have known CN has an obligation to maintain that bridge. A letter from Mr.

Tellier to the Quebec transport minister indicates the bridge is in need of repair, but there are studies which indicate it is safe.

It also has indicated that perhaps the province of Quebec ought to pay its fair share for the maintenance of the bridge. While it is very important for rail traffic, 75 per cent of the traffic on the bridge is vehicular, which comes under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

• (1600)

We heard from people in committee who talked about the historical significance of the Quebec bridge. We believe in that as well. They are prepared to raise money. They are prepared to look at ways of restoring its historical significance.

I wonder if the member has heard from the minister of transport in Quebec as to whether Quebec is prepared to pay its fair share for the bridge to ensure it is safe and properly maintained for historical and transportation purposes. Has he heard from the minister or will he undertake to the House that he can use his good offices to talk to the PQ about paying its fair share?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubé: Madam Speaker, it will be a pleasure to answer the question put by the hon. member for London East.

First of all, regarding the Pont de Québec, since that is the main thrust of his question, I think that basically, it all boils down to the federal government's habit, inspired by Minister Martin himself, of offloading its responsibilities onto the provinces.

The bridge was built by the federal government and used by CN. The Government of Quebec already pays an annual fee for use of the paved section, but the bridge was built for Canadian National. Quebec has already done its share under an agreement which, I believe, was for forty years.

Quebec pays this fee under the agreement. However, the federal government now claims that because of inflation, although it certainly is not excessive these days, the Quebec government should help the federal government meet its obligations. This is fantastic.

I think that in Quebec like anywhere else, when you have a tenant–landlord relationship, the tenant—and the Quebec Minister of Transport made this quite clear—may be willing to renegotiate the lease and pay more. This was in fact suggested in a letter. The Quebec Minister of Transport said that once the repairs had been made, he was prepared to pay for annual maintenance, but because the federal government has been cutting its maintenance budget for the past ten years, the bridge is in a sorry state.

In his preamble, the hon. member said that employees in his riding were interested in buying shares. Madam Speaker, I want the hon. member to listen very carefully. In February of last year, at the invitation of the minister, CN employees across Canada submitted a purchase offer. A year later, they got together with the actuaries and, using their pension fund, they made the same offer, and the response they got from Mr. Tellier, president of CN, and from the government, was the back–to–work legislation passed in February. That was their answer. "No way". That was the answer they got.

On June 1, the union made the same offer. It is an interesting proposition because of the excellent working environment this could create. Since the employees would run the company, they would not want it to show a deficit. And they would save their own jobs. All this was dismissed out of hand. No, they prefer grandiose gestures; they prefer to call upon the international community while ignoring two or three dimensions that I wanted to stress in closing.

The railway companies in all of the big European countries, France, Germany, etc, are public. Yes, in all of them. Why? Because they feel that this public infrastructure is a building block which is necessary for regional development. And what are we doing in Canada? In addition to the things I said earlier, the government is cutting transport subsidies for the regions. The hon. member for Ontario and people from the Maritimes know this. And why is the government doing this? It wants to replace them with new road infrastructures. Some gift. While the federal government would contribute to the cost of building new roads, the provincial governments will end up having to maintain them.

We know that during the spring thaw, a single tractor–trailor wears down highways as much as more than 17,000 cars, according to engineers.

• (1605)

We know that all of our highway maintenance problems in Quebec and Ontario, in Toronto where it is obvious, are caused by trucking. And the upkeep of roads is the responsibility of the provinces. The hon. member would like to see me encourage the Liberal government to reply that, at a time when the federal government is trying to offload its deficit to the provinces, the Government of Quebec should help the federal government meet these responsibilities, which it is no longer able to do alone. No, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in this debate. It is important for me, representing Edmonton Southwest, to ensure some views are put on the table that would reflect the views of Canadians with regard to the privatization of CN.

The Reform Party is generally speaking in support of the bill. We think the privatization of Canadian National makes a good

deal of sense. If we think it is such a good idea and if the government thinks it is such a good idea to privatize CN, perhaps the next bill to be discussed will be the establishment of another crown corporation, the Federal Business Development Bank, which will be continued and greatly enlarged to compete in the financial services sector.

The debate today concerns the privatization of Canadian National. Whenever the name of a railroad is invoked sooner or later taxpayers will have their hands in their pockets. That has been the case ever since day one in the railroad industry in Canada and nothing will likely change that.

Canadian National is the result of an amalgamation of a number of smaller money losing operations which about 30 or 40 years ago were combined into Canadian National. The wisdom of the day was a lot of small money losing operations could be combined into one big money losing operation, and that is exactly what happened.

Canadians have been throwing money at Canadian National hand over fist ever since it was put together to compete with Canadians Pacific. Canadian Pacific was established with a great deal of government largesse. It received copious quantities of land in return for building the railroad. It promptly sold off the land and came cap in hand to the people of Canada saying it needed subsidies or it will close this or that.

Thus is the story of big business in Canada. An hon. member from the New Democratic Party many years ago coined the phrase corporate welfare bums, and he is quite right. The larger the business in Canada, the closer the tentacles of that business are to the coffers of the country.

It is Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, people struggling to get buy, who seem always to be dipping into their pockets to subsidize somebody else. At least with this legislation there is half a chance the subsidization to CN will come to an end, which begs the question of who in their right mind would buy anything that has been losing money since time began.

It was an amalgamation of money losing railroads turned into one big money losing railroad and now carries a debt of about $2.5 billion. Why would anyone in their right mind buy this railroad? Privatizing will not make it profitable. If one takes a historically unprofitable entity and privatizes it, that in itself will not make it profitable.

• (1610)

Canadian National will have to be privatized in a manner which will remove the shackles that have prevented it from being profitable. That means whoever will be buying this railroad, whether it is a zillion individuals or a half a dozen large organizations and a lot of other individuals, these people will need the ability to make the decisions necessary to turn this railroad which has historically lost money into a profit making venture.

That was the purpose and rationale behind some of the amendments we offered to the bill. The Reform Party is by and large in support of the bill. We think it is a good idea and we respect the government for taking this initiative. It has not been an easy chore over the last year or so for the Liberals to reverse direction, as they have in many of the bits of legislation which have come to the table. Who would have thought there would ever be in this day a Liberal government bringing in legislation to privatize a crown corporation? That has not been the Liberal way over the past 30 or 40 years.

When the prodigal son comes home we should welcome him and say: "Well done. We are glad you are seeing the light. What can we do to help?" To dump all over the government because there are some things about the bill we do not like would be counterproductive.

As my colleague from Calgary Centre mentioned, when a private corporation is looking at any venture, granted this is a big venture, business principles are business principles. It is really a question of adding a number of zeros once we get started; it is a question of how many zeros are behind the decimal point.

Canadian National in order to be palatable to future investors must reduce some of its debt load. The debt load is $2.5 billion and people have said it should be reduced to something in the order of $1.5 billion.

A truism in the business world is the first hit you take is always the easiest. Therefore if we are to sell this off we are far better off taking the hit by reducing the the debt CN carries the first time around rather than trying to drag it out. We are far better off getting the price and the debt to a level attractive to purchasers at one time than we are trying three or four different levels.

There are a couple of ways this could be achieved. One is to sell assets CN presently has. That is the way it should be done. CN should not come to the public coffers of Canada, individual taxpayers, and say: "Dip into your pockets and pull out $5 or $10. This is your contribution to getting this white elephant off our backs, this albatross of our necks. Your contribution is $100".

We should be saying CN is in the transportation business, the rail business, and had better sell off a whole lot of these assets. This is exactly what we would do in the private sector; get down to the bare bones, the core business. Once that is done and the assets are sold we could look at how much we have to write down on this debt in order to make it saleable.

CN is a national company. I believe I am accurate in saying that something in the region of 70 per cent of the revenues of CN are generated west of the lakehead. It is a national company but the majority of the revenues of Canadian National are generated

in the transport of raw materials such as coal, sulphur, grain and parts of the resource industry.

• (1615)

That is why this is a reasonable question to ask. If the bulk of the revenues are generated in western Canada and the company is to be privatized, does it not necessarily follow that the privatized Canadian National in order to become profitable will accelerate in closing parts of the operation which are losing money which would then inevitably be that part of the operation probably east of the golden triangle or golden horseshoe of central Canada? In order to be a viable entity CN must have access to the country's industrial heartland. It may not have the wherewithal to continue to operate money losing parts of its operation elsewhere in Canada.

This brings into the debate where the head office should be. We are not talking about where the various repair shops should be. Earlier a member mentioned that a high tech operation in Montreal keeps track of the locomotives and the trains. I always wondered how on earth railroads kept track of their rolling stock. That can stay in Montreal. We are talking about the head office. The head office could be wherever the majority owners of the new privatized Canadian National would want it to be.

There is quite a disparity in the number of employees working across the country. Today, 29,541 people work for Canadian National. Of those 29,541 individuals 2,526 live in British Columbia; 3,567 live in Alberta; Saskatchewan has 1,380; Manitoba has 4,498. Alberta has the western regional headquarters. In Manitoba there is a major repair facility. It is a major yard. Ontario has 7,165 employees and Quebec has 7,795 employees.

Perhaps the head office should be somewhere in Ontario. There are the same number of employees. Perhaps the head office should be in Prince Edward Island. There are five employees in Prince Edward Island; Newfoundland, 167; Nova Scotia, 393; New Brunswick, 1,903; and I mentioned that Quebec has 7,795. With the exception of the maritimes where there is not much of a presence of Canadian National, outside of New Brunswick which did have a repair facility, most of the employees of Canadian National are spread out pretty evenly across the country.

The Liberals dictate that the head office should be permanently in Montreal is because of the delicate nature of the relationship between some people who live in Quebec and the rest of Canada. The government just does not want to ruffle any feathers right now. It does not want to add another ingredient that could possibly be disturbing. It does not want to risk the enmity and the ire of the Bloc Quebecois by saying that the head office can be wherever the owners want it to be.

There are issues of principle that go beyond whether or not members of the Bloc Quebecois get upset. Let them get upset. Who cares? We are running a business here. We make business decisions for business decisions. We could have the Holy Mother here and the Bloc would find some reason for getting upset. Let us just assume that the Bloc is going to be upset no matter what we do.

The next thing then, when we are looking at some of the suggestions that we have made, is the restriction of 15 per cent. Earlier someone said it is not a big deal because the maximum number of shares that anyone has of CP is 11 per cent. What difference does that make? Who cares what the share structure of CP is? What we are trying to do is sell CN provided that the debt reduction on CN is not so much that it makes it an unfair competitor to CP, which is, of course, the private entity enterprise. We do not want to repeat the mistake we made with Air Canada, which was to write off all the debt, throw a competitor that has lots of cash into the marketplace to compete with the private sector, which at the time was Canadian Airlines or whatever its precursor was, and start a price war. That almost put both of them out of business.

• (1620)

In any event the situation is that no one owner may own more than 15 per cent of the shares of the privatized CN. People representing the government have said that it is a non–issue because the maximum share ownership of CP is 11 per cent. Surely it would not be a problem to take this restriction out of the legislation. The government has said it is not a problem, so why have it there?

It is important with Canadian National that if a group comes to the table and is prepared to invest enough money to own more than 15 per cent, then why on earth should it not? It may need to have that control in order to make Canadian National a competitive, profitable enterprise.

I have no reason to believe that this is the case but I am thinking aloud that it could be because so much of the Canadian National business is resource based, it is possible that a number of resource based companies will come to the table in a consortium wanting to buy Canadian National. Perhaps that consortium will want to have more than 15 per cent. The restriction of 15 per cent is artificial. It is not necessary and it does nothing to move the legislation ahead.

Another sop to Canadianism in the legislation is the requirement that Canadian National must remain bilingual just as it is as a crown corporation or as a federal government entity. There are institutions in Canada that are rightfully bilingual, such as the House of Commons and law. Many of the institutions across Canada that are bilingual should be bilingual because we are a bilingual country. When those of us who have lived most of our lives in other parts of Canada come to central Canada we see just how bilingual the country is. Being bilingual, trilingual or multilingual is to our benefit.

What we are talking about now is privatizing an operation that has been losing money for many years. There should be as few strings attached as humanly possible. If the corporation is to become a private corporation, then let it become a private corporation without the strings attached. If it is in the interests of the corporation to be bilingual or multilingual, we can be sure it will remain so, as it should. It may well become multilingual because there are parts of this country where the second language is not English or French, but may well be Mandarin.

Another point I raise is if we are going to privatize CN, let us honestly privatize it without all the strings attached in order to make it more palatable to the people. I do not want ascribe motive here, but it would seem to me that one aspect of the bill is nothing more or less than a sop to the Bloc Quebecois so that it will not get upset about it. If we are going to privatize it, let us do it.

• (1625)

Another point has to do with the marine strategy, the railroads in Canada and the fact that everything in Canada is interconnected. There is not much point developing a port in Halifax if there is no facility to move products from that port to the rest of the country. To do that we will require rail lines.

As this is privatized it is wholly appropriate there be certain restrictions on the new ownership to ensure that any transition is done carefully and in the public interest.

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I enjoyed my colleague's comments. I could agree with a fair number of his concerns. I think all Canadians have concerns.

This is a massive move. He says that he could not imagine Liberals taking this move but the ideologies are pretty fuzzy these days. I would agree that 20 years ago to say that Liberals were going to privatize CN would certainly be out of the question. Privatization has been brought upon us because we have not been able to make this thing work. We are in a new league now. We are involved in world competition and we have to forget about those old standbys we thought we could live with.

The railroad has been doing much better recently than the past 50 or 75 years would indicate, which might make it somewhat attractive to a new buyer. The member categorized three things which I can see fitting together.

One was having the location of the head office dictated and I agree with that. If I am going to own something I should be left with that decision. That would make sense. As someone once said, if you are going to do it, do it right. If we were privatizing something else we would tell the owners that they owned it and were free to put the head office where they wanted to.

The fact we have said CN should be bilingual fits in there too. It was done for the same reason and Canadians realize that. It is only being honest with Canadians. I could add the 15 per cent ownership limit to the list. This is such a massive move and nobody really knows where it is going to shake out. We avoided destabilizing the company as much as possible. This affects all Canadians, so we had to keep those things in mind.

This case is bigger than when TCA was privatized to become Air Canada if we are just talking dollars and cents. With that in mind and all of the uncertainties, what is the price going to be of a share? I do not know but we have to depend on those we trust to tell us. That would be the rationale for not moving any further with it by throwing it completely open and saying: "Have the headquarters where you like. Do not be too concerned about whether it should remain bilingual as it is now. Do not have any limit on the 15 per cent share but let people buy whatever portion they would like".

I suppose it is not really privatization in a sense if we are going to have those restrictions. On the other hand this has been a Canadian owned company which is moving into the private sector. The government was trying to avoid all kinds of pitfalls by putting those riders on for now. There may be pitfalls even with those riders.

Mr. McClelland: Madam Speaker, the central point I was trying to make was that CN has had a record of losing money ever since its incorporation. The fact that it is losing money at a slower rate today is a blessing but it is like dying by inches, you are still going to die sooner or later.

If this deal is going to be palatable in a private market, if it is going to be saleable and if it can be privatized, it will only be privatized because those who will invest in it see the opportunity of making a dollar. That is the way our system works. That is the way it should work.

• (1630)

Concerning the restriction of 15 per cent, if a potential purchaser had the resources to take 20 per cent of the shares, it would ensure there would be a very strong hand at the helm. The other 80 per cent of CN would be widely dispersed in pension funds, in RRSPs, with people all over the country.

However, we had better make damn sure when we are doing something like this that this business is not being run by a committee. It had better be run by somebody who knows exactly what he or she is doing, exactly how he or she is going to do it and has one overriding ambition, to make a profit. There is no other reason for CN to be purchased by any potential investor anywhere.

That person must purchase it with the intent of making a profit. It has nothing to do with the Canadian identity. It has nothing to do with being a good Canadian. It has nothing to do with how much money has already been lost. It is strictly whether there will be a return on the investment when those shares are purchased.

That is the only consideration that anyone who buys a share in this should have. If Bobby Gimby decides he is going to be the head of Canadian National and this becomes part of the national dream then we are sunk. We will end up with another B.C. Resources Investment Corporation where thousands of widows and orphans are going to buy shares in this creature. They are going to see the share value plummet and be resentful beyond words.

It is our responsibility to ensure that whoever buys this baby has the opportunity to turn it into a profitable venture. Otherwise we are going to wear that can around our necks and we will deserve it.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I get rather disillusioned when I hear my Reform colleagues, particularly one who is considered more insightful than most of his brothers and sisters in his party, make comments such as the following: "Bilingualism was given as a sop to the Bloc".

Does my hon. colleague from the Reform Party who has just spoken understand that the Bloc members do not believe in bilingualism? They want unilingualism, they want French. I cannot understand the lack of sensitivity and insight displayed by such a comment. It shows the Reform Party in spite of its attempts, does not understand the country.

A second comment: "We have in this country, two official languages". To suggest that a business can ignore official languages, in spite of the fact that it is une des pierres angulaires de de pays, shows incredible lack of sensitivity.

They can ignore to run trains where it does not pay. They can ignore to do anything except run them where there is the greatest profit.

Is my hon. colleagues suggesting to heck with the city of Montreal? To heck with responding in English or French, the official languages of this country. To heck with everything else that is going to cost money because we, the business community, are going to skim off the richest of the cream. Is that what is being suggested?

Mr. McClelland: Madam Speaker, my colleague from Winnipeg has a good point and he is absolutely right. I cannot believe that I said that language was a sop to the Bloc. Obviously it is not a sop to the Bloc and my hon. colleague opposite is quite right.

It is a sop to Quebec perhaps in general terms but it is certainly not a sop to the Bloc. Whatever it might be to the Bloc, for sure it is not that.

The other point is about bilingualism and this needs to be absolutely clear. I did not say that CN should not be bilingual. I did not infer that it should not be bilingual. I said that it may be multilingual.

• (1635)

What I said was as CN is going to be privatized, take the shackles off and let the management of the company make the decision for themselves. That is a decision that rightfully belongs to the new owners of CN. It is a not a decision which should be made by the legislature of the country.

If we are going to sell it, then sell it with no strings attached. The first hit we take will be the worst hit, so let us take the it, get it off the books and get on with life. Good for the Liberals for bringing the legislation to the table in the first place.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Madam Speaker, what is the point of this debate? Why are we here? I have been sitting here day after day. Are we wasting our time?

I have listened to the debate and the speeches which have been made on both sides of the House. I know a heat wave is hitting the country. I wonder if it has been caused by the intense debate we have heard over the last week or so. I am not sure. Is the only thing we are accomplishing the generation of a lot of hot air?

Last week I took a break and went down the hall to the other place which is known as the Senate. I sat in there for a while and listened to the debate. I heard some very good speeches on euthanasia and other topics. I thought to myself, nobody is listening to these speeches. Nobody in the country is looking at what is happening here. These people have gone to a lot of work and nobody is listening. Suggestions are being made and nobody is listening.

Then I came back to this place. I thought to myself, it is no different here. Nobody is listening. Nobody is paying attention.

The Reform Party has made suggestions. It has worked with the government to fine tune the legislation to ensure it is acceptable to all Canadians. We find that, by and large, our efforts are useless. The speeches we make are falling on deaf ears. Nobody is listening. What is the point of the debate?

During the election campaign my strongest opponent was the NDP candidate who is now running for the leadership of that party. He made a big point of the Senate being unelected and unaccountable. He said that because it is appointed, the people in the other place are not very effective, the balance which it should provide between the regions is not there.

However, my hon. opponent in the election forgot to mention that this place could really use some fixing. This place is not democratic. This place is not doing what it should be doing. The debate here is often very meaningless. The suggestions which are made in good faith are completely disregarded. My feelings about the other place are also the feelings I have toward this place.

People are frustrated because Parliament is not doing its job. I want to use this bill to illustrate what I mean.

I have been here for almost two years now and that time has shown me that this place is guilty of many of the same problems of which we accuse the Senate. What is changing because of the debate we are having here? This debate is coming to a close. In fact, this session of Parliament will soon be over. We have been debating day after day. I wonder if it is accomplishing anything and whether the work we put into our speeches is really effective.

For those who are watching on the parliamentary channel and may not be aware of how legislation is created, very simply the legislation is introduced in the House, generally by the government, but there are private members' bills. It is introduced and receives first reading. It goes through second reading, goes to committee, is reported back to the House and then goes through third reading. That does not mean it becomes law. Then it goes to the Senate and it goes through the same process. Then if the legislation has passed, it becomes law.

• (1640)

As we go through all of these processes, as we work in committees, there should be amendments proposed. There should be open and free discussion. That has frustrated me. A lot of what we do is hidden. It is behind the scenes. It is in the committees. A lot of the work, the research, that is done and the proposals that are made, Canadians are not aware of.

In order for democracy to work that process should be open. Every member of Parliament should have input. By and large that is not happening. The agenda is driven by only a few elected people in the House of Commons. That is unfortunate.

When the debate on Bill C–89 first began, I suggested four things. I was one of the first speakers on the bill. If we are going to produce good laws these suggestions should have been dealt with but by and large they have not. I have heard several reasons why they have not.

If we look at the reasons we begin to realize that they do not hold water. They are not acceptable. First I said that prohibiting the government from arbitrarily cancelling all or part of CN's debts prior to privatization should not take place. I also mentioned that removing the requirement to leave CN's headquarters in Montreal is something that the government should take a serious second look at. We proposed amendments for that. We thought perhaps a lot of politics was involved. What I have seen today probably underscores that fact. I do not think it is a wise business decision.

Another suggestion I made was to remove the requirement that CN comply with the government's policy on official bilingualism. It was pure politics. My hon. colleague has pointed that out very well. I also said remove the 15 per cent ownership restriction.

I heard the members arguing that we do not want to destabilize the company. Any owners who would take over would not want to do that. The arguments which have been presented on the other side are superficial. They do not hold water.

That is why we have to do more in this place than simply generate a lot of hot air. We have to begin to listen to each other and do the fine tuning of legislation that would make it good legislation.

We agree with the privatization of CN. It is a good thing. The government has an opportunity to make it a great thing. I want to suggest that the government use this, its first major attempt at privatization, as a testing ground for the privatization of other crown corporations.

Reformers do not want a lot of unnecessary regulations that restrict companies in keeping down their costs. We do not want that. Yet the government is tying their hands somewhat.

When Reformers ask why tie the hands of the new owners of CN by stipulating that the headquarters remain in Montreal, the Liberals answered and that they wanted to provide a level of certainty that potential costs from relocation of the headquarters will not ensue. Think about the absurdity of that answer. A company would not relocate its headquarters if it would result in some financial disadvantage.

On the other hand, what if there was an advantage financially to moving the headquarters to Winnipeg or some other western place or to the east? What if there was an advantage in doing that because it might be more central to the bulk of the business? Why should they not be allowed to do that? Would they make decisions that were not wise for the company? They would not. That is why the answer that I have heard to to this question is absurd. Seventy per cent of CN's business is done in western Canada. Why put in the stipulation that the CN headquarters must stay in Montreal?

The Bloc says that we are Quebec bashing. We are not Quebec bashing. Where is the consistency in the government's reasoning? When the ancestor to Air Canada moved its headquarters from Winnipeg to the east, westerners argued that this was a Winnipeg based company. The government in its big bubble here in Ottawa said "Oh, no, most of the airline's business is in the east, so we should move the headquarters to Montreal". When the shoe is on the other foot and CN's business is mostly in the west, it has a completely different argument. There is no consistency in what the government is saying. By using the government's own reasoning, it should allow the company, if it wishes, to move the headquarters out of Montreal.

• (1645)

When history and tradition fail the west the Liberals say it does not matter. However, when history and tradition favour the east they write it into the law. Something is wrong. Why run a company 2,000 miles away from its main operation?

In 1987 Madsen Pirie, who was president of the Adam Smith Institution in London and a world renowned expert on privatization, spoke at a Canadian symposium on privatization organized by the Fraser Institute. He had this to say about the fundamentals of privatizing a crown corporation:

> When government engages in an activity such as privatization, it is speaking to several audiences. Among the audiences the government speaks to are the managers of the Crown corporations, the workers who are employed in them, the members of the general public who are customers of the Crown corporations, the general public who are taxpayers and who pay the subsidies to support the losses of those corporations, potential investors who might buy shares in those corporations, the financial and business community which takes an interest in their performance, and the media commentators who observe this process and comment on the results and declare it to be a success or a failure. Every act of privatization speaks to all of these audiences and every act should be tailor–made to maximize the support of each of these different groups.

When we review this bill we should test against Dr. Pirie's list of vested interests or audiences, or stakeholders as the government likes to call them. Bill C–89 must address each of the groups affected by the privatization: the managers, the workers, the customers, the taxpayers, and the investors. If Bill C–89 does not specifically address each of the needs and interests of these groups, then amendments will be necessary. That is what we proposed.

This is what frustrates me as we come to the end of this debate. I do not think one thing we have said here today is going to change the government's mind. We are generating a lot of hot air in the midst of a Canadian heat wave and it is doing us no good.

Dr. Pirie also outlined three key principles of privatization. His first principle was never cancel a benefit. If people are deriving a benefit from the public activity of a crown corporation, never cancel it, no matter how unjust it is. In his second principle he said to make friends out of your enemies: "Find out who the people are who might lose on the privatization process and structure the policy to make sure they gain instead". The third principle he gave was disarm the opposition: "Identify all possible objections to privatization and tailor the policies so that every single one of those objections are dealt with in advance".

Has the government done this? I brought this up months ago, and nothing has been done. That is why I still maintain that a lot of the debate here is not really effective. Has the government done this? I doubt it. The government should ensure that it has considered each of Dr. Pirie's three principles in planning for this privatization.

Has the government explored the idea that came from one of my constituents and which I presented to this government that we could have two or more government objectives rolled into one? For example, the government is giving landowners in the west a one–time payout for the elimination of the WGTA subsidy for the railways, which is commonly known as the Crow rate. Would it be possible, I asked, to give western farmers the choice to have their Crow rate buyout in the form of shares rather than cash? It could be made fairly attractive and then farmers would have a direct financial interest in the economic performance of CN.

I heard one of the Liberal members opposite several hours ago argue that we could never raise the capital in Canada to even have someone grab hold of the major amount of shares in CN. That is ridiculous. Does the member not realize that the crown payout of approximately $1.6 billion is equal to the price the government is asking for CN? What does he mean the capital is not available? Right there is the capital. The main users of the railway are the grain producers in this country, and they could use it. It would give them the benefit. It would meet some of the negative aspects that often come with privatization.

• (1650)

That is why I am saying the government should have been listening. As this idea is being picked up they could have floated the idea. Maybe this is a bad idea, but they should have looked at it. This idea comes from some of the constituents in my area, and it should be dealt with.

Look at the recommendations of previous studies. The government spends million and millions of dollars on royal commissions and studies. One of the recommendations made was that rolling stock could be privatized but the government could continue to maintain the rail beds, maybe as a private corporation eventually. They could maintain the rail beds just as they do the highways in the country. It would allow small entrepreneurs that do not have the capital resources to buy a huge railroad to at least use the efficiency of the rail beds in transporting their products.

The Economic Council of Canada published a report called "Minding the Public's Business". In chapter five, entitled "Government Enterprise and Business", the Economic Council made the following recommendation: "Entry into rail carriage could be promoted in different ways. The provisions of the proposed legislation could be expanded to make running rights more easily available and to open entry into rail carriage to anyone who can meet the basic requirements related to safety and liability coverage. Instead of regulating the activities of CN and CP in their capacity as providers of the rail bed, the management of all track could be assigned to a new publicly

owned track authority. This would require the nationalization of CP's roadbed and the separation of CN's track from the other components of its operation. Alternatively, a public track authority could be created based exclusively on the infrastructure of CN."

We have put this to the government. It seems to ignore it. I do not know why. Why does the government spend all these millions on commission and studies? They come forth with some sensible recommendations and the government promptly dismisses them. This is an idea whose time has finally come and the government should give serious consideration to establishing a public track authority that would operate similarly to our highway system. This would eliminate the tax disadvantage placed on rail companies.

Rail companies are at a tax disadvantage. They pay fuel taxes and they also have to maintain their rail beds. That is not fair. On the other hand, trucks pay fuel taxes, but the highways, their road bed, are maintained at public expense.

A public track authority could charge user fees to rail companies based on the use they make of the tracks. As a result, they would be self–financing. At some point in the future the public track authority could even be privatized.

The Chamber of Commerce supports a fully user pay rail infrastructure and had this to say in their 1994 submission to the special joint committee reviewing Canada's foreign policy: "Canadian businesses are increasingly pointing to an unlevel playing field between the Canadian and U.S. commercial environments. One tangible example among many can be found in the Canadian transportation industry. Rail, for example, provides the most economic mode of transportation for a large part of Canada's freight and for many shippers is the only cost effective mode. It is fundamental to Canada's trade, moving 40 per cent of Canada's exports, and provides a fully user pay infrastructure not liable to ongoing public funding."

Finally, I want to return to a point I have made repeatedly in speeches before the House for the last couple of years. I would like to comment on the importance of the port of Churchill to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. When I said that the government should be looking at more than one initiative, this is another thing it should have looked at.

The privatization of CN should be seen as an opportunity to privatize, expand markets, modernize, increase exports and imports through the port of Churchill. This will take more than just the privatization of CN. It would take the cooperation and likely the privatization of both VIA Rail and Ports Canada at Churchill. It will take the cooperation of the federal government, the government of the province of Manitoba, the cooperation and support of every community and producer whose future will be improved by taking advantage of the most cost effective shipping route for bulk commodities to our customers in Europe, Africa, and South America.

• (1655)

I respectfully ask the government not to look at the Churchill line and the port of Churchill as a liability but as an opportunity requiring creative thinking and a cooperative and creative privatization strategy. I have worked on this quite a bit, and that is why I say one government department must work together with the other one.

One of the main obstacles to making the Hudson Bay route and the port of Churchill viable is the Canadian Wheat Board. Unless the Canadian Wheat Board becomes more open and accountable to grain producers, prairie producers will continue to be routed through costly eastern ports.

Yoy cannot just look at the railroad in isolation. You have to see how it all connects. Why is it that we have this problem? Because the railroads and eastern interests benefit in having the grain go through the traditional route rather than through the port of Churchill.

Farmers are asking important questions that will not be answered until the process of grain sales in routing is opened up.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, the time has totally expired. Questions and comments.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I really do not want to address the issue of the bill that is currently before us. However, I did want to ask the member about some comments he made.

He criticized the quality of the debate and suggested that somehow government members were responsible for that quality of debate. Throughout this day and throughout a good part of last week the majority of speakers on any bill, by a margin of four to one, sometimes nine to one, ten to one, have been Reform Party members. If 90 per cent of the speakers on the bill are Reform Party members and only 10 per cent are government members, would this not suggest that it is the Reform Party members who are responsible for the inadequacy of the quality of debate?

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, I wish the hon. member had been listening carefully to what I said. The point of what I am saying is that those members are not listening carefully to what we are saying.

We have made suggestions to the government. We were not complaining about the quality of debate. We are coming up with speeches, coming up with amendments, working on committees. We are doing all of these things that a good parliamentarian should be doing, but it is useless.

It is no different from what is happening in the Senate. These people make these wonderful speeches and it is to no avail. We come to this House and it is still to no avail because we do not

have democracy built into the system. We debated gun control, and when it came down to it we were not even allowed to vote freely on the issue. Liberal members were told how to vote.

We made suggestions as to how to improve some of the legislation in this House. My point was very clearly made that the speeches we made and the work we did was by and large ignored by the government.

I would like to conclude some of the other remarks I made in regard to the Churchill route because they may be misconstrued if I do not. Suspicion grows that the grain companies, the government bureaucrats, the railroads, and the eastern interests drive the agenda while the western farmer continues to be ripped off, not realizing the full benefits of his labour and his enterprise.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Point of order.

Ms. Catterall: Madam Speaker, I will be delighted to ask the member a question and to drop the point of order. The point was to have been in fact that the member was entering into debate. If I can continue with questions and comments, which is the time—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We have questions and comments. Point of order?

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I was rising on questions and comments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I think the member is well aware that when the opposition parties are speaking we normally allow government to question the party.

• (1700)

Ms. Catterall: Madam Speaker, contrary to the statement just made by the member, I was listening very carefully. It was the quality of debate he was criticizing. If he reviews his blues in *Hansard* he will find out those were the words he used.

I can only say again that 90 per cent of the debate has come from the Reform Party compared with government members and therefore I know who to blame for the quality of debate.

On the point of listening, the member is well aware, and I am surprised he has not said this in the House, there has been a great deal of listening. There were over 40 amendments to the gun control bill in committee. There were dozens more amendments debated—

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Did the member not rise on a point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): She retracted and went back to questions and comments.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Would I not have a chance to finish the remarks I was making? Is she allowed to interrupt me?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am afraid the hon. member was back on debate.

Ms. Catterall: Madam Speaker, would the member not concede there were over 40 amendments in committee, that there were dozens of amendments debated in the House last night on the bill? We voted on over 30 motions last night. Clearly amendments have been put forward with debate.

If the member were to be totally honest with the public he would concede even some points brought forward by members of the Reform Party in committee on the gun control legislation, which he referred to, were incorporated in the gun control legislation and that we have been listening. Listening is not the same as agreeing with everything the Reform Party says; otherwise we would both be on the same side of the House.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, I was involved with C–68, the gun control measure, and if the she wants to debate that, I would be very willing to. I think that is not what is—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I ask the hon. member not to refer to other members in the House as "she". The hon. member is the deputy government whip.

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): In relation to Bill C–68, the changes the government made that responded to Reform suggestions were simply changes where a word may have been clarified. Virtually no other changes were made by the government. They were so minuscule as to be almost useless, very small wording changes.

With regard to Bill C–89 when we asked about allowing a company to move the headquarters from Montreal, the government did virtually nothing to act on that. When we questioned the government's official bilingualism policy being applied to a private company, it remained virtually unanswered, as did the question of the 15 per cent ownership restriction. All of these things we raised were not properly addressed. The answers we were given were superficial. They were not effective answers.

We are talking about Bill C–89, not Bill C–68, a whole different matter. I would gladly address that if we were debating it. What about the cancelling of CN's debts prior to privatization? In all fairness to the government, it addressed that question somewhat. By and large a lot of the suggestions we made fell on deaf ears. That is the problem with this place; that is the problem with much of the debate that takes place here.

We can speak 90 per cent of the time but it makes no difference. I wonder if Canadians realize we are acting as the

official opposition, that we are examining this legislation in minute detail. This is our job but by and large the government is not responding to the positive suggestions we have.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am happy to talk on third reading of the CN privatization bill.

• (1705)

Railway politics in Canada take a prominent place in our history. I know from growing up in this country and working on the railways part time I have a great sense of history. The member for Kenora—Rainy River is another part time railroader. The railways are very important historically to the country.

I am reminded of the railway on Vancouver Island, E&N Railway, very important in the development of the west coast. There is an ongoing contractual commitment in this country to keep that railway going despite some pressures the other way. Those contractual commitments date back to prior to the turn of the century.

In terms of our contemporary history, we are seeing great changes, the stability of our railways, or the instability in the beginning. It is a whole new ball game now. Why is it a whole new ball game now? Government operations and crown corporations can no longer function in the way they functioned for the last several decades.

This is unavoidable because of our fiscal situation and I am reminded of this every day. Two–thirds of government revenues are derived from personal federal income taxes. One–third of federal revenues are to service our national debt. It does not take much of a mathematician to figure out 50 per cent of people's personal federal income tax is going to service our debt.

This situation despite the last budget is getting worse because part of our revenue dedicated to servicing debt is increasing over the next couple of years. We are treading water and sinking slowly. This message is slowly being accumulated by the population at large. It is being expressed in a lot of different programs of government and it is being expressed in how we unavoidably must deal with our crown corporations.

The transport committee, the task force appointed by the minister in September of 1994 which put its finding forth in January of 1995, identified a number of things which I think were largely known to most.

CN and CP are both facing very strong competition from other industries and from the U.S., particularly on the north–south routes, north–south markets. The railways are losing market share to trucking. Deregulation of the U.S. railways is obviously impacting a great deal on the Canadian railways. The eastern routes are losing money and the western routes are declining in profitability.

This same task force also identified that all major North American railways were privately owned with the exception of CN. One wonders why Canada would have such a different contemporary situation. This bill is quite predictable. The privatization was to occur. All the market pressures were there and governments around the world are privatizing crown corporations.

The task force also identified that as a crown corporation CN had been subject to many politically motivated moves and that much of this results from the president and the board basically being patronage appointments. There is a message in all of this for other crown corporations of government.

• (1710)

The standard provisions of any privatization bill are essentially the same no matter what crown corporation is being privatized. What is different are the bells and whistles which deal with investor attractiveness, some of the social ramifications, how it deals with existing employees, how it deals with the public interest and those kinds of things. Essentially that is what most of the debate in the House and in committee has been about. The amendments proposed by the Bloc and by the Reform Party have largely been about the bells and whistles of the bill.

In terms of investor attractiveness, the bells and whistles are a very strong signal of what kind of regulatory environment the new owner is to face when they try to run the railroad. The signals we are sending out with this bill are all wrong. Most of the amendments deal with the signals we are sending to potential purchasers of the railway.

One amendment is the requirement that CN's headquarters remains in Montreal. We have heard several times in the debate that this requirement is absurd because the marketplace can make that decision better than anyone else.

That it exists in Montreal today may have some social and employment ramifications which is why a sunset clause is not a bad idea. We have seen in the history of Canada that different jurisdictions over time have different natural advantages. There are population shifts and differences in trading patterns and all kinds of rationale for which private investors would want to retain the option to move their office to a different location.

Before I get into further amendments I will talk about the way the bill was handled in the House. The bill went to committee after first reading, which was a new process. Normally a bill goes through first reading when the legislation is tabled and through second reading debate and then the bill goes to committee.

Conceptually there are some very nice things about sending legislation to committee after first reading when in a non–partisan way people can get all their points in before the legislation becomes set in any way and then a better bill can come before the House. The concern with respect to this bill was that if the environment was not there after first reading when it went to committee, to take all the best of everything people had to say about the bill to make it the best legislation possible we have really missed the opportunity of second reading debate. We want to have a very close look at the process before we commit

ourselves to a continuation of it whereby we essentially eliminate debate at second reading.

• (1715)

The next point I would like to speak to is about restricting the percentage of shares that any one individual, corporation or association may own. This has a very negative impact on bringing in the kind of investor that would like to purchase a major portion of the new company and bring in a management style that would revitalize the whole company.

The chair of the transport committee, the member for Kenora—Rainy River, said that this had been looked at. The 15 per cent restriction was quite plausible because CP had never had more than 11 per cent single ownership. Surely our view of the world extends beyond the gaze of Canadian Pacific. We have to look at this on a global scale. We have to look at it from a totally different perspective. Government once again is talking about privatization yet government still wants to retain control. There is an irony about this and it is inappropriate.

One investor said that the 15 per cent restriction circumscribes the deal. It certainly does. It dampens investor confidence. It freezes out many investors who would otherwise look at this. It sends out all the wrong signals.

With respect to CN's debt, this is repetitive but CN currently owes about $2.5 billion. It has been established by experts that CN will never sell this debt level. It must be reduced to a level which would allow access to a BBB credit rating. The general concurrence is that amount would be about $1.5 billion.

CN currently has $300 million to $400 million on hand through recent company sales such as CN Exploration, and excess capital reserves. The market value of CN's non–rail estate assets are $400 million to $600 million. In a perfect world this alone would be sufficient to attain a BBB credit rating.

Clause 12 of the proposed legislation gives the minister the power to reduce CN's debt to any amount he chooses. This is a major problem. This is something the other place should look at very closely if we cannot change anyone's mind in this place because there are two major risks in this.

The minister may choose to reduce the CN debt well below the amount at which the taxpayers can receive a return on the sale. This would raise the cost of shares making it appear more attractive but producing a lower yield for taxpayers. As well, excessive reduction in the debt of CN would put CP at a disadvantage which is all too familiar. This was done during the privatization of Air Canada. The intent of the Reform amendment was to limit the minister's power in reducing the debt of CN.

• (1720)

Clause 15 provides for a permanent requirement that CN retain the official languages policy and operates under both official languages. Once again, this is another signal of a regulatory atmosphere that is inappropriate when one is trying to attract investors.

The government does not have official languages control over the private sector. Privatization of CN removes the mandatory compliance of the Official Languages Act. The Reform amendment was to include a five year sunset clause on the mandatory retention of operating under both official languages. Unfortunately this was voted down.

Then we have the Canada clause. The bill does not provide any restrictions of foreign ownership, nor should it. However, the Reform amendment would have allowed a 90 day sale period open to Canadian individuals and corporations before opening it up to foreign markets. This provision would have allowed all Canadians first crack at investing in a Canadian institution. What could be more appropriate? This would have allowed a win–win situation but once again it was voted down.

The marine strategy report proposes that all national ports must become self–sustaining and that all loans must be obtained from the private sector without government backing. Reform agrees with that proposal.

The Sarnia tunnel is a viable access from Atlantic Canada to the American midwest. The Halifax Port Corporation believes that through upgrading the port facilities in Halifax it will secure the handling of the new high capacity deep draft freighters and thus the economic future of marine operations in Atlantic Canada. In order to secure the financing, it needs to ensure that CN connections will be there to connect the ports to the rest of Canada.

The Reform amendment would have included a clause ensuring rail service to the port of Halifax for a period of 10 years, thereby ensuring the development of the port facilities allowing them to compete with U.S. ports on the eastern seaboard and ensuring investor confidence once again. This amendment was not allowed. We call that the Atlantic clause.

The Reform Party supports the bill although the provisions laid out in it are too restrictive and involve too much government interference in what should be a much more complete move to the private sector.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Gun control.

Questions and comments. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on the motion for third reading of Bill C–89. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to a request made by the deputy government whip, the division on the motion is deferred until tonight at 11.15 p.m.

• (1725)

Mr. Hermanson: Madam Speaker, I was watching the House proceedings on television. I heard you ask: "Is there further debate" and saying, "no further debate" you grabbed your papers before a member had a chance to stand. I think that is unfair.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am very sorry but no one in the House stood up when I asked for questions and comments. That was prior to calling for debate.

Mr. Hermanson: Madam Speaker, if no one stood for questions or comments, then you call for debate and you have to recognize someone when they are prepared to stand for debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I repeat, no one stood at all.

Ms. Catterall: Madam Speaker, clearly a debate about a ruling after it has been made is entirely out of order and a little contemptuous of the role of the Speaker.

In addition, however, you very clearly said: "Is the House ready for the question?" Nobody said no. You then asked as you normally do for those in favour and those against.

Mr. Gagliano: Madam Speaker, it is almost 5.30 p.m. If the members are here we could go into private members' hour right away.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Shall I call it 5.30 p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES ACT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.) moved that Bill C–275, an act respecting the protection and rehabilitation of endangered and threatened species, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the debate taking place this afternoon on the protection and rehabilitation of endangered and threatened species. I would like to thank the member for Scarborough—Rouge River and the member for Fraser Valley West for their support in their respective committees when it was decided that this bill should become a votable item.

In essence the reason for putting forward this private members' bill is very simple. It emanates from one important commitment made by Canada to the UN conference on sustainable development and the environment in Rio in 1992.

When the convention on biodiversity was arrived at with the consensus of some 150 nations, Canada was among the first, if not the first nation to sign it, if I remember correctly. It was among the first to ratify it. In other words, there was definitely a very quick response on the part of Canada. There was an understanding of the importance of the issue and the political sentiments of the nation. The aspirations of Canadians were expressed rapidly through these steps.

The signing or ratification of the convention has now reached a fairly large number and has been put into motion by virtue of the fact that a sufficient number of nations in the world have ratified it to make it workable.

What does a bill on the rehabilitation of endangered and threatened species mean? With this piece of legislation, which I hope will be followed by a measure to be introduced soon by the Minister of the Environment, we want to highlight the importance of the ecosystem to which we belong and the importance of protecting the richness that makes Canada so unique in the family of nations.

If one compares the richness in biodiversity and the number of species both in flora and fauna that exist today with what existed a hundred years ago, one has to admit with regret that there have been losses with respect to some species that may never be recovered. In other words, we have lost ground as humans have settled in the country and have adopted various agricultural and industrial practices at the expense of nature. If one looks down the road 100 years from now at the richness of fauna and flora our grandchildren may be able to enjoy, unless we do something

about it fairly soon we would suffer perhaps the equivalent or even greater losses.

Therefore it is necessary to put on the political agenda and on the agenda of Parliament, as well as those of the provincial and territorial legislatures, something that coagulates or gels our thinking on the subject matter. The bill before us attempts to do exactly that. It is inspired by article VII of the convention, the one I referred to earlier, which requires countries to:

> —develop and maintain the necessary legislation and/or other regulatory provisions for the protection of threatened species and populations.

That is how it was put in the Rio convention which we have signed and ratified. It is a very simple, straightforward concept. I am sure that its application and implementation can be achieved if there is adequate political will.

I am glad to report that four Canadian provinces have endangered species legislation today. They are the provinces of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. Close co–operation with provincial and native governments is necessary to protect endangered species. Preventing the extinction of species becomes a method of national and even international concern.

I am not claiming this private member's bill can achieve all that, but it is at least an attempt to subject the matter to parliamentary scrutiny, to encourage colleagues on all sides of the House to think about the importance of the matter, and to ensure that respective governments take the necessary steps.

There are 120 species that are either threatened or endangered in Canada. Of those 120, 43 are under federal responsibility: 18 species of migratory birds and 25 fish and marine mammals. The habitats of these threatened or endangered species are quickly disappearing. According to Statistics Canada calculations the wetlands have been reduced by 70 per cent to 80 per cent so far and the old growth forests by as much as 85 per cent to 90 per cent. These are considerable figures which I commend to the attention of the House.

• (1735)

The following commitment appeared in the red book of the Liberal Party in 1993:

> Managing economic development in human growth without destroying the life systems on our planet and a vision of a society that protects the long term health and diversity of all species on the planet are matters of concern.

In a study conducted in 1991 Statistics Canada concluded that 86 per cent of Canadians supported the protection of the abundance of species we have today. Bill C–275 is simply aimed at identifying, protecting and rehabilitating endangered and threatened species both in the realm of flora and fauna and both in the sense that they have become directly or indirectly threatened or endangered. Why? It is as a result of human activity.

The bill provides the Minister of the Environment with the powers to develop and implement programs aimed at restoring the populations of threatened and endangered species to self–sustaining numbers. Time does not permit me to list the names of the various species. There are too many. However, they are attached to the bill by way of a schedule for any member who would wish to examine it. The bill attempts to provide a context for existing federal and provincial legislation in a complementary and unifying sense that is concerned with protecting threatened or endangered species.

The bill provides a legislative basis for two institutions: COSEWIC, the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, and RNEW, the Recovery of National Endangered Wildlife. For members who might not have heard the terms before, they are two important committees in the protection of endangered species. However they are not required by law and the bill before us today would change the situation.

In addition the scientific expertise of Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada would continue to provide the important first step in identifying threatened or endangered species. In the recovery of nationally endangered wildlife groups it would still be a required step in protecting endangered species. However, Bill C–275 seeks to provide both COSEWIC and RNEW with a common legislative framework to allow for a more responsible, consistent and accountable approach to the identification and recovery of threatened and endangered species. It draws from the categorization prepared over the years by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, COSEWIC. The bill contains two schedules which are available to members. Schedule A lists endangered species and schedule B lists threatened species.

• (1740)

The listing of certain species and requiring the minister to represent their interests have the purpose of allowing recovery programs to be developed prior to species becoming endangered. It is a good precautionary concept. The preventive approach is more sensible and less expensive than simply allowing threatened species to become endangered species and then trying to recover them from the brink of endangerment and to regain ground. In other words the present approach can be subjected to improvements, and this is what Bill C–275 is all about.

As to public accountability, Bill C–275 contains a provision whereby any Canadian may make a representation to the Minister of the Environment in writing requesting the minister to add or delete a species from the threatened or endangered list. I hope it will be used for adding rather than deleting.

The minister must respond within 180 days, advising what course of action will be taken and why. This will have the effect of allowing for public knowledge and traditional knowledge systems such as those offered by the aboriginal people to work together with the scientific process represented by COSEWIC in determining which species in Canada are identifiable as endangered or threatened.

Every year the Recovery of Nationally Endangered Wildlife group shall report to the minister on the effectiveness of the recovery programs carried out in the previous year. The report is to be tabled in Parliament not later than June 1 of the year the report was submitted to the minister. This will be done to address the criticism presently levelled at the Recovery of Nationally Endangered Wildlife group that it lacks accountability and is too slow in enacting recovery programs.

I am sure many members of Parliament and the public at large would be fascinated, rather intrigued and quite attracted to becoming involved if they were familiar with the work done by both COSEWIC and RNEW.

To conclude very briefly, according to the bill the minister shall table no later than June 1 of every a report of a list of every species added to or removed from either the threatened or endangered list. The report will include the summary of the information that led to the species being removed or added to the respective list.

In essence the bill would provide a more coherent approach than we have at present to the protection of threatened and endangered species in Canada, while recognizing the importance of working in close co–operation with the provinces, the territories, the municipalities, aboriginal people and so on, so as to ensure recovery programs for endangered or threatened species are successful.

Furthermore the bill builds on the established systems of expertise represented by the people involved and presently active in COSEWIC and RNEW, so as to ensure that sound scientific principles are maintained when listing threatened or endangered species while providing the opportunity—and this is the main point of the bill to which I keep returning—and the importance of public input and public accountability.

This ends my presentation on Bill C–275 which I commend to the attention of my hon. colleagues. I hope they will find some positive aspects and sufficient substance in the bill to warrant having it sent to committee for necessary improvements and reinforcements.

• (1745)

As I said at the outset, it is a measure that emanates from the Rio de Janiero conference. It flows from Canada's fascination and understandable pride in the richness of its wildlife and in the desire to ensure that what we have inherited will remain for generations to come because we all love our wildlife and we all love nature.

Also as politicians we want to make a contribution to the work that is being done outside the political ranks in the communities at large in order to ensure that this richness remains one of the great things that makes Canada known and admired and desired by so many people abroad.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is with great interest that I rise to speak today to Bill C–275, a bill tabled by the hon. member for Davenport.

For approximately one year now, I have had the good fortune of sitting on the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development chaired by the hon. member for Davenport. He is so interested in the cause and devotes such effort to it that he is undoubtedly a first rate environmentalist and a true defender of our environment. However, the hon. member is also a staunch federalist, which, in my opinion, makes him lean dangerously towards centralization, which we do not consider an option and which can only have nefarious effects on the environment.

Centralization would burn bridges with the community; centralization would distance us from the community; centralization would make us more out of touch with the community. Therefore, the environment would lose out under an excessively centralized system, because the environment is very much a hands–on field and the local and provincial governments have a bigger presence in this field than the federal government.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that we have to give jurisdiction for the environment to the provinces and to the local governments. Furthermore, I would like to stress that the hon. member stated himself at a press conference this morning that aboriginal peoples should be given full jurisdiction over the area. He seemed to have really been caught off guard by a question that a journalist asked, which was whether the federal government was being hypocritical by denying the provinces the jurisdiction which it wants to give to aboriginal people. Obviously uncomfortable, he muttered that certain provinces wanted national standards.

Therefore, I would ask him the following questions: Will he, who is so big on democracy, impose his standards on the other provinces which do not want national standards? Will he accept that certain provinces refuse to adopt the standards? These are questions which merit a reply and for which the hon. member for Davenport is not very clear.

The summary of the bill indicates that it provides for: "the identification, protection and rehabilitation of flora and fauna in

Canada threatened or endangered by human activity, to provide for the protection of habitat and the restoration of population".

Certainly, nobody can be against the protection of endangered animal species and populations. As inhabitants of this planet, we have the duty of respecting and protecting all species with which we share the planet. Otherwise, we are opening the door to the extinction of our own species. Too often, however, we remain oblivious to the need to protect the environment. More and more species are becoming extinct and more and more are threatened, mainly because of human interference.

Recently, the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development sponsored a seminar on wildlife. This very useful and interesting activity gave us an opportunity to become more aware of all the threats to wildlife. Believe me, it was not a pretty picture. Witnesses who were invited to speak on the subject described an alarming situation that required prompt and decisive action. They described the impact of poaching, smuggling and destruction of natural habitat with a lot of expertise and considerable emotion.

• (1750)

They also pointed out the inadequacy of federal action in this field. Not enough financial resources were available to provide for more effective local control of the situations already mentioned. It was clear to us in the Bloc Quebecois that once again, the federal government was not up to the task in this area.

Canada is even incapable of complying with certain international agreements in this sector. One example is the CITES agreement to monitor and stop the trafficking in organs or endangered species. At the seminar, intervenors made it abundantly clear that the federal government failed to allocate the resources to meet its commitments in this respect. As a result we have considerable misgivings about the federal government's desire to protect threatened wildlife and plants and also about its ability to do so.

That is why we cannot allow the federal government to intrude even further in provincial jurisdictions. Although the bill presented by the hon. member for Davenport has its merits, some of its clauses reflect a desire to encroach on provincial jurisdictions, and that we cannot accept. For instance, in clause 8(2), the minister shall secure the carrying out of a recovery program by agreement with the province or municipality concerned. But, and this is the sticking point, the clause includes the phrase: "where possible".

What does the hon. member think would happen if it were not possible? And what about possible agreements with the municipalities? As far as I know, they come under provincial jurisdiction. This clause is typical of the attitude of government members. The Liberals are very good at saying "where possible", although they know perfectly well that very often it would be impossible. If we consider current federal–provincial harmonization agreements, it is clear there are quite a few problems with these agreements.

The federal government has quite simply failed to get the provinces to agree on quite a few issues. The authoritarian approach of the Minister of the Environment has been one of the main reasons why agreements have not been signed. According to our information, the minister has even been challenged at these federal–provincial sessions. I may point out to the hon. member that Quebec, with whom Canada will soon have to negotiate on an equal footing on these matters, recently launched its policy on biodiversity and at the same time asked Ottawa to mind its own business as far as provincial jurisdictions were concerned.

In fact, the Quebec minister of wildlife and the environment, Jacques Brassard, made public his proposed strategy for preserving Quebec's biological diversity, on May 18. In announcing it, he said: "Its actual implementation will be Quebec's responsibility in the end. This was the decision of the Government of Quebec in 1992". I close the quotes by pointing out that the Government of Quebec in question was red and federalist, like those opposite. It was not the wicked separatists.

Mr. Brassard went on to say: "We will be the ones to act. This is why the federal strategy contains no measures and ours has over 200. I do not foresee any trouble, so long as the federal government stays where it is". Make no mistake: the Quebec minister was talking on May 18 about the bill the federal minister was to table, which has since vanished never to be heard of again. To replace what the federal minister withdrew, the government is proposing the bill of the member for Davenport. It decided to give him a bit of rope and to untie his hands. This is a good way to give Liberal members the impression they are useful for something in Parliament.

Moreover, the minister has her hands full at the moment. With all the mail she has to check and even her fictional mail and with everything she says here and there, she and her acolytes have a lot of salvaging to do and corrections to make. The minister has become a great big surprise package. The same rabbit that pops out of the magician's hat could pop out of her mouth. This is farce, burlesque. I think the minister has really missed her calling.

To finish up what I was saying about Mr. Brassard, he told the federal government clearly to focus its actions on areas under its jurisdiction and, more particularly, to regulate international and interprovincial trade and to maintain a constant vigil to stop the illegal traffic in endangered species.

• (1755)

Quebec's message is clear—no encroachment in areas under Quebec's jurisdiction. We therefore oppose the bill proposed by the member for Davenport. In our opinion, it will be the source of confrontation with the provinces. Furthermore, for the federalist provinces, this bill is no pledge of effectiveness in species protection. As I mentioned, the federal government has the unfortunate habit of not applying its environmental legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this private member's bill put forward by my colleague from Davenport.

Bill C–275 provides for the identification and rehabilitation of flora and fauna in Canada threatened or endangered by human activity and provides for the protection of habitat and restoration of populations.

Endangered species is an important Canadian environmental issue that should be carefully considered within a comprehensive, biodiversity strategy. According to one estimate, species are going extinct globally at the rate of several species a day. Since the arrival of the Europeans, only nine species have been rendered extinct in Canada.

Last April reports indicated that Canada had 263 species listed at risk. Some of the endangered species include the whooping crane, beluga whale and the peregrine falcon. The list is growing steadily and only last April eight new species were added. Once a species is lost, it is forever and the actions cannot be reversed.

The Brundtland commission identified one of the prerequisites to sustainable development as the protection of species and ecosystems. The fundamental goal of endangered species legislation must be to ensure that no further native species go extinct and that already endangered species recover to healthy, self–sustaining population levels using the most efficient, effective, fair and balanced means possible.

In 1992 Canada signed the Convention on Biological Diversity. This agreement calls on nations to retain a healthy population of the many varied species in the wild and commits signatories to introducing legislation to protect endangered species. Japan, Australia and the United States all have federal endangered species laws in place at the moment. The development of comprehensive legal protection for endangered species is a first step in meeting Canada's international commitments.

The federal government has jurisdiction over the management and preservation of wildlife on federal lands such as national parks. Provinces have jurisdiction over the management of all wildlife not falling within the federal jurisdiction. Only four provinces, as my colleague has mentioned, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick have provincial endangered species acts. These laws enable, but do not compel, governments to develop a national list of endangered species and implement recovery plans. The remaining provinces have no endangered species legislation.

There are 12 pieces of federal legislation ranging from health regulations to trade rules that address species protection. These federal laws must be harmonized. Rather than developing a weak and ineffective set of standards, the federal government should work with the provinces to come up with a common set of standards that will be agreeable to all parties right across the country.

It is my hope that the federal environment minister will work co–operatively with provincial and territorial governments to develop such a strategy. I understand that harmonized endangered species legislation is currently in the works.

Last November the environment minister stated in the House that framework legislation would be introduced this spring. Members have seen a discussion paper and working document but there has been nothing concrete as yet. However, I suspect we will see endangered species legislation in the fall.

With federal legislation already in the works, this private member's bill may best serve as an example for discussion and consideration by the standing committee and the environment minister.

As part of the process, it is important that all interested parties have the opportunity to take part in the consultation process. The government should consult a broad cross section of stakeholders, including rural and urban centres, and consultation must be open to the public.

• (1800)

It is important that when we develop endangered species legislation we give serious consideration to the variety of options available. Laws must be balanced in meeting both the environmental and economic needs of the country.

Habitat protection will be a contentious and difficult issue when dealing with endangered species protection and laws must be fair and balanced. We need to encourage private land owners to protect endangered species and their habitats as opposed to heavy handed legislation that would penalize land owners. Clearly we have to have the land owners on side.

Bill C–275 does not set out how far the minister can go in taking action to protect endangered species and it is unlikely we will see this clearly spelled out until the minister tables the bill this fall.

Canadians do now want laws that will be economically destructive. We recently saw the U.S. Endangered Species Act shut down a large portion of the west coast logging to save the

spotted owl, thus devastating entire communities. Endangered species legislation must be fair and reasonable and not draconian in approach.

Section 9 of Bill C–275 proposes to give the minister the power to forbid or restrict use of, access to, activity on, or the use of any substance on lands that directly threaten the success of a recovery program. It is most important that we ensure private property rights are respected when any activity or use of lands is being restricted.

Section 11(1) of the bill empowers the minister to pay compensation when actions to protect endangered or threatened species affect a person's property or livelihood. This clause merits serious consideration. When personal property or restriction on the use of property are affected by government action, compensation must be addressed. I am sure my colleague will address this in detail when his turn comes up.

Another area of concern with the bill is section 5(2). This section gives the minister power to implement a recovery program if the minister is advised the cause or probable cause is of human origin. I am concerned this section may be too open ended as it allows the minister to take action before an investigation has taken place. The minister is not required to have proof that actions are warranted or justified. I feel this is dangerous.

Section 5(2) must be tightened up to ensure individual rights are protected. It is not good enough to take action because the minister has been advised of probable cause; rather, cause must be determined and action should, if necessary, be implemented.

In addition, endangered species legislation should apply equally to all Canadian citizens regardless of race or ethnicity. Two sections of the bill imply native Indians may be exempt from legislation or subject to a separate set of rules and regulations. This needs to be reviewed, as there can be only one set of laws applied equally to everyone in Canada.

Whatever rules and regulations are drawn up regarding the protection of endangered species they should be applied nationwide and with equality. The minister should not be negotiating private deals with one group and applying a set of regulations to another.

I am concerned about the potential implications of this section. Legislation should establish one comprehensive set of rules to be applied equally to all Canadians.

I take the opportunity to voice my concerns regarding the trade in endangered species and animal parts. The bill addressed endangered species but Canada is also faced with serious problems regarding the trafficking of wildlife and animal parts and continues to be used as a transit route for shipments of illegal wildlife destined for other countries. This is particularly so in my riding of Comox—Alberni on Vancouver Island. Penalties must be severe enough to act as a deterrent commensurate with the commercial value of endangered species and their parts.

I thank the hon. member for bringing this private members' bill forward in the House. Although I do not agree with all sections of the bill, some of the proposals warrant serious consideration and I hope the environment minister will look at some of the ideas contained in the bill as she drafts her legislation. I look forward to looking at the issue more closely when the minister tables the legislation.

• (1805)

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C–275 I congratulate the hon. member for Davenport for his tireless work to bring the bill before the House of Commons. More important, I congratulate the hon. member for his tireless efforts to protect Canada's endangered and threatened species.

The caribou, the sea otter, the wolverine, the burrowing owl, the blue ash and the red mulberry are just a few of the more than 240 endangered, threatened or vulnerable species in Canada.

Human activity is putting those species at risk. It is up to us as human beings to understand our failings and to work to reverse those failings. When we kill or injure an endangered species we are putting at risk a unique life form. When we buy or sell, import or export an endangered species we are trafficking in the extinction of a species.

All Canadians have a responsibility to prevent native wild species from disappearing from the face of the globe as a result of human activity. All Canadians have a responsibility to protect endangered species to the full extent of our powers. All of us must do what we can to help those species recover.

In Canada wetlands have been reduced by over 70 per cent. We have lost 99 per cent of tall grass prairie. No single Canadian is to blame. We are all to blame and it is up to all of us to act at every level of government, in every occupation, in every community and neighbourhood across the country.

Four provinces have acted to introduce endangered species legislation; Alberta, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick deserve credit for their actions. It is now clearly time for the federal government to do its part in areas of federal jurisdiction. It is also time for the federal government to push hard for co–operative national and international action.

My colleague, the hon. member for Davenport, understands that and the Minister of the Environment understands that. That is why the minister last fall outlined the federal government's intention to introduce endangered species legislation. It is why she held the first ever public consultations on the basics of such a law. It is why she has committed herself to bring such a law before cabinet in the next few weeks and to allow Canadians to

comment on the law before it receives detailed scrutiny by Parliament.

I am very pleased the hon. member for Davenport and the Minister of the Environment are working so closely together to advance the cause of endangered species. Obviously as Liberals we support their efforts and we are pleased to see real federal leadership.

However, this is not a partisan cause and I regret some of the comments I have heard in the House which clearly appeared to be of a partisan nature. I know members of Parliament from every party and every part of the country, including Quebec, want to see Canada a true world leader in protecting endangered species.

Canada was the first industrialized country to sign the United Nations convention on biological diversity. We need to transfer our goodwill and our signature on a piece of paper into real action to preserve our country's biological diversity. We owe that to future generations of human beings and we certainly owe that to future generations of endangered species.

Canadians like to keep their word. In article 8K of the convention on biological diversity, Canada promised to develop or maintain necessary legislation and/or other regulatory provisions for the protection of threatened species and populations. That is one good reason the hon. member and the minister are pushing for action.

There is another good reason to take action. Canadian children expect us to act. They have petitioned and written the Minister of the Environment in unprecedented numbers to call for the protection of endangered fish, marine mammals and migratory birds.

I recently received many responses from my spring–summer householder, something all members send out. Concern for the environment was at the top of the list.

• (1810)

I have heard it described as a sexy issue that has now been pushed to the background. That is nonsense. If we let this issue be pushed to the background we will all pay a very heavy price.

Canadian children and all Canadians believe or should believe that living organisms have the right to live. They do not understand how someone could make a living by selling off the parts of an endangered species. Canada's children are right.

Important scientific and financial issues must be addressed. There are certainly important issues raised by provinces, aboriginal peoples and farmers that must be addressed. Legislation must be realistic and fair. Not all the issues are easy but all of the issues must be resolved.

The biological foundation for our world depends on its diversity of genes, species and ecosystems. We need each sphere of our society to demonstrate both leadership and partnership in protecting endangered species. We do not need overlap or duplication or wasteful actions. We need swift action.

Conservation of endangered species is not the sole responsibility of the federal government, nor of any government. All elements of society have an interest in protecting species and all elements of our society should be intimately involved in planning, developing and implementing conservation programs.

It is important for the federal government to pass legislation that can be a model to the world, legislation that seeks to put an end to the extinction of species as a result of human activity. The federal government must do its part to make things right for Canada's wild plants and animals.

That is the policy underlying the legislation introduced by my friend and colleague from Davenport. That is the policy underlying the actions taken by my friend and colleague the Minister of the Environment. I believe it is the policy that must guide Parliament in our work to protect endangered species, and I am very pleased to have added some thoughts to today's debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is my intention, in the next few minutes, to demonstrate to those watching that Bill C-275, which is before us today, is a typical example of inefficiency resulting from the overlaps that are caused by poor co-ordination between the federal government and Quebec.

This bill, as was pointed out by my hon. colleague, the member for Laurentides, and I am going to repeat it because it is important, provides for the identification, protection and rehabilitation of flora and fauna in Canada threatened or endangered by human activity—the hon. member for Davenport has provided a fairly impressive list, I believe—to provide for the protection of habitat and the restoration of population.

This is a laudable sentiment, and obviously this bill is interesting because the government is limiting its legislation to federally owned lands. After all, the government is perfectly justified in taking environmental action on lands that belong to it.

But the problem lies in the fact that fauna, understandably, do not stay in one place, and sooner or later appear on sites where the federal government does not have exclusive jurisdiction. There is therefore a need for an agreement with the other governments concerned, including the government of Quebec, all the more so as the latter has already made known its intentions in this regard in a letter sent to the attention of the Minister of the Environment last March 28.

In the circumstances, the least we could expect from the federal government is that it would consult the government of Quebec to find out its intentions and that it would table a bill taking into account the potential conflicts of jurisdiction with Quebec.

With respect to the environment, the distribution of powers is not fully spelled out, adding to the risk of overlap, overregulation and duplication. Let us look more specifically at the somewhat ill defined distribution of powers.

With respect to terrestrial fauna, Quebec has full authority over the species inhabiting the public or private lands held by Quebec.

• (1815)

It may also take steps to protect species and their habitat. The federal government has jurisdiction over land animals on federal land only.

As far as our feathered friends are concerned, the federal government was responsible for implementing the 1916 convention on migratory birds. Since this was an international agreement, the federal government at the time assumed responsibility for protecting these birds.

Today, Quebec is responsible for all bird species, including migratory birds, except on federal land. One wonders what happens when birds are neither on provincial land nor on federal land. Furthermore, following a number of administrative agreements, Quebec is now responsible for enforcing Canadian legislation on the 1916 convention on migratory birds.

Finally, as far as marine mammals and fish are concerned—certain fish species are also on the endangered list—the Constitution Act, 1867 gives the federal government exclusive jurisdiction over ocean and inland fisheries. As of 1922, however, an administrative agreement gives Quebec full responsibility for fisheries management, without any regulatory powers, however.

This delegation of authority has changed over the years, and today, Quebec is responsible for managing freshwater resources and the species they contain, while the federal government manages salt water resources. The division of powers remains a problem.

In the light of the foregoing, it is clear that agreements on the division of powers in environmental matters will require a very sensitive approach. Bill C–275, however, ignores the very existence of this problem, which is why it merely increases the likelihood of overlap and jurisdictional disputes between Quebec and the federal government.

In fact, the Minister of the Environment is well aware of the dangers of overlap and the potential for jurisdictional disputes. In a letter dated March 28, her Quebec counterpart, and I referred to this letter earlier, wrote that the federal bill on endangered species constituted an intrusion into one of Quebec's jurisdictions.

Not only does this government not consult Quebec but there is no attempt to consult within the government itself. In his letter, the Quebec Environment Minister suggested ways to regulate this area, saying that the minister should focus federal action on aspects that were obviously federal in scope, in other words, regulating international and interprovincial trade and exercising constant vigilance to prevent unlawful trafficking in endangered species. The bill before us today, however, does not reflect these suggestions, which means that the Liberal government's spokespersons for environmental matters may not have bothered to discuss the matter. Or even worse, they did and deliberately decided to "invade" an area over which Quebec has specific jurisdiction.

We certainly do not doubt the sincerity of the hon. member for Davenport, and I am sure, because I know him personally through the Standing Committee on the Environment, that the bill he introduced today is based on a genuine desire that is found the world over to protect the environment.

However, despite this sincerity, there is a significant risk that this bill will encroach on Quebec's jurisdictions. Even if the hon. member's motions are sincere, this is something we cannot accept.

I realize, and here I want to add a more personal note, that this is not the first time we rise in the House to speak out against bills or to say that there is a risk of encroaching on Quebec's jurisdictions. Every time we do, we look like troublemakers. I feel a bit like a troublemaker myself when I do this. Quite often, the bills introduced in the House are, to all intents and purposes, good bills.

From time to time, in committee, we draft dissenting opinions on committee reports which, all things considered, were excellent. However, we had to file our minority reports because the majority reports contained some very serious threats to Quebec's jurisdictions.

I think we should consider the demographic evolution of Quebecers since the founding of Canada.

• (1820)

When Canada was founded, the number of francophones and anglophones was about even. Today, we represent only 23 per cent of the population. We used to be one of four provinces. Today, we are one of ten and may become one of 12 or 13, when the territories gain provincial status. Quebecers are one of Canada's endangered species.

That being said, I think we must protect the interests of Quebecers. That is what we were elected to do. I know this bill is sincere and relatively well drafted, but because it represents a

serious threat to Quebec's jurisdictions, we intend to vote against this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on the bill introduced by the hon. member for Davenport.

First, I want to praise the hon. member for his unflagging commitment to environmental issues. Second, I want to point out how dedication to a cause can result in progress. Third, I wish to talk about the importance of protecting and rehabilitating endangered and threatened species.

My colleague from Davenport is well known for his commitment to environmental issues through his work as chair of the standing committee on the environment and sustainable development.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member has devoted his political career to keeping the environmental cause in the foreground in society and at the centre of debates in the House of Commons. He knows that sustainable development is the only way to secure our generation's prosperity without endangering the prosperity of generations to come.

[*English*]

He knows that preservation of the world's biodiversity is central to the preservation of the world's environment and the world's future success. He knows that taking an ecosystem approach to environmental issues is critical. We have to look at the big picture and understand that every action in any sphere of the environment can have and does have implications for other parts of the environment.

That brings me to my second point, that the dedication of the hon. member has helped to ensure that the protection of endangered species has become a national priority. Thanks to forceful advocacy by the hon. member and others, our party made protection of endangered species a core part of the Liberal red book. We promised to introduce Canada's first comprehensive federal law to protect endangered species, and we are going to keep that promise to Canadians.

Bill C–275 received first reading in the House of Commons last September. Since that time the Minister of the Environment has called for wide–ranging public consultation on a law to protect endangered species. A few weeks ago the minister completed those hearings and outlined the fundamentals of the new law to the last national consultation meeting.

[*Translation*]

As the minister herself said, she received over 5,000 very articulate letters from grade school and high school students in support of such a law. That is why she drafted the bill hand in hand with representatives of the industry, the farming sector, aboriginal organizations and the provinces and territories.

In addition, the Minister of the Environment and the hon. member for Davenport joined forces to ensure that their wishes for a law to protect threatened species became a reality. Their determination reflects the determination of the Liberal Party and our government. Their determination reflects the wishes of the vast majority of the members of this House and, more importantly, the desire of the vast majority of the Canadian public to bring in such a law.

[*English*]

The law is coming very, very quickly thanks in large part to many years of hard work and dedication by the chair of the standing committee on environment and sustainable development.

This brings me to the third point. The preservation of endangered and threatened species is of vital importance to this country. As the school children who mounted the campaign for endangered species legislation said, "There otter be a law". Mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, invertebrates, plants, and other wild organisms all play a critical role in the environment of our country. Endangered fish, endangered marine animals, endangered waterfowl, and endangered migratory birds are all an important federal matter.

• (1825)

The species of the world contribute to the ecological wonders of the world. Of course these species have the right to exist for their own sake, but it is important to remember how much these species matter to us. They provide us with learning opportunities. They are part of our history. They offer artistic and spiritual inspiration. They are part of our identity as a country and as human beings. They help to sustain us environmentally, culturally, and economically.

Consider the list of endangered or threatened species in Canada and imagine how much poorer a country we would be without them. The Vancouver Island marmot, the beluga whale, the peregrine falcon, the leatherback turtle, the Acadian whitefish, the prairie orchid, the wood poppy, the wood bison, the harbour porpoise, the white–headed woodpecker, and the trumpeter swan are some of the endangered, threatened, or vulnerable species in Canada. These are some of the species that need protection and restoration. They are species whose habitat is disappearing or who have been victims of pollution or have been

slaughtered so that a few human beings may trade in their precious products. That is clearly wrong. That is clearly foolish.

It is important to note the efforts undertaken by conservancy organizations throughout the country to preserve and protect some of our endangered species. I can think of no better example than the Wye Marsh Wildlife Centre in Midland, Ontario, which is located in my riding of Simcoe North. A few weeks ago I had the extreme honour of celebrating the 25th anniversary of the official opening of the Wye Marsh centre with many of its supporters. The centre is today a national example of leadership and ecological awareness and understanding of the importance of wetlands and wildlife in our world. In the past few years this centre has been very active in its program to increase the trumpeter swan population, which we know is very vulnerable.

It is now the time to assist Wye Marsh and similar organizations with meaningful and effective legislation. In addition to this private member's bill, the member for Davenport went to great lengths to organize a forum on wildlife, which was hosted last April by the standing committee on environment and sustainable development. This was a great opportunity for the members of the committee to discuss this serious matter with a variety of experts and organizations devoted to the protection of endangered species. I know that for me personally it gave me a newfound understanding of the consequences at hand and an appreciation of the urgency of this type of legislation.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Davenport and the Minister of the Environment are determined to put an end to these unfortunate practices in the federal jurisdiction. They are determined to have Parliament pass a law with teeth. They are also determined to see Canada adopt a credible and co–ordinated action plan to protect threatened and endangered species.

[*English*]

In our red book we committed the Liberal government to a vision of society that protects the longterm health and diversity of all species on the planet. The initiative we are debating today is one important contribution by the hon. member for Davenport to advance that vision and to advance that cause. We all ought to join him in this worthwhile cause. His bill is proof that he remains as committed as ever to providing good government for this country and responsible policies for the world's environment.

The Speaker: My colleagues, the time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the motion regarding consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C–69, I move:

That the debate be not further adjourned.

• (1830)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 315*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Bernier (Beauce)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew	Bodnar Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Bélair Caccia
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Clancy Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Culbert	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gallaway	Godfrey
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard

Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—145

Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Ringuette–Maltais
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Whelan
Young

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond–Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Langlois
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
Mercier

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Landry
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Schmidt
St–Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Silye
Stinson
Thompson
Venne
Williams—82

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

After the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rosemont has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member for Vaudreuil arrived long after the voting had started. Perhaps he should be reminded of the rules.

Mr. Discepola: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I arrived when the vote was already underway. I would point out to the House, however, that members of the Bloc Quebecois and the Reform Party arrived after I did.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Colleagues, before we get into finger pointing as to who did and did not come in, I would simply put it to all hon. members that if you come in after the vote has started, then you should not vote.

You know what you did. If you came in after it, you can inform the Chair or at least not vote during the course of the regular taking of the vote. If indeed there were some members who came in, the Chair is not aware of it. If hon. members want to declare that now, then let them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fillion: Mr. Speaker, I arrived late, but I relied on the television broadcast.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Colleagues, if there are some hon. members who feel that they came in after the vote was started and who want to have their names taken off of the vote, I want to do that now. It should not take more than a minute. All you have to do is if you came in after the vote and you were recorded as voting, stand right now.

I put it to the hon. member for Vaudreuil. Did you come in after the vote was started, yes or no, sir?

Mr. Discepola: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you. Take his name off.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: I came in late, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Take his name off.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laurin: So did I, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Take his name off.

[*Translation*]

As well as those of the hon. members for Québec–Est, Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead and Verdun—Saint–Paul.

• (1855)

[*English*]

Mr. White (North Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, the television broadcast within the House indicated a 30 minute vote. There must be other members in this House who saw that. As a result it started at 30 minutes.

The Speaker: The Clerk will give me the count unless there are other members who want to declare now that they came in after the vote started. This is the honour system. If there are not any, I want to hear the results from the Clerk now.

I will hear your points of order after this.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in light of what has happened here this evening and in the light of restoring some decorum to the House of Commons and due to the confusion, I would humbly request that you do a revote on this issue.

The Speaker: The vote will stand as it is.

* * *

• (1900)

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT, 1995

The House resumed from June 19, consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries; and of the amendment.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

To start off, I would like to say that we proposed an amendment to improve Bill C–69. As we were denied this amendment, which was defeated in the House, we cannot support this bill.

It was essential for us to ensure proportional representation for Quebec in the unlikely event of other elections here in the federal system involving Quebec. We think it would be very surprising, but, if it did happen, we had to guarantee that Quebec had at least 25 per cent representation. We were denied our amendment; it was defeated democratically in the House and, for this reason, essentially, we cannot support this bill.

I must also point out the importance of the readjustment commissions, the commissions redefining electoral boundaries. It should be said that there are some obvious points here. There are ridings, like my own, with 110,000 constituents; there are other ridings with 43,000 constituents. Representation is therefore not proportional. In some regions, ridings are huge, and the member of Parliament, even with the best of intentions, is unable to serve the entire population.

Therefore the changes to the electoral maps planned for every five years with the census and the readjustment are fundamental and vital. In any decision to readjust boundaries, the primary criterion should be proportional representation. Before continuing, I would like to point out that it is unlikely that we will be involved in any more elections in Ottawa, but I would still like to speak to Bill C–69 because it directly affects my riding.

The federal riding of Terrebonne would be split in two on the new electoral maps. This is fine. As I said earlier, having 110,000 constituents can be a bit difficult, even though things are going very well right now. But it is a bit much as far as proportional representation is concerned, and they want to split the riding in two, to create the ridings of Repentigny and Blainville—Terrebonne.

This split will be the focus of my speech to the House. Briefly, the riding of Terrebonne, as it now stands, the riding I represent, has 110,000 voters, as I said earlier, and 160,000 inhabitants. It is the most densely populated riding in Quebec, and if memory serves, the sixth most densely populated in Canada. We therefore agree on the need to readjust the riding's boundaries.

I would like to show in this House that it is in the interest of the two groups of people concerned to examine the proposed ridings of Blainville—Terrebonne and Repentigny. I believe that a simple mathematical calculation was performed; 75 members divided by the number of people. As I will point out, there are elementary rules to follow. But these rules have not been followed by the electoral boundaries commissions.

To do so, the commissions should go by the rules of geographical size and population density. In my riding in Lanaudière, the population increased 25 per cent in ten years. This was the most significant demographic "boom" in Quebec. So population density, community of interest, cultural identity and the region's historic background—I believe the last two, cultural identity and historical background of the region should be included as criteria, but these are eliminated from the outset, and you will see why.

After analysing the two proposed electoral districts, it is clear that some of these principles were not considered at all by the commission, as I said earlier, I am referring to community of interest and historical background of the region.

• (1905)

I started with the first riding the bill proposed, the riding of Blainville—Terrebonne. In its proposal, the commission, which visited my riding, suggested putting the following towns: Blainville, Bois–des–Filion, Lorraine, Rosemère, Sainte–Anne–des–Plaines and Terrebonne together in the riding of Blainville—Terrebonne.

Although the first five towns met all the criteria, Terrebonne, the most densely populated town in the proposed riding, would be the big loser. In fact, Terrebonne had a population of 39,678 at the last census. These residents have no geographical, economic or cultural affinity with the other towns in the proposed riding.

They do not have the same administrative regions, MRCs, school boards, economic development corporations, employment centres, Quebec manpower development corporations or CLSCs, but the commission still wanted to put them into one riding, grafting together bits and pieces that have nothing in common, and they think this will be a riding that makes sense. However, it makes no sense at all to uproot entire communities.

At a time when we are all working hard to eliminate costly duplication and overlap, we think this should be an opportunity to reinforce communities of interest instead of dividing them.

Considering that the riding of Terrebonne has existed since the Constitution Act, 1867—I have already said this here, but I want to repeat it in reference to the current bill—considering that the commissions are probably going to circulate again, I would like to ask the federal electoral boundaries commission to reconsider the proposal regarding Blainville—Terrebonne, and to decide to leave the riding as Terrebonne.

It meets the first criterion, which is historical development. Under this criterion, the towns of Lachenaie, Mascouche, Terrebonne and La Plaine could be grouped together to form the new riding of Terrebonne.

According to the decennial census of 1991, the population of this new riding would be approximately 91,156, which is within 1 per cent, or 800 persons, of the electoral quota set for Quebec, which is 91,946.

In addition, in the next briefs to be presented in the next hearings, the commission and Parliament will have to take into consideration the fact that the four towns mentioned earlier are already considered to form one entity for the purposes of the administrative region of Lanaudière, the RCM of Les Moulins, the des Manoirs school board, la Société de développement économique des Moulins, the Terrebonne Canada Employment Centre at Lachenaie, la Société québécoise de développement de la main–d'oeuvre and the Lamazer local community health centre.

Therefore, I believe that I have clearly demonstrated that creating the riding of Blainville–Terrebonne would be totally irresponsible and irrational. It is our duty to respect communities of interest, economic communities, historical development and thus to maintain the riding of Terrebonne with the new towns as I just explained.

Regarding Repentigny, we were pleased to see that the previous law created this riding. As I said earlier, with 110,000 voters, there is no reason for us to oppose the boundary as it stands.

In fact, the creation of Repentigny corrects a historical oversight. On April 16, 1647, Pierre Le Gardeur de Repentigny was granted the seigniory of Repentigny. We can only praise this acknowledgement of history which is one of the criteria in the bill before us.

The commission aims to group the towns of Charlemagne, Lachenaie, Mascouche, Repentigny and the part of the RCM of Les Moulins which is included in the parish of La Plaine in this new riding.

• (1910)

In fact the cities of Charlemagne and Repentigny, on the one hand, and Lachenaie, La Plaine and Mascouche, on the other, have different RCMs, school boards, economic development corporations, manpower development corporations and so on.

We can see the aim is to combine two ridings into one, regardless of the economic, social and cultural realities of this area. Here again, administrative overlap and duplication have not been corrected.

In the light of the above, we are asking the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Quebec to review its proposal as follows.

The proposed electoral district would still be called Repentigny. It would include the cities of Charlemagne, L'Assomption, L'Épiphanie, Le Gardeur, Repentigny and part of the regional county municipality of l'Assomption included in the parishes of l'Épiphanie, Saint–Gérard–de–Magella and Saint–Sulpice.

According to the 1991 decennial census, the population of the riding proposed, which we propose to improve, is 91,537, here again, almost exactly the electoral quota established for Quebec, which is, and I repeat, 91,946. Not even a difference of 300 people. It is therefore realistic.

In the new riding, under one administrative region, that of Lanaudière; there would be one regional county municipality; one school board, the Le Gardeur school board; a single economic development corporation; a single employment centre, the one in Repentigny; and a single Quebec manpower development corporation.

In short, the two ridings we are proposing: Terrebonne, in keeping with historical changes, and Repentigny, also in keeping with these changes, are entirely in accordance with the principles established by this same commission.

In the light of these facts, we are asking that, with Bill C–69, there be a little flexibility when the commissions resume their hearings in the regions. We therefore ask the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Quebec to review its proposal, which, we hope, is not cast in stone, and to understand the simple, rational and fundamental arguments here for the greater well–being of the people concerned by this readjustment. That is, of course, in the unlikely event these people will require representation in another federal election.

[*English*]

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in discussion of Bill C–69, an act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions and the readjustment of electoral boundaries.

This bill comes back to us from the Senate and therefore my remarks will address essentially the amendments proposed by the Senate and our reactions to them.

One approaches this debate in a spirit of respect for a co–ordinate institution and for the care that the Senate has attempted to give for the fulfilment of its constitutional duty. I would also say, however, that we are in a special area of the constitutional law of Parliament where each Chamber, being co–ordinate, must recognize that the histories and traditions of the other are different.

The House of Commons and the model from which we borrowed, the Parliament of Great Britain, separated historically from the House of Lords. Therefore conventions as to the role, for example, of the Speaker in the internal conduct of Parliament are different for the two Houses.

That suggests as a principle of constitutional comity a certain amount of self–restraint in the attitudes of one House to another. For example, it would be improper for the Senate to offer suggestions as to the conduct of the Speaker of the House or vice versa, the House offering suggestions on the conduct of the Speaker of the Senate, other than in a spirit of study and a suggestion in the strict sense of the word. Comity enjoins a certain respect for differences in traditions and differences in historical evolution.

• (1915)

This having been said, I will note that some of the suggestions made by the Senate seem to be valuable and the product of reflection. Time always improves examination of a measure. I believe on these points the House is in a mood to respond positively.

The issue of the electoral quotient, the amount of permissible variation from constituency to constituency, was much discussed in the master committee of the House, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs which is really a de facto Constitution committee of the House. It was much discussed. On both sides there was considerable examination of the issue of whether the maximum permissible variation should be 15 or 25 per cent and with the Senate's suggestion the 15 per cent.

I have no particular quarrel. I gather the feeling of the House is very much positive in relation to this point. Similarly with the suggestion in appointing members of the electoral commissions that the members to be appointed or persons to be considered should be residents of the province concerned, that seems to be matter of ordinary common sense.

I see opposite an hon. member who made thoughtful contributions to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I suspect this is something we simply overlooked, and it is good to be reminded of it. It makes sense. It would not make sense to do it the other way.

Our suggestions in changing the procedure used over so many years were directed toward taking the current development in constitutional thinking, which is increasingly to constitutionalize large discretionary offices that exercise constitutional powers in a discretionary way, and to subject the incumbents of the office to some degree of prior scrutiny by Parliament of their qualifications. In an ideal sense this might mean that all executive council appointments would be subject to some sort of parliamentary examination.

It is not the function of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to make a constitutional revolution all across the board. It does not have that mandate. Nevertheless we will notice a change here from a system where the appointment of the commissioners was solely at the discretion of the Speaker of the day and not subject to review.

There were attempts to establish a gloss on this practice made by a distinguished speaker, Madam Sauvé, to consult informally with people outside. In the early eighties the electoral commis-

sions that were formed by Madam Speaker were done after informal and private consultation with outside people. I believe she consulted a current member of the Senate, Senator Beaudoin, who was then a very distinguished constitutional authority.

What we have here is a proposal to further constitutionalize the process by establishing a duty of consultation with the House of Parliament. It is obviously not the same as submitting to Parliament the approval or ratification of that decision, but it opens up the process and it takes us a considerable way along in constitutional evolution. One of the good things in this committee was the general enthusiasm with which this change was recognized by the members of the committee. In responding to the Senate's suggestion again, I see no particular problems with it if they understand they are operating in the spirit of our original intention.

I have more difficulties when we arrive at the more substantive side of the Senate's suggestions. One problem is increasingly directed to what was one of the key thrusts of the recommendations of the procedure and House affairs committee. The problem essentially in this area is that the system of electoral boundaries, which purported to be private and non–political, was inevitably subject to political pressures which, because they were never out in the open, were not subject to public scrutiny and review.

• (1920)

An ideal system of constitutionalizing electoral boundaries commissions would recognize that it goes to constituent power, which is prior to constitutional power and the ultimate source of state authority. That is something, I think ideally, on which we would have a set of very clear, concrete principles to be applied by commissioners so that their discretion would not be, as was once said of Lord Eldon when he was Lord High Chancellor, as long as the chancellor's foot.

Outside people could refer to clear constitutional principles in deciding whether the commissioners' discretion was exercised rationally or was exercised merely arbitrarily and capriciously and of course subject to review by the courts. The biggest gap in the Canadian electoral system is that there is no developed system of court jurisprudence.

If we examine the evolution, the democratization of electoral law in the United States is essentially because they have clear constitutional principles set out in the constitutional charter and a perfected system of court challenge by test cases financed by competing interest groups and clear court rulings. This constitutionalization through clear enunciation of constitutional principles and judicial review was borrowed by the German constitutional system, the contemporary system, from the United States. It goes even more along that road than the United States does.

We have lagged behind in many respects perhaps because of the timidity—self–restraint might be the kinder word—of the Supreme Court and the absence of a disposition on the part of persons affected and even political parties to approach the court where boundaries are obviously gerrymandered or established arbitrarily and capriciously without proper regard to local conditions.

It can however be changed. The feeling of the committee was very clear that the criteria for establishment of electoral boundaries should be set out in the legislation, and that they should be criteria to which what was done by the boundaries commissions in the future would be referable and would obviously be subject to scrutiny by citizens, political parties and others affected, but subject to review by an ultimate authority. This is why we approached the statement of principles.

Coming back to what the Senate has done, I have some reservations in its striking out the provision intended to safeguard against unnecessary revision. I also have some difficulty with its touching the issue of community of interest. I felt that within the committee ourselves we did not go quite far enough in defining the criteria, but at least we made a beginning.

One thing we tried to establish was the respect for continuity, which is one of our constitutional values. Members of Parliament build up a special relationship with their constituencies. There is a relationship of trust which subsists during the mandate of the member. It should not idly be changed. Unless there is a pressing consideration of sociology, economics or something else set out in the criteria, there should be a presumption of continuity. One does not indulge in changes across the board just for the sake of making a professorial exercise.

In looking at the last electoral boundaries commission—and in an earlier pre–parliamentary capacity I served as an electoral boundary commissioner—Madam Sauvé as Speaker approached me and said that she wanted to depoliticize the process. She was looking for people a bit outside the political arenas for that. One of the principles we very clearly recognized was the principle of continuity, the relationship between members and their constituents. If we change a boundary dramatically halfway through a term, what is the relationship of trust between members and their existing constituents from whom the member will be separated by the next boundary change? Obviously one does one's best but it is not good for the relationship of trust which one tries to build up through the municipal, provincial and federal levels of government.

• (1925)

We stressed, however, in community of interest that it should be established in an evolutionary pattern. Constitutions are not static instruments, laws are not and obviously society is not. It is

a principle of the common law and I think of our constitutional jurisprudence that laws should evolve as society evolves.

One regret I had in looking at the work of the latest electoral boundaries commissions, the series of 11 reports that we had, was that in a certain sense in the philosophy, because everybody has a philosophy, we discovered that there had been no contact by the electoral boundaries commission the last time with the federal electoral commissioner who has a great deal of experience. There was no mutual contact between them so there were wide variations in approaches.

We discovered that essentially some of the commissions were looking back to the future. The unique feature of Canadian society today, which some have railed against, some have viewed with despair and others have viewed with joy as an opportunity for the future, is the fact that we have become a community of communities. It is interesting certainly in large cities that all the constituencies are plural in the sense of representing many communities. It is something in some sense that has been achieved accidentally over the years but is consolidated.

One of my deep regrets in looking at the latest exercise is that there is an attempt to turn the clock backward, seemingly, to create uni–communities, uni–ethnic constituencies. This is a false approach to building a Canadian society. It runs against all the trends. This is why in spelling out the criteria we have tried to stress two things: first, continuity unless there is a clear reason for doing differently and, second, a balance of characteristics, a balance of features in which sociology, geography and commonalty of ties all operate together.

We must never forget the prime lesson of Canadian society which will be the hallmark of our society as we enter the 21st century. There is unity in the diversity because of the necessity of co–operation and co–existence between the different communities.

My suggestion to the Senate, and I do so in the full spirit of respect for a co–ordinate institution, is that it should hew more closely to the position adopted by the House. In our committee we gave hours of work, hours of give and take, in discussion of the particular clause and it should not be changed lightly. I would suggest that the excision of our principle of continuity is a step backward, particularly where continuity now by the happy accidents of the evolution of our society adequately reflects the diversity and in a sense the unity through diversity of our society.

I am optimistic about the venture in the constitutionalism of electoral laws. So far in society we have left the political parties untouched. It is my view that constitutionally the political parties as organs of our constitutional system are subject to the same principles of constitutional review as the main governmental institutions.

I would view it as a healthy situation if issues of the internal processes of parties where they operate in such a way as to negate the principles of representation are subject to court challenges and court review as they are in Germany, France and in all the countries that have borrowed from American constitutionalism. We would not have the great constitutionalism of the United States without it. In some senses principles we have established only in terms of consideration of electoral boundaries carry over to the political parties as prime instruments of our constitutional system.

• (1930)

One thanks the Senate for the thoughtful suggestions among which we can very easily accept the reduction of electoral quotas from 25 to 15. "Thank you again for the suggestion of residency. Please, in a spirit of comity, take another look at what we have done with the substantive provisions. We would respect your accommodation to our suggestions here."

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I welcome the opportunity to speak on this whole matter of electoral boundaries, in particular Bill C–69 and the amendments before us this evening.

It seems we have been dealing with this issue ever since I got to this House, and in fact I guess that is the case. Bill C–18, the Liberal government's attempt to disband the Electoral Boundaries Commission, was one of the first bills brought forward. In fact the first time I saw closure used in this House as a new member was on that very bill. This evening we see closure being used again to limit debate on Bill C–69.

The member for Vancouver Quadra talked about the changes that were made at the Senate and the reason we are back here this evening to debate those. Many of those amendments were ours. The quotient that he talked about from plus or minus 25 to 15 I think was a good one, but I think the thing that marks the whole business of Bill C–69 and the electoral boundaries is the mismanagement of this whole issue. We have been working on this for a year and a half, and in fact it may now revert back to the old boundaries commission if it does not get through this week. That shows how badly mismanaged this whole issue has been. I think it has been a tremendous waste of time in this House.

This is the government that was going to do things differently. We have closure on Bill C–69 tonight so that we have to vote at eleven o'clock. We had closure on Bill C–41 just this week on the hate crimes bill. We have had closure being used or time allocation on Bill C–68, gun control, and again on Bill C–85, the MP pension plan. What is this all about? I know members want to get back to their ridings, but it seems to me that this is not a very reasonable approach to limit debate in this very important Chamber.

Bill C–69, should it receive royal assent by the end of this week, will make some adjustments to the Electoral Boundaries Adjustment Act, which was first enacted in 1964. As far as I am concerned, this bill should not be passed. The changes being proposed are not substantial enough to warrant the interruption of a perfectly good process.

The process that was in place before was fine. It is a process that was almost complete in any case. In fact the Canadian taxpayers had already spent around $6 million on a process of redrawing our electoral boundaries before the Liberal government decided to change this through Bill C–18 and now Bill C–69. In fact hearings were held in a lot of ridings in Canada.

If this bill is not passed, we may go back to the original boundaries commission and pick that whole process up. People who have been waiting to make their case patiently are waiting to see what this new boundaries commission is going to be. It has been a year and a half, and I think time is of the essence because we may be only two years away from the next election.

What is the process that was interrupted a year and a half ago? It is a process that occurs every ten years or after each census. But last year there was considerable concern by the new Liberal MPs from Ontario that changes to their riding boundaries would hurt their re–election chances. This was the party that was going to be different. The member before me talked about what used to happen in the old days with gerrymandering. This smacks of the same type of thing.

If this government is unhappy with the results of the boundaries commission when they were allowed to complete their work, it should bring forward some substantive changes. In fact it has not done that. By substantive change I mean true representation by population in this House of Commons and true representation by region in the Senate.

• (1935)

My riding of Peace River has been in place since 1925. It has a population of almost 107,000 people. Of the 13 large ridings in Canada, mostly northern ridings, that have areas of over 100,000 square kilometres, the Peace River riding rates up there at about ninth.

What do we have in this country? Do we have representation by population? We are not even close. The quotient the hon. member before me talked about is going to bring it closer, and it certainly needs to be. We have some constituencies that have populations as low as just over 30,000 people. We have others in downtown Toronto that are in the 230,000 range. This is too big of a spread. I believe we need some substantive changes, not tinkering in this House.

In our minority report to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Suspension Act we called for changes that would make sense in this House of Commons. The key change is that we would like to see the number of seats reduced. Our proposal would create a House with 265 seats based on the 1991 census. This would be a decrease from the 301 that will come into effect under the current formula.

One thing we have heard a fair amount of in the last couple of years is that we are a country that is overgoverned. If we look at the United States, which has a bigger population by far, they have far fewer elected members. I believe we can never get to the situation they have unless we make substantive changes, but we can start the process in gear. The decrease would be spread among the eight provinces and would maintain representation by population as it is at present but with a fairer share for both Ontario and British Columbia.

If this government would only care to listen to what the people want, it would hear that Canadians want less government and fewer politicians. Look at what happened just recently in the Ontario election. Mike Harris promised that he would reduce the number of seats in the Ontario legislature by 25 per cent. It was one of the contributing factors to his election, I would think. And of course he won against considerable odds.

An hon. member: Against the Liberals.

Mr. Penson: It was very interesting that we had a lot of Liberal members in this House talking about the Ontario election about a month ago, but they got fewer and fewer as the weeks passed and it was obvious that the Conservatives were going to win in Ontario.

Of course, to Mike Harris's credit, he did borrow some of our ideas and policies. We applaud him for that.

Another Reform policy in this area is that government should give careful consideration to filling vacancies as they occur in the Senate with province–wide elections. These elections should be conducted in the same manner as the one in which the late Senator Stan Waters was elected, thereby having some popular support in the province. In Quebec, where the senators actually represent defined constituencies, the election would only have to take place in that constituency.

The official Liberal position is that they support an elected Senate. In our caucus we go even further. We believe in what we call a triple–E Senate, one that is equal, effective, and elected. A Senate where there is true representation by region would provide the people of the less populous provinces with an effective voice in the second chamber of Canada's Parliament. A triple–E Senate would give an equal voice to the smaller, less populous provinces and give them the clout in Parliament they have sought for so long.

It is not as if Canada would be breaking any new ground here. Other countries have two democratically elected chambers: the United States, Germany, and Australia. I realize that creating the kind of Senate of which I speak would require constitutional reform, but in the interim this government could hold senatorial

elections in the same way it did when it appointed Stan Waters as a result of that election.

To date, the Prime Minister has ignored his own official Liberal policy and has chosen to fill Senate vacancies with the usual assortment of party hacks and cronies. This is in direct conflict with the stated Liberal policy.

Since Bill C–69 does not bring about substantial change to the redrawing of the boundaries and to the whole democratic process of true representation, I say let us revert back to the old process. Why would I say that? It is because we have already spent $6 million on that process. Hearings have been held in a lot of those ridings. They understood what was going to happen in terms of what their new boundaries would be. It was well along before it was interrupted a year and a half ago.

• (1940)

I say let us change the whole kit and caboodle. Let us bring in true representation by population and bring in true representation by region or else leave the process alone and revert to what it was before. We had quite a good process in place, one that recognized that there are people who move in the country from time to time, one that recognized growth in regions and therefore recognized that the boundaries have to be redrawn from time to time. That process is one we should revert to. The Senate recognized it, with some minor changes. I believe we would be wise to drop Bill C–69 and the mismanagement that has followed it and revert to a process that has worked well for us in the past.

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Madam Speaker, throughout Canada's history the issue of electoral boundary redistribution has been contentious. The hostility is derived from the very premise that those who have power are never willing to relinquish their hold on it.

I want to make it clear from the outset that I am opposed to Bill C–69, as it will attempt to fix a process that is not really broken. The government wants to scrap an electoral boundaries commission that has cost Canadians nearly $5 million and redo that process at a cost of another $5 million to $6 million. My question to the other side of the House is what happened to fiscal responsibility?

I could see the need for Bill C–69 if the original report had in some way been tainted by any type of political influence—in other words, if there had been gerrymandering or if there had been a large outcry from Canadians regarding the current redistribution process. Neither of those events has occurred.

I think the idea of politicians redrawing their own boundaries lies at the very core of a serious problem in Canada. The problem is a lack of trust by the public regarding politicians. It is evident therefore that this government does not see that Canadians are unhappy with the entire process in which politicians have been conducting their business.

Canadians want change. They want a new style of openness. They want a new style of fairness. This type of legislation can only be viewed as regressive. Even though the House was given the absolute right to redraw the electoral boundaries at Confederation, because of the contentious nature of electoral redistribution Parliament agreed to share the responsibility of redistribution with electoral boundaries commissions.

Since the creation of the electoral boundaries commissions in 1964, public perception that there is not a considerable amount of political interference in the readjustment process has diminished. The political interference that took place before the creation of the electoral boundaries commissions was seen as an attempt to ensure as far as possible that the members of the governing party were re–elected. That is absolutely wrong.

I hope this government is not travelling down the same path of earlier governments, where gerrymandering and the abuse of power were seen as commonplace. It is important to note that since 1964, while many politicians have been unhappy with the outcome of redistribution, there has rarely been a complaint of political interference. This is a direct result of one mitigating factor. These commissions are non–partisan. The commissions look primarily at the number of people in the province, not political partisanship. They do not consider how the changes will affect one party over another.

• (1945)

The largest criticism of the commissions is they do not consider enough non–political information. Many times they overlook common community interests or community identities. It is important to ensure redistributed boundaries correspond as closely as possible to the national quotient while also taking into account community interests and the historical patterns of an electoral district.

These factors will enable the commissions to properly manage the geographic sizes of districts with sparsely populated areas. The commissions are allowed to deviate from the provincial average by plus or minus 25 per cent, as the bill was written.

This allows them to accommodate for human and geographic factors. Another issue that causes me a great deal of concern and which was not addressed by Bill C–69 is that because of a 1985 constitutional amendment no province can have fewer seats than the 1985 level of representation regardless of the population of that province.

The exception is P.E.I. which can have no fewer MPs than Senators, not something we disagree with. We therefore have done away with the premise of absolute representation by population. It is clear that within the concept of representation by population emerges the concept of equality of vote. Any

notion of equality which rep by population may permit is countered by the fact the current and historical development of representation in Canada has only partially been based on the notion of this concept.

Since Confederation Canada has developed a system with respect to electoral representation whereby a heavily populated province retains its majority of seats within the House of Commons while the less populated provinces receive an adequate number of seats to ensure appropriate representation.

By no means does the federal government reflect the notion of true representation of population in its purest form. Rep by pop has been altered in order to guarantee a minimum number of seats within the House to the less populated provinces so they do not become under represented if their population base decreases.

Thus while the principle of representation by population may be said to lie at the heart of the electoral apportionment, it has from the beginning been altered by other factors. Due to Canada's vast geographic size and regional differences a modified version of representation by population has emerged.

It is therefore determined the equality of votes guaranteed by Canadians is one of relative equality and not absolute equality. Therefore we do not have equality of voting power but rather relative equality of voting perception.

Canada has many regions and there probably are as many definitions of regionalism as there are people defining it. Regionalism is not some sort of disease to be stamped out. Rather it is a healthy manifestation, lacking at present a healthy constitutional outlet. The only true significant political failure of the Canadian experience is its chronic inability to solve those regional tensions.

The Senate was established to protect the interests of the regions and the provinces, yet for too long western Canada has felt its interests have not been adequately represented in this federal Parliament. The Canadian Senate lacks legitimacy in the eyes of many Canadians because it is an appointed body which runs counter to the fundamental Canadian belief that democratic governments should be conducted by an elected rather than an appointed body.

• (1950)

What Canadians need and what Canadians in more and more numbers want is an effective, elected and equal Senate. A reformed Senate will not just benefit one province or one region, it will help build a better and stronger Canada.

We should have an elected Parliament based solely on representation by population with a constant number of members. This concept will work only if we have an elected Senate in which all of the regions of Canada have an equal number of senators; this would ensure that Parliament reflects a notion of one person, one vote and would allow the Senate to recognize the regional interests of our nation.

Moving on to the specific recommendations from the Senate on Bill C–69, I state for the record we support some of its amendments. Amendment Nos. 1 and 6(a) will reduce the allowable size of deviation from the provincial average to 15 per cent from the current 25 per cent.

This should help to equalize some of the concerns I have raised regarding the inequities of representation by population. This will ensure the ratio between rural and urban dwellers in that it will become smaller. It also allows for deviations of the plus or minus 15 per cent in special circumstances, which is totally acceptable to the Reform Party and is a point we as a party have argued for throughout every stage of this debate.

Amendment No. 4(a) is for the most part a technical amendment which simply states the two non–judicial commission members reside in the province for which the commission is established. The merits of this amendment speak clearly for themselves. However, for those for whom it does not, let me put it this way. Who better to understand the needs and requirements of a particular province than someone from that province?

Amendment No. 6(b)(i) eliminates the provision that a commission will only recommend changing to existing electoral district boundaries where the factors are set out and are to be significant enough to warrant such a recommendation.

Again it is important that an independent body able to make recommendations which could have boundary deviations which may be necessary is also free from the notion of perception of political interference. We must always remember it is simply not enough to be free from gerrymandering; it must be perceived to be free form gerrymandering.

I wish to make it clear that even with the three Senate amendments with which we agree the bill does not improve on the present process to warrant discarding the redistribution that is almost complete.

Bill C–69 failed to address the size of the House by capping or limiting the number of members of Parliament in the future. It plans to increase number of members of the House from 295 to 301. My constituents in Edmonton—Strathcona do not want more politicians; they want less government.

Bill C–69 will ultimately cost the Canadians $5 million to $6 million, as was already mentioned, to redo the distribution process. For these reasons I am against Bill C–69 in principle.

• (1955)

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to take the floor once again regarding Bill C–69, this time at the consideration stage of Senate amendments and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster.

The two speakers who preceded me, the hon. members for Peace River and for Edmonton—Strathcona, spoke for several minutes about their desire for an elected Senate, a triple–E Senate, an efficient Senate, to use the words they used. In theory, it could appear interesting to elect members to the other place on a regional basis. Just imagine. I am merely asking a hypothetical question because this is not at all what I want.

They would like to create a parliamentary Senate with 24 members from the Maritimes, which is what we have now, 24 from Quebec, 24 from Ontario, 24 from western Canada, 2 from the territories and the 6 senators from Newfoundland in accordance with the Newfoundland Act of 1949, for a total of 104, but they would like to have them elected. That could create a balance of sorts. It is plain to see now that the Senate has completely strayed from its original mandate which was to protect the regions.

It is a House which speaks for itself and which, in the final analysis, has no other voice than the one that it gives itself. Except that the amendment proposed by the Reform Party will probably have its day when the time comes to reorganize Canada's political institutions, which will probably be in a few months. In the meantime, we have other decisions to make and we have work to do regarding the new partnership between Quebec and Canada.

This having been said, the Bloc Quebecois opposes Bill C–69 at third reading for a very simple reason. Although we recognized that Bill C–69 was a significant improvement over the current law, we had no other option but to oppose Bill C–69 when this House refused to approve the motion in amendment that I tabled in this House at the report stage, which aimed to secure minimum representation for Quebec. This minimum representation would have been set at 25 per cent, in other words, would have guaranteed Quebec 25 per cent of all seats under the constitution.

I note with sadness that, apart from the Bloc Quebecois members, the only other members who supported this amendment at the report stage were the hon. member for Beauce and the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. This tells all about how isolated the Bloc, an hon. member from British Columbia and the independent member for Beauce were in their move to support this amendment.

It tells of just how isolated Quebec is and it tells the story of just how things evolved until we arrived at this state of affairs. While at the beginning of the federation we thought that we had made a nation to nation pact and, overall, equality for anglophones and francophones, 128 years later, we find ourselves in a situation where we are even denied a minimum of 25 per cent. We find ourselves in a situation where Reform members expound their theory in the House that Quebec is only one province among ten and not a founding people. Canada has reached the multicultural and multiethnic stage; it is no longer at the biethnic and bicultural stage, as Quebec has always seen Canada.

• (2000)

There are two opposing visions. I think it is useless to prolong these arguments about ideas, terminology and behaviour. This fall in Quebec, we will have to make up our minds about what we want. Do we want to be a people, a nation like other nations? Or do we want to be a province like the other provinces? That is the question we will have to answer this fall.

Later, together with our friends in English Canada, liberated from the political structures that are strangling us today, once we stop feeling like a minority group in a country where every day we become more conscious of the fact, then we will be able to create economic and political instruments that are far more effective than what we know today, which makes this debate so pointless.

I will not review everything that has been done since Bill C–18 was passed last year in this House.

A few moments ago, I referred to the fact that Quebec failed to obtain guarantees for 25 per cent of the seats, which was a minimum if we were to support Bill C–69. That being said, our support for Bill C–69 is not a foregone conclusion.

We have reached a theoretical stage in this debate. Tomorrow we will know whether the Senate will be able to garner the requisite unanimous consent to receive the bill from the House as amended and possibly proceed with third reading.

If the bill is not passed by the Senate by midnight tomorrow and has not received royal assent, the current legislation will prevail. After this evening's vote, we will look forward to what happens tomorrow in the Senate. Will there be unanimous consent to proceed or not? We have no control over the process.

I must say the government did a very poor job of scheduling this particular bill. Perhaps it did not expect such a strong reaction from the Senate. That may be, but I think that as soon as the bill was amended in the Senate, if the government had said no and stuck to its guns instead of caving in after the first negative vote in the Senate on this bill, the whole thing would have been settled long ago.

The Senate is starting to make a habit of this procedure, as we saw subsequently. It delayed Pearson, it delayed Bill C–68 to create committees and so forth. However, those who were responsible for these tactics were probably hesitant to use them, and when they did they were rather clumsy about it, so that in the end, the government no longer controls the agenda. We are at

the mercy of a single person who could defeat this bill, as happened in the case of Meech Lake.

However, this legislation would improve certain aspects of determining electoral boundaries. You may recall that if C–69 comes into force, the commissioners will have to hear submissions before starting on their work. This would give them some idea of the situation they would have to deal with.

The commissioners would produce three maps instead of just one, which is an improvement, as I have always said. I worked on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on this bill until quite recently. Basically, I agreed with all the amendments except that when we were denied a guarantee of 25 per cent of the seats for Quebec, it was obvious we could no longer support the bill.

As for the technical improvements, there were quite a few. I see that the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who also worked on this legislation, agrees with me in that respect.

The fact that Bill C–69 obliges the commissions to consider community of interest is certainly an improvement. Providing for a readjustment every five years instead of every ten was another improvement, because this prevents excessive distortion due to the population shifts that occur in Canada.

• (2005)

My colleague, the hon. member for Terrebonne, was speaking earlier about the situation that is peculiar to the area he represents, where population growth is quite incredible. Adjustments every five years would mean avoiding redoing the electoral maps that upset everybody, every ten years.

Bill C–69, the result of a compromise, maintained the principle of the 25 per cent variation in the electoral quota. That is, if the number of voters in a riding was set at 100,000, the riding could have either 75,000 or 125,000 voters. The compromise in Bill C–69 lay in the fact that a riding could no longer have over 125 per cent, which is currently the case. One riding can have 200 per cent of the voters so that others may have 50 per cent fewer. In this regard, I think the bill is well balanced.

It is unfortunate that we were denied the constitutional guarantee for Quebec of 25 per cent of the seats, my own proposal, the bare minimum, given that, in 1867, we had 65 of the 181 seats, that is, two thirds of the members of Parliament were from Quebec. Now, from 33 per cent, if the next election is held using the new electoral map, we will have 75 seats out of 301. In other words, the fateful figure of 25 per cent will be wiped out. This is how the francophones and Acadians outside Quebec quietly became minorities. The same applies to the people of Quebec, who are quietly becoming a minority without a constitutional guarantee, either.

We are not lucky like the province of Prince–Edward–Island to have a senatorial clause. We do not have the special protection enjoyed by the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, which is a constitutional guarantee of one seat, regardless of their population. We are not questioning this—it is a fine thing for them. I am not questioning Prince–Edward–Island's representation or the Northwest Territories' or the Yukon's representation, but why not give the same representation to Quebec?

Two members voted with the Bloc. I remind my colleague for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that they are the member for Beauce and the member for Burnaby—Kingsway. No other member considered it appropriate to support the proposal. Quite the opposite, they all rose to vote against it. Obviously this is their democratic right. I take the liberty, however, of drawing my own conclusions, and Quebec voters can do the same.

Were there other good things? I will look in my notes, as it has been a while since I have had occasion to speak about this. The provisions in Bill C–69 struck a certain balance that made it possible to function. We started over with new commissions and new commissioners appointed by the Speaker of the House and the provincial chief justices, and the Speaker's decisions could be reviewed at the request of a minimum number of members in this House.

Thus, members were involved more at the stage of appointing the commissioners than at the stage of reviewing the map. It is not work suited to MPs, who too often think that the riding belongs to them and who always want to hang on to the same boundaries so as not to lose a particular parish, because in the world of politics, of course, friendships are formed, as are some rather artificial boundaries, that become almost as important as the borders between countries.

We are probably left with two scenarios: either Bill C–69 does not receive Royal Assent tomorrow evening and we start all over again, or Bill C–69 is not passed tomorrow evening and we are left with the existing act. In either case, we will have a problem because we still do not have the 25 per cent for Quebec. Nobody is going to give it to us and that is that.

If the existing act is suspended until midnight tomorrow by Bill C–18, we will have the bizarre and unfortunate situation where commissions that have been suspended or that knew that they were going to be suspended, have nonetheless continued to do their work for quite some time.

• (2010)

And constituents, believing in good faith that the bill presented in the House would pass, did not come before those commissions which were obviously going to be disbanded. However, through the Senate amendments, they were only suspended, and they will be revived tomorrow night. They often held their hearings before empty rooms.

If those commissions, created under the old act passed by the previous government in another Parliament, are to be revived tomorrow night, they should at the very least hold new hearings to allow people to express their opinions on the electoral boundaries that have already been proposed. We should make no mistake about it, there are some members, particularly Liberal members, who think that if Bill C–69 does not pass, we go back to the 1993 electoral map.

On the contrary, I want to tell the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that this is not the case, he will not get back his 1993 riding. We have to tell him that it will be his riding as reviewed by the commission for Ontario. He does not seem to understand it; I would like him to explain to all his colleagues we can see here tonight that if Bill C–69 does not pass, we do not go back to the status quo, but to the electoral districts as they were established before Bill C–18 was passed.

In fact, if those commissions are revived tomorrow night, they will resume their hearings to hear constituents across the country.

Still, everything was not bad with the old act, particularly with regard to the definition of special considerations allowing the creation of electoral districts departing from the electoral quota by more than 25 per cent. Right now, under Bill C–69, a commission can deviate by more than 25 per cent below the provincial quota, and always below—it cannot be 150 per cent or even 126 per cent of the quota, but it could be 74, 65 or 50 per cent—only in very exceptional cases like those isolated and very hard to reach areas.

This is what Bill C–69 provides, but the former act was much more flexible. Let me read it. The act as it stands now, if Bill C–69 is not in force, says that a commission can deviate from the provincial quotient by more than 25 per cent more or 25 per cent less. Thus, it can go as high as 150 or 175 percent and as low as 40 per cent "in any case where any special community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the province appear to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable."

Those guidelines are much more flexible than Bill C–69 where remote areas are concerned. The act we have now is more flexible. It is by no means certain, but it is likely that ridings in areas like the Lower St. Lawrence, the Gaspé peninsula and Lac–Saint–Jean would remain practically unchanged. With Bill C–69, there is a real danger because the commissions cannot go beyond 125 per cent and create a reservoir of voters to compensate for another area.

The same holds true for Northern Ontario, where Bill C–69 will spell problems. I think that a certain balance was achieved with C–69, but that it is far from perfect.

As to the motion moved by the government House leader concerning Senate amendments, I am tempted to say that they are good amendments to a flawed bill.

Since it is a flawed bill, I will vote against the amendments later tonight, and I hope our colleagues in the other place will be guided by the Providence when they make their decision tomorrow on whether Bill C–69 will receive royal assent or the former commissions will be revived.

• (2015)

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this debate has been going on for quite a while. I remember it as one of the first debates in the House. It was ferocious and motives were attributed to the government that were not true, but what else is new.

I recall vividly the first debate we entered into when we said we wanted to update the electoral boundaries bill to better reflect the communities of interest and also make some other adjustments. I recall so well the member for Beaver River commenting on the fact that what we were doing was gerrymandering, trying to fix boundaries and trying to assure our political futures.

Today I listened to one of my colleagues from Peace River who was still using some of the same arguments. I thought it would be useful to recount what happened in my community and how the community came together. Instead of being divided by various political alliances, the community put aside its various partisan political representations and learned to cross political boundaries to support the interests of the community of the regional municipality of Waterloo, of which my riding is one member. There are three ridings contained in that region: Waterloo, the Kitchener riding and the Cambridge riding.

I recall when the commission came out with its proposal on how it was going to divide up the regional municipality of Waterloo. The consensus across the region was that the proposal was not acceptable. It did not make any sense and that the community, on which it would impact, had no representation. Their wishes were ignored.

I underline that because it is important, particularly for our colleagues in the Reform Party to understand this. What I as a member and my colleagues from Kitchener and Cambridge were reacting to was to the presentations made to members of

Parliament by members of the community. Let us say that we were representing the wishes of our constituents.

As I mentioned before, we are contained within the regional municipality of Waterloo. It has three cities, Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge. It also has four townships, North Dumfries, Wolwich, Wilmont and Wellesley. We have seven local municipal councils. Then we have the regional municipality of Waterloo council.

If you looked at the partisan politics of these various councils, we had Liberals, many Conservatives, some New Democrats and even some Reformers. In the case of the riding of Waterloo, which contains the township of Wolwich to the north, the city of Waterloo and part of the city of Kitchener, I used to sit on the Waterloo city council. When I was elected to come to the House of Commons by the electors of the riding, the person who filled my position on the council was a gentleman by the name of Mike Connolly who was a candidate for the Reform Party in the 1993 elections.

When the Waterloo city council first heard about the proposal that was put forward, it was Mr. Connolly, the former candidate for the Reform Party, who moved the motion at the council that the boundaries commission proposal was not acceptable. Is that not rather interesting? You would think that the sincerity of partisan politics would go from the grassroots up to this place but it seems to remain at the grassroots. Mr. Connolly was quite active in making sure the resolution was passed on to the other six municipal councils as well as regional council.

• (2020)

Mr. Connolly, who was appointed to fill my position on city council, had the same kind of support for the government's infrastructure program. Reformers in the House could not find anything useful to say about what turned out to be a very successful program.

Once the local councils talked about the issue they met with my colleague from Kitchener and myself regarding the boundaries. They were very concerned that the Waterloo region, which has evolved over a period in excess of 100 years, have its political integrity respected.

We went to the boundaries hearing. I was there, along with my colleague from Kitchener and the mayor from Waterloo. Representatives from the regional municipality of Waterloo were there. We had representation from all the individual councils. It was a community of interest that crossed partisan political lines to push for something on behalf of the community that made political sense. When one talks about community of interest that is one of the things that I am very happy about in terms of my community, the Waterloo region.

We were going to plead with boundaries commission to change its mind because it had already said what it was going to do. The response of the boundaries commission to our joint plea was that it made a few very minor adjustments. Its members could have told us they could have accommodated us within the perimeter of the boundaries that they set up or they could have accommodated us by drawing lines that made sense, some of which would have coincided with the provincial boundaries but they did not do that.

Once again I am very pleased with this bill. I am pleased with a number of aspects of it. One is that the commissioners in the future will listen to reports from communities before they make up their minds. They will canvass the whole province and then they will have an overall idea of what should take place. Before they can do that they are going to have to hold hearings.

It is somewhat similar to what happens at the local council level when a developer proposes to zone a piece of property. We have in the province of Ontario and in other provinces a process under the planning act that is known as the informal public hearing where people in the community have an opportunity to have their say before the commission makes up its mind or ties itself down to some options.

The reason that is important is I believe that a community like Waterloo region probably could have got the commission to consider much more seriously what my community asked of the boundaries commission. We are going to have minimal changes. We are going to try to minimize the changes to boundaries. Let me expand on that a bit. The boundaries commission took the city of Waterloo, with a population of about 84,000, which is well below the 100,000 or 105,000 people that are supposed to be in a riding, and dismembered that city. It took a big chunk of lakeshore on the north side of the city and then it drew an imaginary line to the east and really did a hatchet job on the municipality. The commission then took a big chunk out of Kitchener and added it to the new Waterloo riding. That did not make any sense.

• (2025)

The commission also did the same thing to the riding of Kitchener. It took away a big chunk of Kitchener and then it gave it a bigger chunk.

It is important for the people in the communities of Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge to have boundaries where they can understand who their provincial representatives are and who their federal representatives are. As much as possible those boundaries should coincide. As well, we should have boundaries whose names reflect the geographic location of the riding. In the case of the Waterloo federal riding, the township of Woolwich is included as well as the northern part of Kitchener. By calling the riding Waterloo, that is hard for people to understand.

One of the proposals put forward in the bill is that there should be a minimizing of the changes to the boundaries. The interests of the community should be the dominant factor. The commissions will listen to the input of the people living in the districts before its members make up their minds. The commissions will conduct informal public hearings where it will hear the constituents. I believe that the end product will be something with which

my community, both in the Waterloo federal riding as well as in the regional municipality of Waterloo, will be a lot happier.

Let me conclude by emphasizing that the partisan political parties in my community came together and in my riding, the city of Waterloo, the person who moved the motion expressing grave disagreement with the proposed boundaries was the candidate for the Reform Party in the last election campaign. He stood for what the community wanted. My position, the position of my colleague from Kitchener, as well as my colleague from Cambridge, come from trying to represent what is best for our community and what our community so articulately expressed to us.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Waterloo for his remarks. I particularly enjoyed his comments about the former candidate for the Reform Party. It will be nice after the next election when we will get to enjoy reading his comments in *Hansard*. I am sure those comments will be far more to the point and much easier to digest.

It is a pleasure to speak to this bill tonight. In a sense the bill encapsulates part of the problem with the democratic process, or the choosing in this case of electoral boundaries. It deals with the neutrality of that, the idea that we as politicians should not be messing around in choosing the riding boundaries. We should be leaving that to a neutral body which will ensure that fairness is the key word in all boundary decisions.

• (2030)

It also gives me an opportunity to talk about the whole legislative process by which we bring laws into being in the House. On a late night sitting like this, it gives me cause for a few moments to talk about the whole idea of debate, which again is part of that democratic process. The flaws that I see in the House and in this current parliamentary system.

I am often asked after being here for a year and a half what I think of it now, if it is everything I thought it would be. Is it everything I thought it would be? Is it everything I thought it would be when I first got here? I have to say sadly with considerable disappointment that no, it is not. This evening I will give a 20–minute speech to a largely empty House. This is my second speech of the day. I gave another 20–minute speech on Bill C–86 earlier today. It was germane to my riding. It was about the dairy commission.

A lot of work goes into the preparation of a speech. There is the research, the time my staff and I commit, my resources, the communication with my constituents and earlier today with my dairy farming constituency, and so on. There is all that effort to prepare a decent and hopefully cogent argument and then I deliver it into an empty House. There has to be something wrong when people back home are wondering what I think of it. I am pleased to be here. I am proud to represent them, but they should know that there is a systemic problem here.

When I see debate after debate and speaker after speaker presenting arguments to themselves and not having someone to debate with, it is rather discouraging. The very process of debate presupposes that there is someone to debate with. We have to suppose that we are going to talk to someone and try to understand their point of view, debate them on the merits of that point and then listen to their points. It goes back and forth until we come to a resolution that maybe was wiser than either one of us started out with.

Again, when I give another speech to a largely empty House, I wonder sometimes about the value of it. Is it just killing time or is it really debate where I hope to speak to someone's intellect and challenge them in some ways?

Yesterday there was a vote on a private members' Bill C–295 that I initiated. It was defeated. I was not upset about the defeat of the bill. What does annoy me is that early in the debate I had misplaced a word in the text of the peacekeeping bill I brought forward. I asked for and received unanimous consent of the House to change the word command to operational control.

The word was changed and for the next three debates I listened to the prepared speeches from the other side. Members just went through their prepared speeches time and time again saying that the word command should be changed to operational control. It had been done at the outset but they did not listen. They are not not listening and they do not care to enter logical debate.

Instead, the government wants to come in with a legislative agenda, crack the whip and tell people how to vote. The concern for actually coming to a consensus is somewhere down there. I referred to it earlier in my dairy speech as the spreadings of the honey wagon.

An hon. member: Some people might not know what a honey wagon is.

Mr. Strahl: I will leave the honey wagon explanation to others.

In his intervention the member for Waterloo was speaking about the need to represent the wishes of his constituents. I urge the member to go back and check his speech. He may want to check the blues to see if he can get that erased. Representing the wishes of a constituency. What does that mean to Liberals exactly? What is the purpose of representing their constituents?

• (2035)

If the Liberals were to represent their constituents but it was not the party line, I wonder what would happen. I am sure the Liberal Party would shrug it off. It would say that probably the member had a legitimate point of view having consulted with his constituents and wanting to legitimately represent their concerns even though they happen to be juxtaposed against the Liberal Party. That would be fine, would it not?

We have seen in the last couple of weeks—and this comes down again to the democratic process—what would happen if Liberal members truly try to represent their constituents in the Liberal Party. First they would get the mild reaction, the tongue lashing. "Mr. Member from wherever, if you do that again, if you happen to be so brazen as to actually represent the people who put you into power, we will make sure that you do not get a voice on committees". That would be the first step: Why do we not just yank them from their role on committees? That is of course a small thing, but when they are trying to do their job I suppose those three or four Liberals would feel just a tad chastized. What would happen if this continued? If the members were so brazen as to vote a second time against the Liberal Party, what would happen?

Suppose the member was a 30–year man having been on the job for 30 years, never voting against or bucking the party line but finally he did what he thought was the wishes of his constituents. Perhaps the member was a former cabinet minister who had bent the ear of several prime ministers. If he dared to step out of line, what would happen? He would be threatened with dismissal from the chairmanship of his committee, having done nothing wrong, having done nothing but represent the views of the people in his riding.

If it were to continue, what would then happen? The Prime Minister would stand up and say words like this: "You either do as you are told or I will not sign your nomination papers next time".

It is incredible. That is the way the old line party seems to think is a good way to run the country. It goes to the very heart of what we are talking about tonight, this need to interfere in the democratic process. The way it says that the party knows best, the constituents know nothing, and the members know less. The Liberals have come from a time when they used to be a coalition of friends scratching other friends' backs to friends warning other friends that if they step out of line, they will not be around much longer. It is a sad, sad day.

I wondered even as I listened to the member from Waterloo waxing eloquent as he said: "We are going to make sure that they are going to listen to us. We are going to make sure that they observe the boundaries we want". What kind of nonsense is that? What kind of diatribe is that when we hear someone saying: "We will make sure the next group that sets the boundaries does what we want". It is nonsense.

The reason it is nonsense is that they do not seem to understand the role of a neutral or fair minded boundary commission. The role of a commission is to come in not to do the wishes and the bidding of the member sitting in the riding. It is to listen to witnesses, do what it can to have input from the community, and then it has to make a decision.

The sad but ironic thing about what is happening here with this bill is that the Liberal backbenchers who initiated this whole gong show of a revisiting this whole thing have shot themselves in the foot so to speak, maybe both feet. They said: "We do not like the boundaries that C–18 gave. We do not like the boundaries and in fact the boundaries are so new, it will give us so little time to adjust that what we are going to have to bring in a new set of boundaries".

By pushing it off until this late, we are going to end up with a set of boundaries for Reformers and Liberals alike that no one will know until probably a couple of months before the next election. What a wise, wise move. Of course it will cost another $5 million or $6 million to do it. I guess that is just pocket change. The introduction of the $2 coin is only going to save $12 million a year and the Liberals had to move heaven and earth for that. But for $6 million they will get another set of boundaries that will not be any better than the ones they had before. They will be slightly different and there will be slightly more of them. I wonder if they are listening to their constituents.

• (2040)

I repeat what the member for Waterloo said: "It is important that we represent the wishes of the constituency". Well, what would the constituency want? Maybe I should not speak for the member from Waterloo. Maybe his constituents do want more members of Parliament.

As a matter of fact if we could get 301 members in the House we could start the renovations. Soon we will not have enough room in the House. We could just push the walls back and add more seats until the House becomes—

An hon. member: Tent meetings.

Mr. Strahl: Maybe that is what they would like, tent meetings in order to handle more members of Parliament that are inevitably going to come because of the way this bill has been set up.

The Liberals refused to listen to the Reform Party. The Reform Party said there should not be more than 265 members of Parliament. They should not be looking to expand the numbers of members of Parliament. They should be looking to restrict them, to cut back on the size of government, not to continually think of ways to expand it.

If the Liberals would listen to the constituents in my riding and I would think in Waterloo as well, they would not be adding more seats and pushing the translators out into the boonies. They would be saying: "We have more than enough people here. We have too many members of Parliament. Let us cut back the size of the House of Commons to 265 members". It would be a manageable thing and would save money. If we are going to go to the trouble of a boundary redistribution let us at least save the taxpayers some bucks. Instead, that gets tossed out. It gets shoved aside and the Liberals decide instead to keep expanding it.

Also there have been comments from many members of the Bloc on their supposed concern about the 25 per cent representation. The firm figure they want is a 25 per cent representation of all the seats in the House of Commons must be from Quebec. I do not know where they are coming from. They want out of Canada but they demand at least 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. They want to make sure they have a referendum this year so they can leave Canada, but they demand that they get their MP pensions. They sound confused. A little bit like the Liberals, although granted in a different way. Still I do not understand what they want.

In the bill we talked about earlier today Bloc members wanted continued access to the Canadian dairy market, except that they want to be a separate country. Quebec has 50 per cent of the industrial milk in Canada already. What do they want? I do not know and I do not think they know themselves. With the three leaders getting together I suppose they just want everything. That way they cover it with the three leaders. I am not sure what else it could be.

It is in the best interests of the Liberal Party to let the bill die. If the they would just let the bill die at least Liberal members going into the next election would have some idea as to where they are going to fight their next losing battle. It is in their own best interests to at least set up their own Waterloo in such a way that they could at least plan for their own demise.

There is no sense in being surprised by this. Why ask for a new arbitrary boundary so that we can try to make political contacts, media contacts in a riding where we do not know the boundaries. It is far wiser to go ahead and make whatever changes are necessary, and members opposite, if there were members opposite, should listen to this. There will be and must be changes. The boundaries cannot stay the same. There is no sense in saying: "I wish this town or this little area were included". It is not possible to stay the same. It has to change. It must change.

If it changes, and it will, let us change it now. We can all get on with life and represent the ridings we have and we will go into the next election knowing the boundaries of the ridings we are going to represent. If some ridings need to be eliminated, perhaps we can eliminate the riding of the hon. member who is leaving the House now. If we have to eliminate some, let us eliminate them now and get it over with so we can get on with making our plans for the next election.

• (2045)

Based on the 1991 census the Reform plan originally tabled with the committee would have created a House with a total of 273 members, 265 seats plus some constitutional requirements to include some extras from certain provinces. There would have been only slight future growth. That is the kind of thing our constituents want. They do not want more government.

I will speak for a moment about the way the amendments came back from the Senate. What an improvement it would be if we let the House of Commons operate with representation by population as close as we can work it. Then we move on to an upper House that is as close as we can make it in representational by region. What an improvement it would be if we said we all have 100,000, or whatever the figure, constituents to represent. Sometimes it is difficult because it is spread out; sometimes it is concentrated in cities. Be that as it may, this is rep by pop in the House of Commons.

When we wanted advice or a sober second thought we could go to the Senate elected by the people, that had regional representation so that for instance the farming community in Saskatchewan would have people it could go to and say: "This is the region you represent; this is the job you have. Get with it and represent my interests as a regional centre". We could go to a senator from Toronto and he could do his best to represent that city and so on.

What a better system it would be if we had true rep by pop in a smaller House of Commons and a triple E Senate. We could all look forward to an election for that and the job it would do.

As I talk about this democratic process, the process of who should choose our electoral boundaries, obviously it should not be the members of Parliament but a neutral body. When we set up cost saving measures we should be willing as members of Parliament to pull in our vision of more seats and instead restrict it to a more cost effective way of doing business in the House.

Think of the way we run things in the House where we should be elected to represent our constituents, not just our parties. Think of the changes required to make sure the House of Commons allows freer votes without party discipline. Think of the changes required in committees when a bill is referred to a committee on first reading in the hope of obtaining ample input from members of Parliament only to find out that in some committees when it comes to a clause by clause debate debate will be restricted to five minutes per clause; amendments will be refused if they are in one official language only; clauses of a bill

will be passed without having a vote; decisions will be reversed on votes; witnesses will be refused.

In the case of the MP pension plan members of the committee refused to hear from members of Parliament to be affected by it or from ordinary citizens. They restrict the input into those committees to maybe a single day. They did not allow enough time on Bill C–68, one of the most controversial bills of the year, to have legislative counsel draft the amendments properly.

We saw our Prime Minister saying do as you are told by the party, not as you are told by your constituents or else. We see motions to extend hours and voting until 1 a.m. or 2 a.m. in order to shove through legislation. We see what we are facing here tonight, another example of closure where the government will force the bill through without allowing all the debate members want on it.

We see all of this compiled in only 20 months of the Liberals in government. We wonder where their vaunted red book promises are. Where is the promise of freer votes, more open government, a chance to represent our constituents? It is gone. In only 20 months of arrogant government that is being wrapped up, shipped out in the fish wrappers of old. It is not a reality. The time has come and gone when we could look to the Liberal Party for reforming the House of Commons.

• (2050)

It is becoming obvious that reform of the House of Commons will take the Reform Party. That is why it is a pleasure to stand here with many members of the Reform Party sitting in their seats listening to the debate, entering into the debate with government members who are willing to. We offer constructive criticism, beg the members opposite to debate us in public on issues such as closure, MP pensions and so on and we get no response.

Still it is a pleasure to make known the concerns of my constituents and the concerns of the Reform Party as we want to make this place work better, more democratically. We want an electoral boundaries system free from political interference. That is why I will be voting against this bill and I am proud to do it.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to participate in this debate on Bill C–69.

[*Translation*]

First of all, I want to congratulate all the members who sat on the parliamentary commission on Bill C–69. I want to point out in particular that this bill was agreed on and approved by all the members of the parliamentary committee. I can remember, for instance, the rather significant contribution made by the hon. member for Bellechasse and his support during the final vote in committee. The hon. member enthusiastically agreed to support this government bill.

However, he had to yield to the higher authorities within his caucus, to the big shots in his caucus, and was unable to support the bill in the House. His colleagues even forced him or encouraged him to move an amendment. Even though we were told that the amendment was in order, it was unconstitutional because it would have changed the constitution of Canada.

As you know, the hon. members of the Bloc and others may want to talk about the constitution, because they get a kick out of it, but I for one do not want to address this issue and the right hon. prime minister did say that he did not want to talk about it. Mr. Speaker, you are totally objective and impartial; therefore, you must have noticed that we have stayed away from the issue of the constitution since we came into office.

I want to come back to the substance of Bill C–69, but I cannot miss the opportunity to comment on the statements made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West.

[*English*]

A little earlier I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Fraser Valley West. He was talking about the virtue within the Reform Party. He was talking about the fact that the Reform Party was so virtuous in his opinion, that the Reform Party could do no harm.

As my colleague the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader said so eloquently, obviously if that had been the case it would have been a very short speech because the Reform Party is rather short on virtue.

Nevertheless, he referred to MPs' being able to in his own party, so he said, vote the will of the people members represent and that they were never disciplined for doing so within the Reform Party. Surely some of us remember when the then justice critic was bumped off his parliamentary committee. The then justice critic, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, whom I see before us in the House right now, got the boot. He was booted off his committee because he said something his leader and many other people disagreed with.

• (2055)

What happened? He got bumped off the committee. He was unceremoniously demoted. That is what happened to a Reform MP. What happened to another MP? I remember a certain speech in the House on Bosnia.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the statement the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell made is absolutely untrue. He has no basis to make that comment. I ask him to retract it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Arseneault): That is a matter of debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker as usual has adjudicated in a totally objective and non-partisan way.

Getting back to those people across the way in the Reform Party, I signed the form that assisted in bumping the member off the committee at the request of someone representing another party. We will not mention the name of that party.

However, let us get back to other members of the Reform Party and what happened to them. Do members remember the debate on Bosnia in the House? I do very clearly. I remember a speech from the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. He spoke very well on the issue. Do members know what happened after that? The member never spoke again; weeks and weeks without being able to speak in the House. I wonder why that happened. He was silenced by the authorities within his party.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is a seasoned parliamentarian. He should certainly recognize his comments have no relevancy to Bill C-69, absolutely none.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Over the years the relevancy rule has had a tremendous amount of flexibility and elasticity. I know within the confines of a 20-minute intervention the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is probably just getting to the very point of debate, which the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster was raising.

Mr. Boudria: Well put, Mr. Speaker. Not only is that true but I was responding to the speech from the member for Fraser Valley West and I know that he would not have made an irrelevant speech.

I will stand up to defend the member for Fraser Valley West against this vicious attack by the Reform Party House leader that we just saw against the member for Fraser Valley West because when he talked about free votes in the House we let him say it because we knew it was relevant to this debate.

We all recognize it in the Liberal caucus. The Reform Party House leader now tried to silence that member and to reprimand him for what he said previously. We will not put up with that. We will defend the member for Fraser Valley West.

Having discussed and proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Reform Party senior big wigs have reprimanded most severely the member for Fraser Valley West a moment ago by the comments from the House leader, and also silenced the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, forbidding him to speak in the House for weeks and then bumping the member for New Westminster—Burnaby off his committee unceremoniously, now we can get back to the main topic of Bill C-69.

• (2100)

My colleagues remind me about the hon. member for Crowfoot who was demoted from the human rights committee, but I shall not even mention the member for Crowfoot being bumped off that committee. I am sure he was excellent, but the authorities within the Reform Party saw fit to demote him.

Let us get back to the substance of Bill C-69, recognizing of course that everything I have just said is totally germane to the bill, as the hon. member for Fraser Valley West so eloquently pointed out earlier today.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This may be a trivial matter, but he keeps talking about the hon. member for Fraser Valley West and I am sure he means Fraser Valley East. To avoid the necessity of having to change *Hansard*, maybe we should correct the member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The hon. member for Elk Island is absolutely right. I am sure the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell will now make that adjustment.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that east met west. That is correct, it is the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. But I would gladly defend the hon. member for Fraser Valley West as well, should that be necessary, against any attack by the leadership of the Reform Party.

On the substance of Bill C-69, this bill was necessary. It was tabled in the House by a parliamentary committee. This bill is the only piece of legislation of its kind. It was produced by a parliamentary committee. I am glad to say that I was a member of that committee very ably chaired by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. Of course we had the distinguished leadership and ability of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

[*Translation*]

Several other members, including Reform members, have also helped to make this bill a rather unique piece of legislation, having been entirely drafted by the parliamentary committee.

So, this bill was debated and passed in the House of Commons. Then it was sent to the other place. The other place, in its wisdom, decided to send the bill back to the House with some amendments.

Despite all this shuffling back and forth, we are on the last day of debate on this bill, or so we hope. The other place refuses to adopt this bill, which is not a government bill, but a bill produced by all parliamentarians, by all of us in this House of Commons, who are the salt of the earth.

I do not want to show a lack of respect for the hon. persons in the other place, but not being subject to electoral rules as frequently as we are—and that is the least we can say since, when they are appointed to the other place, they are there for a good long time—they should not be lecturing us on how to get

elected to this House. This bill is good and I am proud to support it.

As a matter of fact, the member for Bellechasse praised this bill a few moments ago, which certainly means that it must be good. The member for Bellechasse spoke about the five–year redistribution that we will have after this bill is adopted, and it will be adopted. After that, there will be no need for the kind of electoral redistribution we have now.

Some members of this House, such as the member for York North, the member for Mississauga, the member for Ontario and the member for Terrebonne, represent ridings that are often two or three times more populated than other ridings across Canada. This is not normal.

• (2105)

This situation will prevail as long as we have a system where electoral redistribution happens only every ten years following the census.

But now, we have a new formula. We have a good bill, a bill that will allow us to make smaller changes every five years, changes that will ensure that the House continues to apply the principle of proportional representation much more adequately than it does now.

I am not convinced that a member who represents 250,000 or 275,000 constituents can take as good care of them as another member whose riding is smaller, like mine for example, with 100,000 constituents, or yours, Mr. Speaker, with some 60,000 constituents. This is the sort of figures I am talking about.

There comes a time when, unless he has access to considerable resources to help his constituents, a member can no longer do his or her job as an MP alone at the riding level, especially when the riding is very large or heavily populated. This is the case of a number of ridings in the Toronto area and, of course, in the Montreal area, the riding of Terrebonne, which is certainly the best example I could come up with in Quebec and stands to benefit from a bill like this one.

[*English*]

Some members have advocated that it is necessary in this bill to put this business of the 25 per cent representation for the province of Quebec. We know the House has already voted that down, as it had to. This is not a constitutional amendment; this is a bill having to do with electoral redistribution. There are right now a series of thresholds in electoral redistribution and we know what they are. There is what is commonly referred to as the Senate floor: no province can have fewer MPs than it has senators. There are a few other criteria in there as well. At present provinces do not lose seats from what they had prior to the last redistribution, and that is since 1988 or so. We must respect what is in there now. We cannot unilaterally today make those kinds of amendments to give that 25 per cent representation.

[*Translation*]

We must also remember that the whole Canadian electoral system is based on a specific province, when it comes to allocating seats to the other provinces. As we all know—at least those of us who, in the past, worked on redefining electoral boundaries—, that province is Quebec. We take the province's population and we divide it by its number of seats. The quotient is then applied elsewhere in the country. It is as simple as that. There is of course another factor, namely the fact that a province cannot have fewer MPs than senators. This explains why, for example, Prince Edward Island has four seats in the House.

[*English*]

In conclusion, I want to ask all members to support this bill. It is a good bill. It is the only bill produced by a parliamentary committee. It is unique and it is our bill. It is the bill of MPs for electoral redistribution for those of us who got elected and for future candidates who will be elected to replace MPs who will not run again or who will be defeated in the next election and so on. It is the bill for redistribution and it is a fair one for all Canadians.

Without being disrespectful, those who do not get elected to anything, after having made their representation to us once, should recognize the second time that this is the will of the House of Commons, democratically elected, and that the will of the people is totally respected by a bill like this.

I say to the members across that they did not produce one piece of evidence why this bill is unfair, nor do they have any alternative to this electoral redistribution bill. Their members who worked on the committee know better than the hon. member who just heckled from across the way.

• (2110)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is not a happy occasion, because just before the fall referendum in Quebec, the Parliament of Canada has failed to recognize the historic contribution of the people of Quebec and confirm that Quebec will have 25 per cent of the seats in Parliament.

I know the amendment was defeated, but I cannot help talking about it because for us in the Bloc Quebecois, and, I suppose I could say, in Quebec, the most important aspect of the bill is the representation of the people of Quebec. This is a gesture the Parliament of Canada could have made to Quebecers. It is a gesture it refused to make, which sends the following message to Quebecers: "We do not recognize your position, your historic contribution or what you are as a people and a distinct nation".

I realize historic references are not always appreciated in this House. But since I am speaking to you, Mr. Speaker, I will try

and make a few. To know where you are going, you have to know where you are from. We must remember that in 1837–38, we had a rebellion in Lower Canada and Upper Canada, both of which were put down. Upper Canada and Lower Canada were forced to come together in a union. Canadians, and I am referring to the "Canayens", the people who came over to America from France and, before France was defeated by England, had become sufficiently independent to start criticizing France, the church over here quarrelling with the church over there, so that if the colony had remained French, after a while it would have become independent like all the American colonies did after a while. These French men and women, who became the "Canayens", are the ones who were defeated. They were left here, about 60,000 of them, and here in North America they continued to multiply, develop the land and try in spite of everything to preserve their language, their religion and identity.

• (2115)

These "Canayens" who in 1791 obtained their national assembly, these Canadiens who for years elected their members and founded a party called the Patriote Party, who wanted to negotiate the patriation of executive powers with England, and finally, these "Canayens" who, according to the historians, were provoked by the Doric Club in 1837, were defeated and became a minority as a result of the forcible union of 1840.

I say became a minority because we should remember that in 1810 and later in 1822, the British Montrealers wanted to make Montreal Island a part of what was not yet known as Ontario but as Upper Canada. However, they were not successful because the "Canayens" who had large families were not about to become a minority.

After the rebellion was put down in 1837–38, when Lord Durham came to conduct his investigation, he said the following: "I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single state". Lord Durham was anxious to put these "Canayens" in a minority position, to ensure that the character of British North America, come what may, would remain British.

At the time, there were about 450,000 "Canayens" in Lower Canada, 150,000 anglophones and about 400,000 British or people of British descent in Upper Canada. This means that although the population was not the same within the union, Upper Canada and Lower Canada were given the same number of members, irrespective of population. There was a significant difference between the number of people in Lower Canada and in Upper Canada. At the time, it was important to maintain the minority status of the "Canayens".

Once the union became official, it did not work very well. According to the history books, many settlers came to Ontario, to Upper Canada, and when the union did not work out, members for Upper Canada, under the slogan "Rep by Pop", demanded a new government. An alliance was formed between representatives of Lower Canada and others, who did not seem prepared to unite with them in Upper Canada to produce a federation, when it became clear that the union was not going to work and something new had to be found.

• (2120)

But, in exchange, and this was clear, patriots like George–Étienne Cartier who fired the first shots, George–Étienne Cartier who was a member of the McDonald government, could not accept a confederation proposal which did not recognize Lower Canada, what it represented and its importance.

Confederation was enacted in the British North America Act. At Confederation, Quebec, because that was how it was then known, became one of four regions. Quebec was granted 65 MPs out of a total of 181.

Since then, Quebecers have steadily become a minority. This situation led a large number of Quebecers to want sovereignty, and it led us, the Bloc Quebecois, who are here in the Canadian Parliament just a few months before the referendum, to say to ourselves that the Canadian Parliament possibly would recognize the right of Quebecers to 25 per cent of all seats because of their status as a founding people.

Now, I will talk about the Quebecois people. This people has long been recognized as Canada's francophone nation. The francophone nation of Canada, the "Canayens" of whom I spoke, held their hands out to the anglophone nation after 1840 in friendship so that those who called themselves English Canadians could try with French Canadians to piece back together the pieces of two shattered colonies.

For a long time, French Canadians in Quebec desperately tried to find their niche within Canada. They were searching for equality. I said for a long time and desperately because there is something desperate in this repetitive quest over the years, we can even say over the centuries, of the descendents of the first francophones, the "Canayens" who became French Canadians who, despite the circumstances, wanted to take their place within Canada.

It is only after repeatedly failing to do so, after recognizing the potential to develop to their fullest in Quebec, that in the 1960s or thereabouts, because history cannot be boxed in, Quebecers saw events quietly transform reality. At a certain moment, the situation changed: in the 1960s or thereabouts the people who were referred to as the cradle of French in Canada became the Quebecois people.

• (2125)

I am always pleased to quote Daniel Johnson, the father, the one who was Premier in 1966, whose father was Irish. Daniel Johnson, the father, this leading Quebec politician, a French

Canadian, the first to launch his party, the Union Nationale, the party in power without a break from 1944, except for the period between 1960 and 1966. He is the one who called an election on a platform of "Égalité ou indépendance". He was thinking of equality for the French–Canadian nation, but he said in his text: "If French Canadians cannot achieve equality within Canada, it will be legitimate, normal and natural for them to seek political independence within their territory".

The people known as Quebecers have a long and meandering history, having moved from a French colonial identity to a North American identity, from Cajun to conquered, to dominated, to colonized by the British colony, to French Canadian in a colony that gained its independence from Great Britain in 1931. The French Canadians, who became Quebecers in the 1960s, are having a hard time discovering their identity, some of them. Some of them mock it.

Their history, although meandering, is one of courage. And Parliament's recognition in acknowledging Quebecers' entitlement to 25 per cent of the seats would have been a minimum tribute to Quebecers' contribution to Canada.

I would add the following. The French Canadians, I saw it earlier and I am repeating it, it hurts me but it is true, French Canadians desperately wanted to find their place and grow within Canada. Often they were the only ones wanting to. At the same time, though, they developed the qualities that go into making a people. They meet all the criteria of a nation: language, different laws, the Civil Code, their religion, a culture and a community spirit. Neither the people nor the nation is closed, as some would claim.

I quoted Daniel Johnson senior earlier. He was the son of an immigrant and became premier. I do not think I need to provide many more examples in talking of this openness.

This people tried to find its place in Canada. After the referendum when the people said "no" in 1980, because Trudeau had promised change, federal reform, the people followed Bourassa with his five basic conditions. Today, some people have no other choice but to say: "We will take charge ourselves".

They do not want an end to relations. For them, the only way to grow in this country is to say yes to who they are and offer the rest of Canada an economic and a political agreement.

• (2130)

It would not have cost Parliament much to grant this status to the people of Quebec, a status they have anyway, by recognizing that they are a founding people of Canada and play a fundamental role within Canada.

Personally, I would have liked to see such a sign. Instead, what we saw was its failure to recognize this basic difference of ours.

Some members addressed the technical requirements of the rep. by pop. rule and we understand that this is important. However, the message Parliament could have sent or still could send Quebec is infinitely more important than setting the allowable percentage of variance in determining the size of any given riding. We are talking about having one country or two.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised to hear the comments made by the hon. member for Mercier.

In his speech earlier tonight, the government whip suggested that Bloc members disagreed on this bill. This is quite obvious tonight as the hon. member for Bellechasse, who sits on the committee, proposed in committee an amendment to the bill that would have given Quebec at least 25 per cent of the seats in this House.

The suggestion to amend the bill actually came from a senator who testified as a witness before the committee. The committee nonetheless decided that amendments to the Constitution of Canada were not needed at this time and that, as everyone agreed, the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Bellechasse would involve amending the constitution. Consequently, the committee rejected this amendment and decided to preserve the constitutional relations now in effect among all Canadian provinces, and especially the constitutional provisions concerning representation in this House. We then heard the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm deliver a long speech in this House at second or third reading of this bill.

The hon. member for Bellechasse did not have anything to say at that time, while his colleague from Berthier—Montcalm called for major changes to this bill and proposed an amendment. This amendment was rejected by the House. We now hear all kinds of speeches dealing with the amendments proposed by the Senate, which have nothing to do with the constitution, nothing to do with the representation of any province in this House, although all speeches by Bloc members deal with this. This has nothing to do with the motion before the House tonight. Perhaps they would like this to be the case, but it is not.

• (2135)

The motion before the House and the amendment concern only the amendments proposed by the Senate. It is noteworthy that the Senate did not propose the amendments requested by the hon. members for Mercier and Bellechasse. Why? Because such amendments would have also been rejected by the Senate.

I am surprised. During her speech, the hon. member for Mercier rewrote the history of Canada. It is very obvious that our country was built by two partners, English Canadians and French Canadians. That much is obvious to everybody. Canada will continue to prosper because of these two partners. If we are together, if we work together to continue to build this country, there will always be enough wealth for everyone in Canada and no one will be denied their rights. That is what created this great country, Canada, and what will sustain it in the future.

I am certain that when the Bloc Quebecois will have the courage to hold a referendum in the Province of Quebec, Quebecers will tell all of the world that they want to remain in Canada, that they want to remain part of this great country, because they have always worked with all other Canadians to create this country, not without difficulty, but ever hopeful for the future of this great country, one of the world's greatest.

[*English*]

I want to leave that subject and speak instead tonight about the Reform amendment, which is, after all, what we are supposed to be discussing.

I am very surprised to see the Reform Party carrying on the way it has been tonight. Again I have the little green book handy. I was just browsing through it. I know we have heard hon. members of the Reform Party almost speak disrespectfully of the other place. I am shocked, to say the least. I am shocked because here we have a spectacle of the Reform Party on the one hand speaking disrespectfully of the other place and on the other hand supporting the amendments it has made to this bill. I do not think it is any accident that many of the amendments proposed by the Reform Party members in the committee and rejected by the House and the committee are now being supported by their friends in the other place.

The other place has a constitutional right to suggest amendments to this House and send bills back, as it has done in this case, but I am surprised that a party that speaks so disrespectfully of the other place would now support by its amendment the amendments that have been proposed there.

I want to quote from their leader, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest, in the little green book. The book is called "The Gospel According to Preston Manning and the Reform Party". He said the following, although I want to say at the outset that I do not agree with the statement: "The three priorities of the present Senate are, in order, protocol, alcohol and Geritol".

Mr. Hermanson: Hear, hear.

Mr. Milliken: There is the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, who quoted this very statement in his speech the other night, applauding it. Yet I note on the other hand that he is supporting the Senate amendments to this bill.

We are not just asking him to vote for the one amendment the government supports. He is saying we should support a whole bunch of them and has proposed an amendment to do. We are saying reject it because those amendments are not good amendments to this bill and we are asking the Senate to withdraw them. That is what the motion states. It is a sensible bill.

What is the principal objection the Reform Party has? I suggest there are two. One of them is not dealt with in any of these Senate amendments and it was not dealt with in the bill, but there are two. The first was that Reformers wanted the possibility in a riding of moving away from the provincial quotient to the variation permitted to be 15 per cent above or below instead of 25 per cent above or below.

The result of such a change would be to ensure that the ridings would be closer in size. In other words, there would be one person equal to one vote a little more closely across the country than is the case now. In fact it would only apply within a province, but it would result in a substantial shift.

• (2140)

The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster and the others who are hooting and hollering over there tonight know perfectly well that it would result in changes so that large rural ridings such as that occupied by the hon. member for Bellechasse—I could name a whole host of others in this House, but he is here, he was on the committee, he knows the argument—would be enlarged enormously to fill it up with more people to get it closer to the provincial quotient in numbers and other ridings in big cities would be cut up and divided into smaller units. More ridings would move to the cities than there are now and there would be fewer rural ridings in Canada.

I am surprised that hon. members opposite, largely from rural parts of the country themselves, are supporting this kind of amendment. I know their hope lies in winning additional seats in other parts of Canada, but I know perfectly well their hope lies in rural Canada. If they cannot win seats there, they are going to be in difficulty.

Mr. Duhamel: They are in difficulty.

Mr. Milliken: My hon. colleague says they are in difficulty, and he is right on that score.

The second argument they had was that the House was getting too big and they wanted to stop this House from getting any bigger. They said 295 was ample. Some of them wanted to cut it back. There was disagreement on how far it should be cut back, but they wanted to cut it back.

The government and the members of the committee agreed that 301 was not too many and we have agreed to go along with the existing law. So we have proposed no change in the Constitution or in the rules relating to the size of the House and we have left it at 301 members, which is what the number will be after the next election, whether this act passes or not.

Let us see what their leader says about how you fix meetings. He said this is one of the things you have to do to preserve party dignity: "If you think it's going to be that type of meeting, get as many sane, sober people there as possible. Overwhelm the kook element." We are only following his leader's advice. We are going to try to expand this House to overcome the kook element. That is the aim. We are going to try to create another five or six seats, fill them with good Liberals, and overwhelm the kook element in the opposition—and I do not mean the official opposition.

That is just one of the things his leader said. He said more. There is a lot more. This man is productive.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am very curious as to whether the hon. member referring to us over here as the kook element is denigrating our position and impunging our honour. I would ask him to please retract that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Certainly any member can retract anything upon the request of another member, but respectfully I must say to the House that is not a point of order.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I did not think the member would be offended; I was only quoting his leader.

I want to quote the hon. member for Calgary Southwest again. He also said "Every political party has a few bad apples". I think he was right, but I will not throw stones.

The member obviously holds politicians in very low esteem. The hon. members opposite say they do not want to have 301 seats because it would increase the number of politicians, and they say that Canadians do not like politicians. I do not know about the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, the hon. member for Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, the hon. member for Bruce—Grey, the hon. member for St. Boniface, the hon. member for London West. All of these people are not unpopular in their constituencies. I know when they go home they are greeted warmly. They are not regarded as unwanted politicians. Perhaps the hon. member for Calgary Southwest and some of the members of his party feel they are unpopular and therefore think politicians are unpopular. It does not follow. Some are, but I know many who are not. Many of my colleagues on this side of the House are very popular.

Let me read what the hon. member for Calgary Southwest said about politicians: "What's the difference between a politician and a catfish? One is a slimy, wide–mouthed bottom feeder and the other is a fish."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Milliken: I knew hon. members opposite would applaud that one. As my hon. colleague from St. Boniface said, obviously they are intellectuals.

• (2145)

If the hon. member for Calgary Southwest holds politicians in such low esteem, I can understand why he and his colleagues do not think there should be any more in the House. I assure him that my constituents and the constituents of my friends—

An hon. member: You are exhibit *a*.

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member suggests that I am an exhibit. I do not think that is quite fair.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is well regarded in his constituency. I know; I have been there. In St. Boniface the hon. member is very well regarded. In Bellechasse I have no doubt the hon. member is well regarded.

For the member for Calgary Southwest to speak this way about the profession that he now claims to profess and to refer to his own colleagues in this way is unfair and unjust. Hon. members opposite deserve a better defence and I am prepared to defend them from the ravages of their own leadership.

Having said that, let us turn back to Bill C–69. The bill, after all, represents an honest attempt by the government and by members of the House. The House is dealing with a bill that has been approved by the membership of the House in a committee. As the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said in his remarks earlier, this is the first time the House has come up with a bill that has been created or drafted from scratch by a committee of the House. It was agreed to in the committee.

I know the hon. member for Calgary West said in his remarks in the debate on the bill the other day that this was their fourth and fifth choice, that they went along with it only because we rejected choices one to five. All of us had choices we wanted on different things rejected in different ways. We all settled and made compromises. That is the way committees work.

I do not know where the hon. member comes from when he thinks a committee goes the way of only one person. I was only the chair of the committee so I did not even have a vote. I accept the work of the committee as good, solid work. I think it was fair. I think it was reasonable. The hon. member opposite was there. He knows it was reasonable. The hon. member for Bellechasse knows it was reasonable.

When the bill came back to the House, when the government introduced the bill, it had reasonable support. I know hon.

members complained about it. Of course it did not have everything in it that they wanted. They are members of an opposition. They are paid to be here to oppose. So they did what any opposition would do and opposed it. I have been in opposition before. I know how it works.

Let us face the facts. The bill was a reasonable compromise reached by the members of that committee working together. I think we worked extremely well together. We came up with a reasonable proposition.

Now we have this loud criticism going on night and day, especially from the Reform Party, spouting absolute nonsense in respect of the bill. The extraordinary thing is that they have had to do it on the basis of Senate amendments when they know perfectly well the Senate amendments are not ones the committee agreed to. The committee considered almost every one of the Senate amendments in one form or another in the course of its deliberations, rejected those changes in the law, and came up with something different.

The Senate is trying to take us back to the same old law we had before. The Senate amendments proposed in the notice that was sent to the House effectively gut the bill of any significant change over the existing law. Hon. members opposite know that is not what the committee agreed to. They wanted changes in the law. They did not get everything they wanted but they got a good number of changes that were quite reasonable. We all agreed to the changes. For the most part they are good changes and reasonable changes. We should support them and tell the other place that is the case.

Hon. members opposite like to complain about the use of closure in this debate. They have not said a lot about it. Nor should they because we are getting toward the end of a session. An upcoming summer vacation is specified in the rules where members will have a recess from the House and will go to do work in their constituencies. I am looking forward to the opportunity to do some work in my constituency. I am sure hon. members opposite are doing exactly the same.

• (2150)

When we get to the end of the line and are running out of time, the government is trying to get its legislative agenda through and has adopted measures with respect to arranging the time of the House to ensure the legislative agenda is adopted. The government has various tools at its disposal.

Hon. members opposite could get up and quote chapter and verse on the evils of time allocation and probably on the evils of closure. As a member of the opposition I opposed those applications in years past. However I can say to hon. members opposite that they do not know how lucky they are that they have a Liberal government on this side of the House that is so beneficent and so careful in its use of these tools.

I see the hon. member for Beaver River. She was here. None of her colleagues was but she was. She knows that the former government used closure and time allocation right, left and centre with what can only be described as gay abandon. I should also say that it was used by the previous government unilaterally with no co–operation from anybody.

This government used closure today for the first time and with reluctance only because members opposite would not make any arrangement to dispatch this business expeditiously. It is quite reasonable to apply it. Look at the difficulty they are having filling the time with speakers tonight.

With respect to time allocation we have used it in almost every case with full co–operation of the opposition. In other words we have not used it unilaterally. We have done it with co–operation from opposition members. They know organizing the time of the House is important to the orderly conduct of business. They know we have an interest in seeing that bills are passed in a timely way, and that when debate has come to a logical end and it has gone on for too long it is time to bring it to an end and to reach a decision in the House.

I spoke on this issue last week when the time allocation motions were moved and carried in the House with a substantial majority of the members. Only the Reformers and a handful of Independents were voting the time allocation process adopted in the House. The time allocations we allocated on the bills were reasonable. On this one we could not get agreement but closure was a simple, short way to dispatch this item of business.

Hon. members opposite know in their heart of hearts that they want the bill passed. They want the Senate to back off on these amendments and get on with life. They prefer to get the amendments in but they know if we agreed to their amendments tonight they would be standing here screeching at the Senate to pass the bill tomorrow.

The hon. member for Calgary wags his head but he knows perfectly well that is the case. He would not be supporting the amendment otherwise. He wants these amendments if he can get them.

I remind hon. members opposite—and I thank the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for this point—that we have even had support from members of the Reform Party on time allocation when there were bills they wanted passed.

We have not used time allocation unilaterally very often. In fact it has been extremely rarely. The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster keeps a little list and marks it down every day it is used. It is not a long list but he has it there. I invite him to count how many times it was used unilaterally. In almost

every case it was done with the co–operation of one or the other of the opposition parties.

An hon. member: It is a new rule.

Mr. Milliken: It is not a new rule. Standing Order 78(2) has been in the rule book since 1969 when it was passed. It is just that it has not been used before. Governments have usually acted unilaterally and we fought that when we were in opposition.

We are in a different situation. It is a different kettle of fish at the moment. We are getting co–operation from one party or the other because the parties opposite realize that for the orderly conduct of public business it is sometimes necessary to fix times. That is exactly what we have done. We have done it fairly and we have done it in a way that could not lead to any complaints from hon. members opposite despite the screeches of horror we hear so regularly.

I urge members of the House to vote against the amendment, to vote for the government motion rejecting these amendments in the other place and to urge the other place to pass the bill with dispatch so that we can get on with drawing proper electoral boundaries for all the constituencies in our great country.

• (2155)

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C–69 respecting changes to electoral boundaries.

The arrogance and the lack of integrity that have been displayed by the government, particularly over the last couple of weeks, are absolutely astounding to me, the Reform Party and all Canadians. In true Grit fashion the Liberals have had the nerve to campaign on a theme of restoring integrity to government. Yet the government's arrogance is increasing while its integrity is decreasing. The government's lack of competence is appearing in more and more areas.

The defence minister, the heritage minister, the health minister and the minister of Indian affairs are seriously mishandling their portfolios. The human resource development minister has caused a complete collapse in the social reforms promised in the red book.

Speaking of promises in the red book, let us for just one moment take a look at some of the promises in the red book that the Liberals talked so much about during the election campaign. Did they not promise to base key federal appointments solely on the competence of the person rather than on patronage? That promise is routinely broken on a weekly basis.

Was it not the Liberal government that said in the red book that it promised not to alter federal–provincial transfers without the full co–operation of the provinces? That was broken by the introduction of the Canadian social transfer in the recent budget.

Was it not one of the cabinet ministers, the Deputy Prime Minister as a matter of fact, who said that she would resign if the GST was not replaced within one year? Shamelessly that promise was broken on October 25, 1994.

There were more promises. There are sheets and sheets, literally miles and miles of promises the Liberal government has broken over a short period of time. In a mere 19 months it has broken promises to the Canadian people.

The arrogance of the Liberals is clear in their coercive treatment of individual MPs, forcing them to vote against the wishes of their constituents. Can we imagine? The Prime Minister even congratulated those members for toeing the party line. For goodness' sake, if we were not elected to this place to represent our constituents, what were we elected for?

More examples are the Liberal's sexual orientation bill, the gun registry bill, and the disappointing changes to the MPs gold plated pension plan. They have all been torpedoed through the House. The use of time allocation and closure effectively limiting debate in the House is as prevalent as it was in the government before.

The Liberals should be absolutely ashamed of what they have done to parliamentary democracy. They are not governing with integrity. We have seen conflicts of interest, unethical behaviour, broken promises, arrogance and incompetence. The confidence of the people in the government is decreasing as the integrity of the government decreases.

Let us take Bill C–69 as an example. This piece of legislation has cost the taxpayer some $6 million so far. That is the amount of money needlessly spent on previous federal electoral boundaries commission proposals. These were scrapped by the government in Bill C–18 because a number of Liberal members disliked the new maps. Now the whole process is being redone in their favour under the guise of Bill C–69.

• (2200)

To obscure the real intent of Bill C–18, this government put forward a motion which initiated this bill. It asked the procedures and House affairs committee to examine methods of capping or reducing the size of the House of Commons, to improve the process by which the boundary commissioners are selected, to consider how boundary commissioners conduct their work and examine the involvement of the public.

If this bill capped or better yet reduced the number of members of Parliament in the House of Commons, then the $6 million lost by scrapping the previous commission and its proposals could have been justified. The cost savings could have

been much more than the $6 million already spent on the previous commission's proposals.

Sadly and in true Grit fashion, this government has shown its usual contempt for the taxpayers of this country. The government did not address the most fundamental reason it claimed for reinitiating the whole process. The government failed to reduce the already excessive and growing number of members of Parliament sitting in the House of Commons. This bill has been rendered utterly useless in the face of the $6 million which is removed from the pockets of hard working and tax paying Canadians.

Worse still, contrary to all logic, the government actually intends to increase the number of members in the House of Commons from 295 to 301. This will cost the Canadian taxpayers millions in additional salaries, staff costs and how about travel expenses? Of course, something the Liberals do not like talking about very much is the lavish gold plated MP pension benefits which they will receive. We only have to worry about that if there are any members opposite left here after the taxpayers vote in the next election.

In addition to the extra cost this bill imposes on Canadians by increasing the size of the House of Commons, new commissions will need to be struck to redo what the commission scrapped by this government has already done. Judging by the last commission, this will cost taxpayers at least another $6 million, maybe more.

Many Canadians have questions, as do I. Why has this government shown such contempt for the taxpayers? Why does the government fail to cap or reduce the number of members of Parliament? The answer is obvious. It is very clear. Self–interest of course. The interests of the voters and taxpayers were set aside so that no Liberal members would have to voluntarily give up their seats when the numbers were reduced.

This example of arrogant self–interest will backfire when the taxpayers get the opportunity to vote in the next election. Liberal members need not worry. They will not have to voluntarily give up their seats because they will be booted out of this place by the seats of their pants in the next election.

Liberal arrogance and incompetence reared its ugly head before this bill even made its way to the committee. The government actually intended to include a schedule of special ridings exempt from having their boundaries adjusted by the future electoral boundaries adjustment commission.

• (2205)

This is laughable. It is not funny but it is laughable. What a tool that would have been. Imagine the Liberals manipulating the system by creating safe seats. Even though the schedule was dropped in committee, the arrogant attempt to create safe seats shows that the Liberals are running scared. They know what is going to happen to them in the next election.

Whatever happened to the red book promise to govern with integrity? We all know the Liberal red book's title "Creating Opportunity" and what that stands for. Unfortunately the Liberals left out the subtitle: "for deception, hypocrisy and greed".

During committee and at report stage the Reform Party offered a number of amendments to the government which could have salvaged the bill. The government could have succeeded in making the bill workable and productive. It could have succeeded in making this bill worthwhile for the taxpayers. However, the constructive amendments were rejected by the government.

Bill C–69 then went to the Senate where a number of our concerns were again raised. It was returned to the House from the Senate with a number of constructive amendments. For example, the Senate amendment to reduce the allowable size of deviation from a provincial electoral quota of 25 per cent to 15 per cent is well worth supporting and has been raised a number of times by the Reform Party.

A deviation of 25 per cent is totally unacceptable to Canadians. The creation of ridings which could actually vary by 50 per cent is not only unfair but is undemocratic as well. A 15 per cent deviation would promote the equality of vote for each Canadian while at the same time allowing the boundary commissioners sufficient flexibility when drawing up new boundaries. Despite the constructive amendments offered by the Senate, this piece of legislation will still be lacking.

Bill C–69 fails to address the supposed intent of the motion put to the procedure and House affairs committee which was to reduce or cap the number of ridings in Canada. The House of Commons will needlessly swell to a size taxpayers need not and should not support. At a time when it is urgent to cut the fat and bloat we see everywhere in government, there is absolutely no excuse for putting forth legislation which would make the House grow. This is not in tune with the people of Canada or the finances of the country.

It is appropriate to remind hon. members opposite that Premier elect Mike Harris handily defeated the Liberal Party in part because he promised to reduce the size of the Ontario legislature.

This government could partly make amends to the people of Canada by letting this unnecessary and counterproductive legislation die. If nothing else, it would save the Canadian taxpayer $6 million. I urge all members to vote against Bill C–69.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to this debate for some time. I was interested in the comments offered up by the

hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. Back in British Columbia we call some of the comments which were made symptoms of the Ottawa disease: no substance but a lot of cheap political gamesmanship, and this from veterans in the House who could pursue much more productive avenues.

The bill we are discussing tonight was not produced by all parties, as those members well know. We co–operated, which is our norm and we filed a dissenting report. We heard in typical style that this bill will be adopted. One of the problems with this House is that the results are a foregone conclusion when we see the stubbornness with which these bills are approached.

• (2210)

This is the fourth time I have spoken in public on Bill C–18, the forerunner to this bill, on Bill C–69 today and indeed on another occasion to the electoral boundaries commission in British Columbia. This dates back to February 9, 1994, March 21, 1994, May 26, 1994 and again today.

I must say that when members of the public ask me what is transpiring in terms of the whole electoral boundaries situation, there is a natural tendency to try to not talk about it because everything has become so complex, unravelled and intertwined. There is a great deal of uncertainty among everyone as to where we are going on these boundaries and when the changes, if there are going to be changes, will actually take place.

It is important to dredge up the history behind all of this and why we stand here tonight in this circumstance. We have to explain a little bit of that history to understand what is going on here.

One thing was of concern to me last year and is still very much at the forefront of my thoughts. The whole initiative to kill the electoral boundary redistribution process started in Ontario. It had got up a head of steam so that Bill C–18 was being drafted before British Columbians had even received their original electoral boundaries report to know where their proposed boundaries were.

This is typical of how many regions of the country feel left out and manipulated by what goes on in Ontario or in central Canada. It is worth repeating that there is no necessity in this issue. It was not an issue in the campaign. It was not an issue after the campaign. It is not in the Liberal red book, the dead book.

This bill continues to do one thing and one thing only. It responds to the desires of politicians to draw lines on a map. The Ontario MPs are trying to kill the boundary redistribution process. As I said before, they were trying to do that before the B.C. report was even out. This process has been in effect every decade since 1867 during the time of Confederation. It has been tied to the census. There was no public outcry. The outcry does not exist.

Mr. Milliken: There was in 1986, it was changed then.

Mr. Duncan: Phone the electoral boundaries commissions that were in place at the time. Phone the chief electoral officer and ask him if there was a public outcry. There certainly was not. There is self–interest in this issue and that is what it is all about.

What do I do to tell my constituents where we sit on this electoral boundary redistribution process? Confusion reigns supreme because of government actions. There is confusion over timing and confusion over the role of the Senate. There is uncertainty as always over when the election date is going to be and when these things are going to kick in.

• (2215)

Is the original motivation of government, of this administration, still the same today as it was last February? It is a good question; we do not know. When does government embarrassment kick in? I do not know if the government ever gets embarrassed. When does the government want to end the uncertainty? I thought that day would come sooner than it appears it will.

Listening to the debates tonight one thing is very clear. What was a non–partisan exercise to realign constituency boundaries has already deteriorated into a partisan political exercise in Parliament. That is really not what we should intend.

I hope we can separate the whole process at some point into boundary adjustments and the question of how many members there should be in the House. Those two issues became a part of this last exercise when in my view they should be quite separate. If we had left the original redistribution process the way it was and taken an all party committee to look at the number of members for the next exercise we would have been in very good shape.

It may be two years from the next election. When will Bill C–69 ratification lead to a final resolution? I cannot answer that question and I do not think anyone else can at this point.

This whole exercise has been political football and now the is government trying to save face by continuing this charade. It would have been better to drop it at this point. The government has wasted time, money and the goodwill of members to keep a few disgruntled government members happy.

We have debated in numerous readings, we have gone to committee, we have had dissenting reports and now we have six Senate amendments before us and our constituents have lost the thread to this rapidly unravelling bad novel.

I felt strongly in March 1994, as I did on February 9, 1994 when once again I protested politicians' drawing lines on maps. I will talk about Amendment No. 1 the deviation quota. This amendment reduces the allowable size of deviation from a provincial electoral quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Reform can support this amendment. From the outset we called for an allowable maximum variance of 15 per cent to ensure the

primacy of the equality of voting power over sociological considerations.

Elections Canada had reported 51 of the 295 existing ridings exceeded the current permissible population variances. Legitimate concerns were expressed by the Reform Party that this situation could be compounded in light of population shifts between redistributions. The bill still allows for deviations greater than 15 per cent in special circumstances.

Amendment No. 2 deals with non–judicial commission members. When the bill was drafted this clause was probably left out in error. Adding the requirement for the two non–judicial commission members to be resident in the province for which the commission is established does make sense; who better to monitor and recommend boundary changes than those from the province concerned? The Reform Party can support this amendment but overall does it really improve the bill? Does it really change or improve the existing process enough to warrant discarding the redistribution process that is almost complete?

• (2220)

Amendment No. 3, the 20–member factor to challenge the Speaker's appointments to the boundary commissions, is an indefensible amendment in our view and we oppose it. These appointments are not under parliamentary rules a ruling by the Speaker. It may cause the Speaker a little embarrassment but little else. It hardly can be construed as a non–confidence motion in the Chair. It is turf protecting and is adding a political element to a supposed non–partisan apolitical function.

The Senate amendment does not take the House of Commons dynamic into account. The Reform Party views the ability to challenge appointments as an improvement over the current process when the Speaker's appointments cannot be challenged and therefore can be influenced by government.

If we could have maintained this challenge option, I dare say before appointments were made the Speaker would surely have consulted with all parties in the House.

Amendment No. 4 is a trigger based on population shifts. This Senate amendment eliminates the use of a trigger based on population shifts to determine whether a boundary commission must be established in a province. We oppose this amendment.

Already under Bill C–69 the Speaker and the chief electoral officer can order a redistribution where one has not been automatically triggered. To say the least, this elimination of a trigger is perplexing. The trigger is largely a cost saving measure and it is estimated the cost savings are substantial.

Some may argue there could be challenges to this section under section 15 of the charter surrounding the quality element. We view this as extremely remote because the Constitution requires only an interprovincial deccenial redistribution, thus the prevention of an intraprovincial redistribution would not contravene section 51 of the Constitution. To me this is good grounds not to eliminate the trigger.

Senate Amendment No. 5 deals with eliminating the provision that a commission will only recommend changes to existing electoral district boundaries where the factors set out are significant enough to warrant such a recommendation.

The original intent of this provision was designed to encourage the commission to give greater consideration to existing boundaries. We can support this amendment because for all intents and purposes existing or traditional boundaries of electoral districts are also included for the commission's consideration in the current definition of community of interest.

Amendment No. 6 deals with redefinition of community of interest. Reform is opposed to this amendment because it calls for a redefinition of community of interest using the Lortie commission's definition.

Community of interest according to clause 19 would include such factors as the economy, existing or traditional boundaries of electoral districts, urban or rural characteristics of a territory, boundaries of municipalities and Indian reserves, natural boundaries and access to means of communication and transport.

I ask why clause 19(4) currently contained in Bill C–69 is so offensive. It is clear and gives clear direction to the boundary commissions. While the Senate's proposed definition is consistent with the recent Supreme Court decision, the procedure and House affairs committee considered and rejected this definition because it turns redistribution into an affirmative action process.

This is not in keeping with the process that has been in place since Confederation. We oppose this amendment also and that concludes my remarks on this bill.

• (2225)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at this rather late hour we are debating a bill that is purely technical. I wonder whether people who may still be listening would appreciate some information on the present proceedings. There are not many of us here but that is not the point.

We are discussing Bill C–69, which provides for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions. The bill is of particular interest to Quebecers and in fact to all Canadians, as we saw in the course of the debate this evening.

The bill is of particular interest to people in Quebec because at the report stage, we proposed an amendment that would guarantee Quebec 25 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons. This amendment was voted on and defeated.

When we first arrived in the House of Commons, we voted on a bill, C–18, which suspended the proceedings of the commission which had started to review the electoral districts under the legislation then in effect, on the basis of the 1991 census.

We went through the whole procedure to pass this legislation, and now we have Bill C–69 which must be approved before tomorrow midnight, if the new legislation is to come into force. In this area, as in so many others, as we saw recently in the case of the CRTC and satellite television, we may end up with a new legal debate.

If Bill C–18 is once again in effect on June 22 because the bill before the House today has not been passed by the Senate, according to the parliamentary House Leader who has his own interpretation of the facts, we will have a problem because we will have to find out which legislation will be in effect on June 26: the one that was in effect before or the new legislation, when it is passed by the Senate? That is a legal argument we can look forward to.

What is difficult to understand in this process is the government's agenda. The bill was tabled, and we worked together on this bill, as the government's chief whip pointed out. In fact, the hon. member for Bellechasse contributed his expertise to make this bill as good as it could be.

But in the end, we had to vote against the bill, unwillingly, but the government refused to concede on one thing we considered essential: the guarantee of 25 per cent of the seats.

The bill went to the Senate. The senators are appointed, not elected. They come from the regions. They met and tried to find something that could be changed in the bill, with the good intention, no doubt, of improving it. When we look at some of the amendments from the Senate, we wonder how these people, who in principle are supposed to represent the various regions in Canada, could propose an amendment like the one to change the variation in the quota from 25 per cent to 15 per cent.

To put this in concrete terms, suppose there was an average of 100,000 voters in Quebec ridings, the bill provides that the number could grow to 125,000 or drop to 75,000 in a riding because the variation can go 25 per cent either way.

• (2230)

The Senate, for its part, suggested that this quota should be reduced from 25 to 15 per cent. As you can well understand, such an approach could not have been worse for regional representation. This bill came back from the Senate with six amendments. At first, the government said, "We will accept the one amendment that makes sense". An amendment to the amendment was moved by our Reform colleagues, who suggested that we approve a few others. But as far as the substance of this debate is concerned, what is really interesting to us, the people of Quebec, is that the message is very clear. When they were in opposition, government members were the first to demand 25 per cent representation for Quebec and to express a willingness to guarantee such an outcome.

The statements made by the hon. member for Papineau—Saint–Michel, who insisted that Quebec should be guaranteed 25 per cent of seats, are still fresh in our memory. This is not the first time we point out that, when they were in opposition, the Liberals advocated policies that were sometimes very innovative in my opinion. However, now that they are in power, they repeat the speeches made by those they used to criticize when in opposition, and it could even be said that, in some regards, they are going much further than the Tories would have gone.

To us, the message is crystal clear: Quebec no longer has its place in Canada. What they want is to turn Quebec into a minority as quickly as possible, to reduce its representation as much as possible, and they are not even interested in saying that they want to keep Quebec in Canada. They are telling Quebec that 25 per cent is too much. They will reduce its representation as much as possible; they could not care less if some day Quebec ends up with only 5 per cent representation.

In the end, the clear message from the government is that Quebec is not welcome and that it can go on with its plans. On the eve of the referendum, when we see that the government is unable to send us a clear message, as our colleague from Mercier reminded us, we may well ask ourselves where this is taking us. If we look at what happened in history, I remember that the Prime Minister recently stated that, "If we continue like this, the sovereignists will want to keep the name of our country, Canada, for themselves". Rest assured that you can keep that name, even though you took it from us, as Canada first came into being in Quebec.

At the very beginning, before Quebec took its name, it used to be called Canada. So, you took our name. You stole it away and said: "We will turn it into a great country from coast to coast". Both my colleagues from Bellechasse and Mercier made historical reviews, saying that, while it may not be fun to hear historical reviews in this House, we need to be reminded that Quebec is a founding people. We were here first. You came 200 years later. My ancestors were here before the British conquest. This gives me a sense of belonging to this land. We first settled in the province of Quebec, which was known at the time as Canada. When Upper and Lower Canada were created, we were on equal footing as two founding people.

Did you know that this is what we would like to return to, because the only way for us to continue to develop on this land is by restoring somehow the balance that used to exist between Upper and Lower Canada in numerical terms. These were two distinct entities and one could not legislate for the other. They settled their problems between themselves and even had the decency to pay their debts. Debts were released and we started over with a clean slate. Realizing that this did not work so well and learning from this experience, another step was taken in 1867. And what we want to do now is basically the same thing: have two equal people who recognize and respect each other as such, two founding people. It is obvious that within Canada, there are two nations: the Quebec nation and the nation of Canada.

• (2235)

So, let us have two separate countries. Then we can talk about an economic and political union. After all, we will have things to manage together in the process of starting from scratch again so that you can have your country and run it as you wish. Never again will you have to wonder what we want, since we will have gone with all we wanted, and that is a country. That is what we want.

Eventually, discussions would be bound to be held to sort things out because to us it is very important, as a founding people, to be able to deal with you on an equal footing.

You took the name; keep it, it is yours. Not everyone knows this, but you also took the national anthem from us, lyrics and music. That is right, both the lyrics and the music are from francophone Quebecers.

There are people in Canada who are not aware of this important fact. When Canada adopted the national anthem, one of longest debates in the history of this House, the problem was to agree on an English version of the "O Canada". It made for very stormy debates. If there had been television back in those days, we could watch how low members quibbled over how the original "O Canada" should be translated into English.

People can even be found who think that we are responsible for changing the words to the national anthem, when translations were in fact adopted following these events. It is obvious that the small favour we were asking was the assurance that we would continue to carry a reasonable political weight, as a form of recognition for all we had done for Canada. Do not think, however, that we came here and did nothing for the country. We helped build this country, we helped give it a top notch image, a respectable image in the eyes of the international community; we have contributed at least 25 per cent towards its development, because we represent 25 per cent of the population. But, at one point, we made up at least 50 per cent of the population of Canada.

If policies which were fair towards both founding countries had been adopted, if a dominant approach had not been taken in order to crush us, under Lord Durham's policy for example, we would not be where we are today. We would have been two peoples who could have grown in ways we wanted to grow and could have carved out the niches we wanted.

Therefore, our demand for 25 per cent representation was entirely legitimate. Our demand was supported by a very, very large consensus among politicians in Quebec.

It is safe to say, for example, that the Liberals from Quebec who were in the House in 1992 and who are still in the House today, want Quebec to be guaranteed 25 per cent of representation. Therefore, if we add these Liberals, who are government members, to the Bloc members, who are on this side of the House, and to the Quebec Liberals, because, do not forget that the leader of the opposition in the National Assembly, Daniel Johnston, tabled the following motion: "That the National Assembly of Quebec reiterate its goal of maintaining Quebec's representation at at least 25 per cent in the House of Commons of Canada, and that it ask the Government of Quebec to make representations to this effect". A federalist, a Liberal, Daniel Johnston, the leader of the opposition to the Government of Quebec, asked the Government of Quebec to make such representations to the Canadian government.

So we can say that all the elected representatives of the people of Quebec, all the representatives of Quebec, in Quebec and Ottawa, came to bring this message to Canadians who also represent the people, asking them to grant us this representation of 25 per cent. It was denied. For us, as the hon. member for Mercier said, it was a very sad day.

• (2240)

This bill is going to the Senate, to the other place. Personally, I hope the senators do not intend to sit tomorrow or, if they do, that they will take a long time to discuss the bill so it will not be passed in time to supersede Bill C–18 which was passed last year. That is the sad part for Canada, because the referendum will be held this fall and we still do not know what the democratic choice of Quebecers will be. So no gesture was made to Quebec.

In a way, as a sovereignist, I am delighted. I will be able to travel all over my riding all summer, and at all the political meetings I attend during the referendum campaign, I will be able to tell Quebecers that Canada does not want us. Canada is not willing to make any concessions. Canada is not making any gestures.

I think Quebecers will realize there is no future in Canada for us and that we could never develop our potential in this country. We were here first. We want to see a gesture of openness, of sympathy for a people and a nation you say you want to keep in this country. It seems to me that if the government wanted to

show that it loves Quebec, it should have realized long ago that what we wanted was a guarantee of 25 per cent.

[*English*]

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in the debate tonight, but while we see this place going round and round, let me interject this. In the real world New Jersey has just scored and it is two to two with about three and a half minutes left in the game, so stay tuned.

We are tied up in a ridiculous wrangle about changing electoral boundaries. This has been going on for some time now. In 1993 when the former government set up the electoral boundaries commissions, as governments have done for many years, the process kicked into place. It was during the 1993 election campaign that the commissioners started their work. When they came out with the maps a year ago last spring, the present government was very displeased with them and Bill C–18 was put in place.

The question which anyone would ask is: Why was Bill C–18 initiated in the first place? We would not be here today debating Bill C–69 if Bill C–18 had not been brought forward.

The process was proceeding without government interference. The commissioners were chosen, the maps were being redrawn and people were attending the public hearings. That process was being carried out by the electoral boundaries commissions. It was fair and democratic and there was no basis for suspending it whatsoever at considerable cost to the taxpayer. This whole exercise has cost millions of dollars.

Last spring, a year and a bit ago, shortly after the independent commissions reported their findings and were preparing public hearings on the boundary changes, the present government blatantly interfered with the democratic process. Of course government members would argue tonight that they did nothing of the kind.

However, the maps were drawn by the original commissions after the 1991 census. Those people said: "Here is our best shot at it". Maybe they were not perfect. Who knows what the community of interest and all these other geographic and psychological boundaries are. However, the government said: "Wait a minute", and blatantly interfered with the process.

I am sure the government was under pressure from many new Liberal MPs who were not pleased with the new electoral maps, particularly where boundary revisions transferred blocks of voters from one riding to another. Nothing to me is sadder than a self–serving politician saying, "Wait a minute. That is my strong area that you are taking and you had better not do that". Territorialism is probably the most frightening thing that could happen in the Chamber, when someone says: "This is my ground. This is my territory," and as we say in Beaver River, "Keep your mud hooks off it". That kind of attitude is something that is becoming more and more prevalent, certainly not just with Bill C–69 but with a government, as we have seen in the last 10 days, that has said we know what is best for you and you just like it or lump it. Unfortunately, many of the members who are speaking up are going to have to lump it, and that is very unfortunate.

• (2245)

In the guise of opening the redistribution process for fundamental review the government scrapped the maps produced by the provincial boundary commissions and introduced Bill C–18, which suspended the whole operation.

I just did my spring tour in my riding. People asked me, where is this anyway? Is it cancelled? Is it going forward? Are the maps good? Are they no good? What is happening? I tried to explain to them that the government actually put this process on ice for exactly one year and now it is coming up with other legislation and if it does not get royal assent by the magic day of June 22, which is about 48 hours from now, then that whole process that we wasted all this time and money on, Bill C–69, gets scrapped and we go back to the original.

If anything is confusing for us, it is that process. How in the world are we supposed to tell people across the country the facts and the figures and what actually is going on? It is just absolutely ludicrous.

These commissioners last spring were told "You're on ice". You know that feeling, Mr. Speaker. "You're on ice. Hang on to it for a year and we will let you know next June 22 if your work is going to be of any use or not." It is ridiculous. Those commissioners felt disappointed, they felt disillusioned. They thought: "What about all this work? I was being paid good money for my work." It just seems as though it was all for nought.

Many of the witnesses who came in good faith and drove miles in our rural ridings thought the process was going somewhere, that they were really participating in democracy, only to be told, "Sorry, that's on ice. We'll let you know next June 22 if anything in fact is going to happen."

Following a one–day debate in the House of Commons the government imposed that "the question be now put", thereby suppressing any further debate and smothering democracy one more time. Here we are today, the democratic process again being thwarted.

Mr. Speaker, you and I sat in the last Parliament and watched government members then, the Conservatives, bringing in time allocation and sometimes they got really scandalous and just brought in actual closure, and my friend from Kingston and the Islands said that it was "scandalous" and of course "rubbish"

and finally he said "This is morally wicked for a government to do this".

What in the world is the difference between this side and three sword lengths across the aisle? It is three big steps. What ever happens to the psyche that goes from here, saying it is morally wicked, to all of a sudden on that side saying "We are government and we do have things that we need to get through for the Canadian public"?

I do not see any benefit to the Canadian public in this bill, quite frankly. What I see are self–serving politicians who say "We want it this way because I'll keep my good polls and you can give the lousy polls that don't support me very much to somebody else".

This process has gone on for a year. Last July these committees sat during the summer recess. They heard witnesses. It has just been chatted among us here and it is unanimous; you may find it surprising, but we decided that this whole exercise has been pointless. Frankly, there has been no positive outcome on it for anybody. I do not think these MPs are going to be a whole lot better off in the next election, regardless of what their boundaries are, if they keep behaving this way. It will not matter what the boundaries are, folks. It will not matter what the boundaries are one bit if people are disgusted and they say "You in your lofty positions on Parliament Hill, if you don't listen to us, you will go the same way the Conservative Party went in 1993". And no member in this House should think they will not do it. They did it in 1993 and they are prepared to do it again in 1997, with every opportunity that they see for this arrogant behaviour, keeping people here until all hours of the night, ramming legislation through 48 hours before it is actually due.

It has been a total waste of time. It has kept people flying back and forth to Ottawa. It has been an incredible waste of money. It has taken so long to do. This partisan manoeuvring and meddling are why we are here tonight to debate this bill.

The odd person is snorting across the aisle. I suppose that is fine for them. What they are forgetting is that there are real voters out there. We are not just talking about people in the Chamber and then all the rest of the people out there. People are not dumb. After the Charlottetown accord, which I have mentioned so many times in here, people are not going to put up with this kind of nonsense from politicians any longer. It is as simple as that.

• (2250)

Bill C–69 will go the way of the dodo bird for all those people who are running on these new boundaries that are supposed to be sacrosanct and supposed to save their seats. SOS—"save our seats"—is what this government is talking about. It is not going to happen.

This is blatant interference in what is supposed to be a democratic and non–partisan process. If ever I have seen anything that is partisan, it is certainly to say: "We know what is best for you. Father knows best. The House leader, the whip, the Prime Minister know what is best for you". It is interference. And Mr. Speaker, you know better than any of us in this Chamber that when there is interference there ought to be a penalty, for sure.

My guess as to why the electoral boundaries readjustment process was suspended is that the Liberals did not like some of the results in the last federal election. If we look at the numbers, not the theory, it is interesting what happened, especially in Ontario. While we are here in the province of Ontario tonight, we might as well have a look at some of those results. My friend from Ontario would be interested.

The Reform Party came second in 57 out of the 99 ridings. My friend from Broadview—Greenwood knows that. He has probably also added up that in 25 of those ridings the PC and Reform vote combined would have defeated the Liberal vote. That is rather interesting. That starts getting into the actual numbers of this and the hidden reason why so many people are demanding that their ridings become safe.

Across the country the combined PC and Reform vote defeated the Liberal vote in about 100 ridings. If you add that up you realize that only 130 Liberals would have been elected. That would have been a minority government.

If it comes to another vote in 1997, I could refer my friends to the corner over there, where the former government, for the first time in Canadian history, was totally obliterated. That may well happen again.

It has often been said that the Reform Party would split the vote. Of course nothing could be further from the truth, because those people are going to go for absolute, fundamental change and democratization of this system, regardless of what my friends in the governing party would say. This is democracy. It is wonderful.

Closure is okay now that the Liberals are government, making sure that their backbenchers fall into line or their nomination papers will not be signed. That is the kind of behaviour people are sick of and do not want to see any more.

The Reform Party has managed to get some improvements to the redistribution process. The selection of boundary commissioners is less partisan and subject to more public scrutiny. That is a wonderful thing. That is a good move with some of these amendments.

Under the changes that have been made, the role of MPs and the redistribution process has been greatly reduced. As far as I

am concerned, nothing is better than politicians' hands being pulled out of any of these processes. There is nothing better than politicians being yanked back from the process and not being able to take part in it quite so self-servedly.

In provinces where significant population change has occurred, the possibility of a five-year redistribution now exists rather than ten years. I know my friend from York North has an incredible population explosion. It seems wrong that he would have to wait for ten years. There is also my friend from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley. The population in the riding she represents is incredible. To be able to do that on a five-year span rather than ten years is probably really good.

Reform also pushed for a cap or a reduction in the number of seats in the House of Commons. The Liberals rejected it at every stage totally out of hand. As a result, this House will immediately increase to 301 seats and continue to increase in the future.

I ask anybody sitting in this Chamber tonight or watching on TV, if they are not watching the hockey game, does this country need more politicians?

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: Liberals, yes.

Miss Grey: The answer is fairly clear, because there is a direct correlation to the amount of noise on the government side to the question.

If Bill C-69 receives royal assent by June 22, just 48 hours from now, after tomorrow we celebrate the longest day of the year, and nobody knows other than the people who sit in this Chamber how long these days are getting.

If it gets at the new redistribution process, we will begin all over again. We are going to start this dance again. Because of the government's interference in the democratic process, here we are almost two years later back to square one. Because of the time the electoral boundaries readjustment process takes, the new boundaries will not even be known until shortly before the next election.

• (2255)

With this process in place, we will have new ridings and new riding associations. The question of course is where is the money going to be split up between this riding and that riding? How are they going to break up the bank accounts? Who is going to run for nominations in these ridings? The answer: "Your guess is as good as mine". That is ridiculous. You cannot be prepared for an election, move ahead for an election, and nominate candidates if you do not know the boundaries until just a couple of months before the election is called.

This is the government that said it was going to restore honesty and integrity to our political institutions. Canadians are still waiting for that restoration of integrity. They are still waiting for some of those promises in the red book to be fulfilled. They are not waiting for a government that is going to start ramming through time allocation, closure, and the attitude of we know better than everybody else does. We have seen that in this House, and we are going to see it again in 1997 if this government does not get its act together, get these things on their way, and quit wasting time and money. The people who are paying the bills are disgusted with it.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to probably have little time beyond giving my introduction, but I do want to say something with respect to boundary reallocation.

What we are talking about is how many MPs we send to this House, where they come from, what region they represent and what their constituencies are. It reminds me of a story I read a long time ago entitled "How Much Land Does a Man Really Need?" It was a story about a man who, in almost a crusade, spent his whole life amassing land. At the end of the story he died and it was found that the amount of land he really needed was a plot of about two feet by six feet.

I asked myself the question: How many MPs are really needed in this place? I have come to the conclusion that we need 20 MPs. Those 20 would all be cabinet ministers. They would decide what is done and the rest would be redundant. Members may say that does not sound very good, but that is really the way it is right now.

This is a government that promised more involvement for members of Parliament. It is a government that promised more meaningful work in committees. I have observed what happens in committees. During the beginning we had some really good debates, good honest give and take and some true negotiations. However, when we came to the place where we were actually voting on the clause by clause, these poor members from the government side all came in with their little sheets of paper and were told what to do. Even though prior to that I know from the way they responded that I had persuaded a number of them on different issues, they voted against them. When I asked several of them why, they said "Well, we don't really have a choice". That is deplorable.

If that is the way this government is going to work and that is the meaning of more MP involvement then this whole exercise is really an exercise in waste. Why should we even consider increasing the number of members of Parliament from 295 to 301 when most of the members here are redundant in any case?

Added to that is the fact that we are also limited in the debate. As a member of Parliament representing Elk Island, the only way I can represent them and have their wishes influence the decisions of government is through debate. When I debate I put out my best arguments. I try to persuade the other members to

my point of view. We actually experienced this in one of the committees in which I participated, where there was a closure right in committee and we were not permitted to debate. Even if I were able to debate and persuade, if members are not given the freedom to represent their constituents, as is the practice with this present government, there is no point in having them.

• (2300)

My conclusion is very simple: The move of this government to increase the number of members of Parliament is truly an ill conceived notion. It is one that should not even be thought of until it is decided that members of Parliament will be allowed to truly represent their constituents. How deplorable of the Prime Minister to praise the members of Parliament who defied their constituents, who went against what even they believed, by saying to them it was wonderful that they put that aside in order to keep party unity.

This Parliament needs true representation of the wishes of the people. If we had true free votes then surely there would be meaningful give and take, meaningful debate, meaningful negotiations on different points. We would eliminate and we would amend those clauses of bills which were undesirable. We would pass bills in amended form which would be good for the country.

The way it is right now we end up with the lowest common denominator. It is forced on us. We have absolutely no say in the matter. I am speaking now of the Liberal backbenchers who are not permitted to vote according to their consciences and according to the wishes of their constituents. We need to redefine the way Parliament works.

The Senate has sent Bill C–69 back. Of course we have a little bit of a problem with the Senate because it is not elected, but the Senate has in sober second thought come back with some amendments to the bill, some of which we actually support.

This country has the potential for the best government possible. If only we would in honesty and in clarity do away with those aspects of our democracy that do not function properly. We could replace them with a true representative democracy, one in which we acknowledge that democracy works best when the wishes of the majority are considered, when the common sense of the common people by majority vote is brought into this place, where each of us as members of Parliament can represent that. If we find a consensus among the Canadian people for the views that are being put forward because we represent them, then certainly Canadians will continue to have a high regard for law and order which we so desire.

A basic fundamental aspect of democracy is the willingness of the governed to be governed. We are going to lose that if we practise the arrogance of the kind of government we are experiencing here where a small group of people simply impose their wishes on everyone else by cutting off debate, not allowing free votes, controlling and inhibiting the freedom of members of Parliament. It is time that we clarified this. We must indicate to the Canadian people that we are ready to make the needed changes. This is urgent. Really urgent.

For example, while we are going down the tube at the rate of $110 million a day, more and more people are no longer willing to participate in the tax process. Why is that? Because the GST was rammed through without the majority will of the people. It was rammed through using exactly the same system which is being used here tonight. Because of that we are losing between $7 billion and $10 billion a year, and some estimate up to $40 billion to $50 billion per year, in unpaid taxes. People are saying that if this government rams things through that the majority does not concur with, they just will not concur in practice. That is exactly what is happening.

We see the same thing in the justice system. Rules are being passed that do not bear the majority of Canadian support. Consequently there is no reflection in the laws of what the people support. There is a reduced respect for it and this country has an increasing amount of lawlessness and crime.

• (2305)

The government got elected on its word that it would restore integrity, give more meaningful work to members of Parliament, and increase the importance of committees. The government having been elected on those words is missing a great opportunity by not delivering on them. It is a terrible thing that the government is thumbing its nose at the people of Canada by engaging in these practices.

I am appalled at the fact that the government persists in doing things like pushing this bill through for purely political reasons. There is no excuse that would warrant changing the political boundaries simply because after the process had started, a number of members felt they were being threatened.

If we wanted to do the honourable thing, we would say that perhaps there is a problem. In order to provide for continuity and stability in the political process, we would simply begin our work and the rules which are presently in place would stay there until the next election in order to remove the political motivation from the process.

This is a tremendously important era we are embarking on. The government talks about representing the people. It comes up with that theme so often. Members of Parliament are saying that if they have 25 per cent more in their ridings they will be unable to represent them properly. With all due regard, those are empty words from members of Parliament who persist in ignoring the wishes of the very constituents they are concerned about. We need to be honest about this. We need to do what we are sent here to do, which is to represent our constituents.

With respect to the bill before us, we would do well to give it some serious second thought. We would do very well to think soberly and carefully about the ramifications of it. With all of the push and rush of the last few days I am not sure that we are making good decisions.

I cannot believe that raking members of Parliament over the coals as we have been doing for 14 hours a day yields any good thought. It does not give us the best ability to think clearly. Putting through bills such as the MPs pension plan without looking at the long term effects of it and ramming through other bills such as Bill C–41 and Bill C–68 have tremendous implications to our population.

The government rams this through by saying: "We are only going to talk for so many hours and then we are going to vote. You are going to vote the way you are told. We are the majority. We will get it through". That is not the way to provide good democracy and good decision making.

Many members of this 35th Parliament will look back. They will then recognize how grave the errors were because of the lack of thought and the lack of integrity in the democratic process. There is no adequate debate, no freedom to vote, so what can we expect?

• (2310)

The only thing I can do as a member of Parliament is to try to persuade. In most of the committees on which I sat there were two and sometimes four opposition members, but there were always more government members. If I wanted to get my point of view across to influence a change in the legislation we were contemplating I had to persuade.

I challenge government members to be brave, to stand up for what is right and to put aside the years and years, almost a century of a tradition which is taking us down the wrong road. I challenge members of the Liberal Party, who in majority can do whatever they want, to think independently in terms of what is good for their constituents and what is good for Canada. Without disrespect to their leader they should simply say: "I stand on a high principle. I will do what I know is right". I am sure that if members of Parliament from whatever party followed that principle they would be applauded by the people who really matter, the people who elected them.

On the other hand, I would probably be better off politically speaking if I were to encourage Liberal members to continue to do what they are doing. The more they do that the more cynical Canadians will become and the more seriously they will think about alternatives. Canadians had it up to here with the Conservatives because of their arrogance. If we continue to have this kind of behaviour from the Liberal government Canadians will be more likely to look at an alternative in terms of a true democratic system which will represent them.

I also want to say a few words to Bloc members and to the Quebec members of the Liberal Party. These days we are facing the challenge of having our country torn apart. A group of people is saying that Canada as it exists no longer works and that group wants out. Of course, they do not want to opt out of the pension plan; they want to opt out of Canada but not out of the pension plan. These people are saying that Canada does not work.

It is an easy and simplistic response for the government to say that it is Quebec's problem. It would be much more honest to say: "Let us look at what part of it is the Ottawa problem". When will the federal government wake up to the fact that the people of Canada are tired of having somebody in distant Ottawa controlling every aspect of their lives? It is no wonder that some of them would come to that conclusion, although we disagree with it.

All Canadians, not only the people in the west, or in Ontario and eastern Canada, but also the people of Quebec should be made an offer which says: "Let us stay together in a democracy, in a federation which truly works because the people who come here to represent the constituencies are free to represent them". If we were to practise that and if we were to go back to the principles of our Constitution, in which the members of Parliament represent their constituents and guard the rights of the provinces, we could all live together in harmony. We could all survive, look after our own domains and do so very efficiently. No one would be so disgruntled with the country that he or she would feel it necessary to leave.

The electoral boundaries issue is but a symptom of a much larger problem. We need to look at what is causing the problem and correct that. It is in that area that we will maintain the unity of the country.

• (2315)

To all people in Quebec, and they may not have thought of this before, I urge all in la belle province, to consider what we say. We want to be one with them. We want to reconsider. We want to look again at the Constitution of the country. We want to build it in such a way that respect of all Canadian citizens is maintained and that all provinces can live in Confederation in unity and in harmony.

This bill is very important. I urge members to vote against it so that it will die and we can look at this more seriously in a better way later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 57, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 316)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Forseth
Gouk
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Silye
Strahl
White (North Vancouver)
Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Manning
Meredith
Morrison
Schmidt
Stinson
Thompson
Williams—34

NAYS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Arseneault
Asselin
Bachand
Barnes
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Caron
Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Copps
Crête
Allmand
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Culbert
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Iftody
Jacob
Keyes
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marchand
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Proud
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St-Laurent
Stewart (Brant)
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young
Daviault
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dupuy
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Lalonde
Langlois
Laurin
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier
MacDonald
Maheu
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McTeague
Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Ménard
Nunez
O'Reilly
Paré
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Telegdi
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood
Zed—170

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
Bertrand
Canuel
Regan

• (2330)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, as I was absent for the first vote, I would like my vote to be recorded for the next ones with the Bloc Quebecois.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The next question is on the main motion.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

You will probably note as well, Mr. Speaker, that some members who were not here for the first vote may wish to rise to add their names to those who were here for the first vote.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Unanimous consent was sought and I do not give unanimous consent. I would like a recorded vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House did not give its unanimous consent.

The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(*Division No. 317*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Blondin–Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bélair
Calder
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collenette
Copps
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Whelan
Young
Cauchon
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint–Paul)
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Ringuette–Maltais
Robillard
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—152

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle

Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gilmour
Godin	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jacob	Johnston
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Manning
Marchand	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Silye
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	White (Fraser Valley West)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—92

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan

• (2340)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CN COMMERCIALIZATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-89 an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at the stage of third reading of Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the Company to the public.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I will try again. Would you ask the House if there is unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House? If there is, Liberal members will vote yea.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc members will be voting nay.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote nay, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the privatization of CN there is no unanimous consent to apply the vote. We will have another vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is no unanimous consent.

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

(*Division No. 318*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gallaway
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Churchill)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren

MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Richardson
Rideout	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Robillard
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thompson
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—194

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	McLaughlin
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—53	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 11.54 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

TREATMENT OF MUNICIPAL SEWAGE

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 425

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should support the undertaking of a country-wide program of improving the treatment of municipal sewage to a minimum standard of at least that of primary treatment facilities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to my motion before the House today.

The motion deals with the need for the government to support the undertaking of a country-wide program of improving the treatment of municipal sewage to a minimum standard of at least that of primary sewage facilities. The motion is about setting a minimum standard right across Canada for sewage treatment.

As Canadians we often take for granted the vastness and magnificence of our environment. As much as we struggle to balance environmental with industrial and economic concerns we hold our environment in high esteem.

• (2355)

Reform environmental policy supports the balance between environmental and economic concerns and encourages Canadians to develop, renew and conserve our resources and environment to ensure the next generation inherits an environment equal to or better than that which the last generation received.

Essential to a clean and healthy environment are clean rivers, oceans and water bodies. When our water bodies are threatened with over pollution it hurts our environment, our fisheries, our economy, tourism, industry and municipal growth.

For these reasons municipal sewage facilities, set at a minimum level of primary treatment, are essential to maintaining and protecting our environment. That is why I am introducing the motion today.

I will give some background on the state of sewage treatment in Canada today to illustrate why the motion is necessary.

In most provinces the provincial government sets the standard for sewage treatment and for disposal of municipal solid waste and provides the regulatory function. Municipalities are responsible for the actual treatment of sewage and for collection and disposal of garbage. In 1993 approximately 57 per cent of Canadians were served by waste water treatment plants. That compares with 74 per cent for the Americans, 86 per cent for the Germans and over 90 per cent for the Swedes. We are obviously well behind.

Many cities have lagoon facilities which provide minimum treatment. Waste water flows through the lagoon, allowing long residence times for the settling of solids and the microbial degradation of organic matter. This is basically a system where raw sewage, less the solids, is dumped directly into the ocean or water basin with no treatment. This is the system used in the city of Victoria as well as in Halifax. We have the problem on both coasts. I will discuss the objections to this system of dealing with sewage later on.

Victoria is the only city from Alaska to the Mexican border which still dumps untreated sewage into the ocean.

I will give a quick summary of the three types of sewage treatment which include primary, secondary and tertiary treatment facilities. Primary treatment, which I am calling for, is the most basic stage of sewage treatment and is the minimum level I propose in my motion. Primary treatment involves the settling and chlorination stage prior to effluent discharge.

A more advanced stage of treatment is secondary treatment, which uses an activated sludge process to hasten the rate of waste water treatment. Large masses of actively growing bacteria are retained in large tanks and fed waste water. High levels of mixing and aeration facilitate microbial action.

Treated water then goes through a settling stage to remove the micro organisms and is chlorinated prior to release to the receiving body of water. Edmonton, Fredericton, Hamilton and Winnipeg use this more advanced form of waste water treatment on the majority of their municipal sewage.

Tertiary treatment is the most sophisticated form of water treatment practised in Canada. An anaerobic microbial fermentation step is added after the activated sludge process. The final effluent is relatively clean and in desert areas such as Israel is used directly for crop irrigation. Tertiary waste water treatment is used in Calgary, Kitchener, London, Oshawa, Ottawa, Regina, Sudbury and Toronto. In the maritime provinces a large percentage of municipalities do not have any sewage treatment and tertiary treatment is virtually non–existent.

The annual volume of untreated sewage in this country would cover the entire 7,800 kilometre Trans–Canada highway to a depth of nine metres. That is a lot of you know what, Mr. Speaker.

The effects of raw sewage dumping are being debated in cities such as Halifax and Victoria, which both discharge sewage into large water basins. In cities such as Regina, which dumps into small rivers, the effects are potentially disastrous. Sewage removes so much oxygen from the water that fish cannot survive and decomposing sewage may render the water undrinkable.

• (2400)

The government is in the process of major infrastructure spending with funds initially targeted for projects such as sewage treatment facilities, roads and water lines. Many towns and cities remain without any sewage treatment while tax dollars are being directed toward art centres and hockey rinks. Where are the priorities?

The government has made some significant promises regarding sewage treatment facilities in the country. The Liberal red book states on pages 66 and 67:

> One of the country's biggest sources of water degradation is untreated municipal sewage, aggravated by decades of neglect of sewage and water treatment infrastructure. A Liberal government would assist provincial, regional, and municipal governments to finance new or renewed municipal sewage and water treatment infrastructure. This federal commitment would be conditional on municipalities encouraging water conservation and developing a sound financial regime for infrastructure maintenance in the future.

Federal assistance to municipalities for sewage treatment has been discussed in the House for over 25 years. In 1960 amendments to the National Housing Act provided for federal aid for municipal sewage projects to be administered by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Up to two–thirds of the cost of projects would be lent by the federal government. Municipalities would have to repay only 75 per cent of the loan if sewage work was completed by 1963.

The purpose of the 1960 legislation was to provide incentive to make an early start on these problems while it was still relatively inexpensive. Municipal sewage became an ongoing problem with annual allocations of $50 million to $75 million administered by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

The system was put into place 25 years ago, yet today Canada remains with almost half of its residents without any sewage treatment whatsoever. Now costs have skyrocketed. The longer municipalities wait, the more expensive it will become.

Despite efforts to date there are several reasons sewage remains untreated in many areas. One reason is Canada's large land mass and relatively low population which often mitigate the need for expensive, centralized sewage treatment facilities.

Another reason for the low level of sewage treatment is that many Canadian communities located adjacent to oceans and large rivers discharge raw sewage directly into water bodies, as in some cases the solution is to simply dilute the sewage.

In small amounts this may not harm the environment as organic matter can supply nutrition to aquatic organisms and benefit the fishery. However, once communities reach the municipal size, primary sewage treatment should be a requirement.

If we do not encourage a minimum standard of primary sewage treatment we risk damage to the environment, tourism, recreation, fisheries and health. In large amounts raw sewage can devastate the area by drastically degrading water quality, limiting dissolved oxygen levels, harming marine life, polluting shorelines, removing areas from recreational use and endangering human health.

The Liberal Party has recognized that a national waste water program exists and has pledged financial assistance to provincial, regional and municipal governments to finance new or renewed municipal sewage and water treatment infrastructure, but infrastucture spending is bypassing much needed sewer upgrades.

For example, Halifax and Victoria are still without any sewage treatment while at the same time government spent over $12 million in infrastructure funds for improvements to the Olympic Saddledome in Calgary and a hockey rink in Winnipeg.

In the big picture, basic infrastructure such as water and sewage treatment clearly has to take precedence. It is time for the government to renew its commitment to the public. Infrastructure spending should be targeted to local improvements which would benefit the entire community, not just a select few.

Clearly the biggest problem is expense and we all know it. There is no doubt that sewage treatment upgrading will require additional funding. When we look at the environment, environmental costs must be weighed with economic costs. In many instances taking action will be far more economically beneficial than the costs of the long term environmental damage of doing nothing.

• (2405)

Effective municipal waste treatment facilities are an expensive proposition for any municipality as they involve the provision of basic infrastructure as well as treatment facilities.

To counteract the cost, some cities such as the city of Toronto have proposed user pay fees on sewage discharge. That is one way to collect for the cost of cleanup and upgrading. It is one of the many options that warrants consideration.

In deciding which areas necessitate primary sewage treatment facilities, the environmental benefits of treatment must equal or outweigh the environmental costs. I am not proposing that all towns and cities undertake a program of primary treatment because there are many towns that are too small to benefit from sewage treatment programs.

For example, towns with small populations often do not generate enough waste to necessitate sewage treatment facilities. My proposal applies only to the minimum standard of municipalities which by definition have a minimum population of 1,000 residents.

Many studies have shown that secondary or tertiary forms of treatment are not necessary in all cases. In Victoria, for example, studies concluded that the treatment of waste water discharge into the strait would provide no appreciable health or environmental gain to the city or to the strait and that primary treatment was all that was necessary. That is what I am calling for in my motion.

Provincial governments have known about the bio–hazard of municipal sewage for generations, but many choose to ignore the problem. Concerns with the volume of minimally treated waste water were first identified in 1975. Yet many municipalities routinely fail to comply with permits on the discharge of sewage from outfalls.

The Fraser River is B.C.'s most endangered watershed with a sewage discharge amounting to 450 billion litres per year. If one were to package the sewage into one–litre milk cartons and pile them one on top of each other, a year's discharge would extend to the planet Mars and back with enough left over for 100 side trips to the moon. That is a lot of fertilizer.

Federal fisheries scientist analysed discharges from the sewage outfall at Iona Island on the Fraser in 1985 and found 200 toxic substances, many of them persistent and some with the ability to increase in concentration and toxicity as they migrate up the food chain.

Other substances identified are associated with organ damage, birth defects, cancer and second or third generation reproductive collapse in both humans and wildlife. Obviously these substances simply cannot continue to be dumped into the Fraser. I am pleased to report that one of the larger infrastructure projects of the government involves upgrading the Fraser sewage treatment facility.

A report by the World Wildlife Fund said sewage plants in Ontario and Quebec were receiving, along with billions of litres of waste water, about 100 tonnes of industrial metals and

chemicals each year. This discharge can cause serious damage to the ecosystem and contaminate drinking water.

Provinces such as Ontario have been working on developing effluent quality standards for sewage plants but nothing concrete has developed to date. Six years ago the federal and Nova Scotia governments agreed to deal with the untreated sewage flowing directly into Halifax harbour. Concern was raised seven years ago that the lack of sewage treatment facilities in the harbour would have long term consequences on the fisheries and on growth and investment in the metropolitan area.

Over 30 million gallons of untreated sewage enter Halifax harbour waters every day, with close to 20 per cent of this inflow classified as industrial in origin. This has resulted in documented levels of toxic contamination of the harbour waters.

This sewage and waste dumping into Halifax harbour present health hazards on top of the aesthetic problems with the harbour mired in sewage. The Nova Scotia government and Canada entered into an agreement in September 1988 to upgrade existing sewage infrastructure in the Halifax–Dartmouth area.

The agreement recognized that:

> Even though the provision of municipal sewer services is fundamentally a provincial–municipal responsibility, Canada and the province recognize that the current state of sewage infrastructure in Halifax–Dartmouth is of urgent concern and justifies assistance on the basis of a regional development priority; and a significant portion of waste water is generated by federal facilities in the Halifax–Dartmouth metropolitan area.

• (2410)

Some $200 million was set aside to build a sewage treatment facility in Halifax, yet today the project is at almost a complete standstill with over $20 million sunk into consulting and with Halifax no closer to a primary sewage treatment facility. This is where the G–7 conference took place.

Today the estimated cost has doubled to over $400 million, twice that which was first estimated six years ago. The longer we wait, the more expensive it will be.

Now the Nova Scotia government and the federal government are wondering how it will come up with the extra money. After several promises that this will be completed they appear to be backtracking on their promises. Again I go back to the G–7.

Halifax harbour is but one example of the status of sewage facilities throughout the country. It is now commonplace to hear each summer which beaches are open and which beaches are closed due to high concentrations of fecal chloroform. Now is the time to deal with the problem.

In conclusion, I hope all members will support Motion No. 425 to undertake a country wide program of improving the treatment of municipal sewage to a minimum standard of at least that of primary treatment facilities.

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for introducing this private member's motion. It is a very important subject. We share the feeling that this is a question of key importance.

I know my colleague is extremely concerned about matters of the environment. However, at this time when friends are fewer and fewer as days go by, we have almost completed an infrastructure program. The federal, provincial and municipal governments have joined together to launch a $6 billion program, effectively to renew infrastructure including the sewage systems in the country.

Whatever we do we cannot do by imposing ideas from the federal government. It has to start at the municipal level because sewage is a matter for municipalities to deal with and municipalities are creatures of provincial governments. This is why at the time of the election, in our red book, we decided to join with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and with all the provincial governments without exception to start a broad infrastructure program.

The $6 billion infrastructure program has achieved sewage treatment upgrades amounting to $2 billion in total. I will give a few examples of various projects that are being carried on under the program. In British Columbia, as the member for Comox—Alberni pointed out, there has been a $206 million upgrade projected of the Anascis Island sewage treatment plant; one of $2.2 million in Sherwood Park, Alberta; one in the Hamilton—Wentworth region of $25 million; one in Chicoutimi, Quebec, of $7.2 million; one in Grand Falls, New Brunswick; another one in Crossroads, P.E.I; another one in Deer Lake, Newfoundland; and so on.

The irony of it is that the leader of the Reform Party at the time of the election was quoted as saying:

> Any politician who thinks he can stimulate a $700 billion GNP economy with some sewer projects or $2 billion to $3 billion in public works will believe he can start a 747 with a flashlight battery.

• (2415)

Therefore, with due respect, I think my colleague from Comox—Alberni should speak to his leader and suggest that sewer and infrastructure programs are key to the renewal of a prosperous economy. In fact the Reform Party, in its own budget plan, referred to physical and intellectual infrastructures on one page. However, as I read through it, there is not one mention of the environment or sewage projects. It mentions Canadian highways, airports, information transmission systems, ports, and railways, but not one word about the environment, sewage or water treatment.

It would seem to me that this is where it must start. If the member wants to do something constructive he should start at the level of his own party and persuade his leader to include the environment, sewage treatment plants, and infrastructure projects dealing with environmental needs in his future budget.

It is significant that during the infrastructure program the following provinces spent the greatest part of their money toward sewer upgrades and environmental projects. British Columbia has spent as much as 75 per cent, amounting to $488 million. Sixty per cent of all New Brunswick's infrastructure money went into environmental projects. In Newfoundland it was 48 per cent, in Nova Scotia 62 per cent, in P.E.I. 60 per cent. Admittedly, the other provinces spent a minor part of their infrastructure moneys in sewer and environmental projects. Even then, it is pretty significant. Alberta has spent 30 per cent to date, Saskatchewan 32 per cent, Quebec 33 per cent, Yukon 27 per cent, and so it goes.

Mr. Caccia: In Ontario?

Mr. Lincoln: The figure for Ontario was only 16 per cent, and in Manitoba it was 16 per cent.

Mr. Morrison: They fixed up the rinks.

Mr. Lincoln: Well they might have fixed up the rinks, but they also fixed up a lot of sewer projects. In the member's own riding I see that out of this infrastructure project the village of Ucluelet, the regional district of Comox, Strathcona, Port Alberni, and the village of Cumberland all realized sewer projects with their infrastructure money.

What I think we have to do is support what we have already in order to make it a better project and convince the member's own party that the environment counts. When they redraw their famous budget they should include the environment and sewer projects.

I agree that work has to be done, but it will only be done when we sit together with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, all the municipalities in the land and all the provinces so that future infrastructure projects, if we can find the collective money to put them together, will be geared firstly and hopefully almost exclusively to environmental needs.

Admittedly a lot of money has been spent on road repair and all other types of infrastructure projects, which were also necessary. However, maybe we can agree in the future that environmental needs will come first and foremost. In this I would support the member 100 per cent.

What we must do is first of all ensure that what we have already works and works well. What we have attempted here has been a significant achievement to put together for the first time a collective program of $6 billion at a very tough juncture for both provincial and federal governments as well as for municipal governments. It has been a big achievement, $2 billion spent on environmental projects.

• (2420)

I believe that we have the start of something constructive, and I respectfully suggest to the member that this is a solution for the future in what he is trying to do.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I see that the Minister of the Environment has managed to influence the hon. member for Lachine—Lac–Saint–Louis. He speaks the same language as the Minister of the Environment. He now engages in petty politics.

It is with great interest that I rise tonight during private members' hour. Motion M–425 put forward by the hon. member for Comox—Alberni deserves a few minutes of consideration since it deals with an issue that affects us very closely, municipal sewage.

If I understand correctly, the purpose of the hon. member's motion is to prevent municipal sewage from being dumped back directly into the environment without undergoing at least primary treatment, as the motion says.

I, for one, am totally in favour of this. Sewage must undergo a minimum level of treatment. We no longer think that we can flush our sewage directly into bodies of water without negative consequences. We, unfortunately, did this for too long, and we must now pay for our carelessness and stupidity. Today, we must live with and clean up polluted lakes and rivers. Of course, at the time, we thought that our hydrographic system could absorb a certain amount of sewage. Perhaps it could, but did we have the right to do this?

Since then, however, the amount of sewage has grown by leaps and bounds, so to speak, and it now contains an increasing variety of products whose long term effects are totally unknown. At the present time, if we dumped all municipal sewage without treating it, our hydrographic system would be totally devastated and become unusable for no good reason.

Fortunately, some 30 years ago, I would say, we became aware of how big the problem is. The small facilities then in existence quickly became outdated and inefficient, even obsolete.

It is then that it was decided, in Quebec in particular, to modernize existing systems and build more sophisticated and efficient equipment that could absorb and treat large amounts of sewage.

Significant amounts were invested. Provincial funds and municipal taxes were spent through specific programs. Of

course, there were major flops. Some of the plants that cost a lot to build did not live up to expectations. But on the whole, we can say that it was a success.

Much work has been done and much money has been poured into this since, but we are still far from being able to draw our drinking water directly from our lakes and rivers or dip our big toe into certain waters that bathe our urban or semi–urban areas. In that regard, is it not somewhat paradoxical that we treat our sewage before discharging it and have to treat water again before using it?

That being said, it is clear that efforts are required in that area. So far, all the efforts have come from the provinces and municipalities.

Municipal sewage is therefore and undeniably an area of provincial and municipal jurisdiction. So, when the hon. member for Comox—Alberni talks about a country–wide program and a minimum standard, I cannot help but wonder and worry about what he wants exactly.

• (2425)

Does he want the federal government to come and impose, because of its spending power, standards in a jurisdiction clearly belonging to other levels of government? If that is what he wants, I think that he is mistaken. The federal government is certainly no guarantee of a better environment. As media reviews and environmental groups have been telling us regularly these days, the federal government is backing off in matters of the environment. It is cutting funding, abandoning the Green Plan, showing its inability and blatant lack of willingness to meet its own targets and failing to honour every one of its international undertakings under various treaties.

In the face of this abdication, I think that the federal government should stay in its backyard with respect to municipal sewage. Not in my backyard, as the popular saying goes. The government could nonetheless provide funding to carry out this great plan of discharging clean sewage into our waters. A resource envelope divided equitably among the provinces would certainly help achieve this objective. Do not get me wrong. All I am talking about is funds divided equitably, period.

If the federal government starts imposing standards, as it tends to do more and more, its attempt will have to be quashed. Finally, I wish to underline the good intention of the hon. member for Comox—Alberni. His motion reflects a genuine concern for the environment. Besides, the Reform Party's concern for the environment is made abundantly clear anytime we deal with an environmental issue. From Cape Breton, where we have the Sydney Tar Pond Projects, to the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, where the CEPA is being reviewed, the Reform Party contribution has shown exemplary concern for the environment.

In concluding, I should say that municipal sewage is only one element of the much larger pollution problem. It is essential that we immediately correct the problems and that we consider very seriously all the other sources of pollutants. If we do not act now, the condition of our planet will be such that in the future our children and grandchildren will not be able to survive. I would like to propose an amendment on behalf of the Bloc Quebecois to the motion of the hon. member for Comox—Alberni. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve:

> That Motion M–425 be amended by adding, at line 2, after the words "a country–wide program" the following: "with opting out provision and full financial compensation for all provinces".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Laurentides, seconded by the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, is in order.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the motion by the member for Comox—Alberni concerns the establishment of a country–wide program to permit municipalities to upgrade their sewer systems. I would point out to the House that the infrastructure program launched by the government in co–operation with the provinces and the territories has helped municipalities modernize their effluent treatment facilities and, at the same time, has created the jobs these communities badly needed.

• (2430)

On June 14 of this year, the government approved $1.2 billion dollars for infrastructure projects across Canada to modernize and expand sewer systems. If we add to this the funds approved for projects to improve drinking water supply and treatment systems, we end up with a figure of $1.9 billion, or a third of the money earmarked for the infrastructure program, going to water or sewer system projects.

These figures indicate that clean water and establishment of a healthy environment are priorities in each province. The municipalities invest the money from the infrastructure program to provide essential services, and we are their partners in this undertaking.

The improvements will benefit the municipalities themselves and Canada as a whole. The projects will mean work for workers, improved quality of life in the communities and a better future for our children.

[*English*]

The member sponsoring this motion comes form British Columbia. In that province 75 per cent of infrastructure works funding has been set aside specifically for sewer and water projects and $388 million has already been approved for sewage treatment improvements.

The largest single infrastructure works project in the country is a major sewage treatment facility in B.C. The $206 million upgrade to the Annacis Island sewage treatment plant will reduce waste reaching the Fraser River. Costs will be shared with the province of British Columbia and the greater Vancouver regional district. The upgrade will cover the first phase of secondary waste water treatment and reduce the level of pollut-

ants expelled into the Fraser River, home of the largest salmon run in the world. More than one billion fish migrate up the Fraser River to spawn every year.

Still in British Columbia, communities from one end of of the province to the other are taking advantage of the unique partnership created by Canada infrastructure works to upgrade vital services and boost their local economies. For example, in the Okanagan region infrastucture funding of $27 million is allowing the district of Summerland to build sanitary sewers and a sewage treatment plant. With a population of almost 10,000 Summerland is the largest community in the Okanagan without a community sewage program.

Thanks to the $7.5 million in infrastructure works funding Prince George is moving ahead with stage three of a waste water treatment plant in that city. Smaller communities are also benefiting. On the northern part of Vancouver Island, Port Alice, Port McNeill and the district of Powell River are upgrading or building sewage facilities under the infrastructure program.

[*Translation*]

By taking advantage of the possibilities for co–operation offered by infrastructure works, municipalities can begin earlier, and at a lower cost, to modernize their water treatment facilities. In my province, Manitoba, Winnipeg is modernizing its sewer system in order to reduce spillover into the Red River. Four projects worth a total of $20 million will prevent the rise and overflow of sewer water.

[*English*]

A similar project is now under way in Hamilton, Ontario. That city is building a $25 million facility that intercepts combined sewer overflows and contains them for treatment at the water pollution control plant. Here again is a case of the national infrastructure program responding to local priorities and improving our environment.

The infrastructure program is bringing water and sewer service to many rural Atlantic Canada communities for the first time. Examples include Colchester county, Nova Scotia where a $13 million project will build a sewage treatment plant to service the town of Truro and surrounding area. This improved infrastructure will assist industrial development while enhancing the local environment. What is more, using the latest technology will develop the job skills of those employed in the construction and operation of the plant.

Three communities in Prince Edward Island have worked together to expand sewer facilities. Bunbury, Southport and Crossroads have now been amalgamated into one town. The community is pleased with the rapid implementation of the $1.5 million project. It is a densely populated area and environmental problems were imminent if the sewer system had not been extended.

• (2435)

According to the head of the local pollution control commission, the community benefits in several ways. I quote: "One is the potential for safer groundwater for a much longer time. It also makes the area much more attractive to live in. There's also a greater potential for commercial and industrial development in the area".

In the community of Conception Bay South, Newfoundland about 350 homes, schools and businesses will have water and sewer services available to them this summer for the first time. The $5 million infrastructure project employed over 200 people and has been a real shot in the arm for the local economy. The town's mayor says that it is the best thing that has ever happened to his community. I quote: "There are a lot of families that have been waiting a long time, perhaps 20 years, for these services, if not for the infrastructure program".

[*Translation*]

Finally, the infrastructure program has allowed large and small municipalities across Canada to make improvements to their sewer systems, improvements they established as priorities themselves.

Thanks to federal–provincial co–operation, these improvements may be made now and create the jobs these communities so badly need. The program is a fine example of what can be accomplished when three levels of government decide to work together for the welfare of the people.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is now 12.35 in the morning and it is a privilege to speak to the motion put forward by my colleague from Comox—Alberni. The motion says:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should support the undertaking of a country–wide program of improving the treatment of municipal sewage to a minimum standard of at least that of primary treatment facilities.

The motion put forward is to improve sewage treatment facilities, part of what I might call need to haves rather than the like to haves, which are often put forward by the government in its infrastructure program.

This is not a western issue. It is a national issue. It is also an issue raised by the Liberals in their red book, an issue that now seems to have been put on the back burner.

I want to read the promise in the red book word for word. I encourage my colleagues from across the floor to listen closely. It states: "One of the country's biggest sources of water degradation is untreated municipal sewage, aggravated by decades of neglect of sewage and water treatment infrastructure".

This sounds very similar to the motion so I would assume its mover would have the full support of all the members on the government side on this one.

The lack of basic sewage treatment is a serious problem. According to the Sierra Legal Defence Fund report: "If the annual volume of untreated sewage were piled on the trans–Canada highway, all 7,800 kilometres of it, it would cover the road to a depth of nearly 9 metres from coast to coast".

Running on the boundary of my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby is the Fraser River. British Columbians realize that the Fraser is in serious jeopardy. Unfortunately most do not truly understand why it is in the condition that it is in. I am sure there are many answers, complex scientific ones, but certainly one answer is that it is how sewage is handled in and around the river.

Just last week the Fraser River Management Program issued a report card on the Fraser basin. Sewage treatment plants on the river were singled out as the biggest problem, receiving an *f* grade, a fail. Dumping of under treated sewage is benefiting no one and is endangering once abundant fish stocks.

The Outdoor Recreation Council declared that the Fraser River, which supports about a $300 million a year salmon fishery, is British Columbia's most endangered river.

We realize that the cost of upgrading or building new treatment plants is rather expensive. We also realize what our priorities are. Our priorities should always be for the well–being and health of Canadians.

A ribbon cutting ceremony for a new sewage treatment plant may not make for great photo opportunities but photo ops are not what will keep the country environmentally sustainable. We all know the Liberal government is more into photo ops than it is into environmental cleanups.

• (2440)

The government implemented its grand infrastructure programs soon after they were elected. They talked about funding going toward roads, sewers, bridges and water mains, except here is where some of the funding is actually going: $15 million for renovations to a coliseum; $21 million for a convention centre; $173 million for a trade centre; $50 million for an arts centre; $24 million for a tennis stadium; and almost $15 million for building a circus training facility.

This is only a portion of the list. I believe the list I just read will give an understanding of how wasteful this government has become. Among the legitimate projects there is also a lot of Liberal pork. These are misplaced priorities from misguided Liberalism.

Our motion clearly calls for the federal government to improve municipal sewage facilities to a minimum standard of at least primary treatment. With only three types of possible treatments available, this is the second from the bottom for effectiveness yet it would be far greater than some Canadian cities currently have. Some of them have nothing at all.

In Halifax, Nova Scotia the city dumps all of its raw sewage down the pipe into the ocean. That is 250 years of pumping untreated sewage right into the Halifax harbour. The same method is used in Victoria, British Columbia. In both places proponents hope that the cold tidal waters will be capable of carrying the waste out to sea. I believe both cities are realizing that there is only so much that the waters are able to neutralize.

So many promises have been made that people are having trouble keeping track of which level of government actually said what. For Halifax, the federal, provincial and municipal governments apparently earmarked $200 million to build a new treatment facility yet residents of Halifax are still pumping over 100 million litres of untreated sewage into the harbour each day. While Nova Scotia waits for its much needed facilities, Montrealers will be serving up aces in their new tennis complex and doing somersaults in their new circus tent, all part of infrastructure money.

This country's deficit and debt are ballooning larger every day. The federal government must be frugal on how it spends its money. My constituents have told me that when their bank accounts are low, they spend according to priority. They only purchase what is most necessary and they expect the government to do the same.

Like many of my constituents, Canada has basic necessities like education, health and the environment. When my own personal bank account is low, I do not go out and purchase a painting but when the federal government's bank account is low it goes out and builds an art gallery. Something just does not make sense here.

The Minister of the Environment talks of sustainable development but talk is insincere when the words are not put into action. British Columbia's Fraser River is the greatest salmon producing river in the world. People living along the Fraser have always had a close connection with the river, relying on it for water, food, transportation and livelihood. However this river system cannot be sustained if municipalities along the river are forced to release untreated sewage.

My colleague from Comox—Alberni is not proposing anything new with his motion. He is simply reminding the government of its commitments for sustainable development. I hope that the revenue minister as well as the member for Halifax are listening closely to this debate because Victoria and Halifax are the two Canadian cities that are dumping untreated sewage into our waters.

I note that the revenue minister is quite aware of the situation. In February 1993 he wrote a column in the *Globe and Mail* entitled: "The benefits of dumping sewage in the sea". In the article he wrote: "When the waste water leaves the pipe, it is immediately subjected to vast quantities of cold, fast moving sea water high in oxygen which would result in a biological, bacterial and chemical change". Strangely enough, he does admit there is the possibility that something dangerous but unknown may be in the discharge water and might become a problem in the future.

Finally it should be noted that in 1989, 70 per cent of Victorians supported treatment for all waste water coming out of Victoria's capital regional district. I hope that the minister will have the courage to listen to his own electorate.

The government was so proud of the red book during the election. I often heard the Prime Minister tell Canadians that if his Liberal government was not following the red book promises to notify him and make him accountable, not that the red book was so great anyway.

Someone mentioned to me recently that the Deputy Prime Minister said a similar thing but added that if promises were not kept that they should give her a good swift kick. After the next election, the voters will not be able to kick the minister around any more for she will not be around.

The Reform Party through this motion is asking the government to live up to its basic promise and to support improvements to municipal sewage facilities. Should it fail to do so it will be conveying a message to Canadians that the red book was merely an election pamphlet which was long ago forgotten.

• (2445)

I urge the government to take care of the basics, to do at least the minimum and quickly act positively in response to the motion presented today.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the motion and the well researched speech by the hon. member for Comox—Alberni are very important and stir the sentiments of many in the Chamber who share the views with respect to the importance of continuing this effort.

I remind my colleagues in the Reform Party it was the Liberal Party and the Liberal government which initiated the infrastructure program. Even if the method by which the program was launched is not 100 per cent satisfactory, programs related to sewage treatment, water improvement and the like have been set in motion which permit the debate tonight in a search for ways of improving what is under way.

The infrastructure program is a good measure. It has helped to create jobs for Canadians and it has helped to finance initiatives environmentally oriented in conjunction with other initiatives, as the hon. member for Comox–Alberni has already indicated and as the parliamentary secretary indicated in his reply.

What needs to be stressed in the debate is the importance of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities and of the respective provincial governments in deciding how the money is to be allocated. Evidently Ottawa, even if it wanted to allocate 100 per cent of its funds to a specific purpose, would have to obtain the concurrence of the other two partners. Therefore there is the necessity of working very closely with and convincing municipalities and provincial governments to agree to what we think are the priorities for the infrastructure program.

However, the infrastructure program has come to an end. This is year two and the scheme has virtually been completed. The question is how to continue. Obviously in considering the economic policies of the Reform Party and the limitations which have been imposed by the budget one would have to be very creative in the search for the funds.

I invite members of the Reform Party to look at a study conducted by the Department of Finance in December of 1993 and January of 1994 entitled "Tax Expenditures". There is one item which is rather considerable, a tax expenditure which is the equivalent of a loophole in the taxation system with respect to lottery winnings. In 1991, because of non–taxation of lottery winnings, the loss in revenue amounted to some $860 million. I suspect that amount increases every year. Therefore there are places where moneys can be found by way of improving our taxation system and by closing loopholes.

I bring these thoughts to the attention of the hon. member for Comox—Alberni because I am sure he is very keen in his search for funds required in order to continue the infrastructure program in years three and four.

• (2450)

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House at this late hour and be the last speaker on the motion brought by the member for Comox—Alberni.

Like the member for Davenport, I will begin by congratulating the member for Comox—Alberni on his motion and on the presentation he gave which was a very thorough exposition of the nature of the problems in our country and in every modern society dealing with effluent. We have to be very conscious of this. This is an example of the type of debate we can have in the House to search for the best solutions to these perplexing and complex problems from a technological point of view and from a human management point of view.

I suppose as a member of the government one regret I have about the debate is I was disappointed to see it degenerate so quickly on the other side of the House from what I considered to be the high level of the opening moral tone of the member for Comox—Alberni to other members of his party who then used the motion as a way to attack the government for not doing things which we have been doing.

It reminds me of earlier when I listened to the member for Fraser Valley East spending his whole speech complaining that there is no discussion in the House. When members of the third party get up and use these opportunities to attack another party, no wonder we do not get into any discussion.

This is a constructive opportunity to exchange views. The member for Davenport has indicated members of the House on all sides are passionately interested in finding solutions to these problems.

I, as chairman of the foreign affairs committee and the member for Red Deer, who also sits on that committee, are more than aware of the consequence of effluents flowing from Victoria into international waters and our relations with the United States. It behoves all of us to be aware of that.

To suggest that the government is not aware of it is totally ignoring reality. Suggesting the infrastructure program has been deficient in this respect is doubly unfair. The infrastructure program is, as the member knows, a tripartite program conceived in the Canadian spirit. It requires the collaboration of the federal, provincial and municipal governments.

When we look at the way the infrastructure program has been applied around the country and the way it has been used, it co–ordinates the needs and desires of all people. Members of the Reform Party should be happy because at the municipal level we are getting the input from the very lowest level of government in the European sense of subsidiarity, that which is closest to the people, and it is their choice.

There are municipalities that have selected water treatment facilities. In those cases the federal government has participated, encouraged and done its best to make sure the country and the needs of the municipalities are served. Where other municipalities have chosen other priorities, the federal government has recognized that it is their right as citizens and as municipal governments.

I suggest to the third party we should concentrate not only on the question of effluent removal, which is a most important priority, but also on the principle on which the country is founded; a principle of tolerance and co–operation by all levels of government. If we can get all our programs working that way and use persuasion to get the federal government to do its work we can achieve the results wished for by the member for Comox—Alberni without trampling on the rights of local municipalities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 is deemed to have been made.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on the recently passed gun legislation.

• (2455)

Our articulated gun bill in Canada says something for us as a society not only for today but for generations to come. However, I have some real concerns in the ability to apply that law. We would like to think that Canadians are law–abiding citizens in terms of there being seven million guns. I do not know who counted them. I do not know who knows for example that I have three guns.

Let us say there are seven million guns out there. A lot of those guns have been sitting around. They are in attics, basements and behind pantry doors. A lot of them are not used and have not been used for years. I have two rifles that have not been used for 20 years. My concern is that we must have some incentive to flush out of existence a lot of those rifles and guns which have not been used, are not being used and will not be used unless they happen to fall into the wrong hands.

I am proposing a form of gun amnesty in Canada. There would be some incentive for people to turn in those guns. Some people are quite aware they have no use for the gun but there is a reluctance or a sentimental attachment to it. Perhaps the widow's husband used the gun for many years and she is just a little bit reluctant to get rid of it but at the same time knows she has no earthly use for it.

The bill could be improved. The application of the bill certainly would be much easier. It will be a tremendous and horrific job for our police departments unless there is genuine co–operation to register the guns.

My proposal is to have a form of amnesty, amnesty plus if you like, with some sort of minimal tax credit, something in the area of $25 or so for turning in those guns. Motivation is needed. I do not think a lot of people would object to that. It would not cost very much. It is going to cost something to register the gun

anyway so it is not as if it were all lost. Some program like that with a public relations selling job associated with it would have a very positive effect on the number of guns that are in this nation.

I would be glad to turn in my two rifles and keep my shotgun. In that case I would probably make better use and take better care in the storage of my shotgun than if I had a whole lot of guns sitting around.

We could flush out those guns that are no longer used and where their purpose is long forgotten. I do not see any advantage to having them sitting around when people will be reluctant to go through the inconvenience of registering them. They would be relieved if there were some way in which they could dispose of them. The motivation could be a very small tax credit. I think it would work. I have received very positive feedback from some very unexpected corners when I think back to their attitude toward the gun bill. That is why I brought this matter forward.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Leeds—Grenville brings forward a very interesting proposal. There is a new twist I have not heard before which is the aspect of the tax credit.

With the passage of Bill C–68 in the House of Commons and the expected passage of the same bill in the Senate later this year, we will be registering all firearms. As the member for Leeds—Grenville has said, some people may not want to register firearms.

Frankly, I do not think it will affect the gun owners themselves, but for those who have inherited firearms or have had firearms lying around the house, they may not want to go through that procedure if it is not their intention to use those firearms. Of course I think mainly of long guns, rifles and shotguns. Firearms can be sold. Handguns, even the prohibited ones, can be sold to people who have similar types of firearms. They can be turned in at any time or they can be sold out of the country.

It is correct that when there is an amnesty it focuses the idea in people's minds so they become more conscious of turning in their firearms. A lot of people will turn in firearms without any compensation but certainly more people would turn in their firearms if there is compensation.

The main problem is the cost which would be considerable. One never knows how many people would take advantage of the amnesty but we would have to expect that there would be a cost.

The other question that has to be looked at is if prohibited weapons are being turned in that can be purchased on the street or out of a trunk of a car for a very small amount, then these people with the tax credit would receive more than they actually paid for the firearm. That would only take place for a short while. Once registration came into effect they would not be able to do that. However, it is certainly something that should be examined further.

I know the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice will be discussing this idea with the Department of Finance. Something may result from this but it is too early to speculate whether the idea of the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville will result in a solution or not. We will have to wait until these discussions take place.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed adopted.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1.02 a.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 21, 1995

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HIRE A STUDENT WEEK

Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada employment centre for students is celebrating its annual hire a student week across Canada, June 19 to 23.

The goal of hire a student week is to gain support from potential employers and to heighten awareness of the services available through the Canada employment centre for students in Saskatoon as well as in other parts of the country.

People will notice the hire a student buttons being worn by students at the events planned to celebrate this week. In Saskatoon we had button day on Monday, flag raising day was yesterday, today is a hot dog sale, fitting for students, tomorrow is job shadowing day and on Friday, most important, is employment appreciation day.

I extend a big thank you to the hard working young people in the Canada employment centre for students office in Saskatoon, in particular Thomasina Burke, for all the hard work they do in helping students find much needed summer employment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have to deplore the government's inaction regarding the mining industry. In spite of several initiatives on the part of parliamentarians and the natural resources committee, this government never agreed to provide assistance to this major industry which employs tens of thousands of Canadians and Quebecers.

On June 5, I supported the motion put forward by the hon. member for Timiskaming—French River to implement a mining incentives program. Instead of taking steps to ensure this industry's viability, the government chose to let the investment climate deteriorate.

We must make sure that our mining sector will be able to develop in the future and continue to create thousands of jobs in Quebec and Canada instead of abroad.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the committee on natural resources requested during the examination of the Department of National Resources Act, the Minister of Natural Resources tabled this morning the fifth annual report to Parliament, "The State of Canada's Forests, 1994".

Canada's forests continue to be a major engine of economic growth for Canada, particularly in certain regions of the country such as my home province of New Brunswick, but they are also essential to our environment.

The theme of this year's report, "A Balancing Act", describes the challenges of maintaining timber for our industry while conserving habitat for wildlife.

As the world's largest exporter of forest products, the eyes of the world continue to watch how well Canada is able to balance its economic and environmental needs.

[*Translation*]

I would like to take this opportunity to urge all my hon. colleagues to read the fifth annual report tabled in Parliament and to participate in the public debate on the future of the most precious of our natural resources: our forests.

* * *

[*English*]

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled to address the issue of child poverty, a phenomenon generally attributed to the third world.

Canada is not a third world nation and yet there are nearly 1.3 million Canadian children living in poverty, enough to form the fifth largest province. Think about it: shocking, incredible, terrifying, intolerable; yes, all of these.

S. O. 31

Five years ago the Government of Canada in the House resolved to achieve the goal of eliminating poverty among our children by the year 2000. Resolutions and objectives are not enough. Effective anti–poverty initiatives and immediate action are warranted, indeed demanded.

None will deny the necessity to eliminate the deficit as expeditiously as possible but let us strive to bring this deficit to zero in a compassionate and reasonable way. Let us not forget the children in poverty during this era of fiscal restraint. Our country's future depends on solving both problems quickly and fairly.

* * *

G–7 SUMMIT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I offer an alternative version of the interpretation being put on the G–7 summit by the Prime Minister.

The G–7 summit did not deal in any significant way with a lot of the serious problems facing the international economy. The G–7 summit did not deal with growing polarization between rich and poor within industrialized countries and between industrialized countries and the third world. It did not deal with the international debt problem of third worlds.

Finally and most significantly, because this is what the Prime Minister likes to talk about, it did not deal with the whole question of money speculators.

All it did was provide that the IMF might have more money in the end to bail out economies damaged by speculators. When we bail out those economies in the current context we bail out the speculators themselves.

What we have increased here is the global welfare state for money speculators rather than dealing with the root of the problem which is curbing speculation—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North.

* * *

CALGARY STAMPEDE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on July 7 a western tradition continues and that wild west show, the Calgary Stampede, kicks off its 10–day extravaganza.

I invite all members and Canadians across the country to come and experience all the parades, pancake breakfasts and the rodeos. Try horseback riding, line dancing and all the other fun that marks this favourite time of year for Calgarians and thousands of visitors.

If a Canadian vacation is what you need, come to Calgary this July for the greatest outdoor show on earth. We will be glad to show you our western hospitality.

Two final notes. Liberals who have been disciplined for voting against the party line should pay close attention to the calf roping event. Any MP who is not opting out of the MP pension plan should avoid the greased pig wrestling contest.

* * *

SAFE GRAD

Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, high school graduation time is again upon us. I take this opportunity along with my colleague from St. Boniface to commend the laudable actions of many students across Canada for their participation in the safe grad program.

This year's students from across the country including Manitoba will again take part in the safe grad program. This combines student graduation celebrations with realistic measures to prevent accidents and other problems which could be associated with drinking and driving.

Safe grad is a student run program with input from parents, teachers and police. Safe grad is geared toward the needs and wishes of individual schools and their students.

I am most impressed with the students of our country and their support of safe grad. Along with the member for St. Boniface, I commend them on their actions. On behalf of the House and my colleagues, I wish all students a safe and happy graduation.

* * *

• (1405)

[*Translation*]

BURMA

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that today is the 50th birthday of an outstanding woman, Aung San Suu Kyi, the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize winner who is fighting for democracy in her country, Burma.

After winning the 1990 elections with an 82 per cent majority, Mrs. Suu Kyi was imprisoned by the Burmese military authorities and has been under house arrest for nearly six years.

The Canadian government must take positive action in support of those values set out in its foreign policy statement, should there be any left, and bring pressure to bear on Burmese authorities for her release.

The Bloc Quebecois salutes the courage of this woman and thanks her for fighting for democracy, liberty and human rights under extremely difficult conditions.

[*English*]

ROGERS SURREY

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Rogers Surrey community channel has served New Westminster with excellence for many years and now local producers are reaping the rewards of their hard work.

On May 30 in Halifax, Nova Scotia executive producer Catherin Ackroyd and co–producers Jim Reis and Archie Miller were recognized for their documentary "Lest We Forget: Canadians in Normandy".

The Canadian Cable Television Association awarded the hour long program as the best documentary in Canada in 1994. The program also won best documentary of the Pacific programmers region for provincial awards of excellence.

From a Canadian perspective "Lest We Forget" shows the dramatic events of the D–Day landing with interviews of veterans from the Canadian Scottish regiment and the 1st Canadian parachute battalion.

In the year of the 50th anniversary of the second world war it is important for all Canadians to appreciate what our veterans did on our behalf. I thank Rogers Surrey for its service to my community and its longstanding commitment to excellence in community programming.

* * *

ABORIGINAL SOLIDARITY DAY

Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is aboriginal solidarity day and I call on my colleagues in the Chamber to show their solidarity with Canada's aboriginal people.

I also bring greetings from the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs. Last week I attended its assembly in Winnipeg. I can attest to its solidarity as it prepares for the dismantling of the Department of Indian Affairs and for self–government in that province.

Today on this day of solidarity I call on members of the House to work together with the First Nations to implement self–government in Manitoba and across Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint–Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to salute, personally and on behalf of the government, the recent appointment of Louise Fréchette as Deputy Minister of National Defence. Mrs. Fréchette's appointment to that important position in the Department of National Defence shows once again the government's true commitment to promote greater participation of women in all lines of activity.

[*English*]

Louise Fréchette began her career with the Department of External Affairs and has since occupied various posts, including Ambassador of Canada to Argentina and Uruguay and most recently as Canada's first female ambassador to the United Nations.

Prior to her appointment as deputy minister of defence she was the associate deputy minister of finance and G–7 deputy.

This appointment is a testament to Mrs. Fréchette's hard work and perseverance. I wish her much success in her new post on behalf of all my colleagues. Félécitations et merci beaucoup.

* * *

LEADER OF THE REFORM PARTY

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks we have learned the hon. leader of the Reform Party has designs on becoming the leader of the opposition. Apparently the leader of the third party has decided he needs a car upgrade. Chevys are great cars and lately he has found his accommodation not to be to his liking.

Having made these discoveries he felt it was easier to become leader of the opposition than to get the Reform Party to increase his expense account. Therefore he has initiated a feeble attempt to get backbench Liberals to defect to the Reform Party. Such unrestrained political ambition is so blatant it is embarrassingly dangerous.

I have a message for him on behalf of my colleagues. There will not be a stampede, so do not hire the interior decorator for Stornoway just yet.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOMALIA

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the commission of inquiry into the behaviour of the Canadian Forces in Somalia is about to begin its public hearings, it is increasingly obvious that the measures taken to protect potential witnesses are largely inadequate. Indeed, several members of the armed forces fear reprisals from their senior officers if they tell what they know or what they saw in Somalia.

The Minister of National Defence must immediately reassure these soldiers and encourage them to testify, by publicly promising that no retaliation measures will be taken against them.

S. O. 31

• (1410)

We must shed light not only on the events which occurred in Somalia, but also on the reprehensible behaviour of several other members of the armed forces, including at the Petawawa military base. The government must restore the honour and integrity of the Canadian Forces, which were greatly tarnished following these dramatic events.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are happy to say this appears to be one time when the justice minister and Reform can agree.

The justice minister needed reminding by Reform that DNA evidence can be a useful tool in determining a suspect's guilt or innocence and that Canadians wanted action on this issue now.

Following that reminder the justice minister stated he will immediately introduce legislation allowing court ordered DNA testing of suspects charged with violent crimes providing he has the support of the House.

We assure the justice minister not only will our members support his initiatives, all Canadians will most heartily support him. As we leave the House for the summer it is encouraging to see the government can act quickly and decisively when an important issue affecting the lives and safety of Canadians is brought to the forefront by Reform.

We trust and hope this spirit of co–operation to enact important legislation wanted by Canadians will continue when the House returns in the fall to conduct the nation's business.

* * *

ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Prime Minister to have his ethics counsellor investigate the awarding of a contract for legal services for the Saint John Port Corporation to a lawyer in a law firm in Saint John, New Brunswick, which is owned by the brother of the executive assistant to the Minister of Transport and in which a government member of the House continues to practise.

This is a straight conflict of interest. The awarding of this contract calls into question the integrity of the government. It is against the policies of the red book.

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec pequiste government did not wait for the referendum campaign to start squandering public money. The Parti Quebecois has already spent $11.2 million on its propaganda campaign. That amount only includes activities which can be directly related to separatist propaganda.

Imagine what the total amount would be if we were to add the salaries of ministers, members of the legislative assembly and PQ government staff, who did nothing but promote their separatist obsession since the provincial election. It is time for Quebec separatists to stop wasting money on their pet project. Quebecers expect the PQ government to work with us to create jobs and stimulate the economy.

* * *

[*English*]

G–7 SUMMIT

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia is still enjoying the prestige and recognition it has received after successfully hosting the G–7 summit.

It was not only Halifax that hosted the events associated with the summit, both Lunenburg and Chester in my riding of South Shore played host to spouses and daughters of the G–7 leaders last Friday.

They were welcomed by the town crier, William Cluett, treated to a guided tour of the historic town and enjoyed lunch in the scenic village of Chester.

The type of hospitality and scenery to which the spouses and daughters were treated is typical of the entire South Shore. Whether visiting Shelburne County, Queens County or Lunenburg County you can be guaranteed a spectacular coastal view and a warm welcome from the residents of this beautiful part of Canada.

I urge all members of the House to visit the South Shore of Nova Scotia this summer and see and experience for themselves the numerous events this area has to offer.

Once again I go on record in the House thanking the many individuals who gave their time and talents, as well as the well wishers who lined the streets of Lunenburg for making the leaders' spouses and daughters' visit a success.

* * *

THOMAS SZAJKO AND JASON SHULTZ

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—

Similkameen—Merritt because last spring two of my constituents, Thomas Szajko and Jason Shultz, put their lives on the line to rescue six people from an intense house fire.

Both these men entered the inferno without regard to their own lives. They managed to awaken five residents of the house and rescue them. They re–entered to seek out the last victim who was crying for assistance. Without their bravery and determination, the final resident would not have survived.

On Friday, June 23 these two heroes will be awarded the medal of bravery, presented by the Governor General of Canada for acts of bravery in hazardous circumstances. Few would dare to do what they have done. I take this moment to pay tribute to these two heroes. They show the true spirit of humanity and compassion for others.

Not only is the town of Oliver proud of these two men but all of my constituents, indeed the country, should be proud of their remarkable achievement.

• (1415)

I encourage all members of the House to acknowledge the fearless actions of these two great Canadians.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

FEDERALISM

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tried to justify Ottawa's new strategy on the Quebec referendum as follows, and I quote: "There has not been enough emphasis by the federalists on demonstrating that the federal system works well and works for Quebec. I think that is one of the problems". The minister's perception of the facts is selective, to say the least.

My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Can he seriously claim that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when in one particular case, his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has refused to compensate Quebec for what it spent on educating young Crees, a total of $130 million?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs gave a very good explanation. If I remember correctly, there was an agreement between the federal government and the provincial government. The terms of that agreement were met, but there were some additional, unforeseen expenses that were not covered by the agreement.

That particular aspect is being discussed now, but the terms of the agreement as such were met. If there were additional expenses that were warranted, that can be discussed, but we did what is essential to good federal–provincial relations, that is, we complied with the agreement as negotiated and approved by both parties.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the Prime Minister keep saying that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when Ottawa still refuses to transfer responsibility for manpower training to Quebec and in fact plans to intervene even more in this area, thus leading to further costly and inefficient duplication?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development made offers to all the provinces, including Quebec, in which he proposed to conclude temporary agreements that would include a transfer of responsibilities, but Quebec said no. Other provinces are discussing the problem with the minister, but Quebec wants all or nothing.

I think we must maintain a federal presence in these areas, because Quebec, like other provinces where the economic situation is not as good as in the richer provinces, needs the federal government to redistribute resources from those who have jobs to those who do not. And this has no connection with federal–provincial relations.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that Quebec wants all or nothing. This is an outright reproach to one of his ministers, the minister responsible for the referendum in Quebec, who when she was a minister in the Johnson government, turned down the federal government's offer on manpower training.

How can the Prime Minister keep saying, like his minister, that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when Ottawa's withdrawal from social program funding puts the provinces, including Quebec, in the very difficult position of either having to cut services or raise taxes?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even before the federal budget, the provincial government in Quebec City cut $500 million from its budget for health care services, and that was last fall, when the PQ came to power. Look at what Minister Rochon is doing now. I read the papers like everybody else.

I think we explained our position very well. As for the reference of the Leader of the Opposition to the position taken by the Minister of Labour, as a party leader who changed parties five times, he is certainly not in a position to tell anyone to be consistent in politics.

Oral Questions

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Fédération nationale des associations de consommateurs du Québec and the Canadian Council, which represent over 300 organizations, have joined forces with dairy producers and processors to demand that the federal government renew the moratorium on bovine somatotropin, which will end in nine days.

• (1420)

Since the ministers of agriculture and health have been waffling for months on this important issue, I would ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to follow up on the request of consumer associations, the dairy industry and even the Standing Committee on Health to impose a strict moratorium for an indeterminate period on the use of somatotropin? It is up to him to set down the rules.

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just because the voluntary moratorium agreed upon by manufacturers and the Department of Agriculture ends on July 1 does not mean that the sale of BST will automatically become legal.

Health Canada continues to study the issue and will approve the product only if scientists are convinced that it is safe and effective.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister does not even recognize the work of the heath committee, which is unanimous regarding the issue. The agriculture committee has declared war and is demanding that Health Canada make its studies public and the minister is taking no action.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that people have the right to drink the most natural milk possible, and that by refusing to extend the moratorium, he is exposing consumers to the risk of unknowingly drinking milk tainted with hormones, without knowing the real impact that this will have on the health of humans and animals?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Health explained the situation clearly. There was a voluntary moratorium and the Minister of Health did not give permission for this product to be used for the Canadian market. And we will not give permission until we have very clear advice that there is no danger.

At the moment, we are fully aware of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and I would like to remind you that almost weekly, a member of my caucus raises the issue. We are very much aware of the problem and, contrary to what some people are implying, the product will not be authorized for use after July 1 of this year.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as this session comes to an end the great imperative for the Prime Minister is to re–establish the ethical standards of his government.

When the government came to power it promised to make government integrity its number one priority but 20 months later that red book promise is in tatters with ministers flouting the federal code of ethics, the ethics counsellor reduced to impotence, and the Prime Minister defending party loyalty and discipline over the principles of democracy and ethics.

Will the Prime Minister send a clear signal to Canadians today that unethical behaviour in government will not be tolerated? Will he can tainted ministers, starting with the Minister of Canadian heritage?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after many days of arguing the case we stated that everything had been done according to the laws of Canada. The record of the government over the last 20 months has been the best we have seen in a long time. I am applying myself to making sure that all ethical and normal rules that should apply to members of Parliament and to cabinet are followed by all cabinet ministers. That has been debated.

After 20 months and on the last day before we adjourn they repeat the same question they have used for the last three weeks. We must be doing quite well if they have nothing else to talk about.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government also promised to put an end to the politics of patronage and backroom deals.

But over the last 20 months what have we witnessed: $26 million diverted in Nova Scotia from highway 104 to a road in the riding of the minister of public works, campaign workers lined up in Victoria for patronage plums from the justice department, and the Liberal family contact rewarded again and again with government contracts and favourable cabinet decisions. This is like a rerun of an old movie: Brian Mulroney Part II.

• (1425)

Will the Prime Minister make a new commitment today to purge political patronage from his administration by restoring funding to highway 104 and by disciplining members tainted by patronage, starting with the minister of public works?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the list of things. I will explain every element of it to the House of Commons.

The Minister of Transport said many times that the change in the situation in Nova Scotia was requested by the elected provincial authorities in Nova Scotia. The member refuses to recognize that.

He made another so–called attack talking about family contacts, knowing very well who he is trying to attack, and he cannot prove anything. I will not go to his level to try to defend myself; I have a record of 32 years in public service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Not one contract or not one favour has been given to anybody close to me and my family. I do not have to insist. Every member in good faith knows it.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government also promised freer voting in the House of Commons and a meaningful voice for backbenchers.

In the past few weeks, however, we have seen nothing from the government but a growing disregard for the democratic process: time allocation and closure, Liberal backbenchers being punished for voting the wishes of their constituents, and cabinet ministers who break conflict of interest guidelines being defended by the Prime Minister himself.

Will the Prime Minister reaffirm his red book promises of freer voting and greater MP power in the House by lifting the heavy hand of discipline from those MPs whose only crime was to respect their constituents' wishes?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have done it since I have been prime minister.

In some opinions expressed not long ago, it seems a few years ago, this institution was considered not very acceptable in performing well. It was 9 per cent. The last time there was the same poll it was published not long ago that collectively we have managed to lift respect for this institution from 9 per cent to virtually 30 per cent.

There was an international poll which said there was more respect for the Parliament of Canada in Canada than there was in England, the United States, France, Italy, Germany and so on.

I am not afraid to reply to the person who fired his own justice critic. I have some rules in my party which people know about, but we have more democracy in our party than in any other.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of Parliament for quite some time and it is the first time in the history of this Parliament when members of Parliament of the government side presented dozens of amendments to the House of Commons, as we saw last week, and we let them vote on them.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Yes, we did. It is the first time there was so much freedom in the House of Commons. We have never seen that before. The vote has passed and I think members on this side of the House of Commons are going home happy, feeling they have done a good job.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEFENCE INDUSTRY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

A study done by the defence industry research group reveals that Quebec would be particularly affected by cuts to the defence industry production program, DIPP. This study concluded that 60 per cent of DIPP's funding in Quebec would be cut, that is, $50 million, and so research and development would drop by $150 million.

• (1430)

Will the minister admit that he is on the wrong track in cutting funds to DIPP, when he knows very well that, for every dollar the government puts into this program, the industry puts in three, and jobs in high tech industries like aerospace are directly related to contributions to the program?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we discussed this issue last week. As I indicated then to the member, I acknowledge that DIPP is very important, but the government has decided to reduce grants to Canadian private enterprise and to review DIPP.

We think that it has long been an important program in Canada, but this does not mean that this sort of program should not be reviewed. Perhaps the member has some ideas that could be adopted.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister should not concern himself with my ideas. I am more worried about his.

After attacking at the Quebec pharmaceutical industry, the minister is now going after the aerospace industry by cutting DIPP. Is this the sort of federalism being offered to Quebec, where Ottawa continually threatens high tech industry in Quebec, offering only unemployment and technological delay in exchange?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the Bloc supports high tech companies like Monsanto and Eli–Lilly.

I would remind him that Quebec is not the only province with a high tech sector, particularly in aerospace. There are companies all over Canada, such as Pratt & Whitney, which is located not only in Montreal but also in Lethbridge and Halifax, and is very concerned about international competition for grants from the government. We are very much aware of this competition and have some ideas to propose for this sector.

[*English*]

HIGHWAYS

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it just does not fit, really. The Prime Minister just said that the highway 104 scandal is the responsibility of the province of Nova Scotia.

I recognize that the Minister of Public Works and Government Services refuses to answer for the misappropriation of funds—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: As I mentioned during the last question period, whenever a question is put it is put to the government. The government may choose to answer in whatever fashion it wishes.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, now I find that the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is telling people that the federal government has found a solution.

Before the session closes I would like to try to get the minister of public works up on his feet and be blessed with an answer. Will the Liberal government be returning the $26 million to highway 104 as suggested by the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is very interested in this matter and I understand her concerns. We have listened to people who have made representations with respect to highways in Nova Scotia on a number of occasions.

Although the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is a very hard working member of Parliament, it does not change the reality that decisions for highway construction, the allocation of funds and the routing of highways is a provincial matter.

I know it is extremely difficult for the hon. member who has asked the question to understand that, but I intend to be patient and to continue to explain to him that whether it is in Manitoba, British Columbia or Nova Scotia, the decision for the construction of highways and how the funds are allocated is the primary responsibility and falls within the constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces in question.

• (1435)

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder who is going to get the babysitting fees for the minister of public works, the minister of transport or me?

The government has refused to give documents to the Citizens for Fairness Coalition in Wentworth Valley, Nova Scotia, but I delivered them myself at a rally in the valley.

I would like the Prime Minister to answer this question. Why does the government have to be threatened with lawsuits by outraged citizens before it acts to rein in cabinet ministers who are clearly out of control? What assurances do we have that the minister of public works, in particular, will be given a wake–up call by the Prime Minister?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we continue with the programs already in place to deal with highway construction in a number of provinces, no doubt citizens in every part of the country are seeking as much as they can get to build highways. That is the case in Nova Scotia.

We fully understand the concerns, especially in my case being a New Brunswicker. We recognize that highways in Atlantic Canada need a lot of funding.

Rather than railing at the rally in the valley about the 104, I look forward to the hon. member and his party telling us where they would get more money and what they would propose for highway construction in the country. Since this is not federal jurisdiction, they might want to tell us how they propose to fund highway construction in Nova Scotia and elsewhere where it is required.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FRENCH–LANGUAGE RESEARCH JOURNALS

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after providing financial assistance to Canadian research journals for years, in January, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council announced a new policy based on the number of subscribers rather than on the quality of the publications. As a result, funding for French–language journals is being reduced by half.

My question is for the Minister of Industry. Will the minister confirm that the cuts under the new Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's policy will be borne almost exclusively by French–language journals, while English–language ones will be generally unaffected?

[*English*]

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while it is true the Social Science and Humanities Research Council will have less funds three years from now than at present, those cutbacks were less proportionately than in many other areas of the government, less proportionately than the Department of Industry.

The Social Science and Humanities Research Council has worked very hard in making adjustments and to make them in the best possible way for the whole research community.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the council's new criteria do not take into account the relative size of the francophone and anglophone markets in Canada. To give out grants on the sole basis of the number of subscribers amounts to a death sentence for francophone journals.

In that context, does the minister recognize that the real impact of this new policy of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which gives an outrageous advantage to anglophone journals, is tantamount to eliminating funding for French–language research journals?

[*English*]

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council represents all the researchers in the social sciences and humanities in Canada, both anglophone and francophone, and has on its council both anglophone and francophone members. It treats and funds researchers equally all across the country.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the American government is poised today to punish Canadian industries for the Liberal policies of cultural protectionism.

Mickey Kantor will issue his retaliation hit list today. Because the Liberals are closing our borders and choking off competition. hundreds of millions of dollars worth of Canadian business stands to suffer.

Why will the Minister of Canadian Heritage not live up to the pro–competition rhetoric of the industry minister and avoid this trade battle with the U.S. which damages Canadians business and allows CMT into the market?

• (1440)

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague does not seem to realize that Canada is one of the most open markets to cultural products in the world, for the benefit of Canadians. However, when a Canadian producer does a good job, creates employment and Canadian content he should be supported.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, despite the woolly answer from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Mickey Kantor will issue a hit list today, regardless of whether the CMT deal with NCN goes through during the current negotiations.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage is letting CRTC run amok. The CRTC was directly responsible for the negative options billing fiasco. It is responsible for the satellite policy debacle and now it has forced the government to sacrifice Canadian industries and jobs in a high stakes poker game within the U.S.

The CRTC's time is—

The Speaker: The question, please.

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast): The government has repeatedly stated that it has raised competition but the CRTC disagrees.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

On January 1, the United States took advantage of the establishment of the World Trade Organization to impose on Canada new restrictions on imports of sugar and products containing sugar, thus jeopardizing over 2,400 jobs. Also, a bill sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms is currently before the U.S. Congress and seeks to prohibit access to the American market to any business having commercial ties with Cuba.

Meanwhile, American sugar is flooding our market to the point that the revenue department felt the need to initiate an antidumping investigation. Can the minister tell us what concrete action he will take to prevent the Helms bill from being passed?

[*English*]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been vigorous in our protests about the Helms bill. They have taken a variety of forms. We followed the traditional one of protesting to the United States state department. The Prime Minister had occasion to raise the matter during heads of government meetings. For my part, I have on a number of occasions pressed the matter with the United States trade representative.

The result of our protests and those of European countries, Japan and other major trading partners of the United States has been to encourage the administration to seek a revision of the bill in such a way as to meet our trading concerns.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister has been aware of the problem for several months. In spite of his often repeated assurances, nothing has changed and the situation still represents a threat to our companies.

Will the minister intervene with American officials regarding the so–called black list presumably made by the U.S. Treasury and said to include the names of Canadian companies doing business in Cuba, including sugar refineries?

[*English*]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to what the hon. member refers. In the case of the so–called black list, there have been press reports of the United States treasury issuing a "black list", if he wishes to call it that, against four subsidiary companies in Cuba, in which a Canadian company has an equity position.

The United States treasury has not issued such a list. Therefore I must take the member's question as hypothetical.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

In the 1800s railroads were given the power of expropriation as they expanded across Canada. Today, as railroads abandon lines everywhere, I would like to know why the new Canadian transportation act contains a similar or parallel power of expropriation?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member is interested in this matter. If he takes a close look at the proposed legislation he will find, and I am sure he agrees, that it is no longer appropriate for railroads in Canada to have the direct expropriation powers they enjoyed over many years.

• (1445)

We have suggested in the new legislation that in the event where negotiations do not lead to a satisfactory settlement, railroads will no longer have the direct power of expropriation. They will only be able to move in that direction with the consent of the government and cabinet.

I agree with the hon. member that it is a situation that should only be allowed to exist in extraordinary circumstances. Certainly the new legislation will not allow railroads to become involved in any direct expropriation on their own.

* * *

LITERACY

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's literacy program has funded a booklet entitled: "Making Scenes Between the Lines", scripts written by street kids for use in our students' classrooms. In it a principal says: "F—— you. Empty your pockets", and the student responds: "F—— you, I will. You can take your attitude and shove it up your f——ing a—".

Why is the government allowing the literacy program to fund $200,000 for such a project and what in the world is this supposed to accomplish in our schools?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not avail myself of the same reading literature that the hon. member obviously does.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

An hon. member: You should read it. You might learn something.

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Calm yourself.

One reason for supporting literacy programs is to bring important opportunities to large numbers of Canadians, particularly those who have not had an opportunity for education. It brings them into the system to learn the basic functions of reading and writing. We supply those grants to a wide variety of organizations, mainly the ABC Canada organization, a group of corporate sponsors which provides that kind of funding. They make the decisions based on those peer groups.

If the hon. member wants to send me a copy of the publication, I would be glad to look at it and respond. The hon. member should recognize the ultimate and important value of helping street kids to learn to read.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is going to every school in the country, not just to street kids and government money is being spent on it.

My party believes in literacy and keeping kids off our streets, but handing out scripts like this to every high school in the country is hardly the way to do it. Learning how to spell obscenities is not literacy and the real language the government talks about can be learned by reading washroom walls, not through government programs.

Can the Prime Minister assure the House and Canadian parents whose kids are going to be getting this stuff on their desks in September that it will not happen and this project will not go ahead?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, like other members of her party, seems to forget that the decisions on these matters as to what appears in the classroom are not made by the federal government but are decisions of the local school boards. If the school boards do not want to make access of that kind of literature to their children, it is their choice.

I have already indicated that if the hon. member would be good enough to send me a copy of the publication, I will take it up with the secretary of state for literacy to determine what the sponsorship is and what the use is. We would then get a response back to the hon. member.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The many cuts imposed by the federal government on the National Film Board since 1984 have literally disrupted their services. In Quebec, seven municipal libraries are affiliated with the NFB and carry NFB films and documentaries. However, citizens who do not reside in these municipalities must pay up to $100 per year, for example in Abitibi–Témiscamingue, to avail themselves of the services of an NFB library.

Is the minister aware that the repercussion of this NFB policy is that access to the NFB collection has become considerably more restricted for residents of remote regions?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NFB is making budgetary adjustments, there is nothing surprising about that. In addition, we are reviewing its mandate, and during this process we will study the NFB's distribution policy. Lastly, the future lies in distribution via the information highway, and, in this area, the NFB is on the cutting edge.

• (1450)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister not feel that the NFB should be strongly encouraged to come up with ways of making this collection more accessible, for example through video rental stores?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague is a little behind the times technologically. The NFB is in the process of setting up a robotics centre in Montreal which will provide a direct link between its collection and the entire country, once the centre is linked to the information highway. It will serve all parts of the country, including out of the way areas like the one mentioned by our colleague.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, medicare waiting lists are now so long that an American firm is selling insurance here. This is a disgrace. Health care delayed is health care denied. Can the health minister explain why medicare waiting lists are so long?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for waiting lists. Sometimes they are long because emergency cases go ahead of others.

One of the good things about our country and medicare is the fact that people do not need a large wallet and there is no need to spend excessive dollars on insurance administration. The dollars we spend go directly to patient care. We are going to continue to ensure that happens. That is the best way to treat the people of Canada: based on need, not based on whether they can afford to pay.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this plan is actually called waiting list insurance. If a person has to wait more than six weeks for surgery, the company will pay to take them to the U.S. to have it done.

Instead of handing us rationing and rhetoric will the minister admit that reasonable access is a thing of the past in Canada?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every country has a form of rationing of medical care. I happen to like the way ours is which is based on the degree of need. In other countries it may be based on how much money the person has, where they live or whether they have insurance. When a person goes to a hospital in Canada they are treated because they are sick, not because of the kind of insurance they have.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INCOME SECURITY

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

On Monday in Quebec, Minister Blackburn announced a thorough reform of the income security system.

Within the context of flexible federalism and consultation with the provinces, how does the Minister of Human Resources Development, who is about to table components of the federal reform plan, intend to work together with his counterparts in Quebec?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi for his question.

I was very interested in the proposals from the Quebec government, especially since the approach suggested by Minister Blackburn reflects the approach taken by our own government as year ago, particularly the proactive measures for steady employment and plans for decentralizing authority, for local centres and community centres.

I am prepared to co–operate with Mrs. Blackburn, and I hope she will co–operate with our government, in the best interests of all Quebecers.

* * *

MINIMUM WAGE

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

One of the main demands made by womens' groups, especially those that organized the bread and roses march, is for governments to raise the minimum wage.

• (1455)

Since the federal minimum wage has not been increased since 1986, does the minister intend to correct this situation and announce an increase this year?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are looking into this right now, and we intend to make a decision very shortly.

I might add that after checking with federally regulated employers, we found that most businesses operate on the basis of the minimum wage in each province. Right now, we can assume that a very small majority of workers are paid the federal minimum wage.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this may be a good opportunity to look at federal encroachment on provincial jurisdictions in all areas connected with manpower.

Since the average provincial minimum wage is around $5.60—even if only a small majority of people are concerned, these are always too many, and we should find out how many people are earning such a low wage—would the minister agree that a federal minimum wage of $4.00 is clearly inadequate and should be increased as soon as possible?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the minimum wage varies widely in this country, depending on the province. It varies from $4.75 to $7.00 in certain provinces. Most employers adjust to the minimum wage in the province where they live, and meanwhile, we are looking into adjusting the federal minimum wage accordingly.

* * *

[*English*]

SOMALIA

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister promised the Somalia inquiry would be free and open. He said that anyone having pertinent testimony had the responsibility to appear. However earlier this week Justice Letourneau suggested serving soldiers might need to be protected and offered that some could testify in camera.

Does the minister accept that military witnesses may need protection? Will he ensure that soldiers can testify, perhaps even against the department and their seniors without fear of reprisal?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that Justice Gilles Letourneau, the chairman of the commission, was quoted in press reports as stating that some soldiers may fear reprisals or being prejudiced in their military career. He did insist however that there is no evidence to that. Perhaps he was taking precautionary steps. He is considering a promise of confidentiality of information, a pledge that the inquiry will investigate any allegation of ongoing reprisals and an offer to allow vulnerable people, if it is shown that this is the case, to give testimony in private.

It would be improper for me or the minister to comment on any other aspects of the commission until the commission has finished its work.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us look at a specific example.

Justice demands that Mark Boland testify, but he has made allegations about the conduct of military police and even now is in their custody. He may have the right to appear, but I question his freedom to do so as long as his treatment and even well–being are under the control of the very people against whom he may testify.

What will the minister do to ensure that a soldier like Mark Boland can without fear of retribution testify freely before the commission?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just suggested and mentioned some of the areas that were being considered by the chairman of the commission. I believe it is the commission's responsibility to decide on this aspect of witnesses and their protection if necessary. I would like to leave it at that.

* * *

DRUG ENFORCEMENT

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

It is clear that current drug enforcement policies need to be reviewed in this country. The B.C. coroner last week raised the issue again, as law enforcement officials and many other people have done recently, suggesting that a radically different legislative approach needs to be taken for the possession and use of hard and soft drugs.

In Canada the last comprehensive public review was in 1970 with the Le Dain commission. Has the minister's department taken any steps to initiate a comprehensive review of Canada's drug enforcement policy?

• (1500)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the Department of Justice we are always looking for controversial new topics to undertake. Perhaps the hon. member has given us something to do for the summer.

I should say that at the moment, as the hon. member may know, the Standing Committee on Health has Bill C–7 before it, which was introduced by the government to deal with a variety of matters in relation to non–medical drugs, their use, and prosecution and enforcement of laws in relation to their illegal use.

It may be that after that bill has been dealt with the Minister of Health may wish to speak more broadly to the question of the drug enforcement strategy. I am sure she will take into account the points made by the hon. member in formulating that suggestion.

* * *

BOSNIA

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it relates to the situation in Bosnia.

As the House will be rising for the summer, the Prime Minister and the government will know Canadians are extremely concerned about what is happening to our soldiers in that part of the world. Given the fact that the House is rising, I would like to ask the government whether it would make a commitment to voluntarily brief members of the House of Commons on a regular basis, in particular members of the Standing Committee on National Defence, so we can be kept abreast of what is happening in this ongoing situation.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to indicate to members of the House who are interested in the safety of our soldiers in Visoko that a liaison officer from the Bosnian government is now in the camp in Visoko to make appropriate arrangements to restore freedom of movement to the troops, including the resupply of our soldiers there.

In regard to the suggestion just made by the hon. member, indeed we have offered periodically to brief political parties, the official opposition and the Reform Party. Certainly if the caucus of the Conservative Party could get together we would be delighted to brief them.

As the member knows, we are the servant of parliamentary committees. If the chair of the standing committee wants to have briefings, I am sure the defence department or my department will respond quickly and expeditiously.

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Dr. Victor Quintana, member of the Mexican Chamber of Deputies.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Témiscamingue, proud to live in the Abitibi—Témiscamingue region, and on behalf of my colleague for Abitibi and of members from all regions of Quebec and elsewhere, I draw your attention to the remarks made by the Minister of Canadian Heritage in response to a question from my colleague for Québec.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage showed a flagrant lack of respect and a disdain for the people of remote regions like mine. In his response to my colleague for Québec, he referred to new technologies, using qualifiers. He then used the expression "reculées" (out of the way, backward) to describe the regions, probably in reference to all sorts of things going on in his head as his department is making decisions regarding major cultural sectors in the regions—such as the National Film Board or the Festival du cinéma international.

• (1505)

As the member for Témiscamingue, I cannot accept such remarks. Through you, I ask the Minister of Cultural Heritage to apologize to all of the people of Abitibi—Témiscamingue and everyone living in the regions, who are not necessarily the people who live in large urban centres.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at issue is not the respect I have as a Quebecer for all parts of Quebec, but a knowledge of how to speak the French language. I refer you to page 1632 of the *Petit Robert*, where "reculé" is defined as "lointain, difficile d'accès, isolé" (distant, hard to reach, isolated). I see nothing to offend people in this.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: This is unacceptable.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): I would like to go back, Mr. Speaker, to the words that the minister just said. The minister just demonstrated that he has an extremely poor image of those Quebecers who do not live in cities when he said that he finds it utterly normal, parliamentary, respectable and acceptable to say that these people live in isolated, hard to get to and distant regions. There are no distant regions in the province of Quebec. In fact, the minister was talking about people who live in vibrant and constructive communities which contribute to our society.

I would like to ask this minister, who has a very good knowledge of the French language, having used it on many different levels, to, very modestly, very simply, withdraw his unfortunate comments, and then we can put this whole incident behind us.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I do not believe that this is a matter of privilege. This is a debate and, in this House, we have a lot of time for debates, therefore, I will let this issue rest here. There is no matter of privilege.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to raise another point of order?

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I will not be able to intervene; you have already settled the matter. However, talking about shrinking a country's boundaries, just look at the position of the Bloc Quebecois.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I had hoped that you had forgotten that today is "wonderful Wednesday". Let us move on to Routine Proceedings.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1510)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 48 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, on the future of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the multi-channel universe.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response thereto within 150 days.

[*Translation*]

I also have the privilege to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage on the government's proposed orders issuing directions to the CRTC respecting direct-to-home satellite distribution and pay-per-view programming undertakings.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons entitled "Employment Equity: A Commitment to Merit".

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to make a brief comment on the Reform Party's minority report, which is attached to the employment equity report from the government.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-338, an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Income Tax Act with respect to the political activities of charities receiving public funds.

I would like to thank the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth for seconding the bill.

The bill would allow the revenue minister to disqualify from charitable status corporations, trusts, and organizations that receive discretionary grants from the public money of Canada if they engage in public activity that goes beyond the direction of their charitable object.

I call upon members on all sides of the House to support the bill. I would remind them that our federal debt is now over $550 billion.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

INTERVENOR FUNDING ACT

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-339, an act to provide for the funding for intervenors in hearings before certain boards and agencies.

• (1515)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to present a private member's bill entitled an act to provide for funding for interveners in hearings before certain boards and agencies, which responds to concerns from constituents in my riding.

The bill establishes the principle that a proponent of a project that requires review and approval and that affects the public interest or the environment should assist with funding for interveners.

The bill will assist interveners with a record of responsible representation of a facet of the public interest to put their arguments respecting the project before the approving authority.

I look forward to the support of my colleagues when the bill comes forward.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–340, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (termination of CBC's television operations).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to introduce these three private members' bills. The bills are part of our package to privatize the CBC.

One of the bills amends the Access to Information Act and would make the CBC more accessible to Canadians. Presently it is exempt from the Access to Information Act and the bill would end that exemption.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to continue. The explanations as you read them are self–explanatory.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): moved for leave to introduce Bill C–341, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act (Canada Council, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Canadian Film Development Corporation, National Arts Centre Corporation).

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–342, an act to amend the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Arts Centre Corporation).

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

• (1520)

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–343, an act to amend the Criminal Code (arrest without warrant).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce this private member's bill which I feel will have no difficulty finding support throughout the House.

The purpose of the bill is to give a peace officer the power to arrest without warrant a person who is in breach of a probation order binding the person.

We are thinking particularly of the number of reports that have come through the police commissions to my office of stalkers and other individuals who are out on parole, probation or found in areas where they have been told not to be. The police have no authority to do anything other than report. We feel they should have, for the safety of all Canadians, the power to arrest. We would seek support for the bill.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC HARBOURS AND PORT FACILITIES ACT

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière–du–Loup, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–344, an act to amend the Public harbours and Port Facilities Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change a time–honoured practice under the Public harbours and Port Facilities Act by which harbour masters and wharfingers are appointed at the discretion of the minister, often as a political favour.

The purpose of the bill is to ensure that appointments are made on the basis of individual qualifications. The decision will still be up to the minister, but he will have to designate appointees who have shown they are capable of performing the duties involved, all of which would be part of the current review of Canada's marine policy. I think the House would have no trouble passing this bill.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

[*English*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

REFERENDUM ACT

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be designated as the committee of the House of Commons to which any matters shall stand referred pursuant to the Referendum Act.

The Speaker: Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Government Orders are reached later this day I think you would find unanimous consent that notice of ways and means motion No. 28, standing in the name of the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions, will be deemed carried on division when it is put to the House.

Notice of ways and means motion No. 29, standing in the name of the Minister of National Revenue, will be put to the House, a division will have been deemed to have been demanded, and the same will be deferred until 11.30 tonight.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

• (1525)

PETITIONS

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada. The particular petition comes from Leamington, Ontario.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

[*Translation*]

ELIGIBILITY TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my privilege to table in the House a petition signed by more than 850 residents of the riding of Charlevoix.

Your petitioners call on the government to make zone 16 in the central northern region part of zone 25 in Northern Quebec, in the case of municipalities included in the MRCs of Charlevoix–est and Charlevoix–ouest, for the purposes of eligibility for unemployment insurance.

Since most of the jobs available in zone 16 are seasonal, your petitioners want to be part of zone 25, which better reflects the kind of jobs they have.

[*English*]

TAXPAYER PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present several petitions today.

The first is from 120 constituents of my riding as well as other parts of British Columbia. They call upon the government to reduce its spending and instead implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal spending.

I am pleased to present the petition today.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as well there is a petition that once again reflects the concerns of Canadians about the Young Offenders Act.

The petition has almost 200 signatures from all parts of British Columbia including my riding. They call upon Parliament to review the Young Offenders Act in an open and accountable process which addresses the following principles: deterrence of the offender, accountability of the offender, and the rights of the victim.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): As well, Mr. Speaker, I have one small petition with which I disagree relating to the Canadian Human Rights Act.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

JUSTICE

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as well, I have a petition that calls for stiffer treatment of criminals and to return rights to law–abiding citizens. It is from approximately 150 petitioners, 25 from British Columbia and others from across Canada.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to return rights to the citizens of Canada from the criminals and request that Parliament honour these requests.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions asking Parliament to lobby on behalf of Leonard Peltier.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions urging Parliament to amend the human rights act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

I have two other petitions asking Parliament not to amend the human rights act in any way that would indicate approval of same sex relationships.

VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition calling for stiffer sentences and mandatory treatment for all child abusers.

BREAST CANCER

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my last petition today is on the matter of breast cancer in Canada.

The petitioners call for Parliament to support centres of excellence for breast cancer research, a national toll free information and support system for breast cancer research, and core funding for that research. They call upon Parliament to spearhead federal and provincial action on breast cancer.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to present a petition on behalf of approximately 300 constituents of my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona.

The constituents request that the human rights act not be amended to include the term sexual orientation in order that no Canadian receives special rights or privileges based solely on sexual behaviour.

It is my pleasure to submit the petition and to inform my constituents that I concur.

• (1530)

The Speaker: Colleagues, it is not necessary to agree or disagree with petitions. We ask you not to.

I will get you all in. How many of you have to catch a plane? I will get you in, I promise.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition from my riding and parts of the city of London, Ontario which contains four pages of signatures.

This is a petition calling on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

It notes acts of discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians are an every day reality in all regions of Canada and that this type of discrimination is unacceptable in a country known for its commitment to human rights, equality and dignity for all citizens.

EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions from Lac–la–Biche, Alberta in the constituency of Beaver River.

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, they are saying whereas the majority of Canadians are law–abiding citizens and respect the law, whereas the majority of Canadians respect the sanctity of human life, and whereas the majority of Canadians believe physicians in Canada should be working to save lives, not to end them, they are praying that Parliament ensures present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously.

They pray that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

Also pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of constituents from Bonnyville, again in Beaver River. Whereas decriminalizing assisted suicide or legalizing euthanasia could lead to a reduction in patient–physician trust and respect, the degrading of the value of human life and the erosion of moral and ethical values, and whereas palliative care is active and compassionate care which can relieve the pain and suffering of terminally ill persons and families without the dangers of suicide, these petitioners pray that Parliament continue to reject euthanasia and physician assisted suicide.

They also request present provisions of section 241 of the Criminal Code of Canada which forbids the counselling, procuring, aiding or abetting of a person to commit suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament consider expanding palliative care that would be accessible to all dying persons in Canada.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this petition may be one of the most important petitions tabled in the House of Commons. It was signed by students at Lavallée, Windsor Park Collegiate and Nelson McIntyre, all schools in my riding, and concerns national unity.

These petitioners point out that:

[*English*]

Quebec has been a founding partner of Canada and its richness and uniqueness in terms of language and culture, its population, its size and its position have enriched the entire nation.

In spite of differences we have had over time, we have been able to reach accommodation to the benefit of all parties and certainly to the benefit of the entire nation. These students believe separation would jeopardize the quality of life of all Canadians, particularly young people. They insist we all work very diligently and responsibly as adults toward national unity; a stronger country for ourselves but let us not forget them.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have five petitions to present. The first deals with our financial condition. The petitioners pray and request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes and implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal funding.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition unfortunately arrives too late because Parliament rushed through Bill C–68.

I have 250 signatures from my constituents asking more attention be paid to people who are breaking the laws with respect to guns as opposed to law–abiding citizens who came under the gun as a result of that act.

The third petition with 151 signatures draws to the attention of the House that public safety is the number one priority of the criminal justice system.

The petitioners want Parliament to support laws that will severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of crime and support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions which recognize and protect law–abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms.

• (1535)

JUSTICE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the House, the last two petitions have had the greatest number of petitioners coming to my office. The first one specifically refers the bill of my colleague from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Bill C–240. The petitioners call on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post–sentence detention orders and specifically passing Bill C–240.

A related petition with 686 signatures calls for keeping dangerous offenders and paedophiles locked up for life, eliminating statutory release and posing stiffer sentences for violent offenders. There is a whole list here.

This issue has prompted the greatest number of signatures in my constituency. Although I do not have any obligation to comment on it, I will say that I do concur.

The Speaker: I prefer you did not.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions signed by many residents across my constituency which deal directly with national unity in Canada.

They state that whereas the hon. Leader of the Opposition has travelled to other parts of the world to promote the separation of Quebec from Canada, and whereas the majority of residents of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke wish to promote Quebec's continued participation in the Confederation of Canada, therefore the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call on Parliament to inform the Leader of the Opposition he is not supporting the majority view of the residents of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke when he is travelling to promote the separation of Quebec form Canada.

They want national unity in Canada.

PHONE SEX SERVICES

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition signed by my constituents.

The petitioners, most of whom are concerned parents, have expressed grave concerns of the arrival in Canada of new phone sex services that originate from foreign countries. These services are classified as standard overseas calls and their advertising and access are not regulated, as are domestic services of the same nature.

Unlike –900 and –976 calls which parents can block, these –011 numbers cannot be blocked. The petitioners believe children's access to these services should be curtailed and they request Parliament to enact a publication ban on foreign sex line numbers and to regulate foreign sex lines and restrict publication of the numbers to adult subscriptions to be accompanied by a warning as to their graphic nature.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and honour to present a petition on behalf of 100 constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding area.

The petitioners humbly pray and call on Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people, binding on Parliament, to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

JUSTICE

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition with the signatures of 7,582 residents of southeastern and central Ontario. This was presented to me by Tracey Bridgeman of the Durham region.

It calls on Parliament to recognize that crimes and violence against persons are serious and abhorrent to society. It also requests we amend the Criminal Code, the Bail Reform Act of 1972 and the Parole Act accordingly.

JUNK MAIL

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 1,950 residents mainly of the Victoria, British Columbia region, asking that Canada Post cease to deliver junk mail.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and pleasure to present a number of petitions which I have grouped into six topics in order to facilitate their presentation.

The first is signed by 83 responsible firearms owners from Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan who use firearms for their livelihood, sport and industry. They call on Parliament to recognize Canada already has the toughest gun control in North America with strong regulations regarding usage and storage, and to further recognize there is no relationship between responsible gun ownership and the use of firearms in crime.

• (1540)

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next group of petitions is signed by 47 constituents of Saskatchewan, not in my riding, who call on Parliament to preserve Canadian unity, parliamentary tradition and to protect the rights of all the people of Canada by prevailing on the Speaker of the House of Commons to recognize the Reform Party of Canada as the official opposition during the remainder of the 35th Parliament.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to present a petition signed by 195 school teachers from my riding regarding the status of the Young Offenders Act.

The petitioners call on Parliament to change the legislation to make young offenders more responsible for their actions, to make the names of young offenders public and to increase the severity of consequences for repeat offenders.

RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next group is petitions is with respect to the elimination of the Crow benefit.

The petitioners call on Parliament to eliminate the debt incurred by CN Rail and get the CN empire, government owned grain hopper rail cars and the Port of Churchill to western Canadian farmers operated in conjunction with the Canadian Wheat Board, thus allowing effective competition within rail transportation.

JUSTICE

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is from 25 residents of Saskatchewan who are greatly concerned that under section 745 of the Criminal Code convicted murderers sentenced to life imprisonment without chance of parole for 25 years are able to apply for review after 15 years. The petitioners request the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the last group of petitions which I have the honour and privilege to present today is signed by 425 concerned Canadians, primarily from Saskatchewan and British Columbia, who request that Parliament support the existing laws which severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in crime, support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions which recognize the rights of law-abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms, and support legislation which will repeal and modify existing gun control laws which have not improved public safety or have proven to not be cost effective or have proven to be overly complex so as to be ineffective or unenforceable.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for me to recognize the last three members for petitions today?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to present yet another petition from citizens in my riding who are opposed to the approval of BST, the drug injected into cows to increase milk production.

A recent Angus Reid poll suggested 74 per cent of Canadians are concerned about BST and would pay more for milk from cows not injected with it.

There is no shortage of milk in the country. If there should ever become a shortage of milk the solution would be to get more cows.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the federal representative for the riding of Welland—St. Catharines.

The petitioners oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amendments to the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

The petition contains 38 signatures.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, citizens from across British Columbia have given me several petitions which cover a variety of topics.

In the first petitioners are concerned that the definition of marriage remain the legal union of a man and a woman.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners request that assisted suicide and euthanasia not be allowed in Canada.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the petitioners request that protection enjoyed by born human beings be extended to unborn human beings.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the fourth petition the petitioners request that firearms legislation target the criminal misuse of firearms and not law–abiding citizens.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps readying Parliament for the next federal budget, in the final petition the petitioners request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes.

JUSTICE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a privilege to rise on behalf of my constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to present petitions. I have three petitions to present today.

The first petition was initiated in the memory of Mindy Tran, an eight–year old who was abducted and tragically murdered in her home town of Kelowna, British Columbia. The 248 signatories request that Parliament impose maximum existing legislation, deny eligibility for parole, bring in new legislation and hold a binding national referendum on the issue of capital punishment as a deterrent to these social predators victimizing our children.

• (1545)

SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition also deals with the criminal justice system. Outraged citizens are concerned with sexual assaults on women.

The petitioners call on Parliament to amend section 271 of the Criminal Code to include a minimum sentence of five years where a person pleads guilty to or is found guilty of level one sexual assault.

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker the third petition, bearing 71 signatures, is in regard to the bovine growth hormone that is injected into dairy cows.

The petitioners request the Government of Canada to protect our health and food supply by disallowing the unnecessary genetic manipulation of dairy cows through the injection of bovine growth hormones.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of Canadians from Merritt, Kamloops, Oliver, Langley and Surrey, British Columbia.

The petitioners point out that Canadians, particularly women and children, are becoming increasingly fearful of walking on the streets in their communities. They ask the House of Commons and the Minister of Justice to take whatever steps are necessary to amend the Criminal Code and parole system to ensure that safety and peace return to our neighbourhoods.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition, signed by people primarily from Ontario. It indicates that deep cuts to Canada's social programs will hurt all Canadians and have a profoundly negative impact on the four million adults and children living below the poverty line.

The petitioners point out that 50 per cent of the debt of Canada is the result of monetary policy, 44 per cent is the result of tax policy and less than 6 per cent is a result of all government programs.

Therefore they point out that social programs ought not to be severely limited, in that they are our right and heritage.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 183 and 196.

[*Text*]

Question No. 183—**Mr. Comuzzi:**

What portion of the announced $300 million adjustment payment following cancellation of the WGTA will be directed toward enhancing infrastructure for the port of Churchill?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food), Lib.): No final decisions have yet been made on the precise allocation of the $300 million multiyear WGTA adjustment fund. Discussions with private sector stakeholders, including farm organizations, and provincial governments are underway to solicit advice as to priorities. The fund first becomes available on April 1, 1996.

To date, the advice received by the government has emphasized the use of this fund to: offset some of the impact of changes in the Canadian Wheat Board's freight cost pooling system; provide transitional support for the alfalfa dehydration industry; and build or upgrade agricultural infrastructure on the prairies, and especially the road system.

Final allocation decisions will take all relevant interests into account, recognizing that a $300 million fund cannot address every expectation. The objective is to assist the prairies agricultural sector to make the necessary transition to an economic environment without transportation subsidization.

Question No. 196—**Mrs. Hayes:**

With respect to the UN New York preparatory conference in March 1995, (*a*) what was the total amount spent by all federal departments and agencies as well as the breakdown of those costs by department and agency, (*b*) who were the representatives that comprised the Canadian delegation and what were the guidelines utilized in the selection of those delegates?

Hon Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): I am informed by Status of Women Canada (SWC) as follows:

The four week New York preparatory meeting for the World Conference on Women March 15 to April 7, 1995 was held concurrently with the regular session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

(a) Cost to the federal government for participation at these meetings were as follows:

Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)—$973

Status of Women Canada (three officials)—$19,677

Foreign Affairs (one official)—$5,000

Canadian International Development Agency (one official)—$8,055

Non-governmental organizations (two representatives)—$16,215*

*Funded by Status of Women Canada

Total Cost:—$49,920

(b) Representatives on the Canadian Delegation included:

Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women); Status of Women Canada, Valérie Raymond, executive director, world conference secretariat; Status of Women Canada, Rhonda Ferderber, director, external relations and communications; Status of Women Canada, Sheila Regehr, senior policy analyst; Foreign Affairs, Adèle Dion, co-ordinator, international women's equality; Canadian International Development Agency, Diana Rivington, senior policy adviser, women in development directorate; NGOs, Madeleine Gilchrist and Gulzar Samji; and two representatives of the government of Quebec, costs covered by the government of Quebec.

The appointment of a delegation to represent Canada at world conferences and/or preparatory meetings leading to those conferences is the responsibility of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In selecting members, the minister ensures that the expertise is well matched to the issues to be addressed and that the delegation is representative of the diversity of Canadian interests at play in the conference.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

An hon. member: Agreed.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the second time I am asking about Question No. 117, which I placed on the Order Paper on December 1, 1994.

I understand that the government normally takes 45 days to answer these questions. It has now been seven months. I thought it was a fairly simple question, asking about the taxable liability of civil servants who have travel allowances and chauffeured limousines to move around the country.

I hope the government will see fit to answer this question forthwith, after seven months.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day in responding to a similar point of order raised by the same hon. member, the question asked involves a tremendous amount of detail from all parliamentary agents, crown corporations, every department and agency of the government, all governor in council appointees, armed forces personnel and RCMP personnel. He has asked for a tremendously detailed answer. Frankly, I am not surprised that it has taken so long to answer. I am sorry it has taken so long.

I should advise the hon. member and he will be interested to know that of the 209 questions on the Order Paper to date, 166 have been answered and 43 are outstanding. That will be less the ones that have been answered this week. I think there have been four answered already this week.

In fact, 80 per cent of the questions that have been placed on the Order Paper during this session of Parliament have been answered. The government has been assiduous in attending to its duties. I know the hon. member will agree, having heard those figures.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to suggest that all notices of motions for the production of papers stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1550)

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS ACT

Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew (for the Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.) moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Customs Act and the Customs Tariff and to make related and consequential amendments to other acts be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to an order made earlier today the motion is deemed adopted on division.

(Motion agreed to.)

EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew (for the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.) moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Income Tax Act be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to an order made earlier today, a recorded division is deemed demanded and deemed deferred until 11.30 p.m. this evening.

* * *

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are 33 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C–91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada.

Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 will be grouped for debate but voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 2 and 5. On the other hand, a negative vote on Motion No. 1 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 2.

A vote on Motion No. 2 applies to Motion No. 5

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 will be grouped for the purposes of debate but voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 12 and 13 will be grouped for the purposes of debate. A vote on Motion No. 12 will apply to Motion No. 13.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18 will be grouped for debate but voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 16 applies to Motion No. 17. Motion No. 18 will be voted on separately.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I shall now propose Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 to the House.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent on the part of the House to consider that when you call a group, all the motions in the group would be deemed put to the House without your having to read them or have them moved. I think there is a disposition throughout the House in that regard today.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you might find unanimous agreement to start with Group No. 4. I understand that is the wish of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In that case I shall propose Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18 to the House.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C–91, in Clause 23, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 42, on page 10, with the following:

"shares with a par value of $100 each, but the paid–in capital of the Bank,".

Motion No. 17

That Bill C–91, in Clause 24, be amended

(*a*) by replacing lines 18 and 19, on page 11, with the following:

"24. The rights conferred by shares include"; and

(*b*) by deleting lines 26 to 38, on page 11.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C–91, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 42, on page 12 and lines 1 to 23, on page 13, with the following:

"(*a*) authorizing the issue of shares in one or more series and authorizing the Board to fix, by resolution, the maximum number of shares in each series and to determine the designation, rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions attaching to the shares of each series, subject to any limitation set out in the by–law;

(*b*) changing authorized shares without par value, whether issued or not, into shares with a par value and changing authorized shares with a par value, whether issued or not, into shares without par value; and

(*c*) consolidating or subdividing shares."

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, before I get into the debate I would like to express my appreciation for the unanimous consent given to the grouping and that all of these motions are deemed to have been put, to expeditiously advance the debate and the passage of the bill.

However, I also need to register very clearly and unequivocally that the establishment of a crown corporation like the Federal Business Development Bank or by whatever other name it might be called in the future is not consistent with Reform Party policy. We would suggest that such a crown corporation, organization or corporation not exist. Even though that is our position, we want to make the crown corporation as efficient and effective as it can be. That is the purpose of the amendments that our party is presenting to the House this afternoon.

• (1555)

With regard to Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18, which refer to clauses 23, 24 and 27 of the act respectively, each of these amendments and those respective clauses refer to the capital structure of the proposed FDBD. The capital structure as covered in clause 23 suggests that it consists of a variety of instruments. The first of these are common shares with a par value of $100 each and an unlimited number of preferred shares without par value, but the paid–in capital of the bank together with any contributed surplus related to it and any proceeds referred to in paragraph 30(2)(d).

This paragraph from 30(2)(d) really has to do with hybrid capital instruments. We will talk about that in just a moment. We also need to recognize that those things that have been described as equity have to do with contributed surplus and retained earnings.

Therefore, a couple of things need to be suggested here. First, the categorization of common shares versus preferred shares needs to be distinguished. The common shares and the preferred shares will be owned by the crown which is the Government of Canada. However, as I understand it, there is a difference in how they are treated in terms of the presentation of the budget to the House of Commons.

The preferred shares, to the best of my knowledge, will not be in the budget but off budget. In other words, they are considered as an investment of the government so the people are unaware of what the disposition or exposure is of the Government of Canada in the equity of the Federal Business Development Bank.

Motion No. 16 deletes from the capital structure of the bank the category of preferred shares. This would suggest that it is better to take them out.

When we get to clause 24, if there is going to be a share capital part of the capital structure of the bank, to make it more efficient then it ought to be possible, in fact it is necessary in our opinion, that there be a variety of classes of shares and that they be created in such a way that there is a maximum of flexibility possible.

If some future government would like to do what the current government is doing, that is privatizing crown corporations like CNR, then this capital structure would be a very convenient way to make the thing go smoothly. From that point of view, it is an improvement to go to a share capital position.

Our suggestion is that there be only one class of shares which are common shares rather than preferred shares. Motion No. 17 clarifies and makes more efficient the disposition, control and management of those shares.

I would like to focus briefly on the hybrid capital instruments. Nowhere does the act define exactly what is meant by a hybrid capital instrument. This raises a whole series of questions. The

first question has to do with what is the priority claim in the event of dissolution of the bank or in the event of looking at the earnings of the bank as to who gets paid and in what order they get paid. Do they take preference to the preferred shares or do they take a secondary position or do they maybe even take a tertiary position? It is not clear.

Therefore the act is deficient in not making that clear. The act is also deficient in not clarifying exactly who will own these hybrid financial instruments.

The question really arises of who will be expected to buy these things. Are they going to be individual citizens? Is it going to be the Government of Canada?

• (1600)

The way the act is written, it is possible that the government could own these, that individual citizens could own these, that corporations could own these. That raises the other good question: Could some kind of persuasive power be directed towards the banks and it be requested that they supply this hybrid capital, in which case it is almost an expectation that it is just short of exercising a tax on the banks in order to supply the capital for this crown corporation? I do not think that is a desirable situation to be in.

The other situation is that if you create a hybrid capital instrument and nobody knows exactly what we are talking about, that is like creating something we are supposed to be supporting and we are not sure what it is we are supporting. One has to be very critical of that kind of provision in an act of this kind.

There is one other point that has to be raised here, and that is the actual manner in which the retained earnings and the contributed surplus is going to be handled by this bank. On one hand, the bank is told that it must manage its affairs in such a way that there is complete cost recovery in terms of the loans and the financial transactions it engages in. On the other hand, there is a provision that the capitalization of the bank contain a parliamentary appropriation.

It depends a lot now on what the mix of these equity positions is going to be. If the major portion of the capitalization of the bank is going to be a hybrid capital instrument and if that has prior claim, then indeed the bank is obligated to pay the holders of these hybrid instruments before it considers any profit to the bank or any return on investment. If the major part of that is there, that becomes a direct charge against the earnings the bank might make. Most of those earnings will come from the money it lends to various entrepreneurs.

I would respectfully suggest to the House that we adopt these three amendments to the act.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, to begin I would like to say to the industry critic for the Reform Party and the critic from the Bloc Quebecois that as we in committee designed this bill we had a very constructive debate, a very solid exchange of views. I am happy to see that this spirit is continuing today in the House, because it is important that we put this bill through the House today, with all the responsibility we have been given to make sure we do the right thing.

At the same time, members must realize that this Business Development Bank of Canada is an instrument that we need to act as a catalyst with the small and medium size business community and it must be done. This bill must be passed before this House adjourns.

I now want to deal with the Reform Party member's concerns about this area of the bill on these motions. I want to humbly differ with him. Where the member has said that we are not specific about the options the bank may choose to get into and therefore the crown's liability might be increased, I differ with that.

I want to be very specific. Under section 30 of the bill, it is entitled the debt to equity ratio. Section 30 is very specific. The aggregate of (a) the borrowings of the bank under subsection 18(1) and section 19 and (b) the contingent liabilities of the bank in the form of guarantees given by it must not at any time exceed 12 times the equity of the bank.

• (1605)

We go on and we are very specific about the definition of equity:

> For the purpose of subsection (1), the equity of the Bank consists of
>
> (a) the amounts paid for its shares, including any contributed surplus;
>
> (b) the retained earnings of the Bank, which may be positive or negative;
>
> (c) the amounts paid to the Bank as capital by Parliamentary appropriation; and
>
> (d) such proceeds of debt instruments, hybrid capital instruments or any other arrangements as may be prescribed as equity by the Governor in Council.

What I am suggesting by that very specific control the bank has is that the amendment the Reform Party is putting forward is not necessary because any activity in respect to the concern of the member of the Reform Party could only be undertaken if it met the bank's eligibility criteria. If the eligibility criteria were not met, then the bank could not proceed holus–bolus on its own.

I believe that the bill, as it stands, amply covers the Reform Party's concerns.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in the debate on the fourth group of motions and I am pleased that we have agreed to

accommodate one of our Reform Party colleagues, who had to return to his riding unexpectedly early.

I should mention from the outset that the amendments before us are very technical and very specialized. We support them, because, on the whole, they strike us as not altering the spirit of the bill to any degree, a bill, I might add, that we condemn with all the strength we can muster. This is perhaps a bit of a disappointment for our Reform colleagues.

This very important bill changes the rules of the game and the way of doing things in addition to changing the name of the largest federal financial institution. The change is being made on the sly, without debate or show, make no mistake about it, even though the bill will completely change the operation and the mission of the bank in its relations with future clients.

It will have the role of agent of regional development. We will, however, come back to this point at length during the course of the day. The mission of the bank is being changed in that the nature of the role of economic developer through small business will be altered. We have questions about the way the bank will work in the future, because, in our opinion, it will have to become more commercial in nature and assume the accompanying concerns.

At this point in the debate, I would like to inform you that we will support the three motions by our colleague from the Reform Party, and particularly the amendment to prevent the issue of preferred shares. We consider it important in the context that the legislation clearly state preferred shares may not be issued.

I end my remarks here and will comment further on the bill itself in the coming hours.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 16?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

• (1610)

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 17.

The next question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew (for the Minister of Industry), Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That the title of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 3

That section 1 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 4

That section 2 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 6

That section 3(1) of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 26

That section 43 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 27

That section 44 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 28

That section 45 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 29

That section 47 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 30

That section 49 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 31

That section 51 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 32

That section 53 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 33

That the Schedule to Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C–91 be amended by deleting Clause 1.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C–91, in Clause 3, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 27, on page 2, with the following:

"3. (1) The Federal Business Development Bank is continued as a body corporate."

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to this motion put to the House by the government wherein we name the Federal Business Development Bank the Business Development Bank of Canada.

I think it is only fair to give a little background on this issue, because it was quite a contentious issue in the industry committee. It is important for Canadians to realize that the industry committee over the last year has been seized with one issue primarily. That one issue has been access to capital for small business.

Most members of the committee would agree that we did not let a day go by when we did not explore and examine opportunities and ways in which we could put the small business community on the front burner in the House of Commons. Having worked in this city for many years, I must say that I have found the industry committee to be a united force on this issue.

There were times when we felt we were not the industry committee but really the small business committee. I think it would be fair to suggest that we all wanted to put the small business stamp on every issue we touched. Lo and behold, when the reform of the Federal Business Development Bank came along we decided as a committee to rename it the Small Business Bank of Canada. We became emotionally attached to the issue of small business, to the point where we would probably have wanted to name this institution the Small Business Institution. But reason prevailed and a number of people took the committee's recommendation and did a more thorough analysis of exactly how Canadians felt about that name in all regions of the country. A number of important facts came back to us.

• (1615)

By naming the Federal Business Development Bank the Small Business Bank of Canada we would be creating an expectation for that institution which in fairness it could not fulfil. We would have been suggesting that the bank had powers way beyond the powers this bill is giving it. Most Canadians probably do not even realize that the Federal Business Development Bank is not a deposit taking institution. Right off the bat that is an important thing for Canadians to realize.

Another thing we have discovered is that even though the bank is committed to the traditional sectors of our economy, we also want to give it a new type of energy and a new focus on the innovative economies, the knowledge based industries, et cetera. The small business categorization seemed to limit that group. These are new and emerging businesses but it does not take long before they become large businesses. To restrict the bank to the small business name would, in the long run, have created an adverse image and adverse impact on the bank. All committee members did not in any way, shape or form want to do anything other than make sure that this re–tooled, renewed bank with expanded powers got off on the right foot.

I realize that emotionally many of us, including myself, were attached to the name Small Business Bank of Canada. In light of the fact that all of this other information has been brought to our attention, I would ask members to support the government amendment with respect to the new name, the Business Development Bank of Canada, which better reflects the mandate of the bank.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise for the second time. Changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank is a substantial change indeed, especially when there has been no real expressed need. It would appear that the parliamentary secretary's memory of what happened in committee differs from mine.

I would invite you to read again the report on small and medium sized business financing, put out last year by the committee, especially recommendation 19, if my memory serves me well, which came out of left field since the committee had not debate whether the FBDB should change its name. It was our very courteous colleague from Broadview—Greenwood who, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, strong armed the committee into considering the results of the reflection which had taken place in the minister's office to the effect that the Federal Business Development Bank should change its name to the Small Business Bank of Canada. Strangely enough, there is no comment regarding this recommendation in the report. I believe that everybody understood that the parliamentary secretary had no other choice than to present certain proposals.

• (1620)

However, it was not enthusiastically received, since everybody agreed that the Federal Business Development Bank had a very good reputation and that changing its name to the Small Business Bank of Canada would result in extra costs and a waste of efforts, all the more as it apparently narrowed unduly the federal bank's mandate.

It would appear that cabinet continued to reflect on the issue. We are told that, during the past year, they consulted many Canadians, from coast to coast I suppose, and concluded that the Canadian public wanted the Federal Business Development Bank to change name. Whereas, last year, they had a very narrow view of the issue, now they have a wider view, and want to call the bank the Business Development Bank of Canada. The decision has already been made; that is what the bill proposes.

The name was too restrictive before, but now it is too presumptuous. I think that the development of a country like Canada does not rest on the name of a bank. This would mean that the only possible kind of development is a financial one when, in fact, there is also a social and cultural development in Canada.

This name change will bring about all the disadvantages we had anticipated right from the start, that is unnecessary spending, the costs of changing all business cards, letterheads and signs and a waste of energy. We also learned from the bank's representatives, during the proceedings of the committee, that in these times of economic recession and budget crisis, the bank has decided to move most of its branches, economic austerity notwithstanding.

So we ask where is the coherence in this government if it cuts seven billion dollars in transfers to provinces for social programs and allows spending of that nature which seems entirely unnecessary and untimely. We know just how capable of deep and logical thinking those people across the street, in the Langevin Building, are.

Unless the federal government sees in this Business Development Bank of Canada—and this is how we interpret the objective of the government—some special instrument for intervening in the post–referendum Canada which is coming, where the federal government, without any mandate and without consultation with anyone and especially not with provincial governments, is establishing—and we have said it many times and we hope Quebecers will understand what is involved, what is behind all this manoeuvring, truly the dark side of the moon—a whole system of instruments which will allow it to meddle more and more in the daily lives of Canadians and Quebecers. This is the new flexible federalism which, in fact, will turn provincial governments into regional governments.

What worries us is when we hear the testimony of well–known Liberals like Claude Castonguay and Jean–Claude Rivest, now a senator, and a former special adviser to Premier Bourassa, all articulate federalists. They declared publicly on the CBC that Canada is being fundamentally restructured. Quebecers should reflect on that, on what these people say.

So, when we see how far the federal government is going in terms of the new mandate of the Business Development Bank of Canada, which will be asked, among other things, to promote entrepreneurship and support all programs developing entrepreneurship in Canada, we notice that these terms are unclear and undefined in the bill and will allow the government to intervene as it sees fit in any area that it finds interesting, as it will be able to do in another context, under Bill C–88 concerning internal trade that we will also comment on later today. Again, in clause 9, the federal government is giving itself huge powers, without any mandate, without consulting the stakeholders, even if nobody asked for this. It is again doing it on the sly.

• (1625)

We are also aware that there was a meeting on this issue in Calgary; no one had authorized the federal government to act as it did and the federal government did not inform its partners of its intention to pass Bill C–88 that we are going to study later on today or tomorrow.

Instead we propose that clause 1 to maintain the status quo regarding the name of the Federal Business Development Bank be dropped, for all kinds of reasons. It is a corporation which has an excellent reputation and with which Canadians and Quebecers are familiar. It has proven itself, it has played a useful role as a bank of last resort and we will come back to this concept later on.

If only to set an example and because of the costs and unnecessary efforts involved in changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank to Business Development Bank of Canada, which furthermore we find presumptuous, we

are going to vote against the government's amendments. We are going to propose instead to cancel clause 1 which aims at changing the name of the bank.

[*English*]

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, there are a number of principles I would like to adhere to when rising to debate on this first group of motions having to do with changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank. A number of the principles I want to centre on are fiscal responsibility, democratic decision making, and some of the provisions in the bill itself.

My hon. colleague from the Bloc has illustrated so clearly and so well the additional cost that will be incurred because of these kinds of changes that I do not think are necessary. If on the one hand it would change the function of the bank by changing the name, then let us do it but it does not.

In the whole function of the bank the mandate has been expanded and the capitalization structure has changed. The capital that is available to be lent out has changed. In fact the current capital is about $3.2 billion and under the new provisions of this bill it rises to $18 billion. There are some points there that this bank now becomes a very major player in small business lending.

The parliamentary secretary made a big point about the fact that this is going to be the small business bank and that we all have an emotional attachment to small business. My attachment to small business is not on an emotional basis. My attachment to small business is very pragmatic and very hard headed. It is very simply that 85 per cent of the new jobs created in Canada are created by small business. That is the significant part. If we ever want to really build this economy, we have to pay attention to small business. We have to grow it and we have to develop it. It has to become larger and eventually has to graduate from a small business to a big business.

Those are all very desirable things. The big point here is that we are entering into a request to change the name of a bank. I really wonder what the result will be of changing that name.

What bothers me on the democratic part of this thing is that we entered into an arrangement in this House where we could get the bill to committee before second reading, a bill that was supposed to be discussed in the House. What happened? It meant that all the members in the House were not able to contribute to the debate on the provisions of the proposed legislation in the House.

The bill went to the committee and the committee worked on it. It worked fast. All parliamentary standing committees should take a lesson from the way the industry committee works. It gets co–operation. It works well. There is a lot of disagreement and fighting back and forth but there is no recrimination and that is very significant. We recognize a good idea. It does not matter where it comes from and that is wonderful.

• (1630)

When the decisions of that kind from committee are presented to the minister and he turns right around and says he is sorry about that committee but he is on his way, it will be the Business Development Bank of Canada and he does not care what we think, that calls for real criticism and begs the questions of how important a committee is. What has happened to the procedure?

If everyone in the House agreed to name the bank the small business bank of Canada, would the minister have said sorry, Parliament of Canada, but the name will be the Business Development bank of Canada not the small business bank? The minister exercised that kind of authority in committee, which he would not dare do in the Parliament of Canada. There has been an abuse of the intent and the spirit of bringing this to committee before second reading.

I also want to come to grips with the word complementary which was touted. This new bank is now supposed to be complementary. We could not get the experts, legal or anything else, to define complementary clearly. It was ultimately brought into the bill in a new kind of way. I hope the parliamentary secretary, the minister and all of the department officials will be able to administer this act so it is complementary and not in direct competition with the existing field.

I do not think it is fiscally responsible to incur costs of making all of those changes from the Federal Business Development Bank to the Business Development Bank of Canada. It is unnecessary and will change nothing. If we are to do it that way let us not change it at all.

Democracy needs to prevail in the House. We ought to recognize how important it is the wishes of committees have meaning. I must recognize at the same time, although it is not part of these motions, that in the committee there were some significant amendments made and the minister accepted them. We need to recognize the minister went the other way around, which I think is an abuse of his privileges.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): You cannot win them all.

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Speaker, is it interesting how the parliamentary secretary gets so excited about this issue. That is to be a fundamental question not only for the parliamentary secretary but for all members on that side of the House. How well do they recognize democracy and the wishes of the people when it comes to voting in the House?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I totally agree with what my friend from the Reform Party said about committee proceedings. In committee there are ideas exchanged, some serious work done. However, we get the impression that, in spite of all

the work that is done, when the government wants to impose a direction or a decision, a committee does not carry much weight.

As regards this grouping of amendments, I would like to remind members that with this bill, the government aims at streamlining and modernizing the Federal Business Development Bank. These are words that are really suited to the market situation as this century comes to an end. But they do not fool anyone about the primary intention of the federal government, which is to interfere even more in regional development. Knowing as we do that this element of regional development is extremely important to Quebec, it is obvious that the government intends increase its presence through this structure, this bank, to interfere, to play a role in the most important processes of the economic development of the state of Quebec. We can feel that very clearly.

The government is introducing totally new legislation, the Business Development Bank of Canada Act, which is the new name of the bank, and thereby revokes the Federal Business Development Bank Act. The Bloc opposes any amendment to the current act instituting the Federal Business Development Bank. The bank must continue to provide last resort bank services to small business. Why? Because this is its basic mission, which is to support small businesses having difficulty obtaining financing.

• (1635)

But now, the government wants to set itself up as a banker. We all know very well that Quebec's position is very clear as regards financial support to business. The Quebec premier said clearly that Quebec does not want to act as a banker but that it is ready to implement numerous measures to support small business.

The federal government has just given itself a means to act as a banker and to compete directly with banks. This group of amendments on the new name of the Federal Business Development Bank is particularly important. The intent of the government is to turn it into a genuine bank.

If we look closely at the very centralizing bill put forward by the Liberal Party of Canada, we understand the reason for this name. It comes from a very clear federal Liberal tradition that goes back to the Trudeau era. A very centralizing tradition with tentacles everywhere.

From now on, the central government will not be involved in regional development, and even less in local development. It is developing, using a global strategy, all over the map. In other words, what is good for Canada is good for Quebec, what is good for Newfoundland is good for Quebec, what is good for Ontario is good for Quebec, what is not good for Ontario is not good for Quebec. We know that Ontario has the final say, because the Minister of Industry is from Ontario.

We oppose this group of government amendments relating to the naming of the Federal Business Development Bank. I refer to the motion of my colleague for Trois–Rivières that says that the Federal Business Development Bank is to be maintained as a body corporate. We propose that the bank retain its primary mission, the current one.

The dissenting report of the Bloc Quebecois members sitting on the Standing Committee on Industry concerning small and medium size enterprises says, and I quote: "That the Quebec government is in a better position to recognize the funding needs of small and medium size enterprises, to develop programs and to implement them".

I will go further into other groups of amendments later on and list the tools Quebec has in this field of activity. By moving into this field, the federal government is once again creating a lot of costly duplication.

As we have said on many occasions, Quebec does not accept that the central government can apply Canadian industrial development plans throughout Canada, with national standards and objectives established by the Department of Industry.

We have to acknowledge something that is very obvious: "Quebec's control in this field of activity must be recognized by its Canadian economic partner, that is Quebec must have sole control over access to small and medium size enterprises and regional development".

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to speak to Bill C–91 and emphasize the very positive work done by the critic of the Bloc Quebecois on this matter, the member for Trois–Rivières, who, as you know, has extensive experience in financial assistance to small business.

I think it is worthwhile to repeat what others have already said, that such a bill worries the Bloc. We do not understand how the Minister of Industry could waste his time reviewing the Federal Business Development Bank, since this institution was and still is an instrument much appreciated by small business.

We are convinced that, if the Minister of Industry is really hard–pressed for work, he could have reviewed the assistance programs for the defence industries, with some help from the secretary of state for science, research and development.

I see that the secretary of state is eager to participate in the debate, whether directly or indirectly. Essentially, we are concerned about the fact that this bill is sanctioning a concrete and immediate interference in an area of provincial jurisdiction, that is regional development.

• (1640)

Madam Speaker, you certainly know that Quebec has been demanding that regional development be recognized as a provincial jurisdiction, in accordance with the constitution, since 1974—in fact probably since 1968, but at least since 1974, when the Industrial Development Bank was established. That was the first real interference by the federal government.

I could very easily demonstrate that, certainly as far back as 1974, the federal government has used regional development as a pretext to meddle in a lot of areas that are not under its jurisdiction.

As for ERDAs, or Economic and Regional Development Agreements, why is it that we are debating in June 1995 a bill put forward by the Minister of Industry, when he did not even deign to negotiate and sign ERDAs? Why is the government making this a priority, but did not feel concerned and compelled to get involved in the renewal of these agreements? One can only wonder.

In fact, this needs to be said. Our friends opposite are consistent in their ways; they are using regional development as an excuse to move into areas over which they have no jurisdiction under the constitution. That is what this interest in regional development and ERDAs is all about. Let me back this up with a few facts and figures.

The second batch of ERDAs, those covering the 1984–94 period—I think the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry should listen, because even if he is from Toronto, he could learn a thing or two—were on cultural products, fisheries, transportation and tourism. Can you think of an area that is more obviously and explicitly a provincial responsibility than tourism? Regional development was used to step into areas of jurisdiction not assigned to the federal government.

That is the kind of trick that should make us see clearly that the federal government will never play fair and square at the game of federalism and abide by sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act. It had been amply demonstrated that this many armed, one track and rule bending government is trying to encroach on areas of jurisdiction that are not its own.

It must be said that the Federal Business Development Bank, in the present state of affairs and because of the way it operates, is something small and medium size businesses in Quebec appreciate because it had a well–defined mandate limited to providing last resort assistance. I think that every member of this House has had the chance at one time or another to deal with officials of the Federal Business Development Bank. I know that often, when as an MP I had occasion to refer people to the FBDB, it was because traditional institutions such as chartered banks had refused to help. As stated in its enabling legislation, the FBDB was a last resort lending institution.

Why review the mandate of the Federal Business Development Bank? At whose request? Why is this a government priority when we have so many other fish to fry, particularly I might add in the area of science and technology, about which the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology published a report? I do hope we will get to discuss it in this House, as it would provide me with an opportunity to share views with my good friend, the parliamentary secretary. Over the weekend I read the report, which was tabled recently and found it quite enlightening.

• (1645)

This report of the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology talks about growth, and wisdom, and it proposes four courses of action, but it gives no real indication that this government wants to work to make science and technology a priority. It would have been much more useful for the government to work toward that goal than to review the Federal Business Development Bank Act that no one, in the end, wished to review.

Once again, we must keep in mind that the Federal Bank, established in 1974, was appreciated, and still is, by small and medium size businesses in Quebec and perhaps even in Canada, because it offered consulting services, financial services which were mostly self–financed. For no apparent reason, the Federal Business Development Bank, under a new name, is being asked, as my colleague for Trois–Rivières pointed out, to become a rather traditional lending institutional and to compete with existing institutions. I know that some witnesses raised this as a concern before the Committee on Industry. We fail to understand why the government is bent on stiffer competition in an area that did not need it.

There is cause for concern here, and I think that we will never give enough attention to the real threats for Quebec which are included in this bill, especially under clauses 20 and 21. Are you aware of the Liberals' old tactic? The bill will allow the new bank to do business with organizations or persons directly, over the head of the Quebec government. This is the same old unhealthy, obsolete tactic of divide and conquer, and it fools nobody.

They want to divide and conquer by making funds available. The government whip is a well informed man generally, but obviously, his somewhat Canadian naïvety can sometimes lead him to support principles that are unhealthy for Quebec. As we know, under clause 20, the bank will be allowed to do business directly with organizations or persons, without taking into account the will of the Quebec government.

I know the government whip would surely not have wanted the official opposition to support such principles that obviously—and this cannot be said too often—are very disrespectful to Canadian federalism.

As I have stated, Madam Speaker—and I will conclude with that since you indicate that my time is up—if the government is really serious about regional development, it should transfer tax points or make direct payments to the Quebec government, because we have plenty of projects.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address this House on Bill C–91. This bill seeks to do many things, including changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank, which will become the Business Development Bank of Canada. As they say, what is in a name? What does that name change involve? Let me explain a few things, particularly as regards clause 21, which reads:

> The Bank may carry out duties or functions that may be assigned to it by the Designated Minister in relation to the administration of any program supporting Canadian entrepreneurship, to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions.

The clause says "to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions". As you know, when a bank lends money, it takes a risk. Here, the level of risk is not defined. We have reservations about that.

The minister responsible for implementing the act can ask the Business Development Bank of Canada to support Canadian entrepreneurship by carrying out duties or functions currently assigned to other federal departments or agencies.

• (1650)

Bill C–91 seeks to ensure that the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, better known as the FORD–Q, will be the provider of federal services and programs to small and medium size businesses.

I have several objections regarding this bill. First, this legislation is another centralizing measure which will create unnecessary and costly duplication. Bill C–91 completely eliminates the role of the provincial government in terms of helping small and medium size businesses.

As you know, this contradicts the Liberal government's claims that it wants to abolish duplication and overlap with the provinces. This centralizing attempt is obvious in clauses 20 and 21, which will allow the Business Development Bank of Canada to enter into agreements with other federal departments to deliver assistance to small and medium size businesses directly.

The agreements signed, including with the Federal Office of Regional Development for Quebec, will allow the federal government to interfere more in regional development projects. I did not say "to get involved", but to "interfere", which is definitely not the same. "To get involved" is to act like a partner, while "to interfere" is to usurp a place when you are not invited.

Clause 20 of the bill provides that the Business Development Bank of Canada may enter into agreements directly with any other body or person. That means that it could have agreements with regional development councils, which is precisely what the FORD–Q would like. In Quebec, the Act respecting the Ministère du Conseil exécutif does not allow agencies under provincial jurisdiction to enter into agreements with the federal government without the minister's approval. We can see here the difference between partnership and interference.

Consider the context of clause 20, which is far from innocuous because the Quebec legislation could be bypassed. Given the present budgetary restrictions, if the federal government wants to fund projects advocated by a regional development council, the council will strongly pressure the Quebec government for an exemption. Unfortunately, this is already a common occurrence. The federal and provincial governments are on a collision course because of legislation that does not foster partnership, but interference in a local process.

Once again, we have the federal government blatantly disregarding the very existence of the Quebec government and securing the legislative authority to act without prior consultation with Quebec or, for that matter, any other province. I am referring to the Quebec situation because I am familiar with it, but all provinces will suffer from the adverse impact of this bill.

My second misgiving concerns regional development and more particularly the federal government's centralist attack that is in direct contradiction with Quebec's regionalization policy.

I had the honour and the privilege to sit on the National Capital Commission—and I am talking about Quebec City and the future of Quebec—and I heard the presentations made by many stakeholders who believed that regionalization in the province of Quebec is crucial. However, the federal government has never recognized that regional development is an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

During every round of constitutional negotiations, Ottawa has ignored our demand. Instead, Ottawa promised the government of Quebec to limit its presence in the regions to what is provided for under the Canada–Quebec framework agreements. However, ERDA, the Economic and Regional Development Agreement to which my distinguished colleague referred earlier, came to an end, that was in December 1994 I think, and the federal government has refused to renew it. The Canada–Quebec agreement has expired.

• (1655)

Without joint programs with the government of Quebec, the mandate of FORD–Q becomes practically obsolete. So, to maintain its visibility in the regions, the federal government has found nothing better than to redefine the mandate of FORD–Q.

Nowadays, FORD–Q is known as the delivery arm for all the small businesses assistance programs set up by the federal departments and will be able, on the one hand, to provide assistance services to small and medium size businesses through a single information window and, on the other hand, to develop new programs, particularly for exporting SMBs, through federal departments.

A third concern of mine has to do with the fact that the federal government prefers to withdraw from social program funding. It is well known. It takes the taxpayers' money to create useless overlaps with Quebec agencies which support small and medium size businesses.

The 1995 federal budget, as we know, cut more than $7 billion from social programs. The federal government is asking people to make sacrifices because it has no more money. It even uses the surplus in the unemployment insurance fund—of all things—which is financed by employers and employees. And what does it do with this money? It finances new child care programs, new programs to fight against poverty, new manpower training programs, which, it must be said, all infringe on provincial jurisdictions.

Unfortunately, the federal government is in no hurry when it comes to responding to Quebec's demands, which are that it withdraw from the fields of manpower training and regional development and reduce this costly and useless duplication. However, Ottawa continues to ignore Quebec's demands, even though this waste of money affects taxpayers and creates an administrative mess, because the beneficiaries of these programs no longer know where to turn. Moreover, it creates unproductive and unhealthy competition between programs that are not even based on the same strategies. And that is where the problem lies. These programs are not based on the same strategies. Strategies which are useful, necessary and beneficial to Quebec are not necessarily the ones chosen by the federal government.

I will conclude by saying that I regret that this bill has been proposed in this form by the government and that I fervently hope that, this fall, Quebec will take control of its destiny and that we will no longer have to engage in these pointless negotiations cap in hand, with Ottawa, but rather will be able to negotiate as equals with the goal of a happy and healthy prosperity for all.

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C–91, an Act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada. The purpose of the bill is to replace the Federal Business Development Bank by the Business Development Bank of Canada.

The Liberal government has decided to introduce a totally new piece of legislation, creating a new body, the Business Development Bank of Canada, instead of amending the existing legislation governing the Federal Business Development Bank. We must not delude ourselves. This new legislation is fundamentally similar to the present legislation although it makes some major changes.

As for the mandate, it is changed in such a way that the Federal Business Development Bank will no longer offer only last resort financing, but will now have the power to offer financing to complement that available from other financial institutions.

It will also be easier for the new Business Development Bank of Canada to enter into agreements with private and public partners, at both the federal and provincial levels, to form lending consortiums. The new bank will therefore be able to establish subsidiaries and to use a greater number of financial tools to fulfil its mandate. Clause 20 of the bill gives the bank great flexibility to negotiate agreements with other federal departments as well as with provincial and local agencies in order to fulfil its specific mandate.

• (1700)

By giving the bank greater leeway, the federal government will be able to develop an integrated approach to interfering in every aspect of regional development, in Quebec in particular, where the Federal Office of Regional Development has become the delivery arm for all federal programs.

In this context, Bill C–91 constitutes another centralizing offensive from the federal government, resulting in costly and needless duplication. It completely negates the role of the Quebec government in providing assistance to small business. This is in contradiction with repeated statements by the people opposite, who said they wanted to eliminate duplication and overlap with provincial programs. On the contrary, this a perfect way to perpetuate the problem.

As I said earlier, this is a centralizing offensive based on clauses 20 and 21 of the bill. These two clauses enable the Federal Business Development Bank to enter into agreements with other federal departments or agencies in order to deal directly with small and medium sized businesses, which will allow the federal government to interfere even more in regional development projects.

Clause 20 of the bill also enables the Federal Business Development Bank to enter directly into agreements with a person or agency, which means that the bank could enter into agreements with regional development councils for example. In Quebec, however, the Executive Council Act prohibits provincially regulated agencies from entering into agreements with the federal government without ministerial consent.

One could think that this section is harmless, since it is governed by a Quebec provincial statute. However, in the present context of fiscal restraint, if the federal government offers to fund projects put forward by a RDC, the latter will press the Quebec government to allow a departure from the law, which is common practice.

Once again, Ottawa dismisses Quebec's role in the matter and shamelessly gives itself the power to act without consulting the provinces. This centralizing offensive in regional development runs directly counter to Quebec's regionalization policy. The federal government has always refused to recognize regional development as an exclusive provincial jurisdiction, dismissing this claim in every constitutional negotiation, while implicitly making a commitment to the Quebec government to limit its action in regions through Canada–Quebec agreements.

However, the Economic and Regional Development Agreement, or ERDA, expired in December 1994 and the federal government refused to renew it. This government can never claim to support regional development by replacing essential components of a social plan with direct assistance to small and medium size businesses. By dismissing Quebec's achievements in terms of assisting exporting small and medium–size businesses, the federal government is trying to make Quebec look like the one responsible for the overlapping which it is creating with this bill.

The FBDB is a successful regional development tool which is greatly appreciated by small and medium size businesses. By and large, Quebec's small and medium size businesses get one third of the loans from the FBDB, but they definitely do not rely as heavily on the bank's extension services. Since the bank has no exclusive commercial objective, such as maximizing profits—it only seeks to recover its costs—, Mr. Rémillard, of the Canadian Bankers' Association, says that it helped develop new financial tools which were often used later by commercial financial institutions. The bank acts as an innovator by proposing new forms of financing which other financial institutions can apply when dealing with small and medium size businesses.

Therefore, the Bloc Quebecois will make sure that the bank remains first and foremost a tool for economic development, that it does not compete with other such tools used by Quebecers, including the caisses populaires, the solidarity fund and the CNTU fund, and that it has the means to support Quebec businesses.

• (1705)

The effect that the bill could have on the bank's role in economic development is very worrisome. In fact, two provisions in the bill, when combined, cast doubts on the bank's ability to maintain its role as a tool of economic development: the broadening of the bank's mandate and the bank's ability to obtain private capital financing through hybrid instruments, contingent on certain conditions.

Firstly, the bank would no longer be just a last resort lender: it would be able to offer complementary financing which would be a little different from what existing financial institutions offer. The danger is that the bank could target its activities more towards complementary financing than last resort financing. Since there is less risk involved in complementary financing, naturally the bank will tend to favour this type of financing.

Bill C–91 is another move in the federal government's centralizing offensive, as I mentioned earlier, which only causes costly and useless duplication. Bill C–91 dismisses totally the provincial government's role regarding assistance to small and medium size businesses. It goes against the Liberal government's claims that it wants to abolish overlaps and duplication with the provinces.

Furthermore, clause 20 of the bill allows the bank, the FBDB, to enter into agreements directly with individuals and with organizations. This means that the FBDB could enter into agreements with regional development councils, for example.

But in Quebec, the Executive Council Act prohibits organizations which are governed by provincial law from entering into such agreements. Regarding regional development, the federal government's push for centralization runs counter to Quebec's policy on regionalization.

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak at the report stage of Bill C–91.

When the bill was tabled on first reading, I had the impression it would simply change the name of the bank and increase the amount of capital available. In other words, it would make a certain number of adjustments, considering the fact that the legislation establishing the bank was at least 20 years old. At first glance it seemed quite logical and understandable that the minister responsible for the bank should want to update the legislation.

However, after considering the bill and reflecting on the scope of certain clauses, I feel I must condemn this legislation and, as my Bloc Quebecois colleagues have done, point out to the House that a number of clauses are potentially dangerous.

In fact, the bill would change the mission of the Federal Business Development Bank and allow the bank to be used for purposes which may be questionable and even unacceptable to the provinces and to certain regions in the provinces.

First, a few words about the bank's mission. As you know, the Federal Business Development Bank continues the tradition of institutions that were established after the war to help small

businesses raise the capital they needed. In the case of defence conversion, they were to help Canada build a thriving civilian industry that would contribute to the country's prosperity.

The institution was well received by Canadians and Quebecers. It has excellent credentials and has proved its worth.

• (1710)

The bank's mission was, more or less, to provide last resort financing, in other words, to help developers who found it difficult to get financing from traditional financial institutions. The Federal Business Development Bank was set up to ensure that the necessary capital would be available to entrepreneurs so they could start small businesses.

It is clear that this bill will change the mission of the bank. It is now described as providing complementary financing not customarily provided by traditional financial institutions. Complementary financing is not the same as last resort financing. Last resort financing is needed when the institution or the developer goes to the institutions and although the banks agree the project is worthwhile, they cannot provide the capital, while complementary financing does not have quite the same connotation.

It is clear that if the bank is described as providing complementary financing, it is directly competing with institutions across Canada that were set up to help entrepreneurs find capital. An example is the venture capital fund which has become an institution in Quebec. It seems that in Canada, Quebec is known for its institutions that specialize in providing venture capital for entrepreneurs.

I am thinking as well of the solidarity fund of the FTQ, the industrial development corporation and the Innovatech companies. In short, the Federal Business Development Bank, by abandoning its purpose of providing last resort capital, will now be competing with institutions that make attractive capital available to promoters.

This change in the bank's purpose is regrettable. In my opinion, the aim of the bank was to provide last resort funds. It was good at that. By changing its purpose and allowing it to subtly change its objectives and the type of capital it will provide, we may be putting Canadian business seriously at risk.

Perhaps we of the Bloc could have viewed somewhat positively the purpose of providing complementary funding, but I think the bill should have provided that the purpose of the bank was to continue to provide last resort funds.

Two clauses are also cause for concern. Perhaps there are others, but I think my colleagues will look after pointing them out to the House. Clauses 20 and 21 raise problems, in my opinion. Clause 20 provides that "the Bank may enter into agreements with —any department or agency of the government of Canada or a province or any other body—". The reference here is perhaps to cities, educational institutions, regional development councils—any other body in order to carry out its purpose.

If clause 20 were adopted as it stands, the bank could intervene directly with bodies that come under provincial jurisdiction.

I think this is potentially dangerous, given Canada's economic history and even its political history. One realizes that over the years one of the major problems with Canadian federalism has been that, given its spending power, the federal government has been able to interfere in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. The most obvious and striking example is education, an area which, under the constitution, clearly comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces but an area where, over the years, the federal government, with its spending power, has been able, first directly with the universities, and also directly with some school boards for certain programs, to step in and often, to a certain extent, divert these bodies from their goal because they had to meet the federal government's funding requirements.

• (1715)

I am myself an educator by profession. Over the years, I have often seen federal programs proposed. It was a little difficult for the local administrators to refuse. They were afraid that if they did, they were going to be turning down large amounts of money, maybe $10,000 or $100,000. Administrators therefore did what the province of Quebec did in the fifties with respect to university funding.

Local or provincial governments must, in such a situation and as a last resort, accept the interference of the federal government because large sums of money are at stake.

In clause 20, the federal government provides itself with the necessary means to interfere, again, in areas that come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. It is probably also ensuring that there is yet more duplication so that federal, provincial and municipal agencies compete, which is very harmful. The history of the Canadian federation since day one shows that this was a serious flaw in the Canadian federal system, where different levels of government can compete in major areas.

I would have liked to say a few words more on clause 21, which mandates the bank to support entrepreneurship. This is an extremely vague term that could be made to mean just about anything. Again, this could be another excuse for the FBDB to interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Perhaps we would see less cause for concern or suspicion if the whole regional development policy had not changed so drastically these past few months. But since it did change, we suspect that the Federal Business Development Bank could be the federal government's way of making up for what it is no longer investing in the area of development and ensuring that there is more and more duplication in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address Bill C–91, which seeks to change the name of the Federal Business Development Bank, as well as its purpose.

The Federal Business Development Bank is a long–standing institution which has played an important role in economic development, as a bank of last resort. That was and should continue to be its mandate since that bank should not compete with other financial institutions.

The bank gets a new name which is of strategic importance for the federal government. It will become the Business Development Bank of Canada. What does that name mean exactly? Will it strive to develop business and the economy or Canada?

It reminds me somewhat of development banks in Africa. I guess the government now recognizes that it is running a developing country. We must look like a developing country in the eyes of the international community. The federal government just confirmed that the state of its economy is appalling, that its debt is staggering. It just said so. It will probably get foreign money through the Business Development Bank of Canada, just like the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development gets money, even from Canada, the United States and Japan, to develop eastern countries which have problems.

• (1720)

By using such a name, it should be easier for us to go to Japan, even China, and to richer countries, since Canada has become a developing country. In fact, we are among the 65 or 70 poorest countries of the world if you look at the national and foreign debts. Canada is on the same level as developing countries. This new name is a pretty smart idea. It will probably allow Canada to borrow more money abroad to promote its own development, before it goes bankrupt, assuming this is not already the case.

In Quebec, we took control of our financial institutions a long time ago. In Quebec, we already have control over a few hundreds of billions of dollars thanks to our *caisses populaires*, the Fédération des caisses d'économie Desjardins du Québec, the provincial charters we control ourselves, as well as over our priorities in terms of our activities, and we want to keep it. We also want very much to continue to cooperate with our financial institutions.

We do not want the federal government to interfere through a financial institution which will have a much broader mandate and will prevent Quebec from working hand in hand with its own financial institutions as it has always done.

We had to build our financial institutions ourselves because the federal government was not very useful in helping us to keep our money and invest in our industries. Again, I understand very well why the very centralist Liberal government wants to control everything. It wants to control our priorities, it wants to collect our tax revenues and spend the money according to its own priorities. Not only does it want to impose its priorities in terms of manpower training, but it also wants to do so in the trade area.

Let me give the House some examples which have led me to believe that the federal government is trying to increase its control. It says that it will be able to sign agreements with other financial institutions and with other private companies in order to defend some industries. For instance, we know, and I often come back to this issue which I find important, that the federal government never supported Quebec's hydro development programs. The province of Quebec was the sole investor in Hydro–Quebec. It invested tens of billions of dollars, while the federal government never spent a penny on these projects.

Again, the federal government will want to be the one to decide which industries should be given priority for development purposes. This means that the federal government could favour businesses in the uranium, natural gas or oil industry, for example, over businesses in the electric power industry. That is what it means. When we say that the federal government wants to control industrial priorities in Quebec, it does it through the Federal Business Development Bank by interfering even more and by making decisions regarding economic development priorities in that province. It is terrible.

Do not think that we are fooled. We can see very clearly what is going on. We know the history of Quebec. We have lived through it. I come from Quebec, I was part of the business community and I know full well that Quebecers had to work twice as hard to achieve the equivalent of what Ontario was able to achieve. Why is that? Because the federal government was working against us.

• (1725)

The federal government has always worked against us. Just look at what is happening in Ottawa with regard to research and development, for example. Three or four years ago, I conducted a study to see who was getting research and development contracts. Well, in 1990, research and development contracts awarded to businesses and universities by the federal government totalled 1 billion—

Some hon. members: It was done previously.

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil): Yes, it was done previously under the Liberals and it continued a little under the Conservatives. It cannot be done overnight; it takes time.

In 1990, the federal government gave $1.2 billion more in contracts to businesses, universities and research centres for research and development in Ontario than it did in Quebec.

We are not totally blind in Quebec. I can assure you that this new financial institution which is coming to Quebec has gotten Quebecers quite worried. This worries not only the sovereignists, but also Quebec's other financial institutions. The reason we are protesting this new kind of bank which will in a certain way change the order of things in Quebec's financial system is that we are totally against any change in this system.

To reply, in part, to the hon. member who is muttering over there, back when I was a Conservative, we simply wanted to scrap the Federal Business Development Bank. We came very close to scrapping it precisely because we really do not need this financial institution, especially now with its new vocation, which will be to rock the boat when it comes to the agreements between our financial institutions, our businesses and our universities. If we could gain control of job training, we could close the loop and bring lasting prosperity to Quebec, and be rid of the federal government that is stifling our growth. We are really looking forward to becoming sovereign.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to Bill C–91, whose purpose is to provide a new name for what was referred to as the Federal Business Development Bank and will now become the Business Development Bank of Canada.

As usual, and as has been going on for a long time, the federal government took advantage of this opportunity to change the mandate of the institution, so that from now on, as other Bloc members have said so eloquently, it can be used as an instrument, and it is indeed an instrument, to put the finishing touches on this contemptible encroaching on provincial jurisdictions, disguised as regional development.

I would like to elaborate somewhat on the monster the government is creating with this legislation. In this bill we sense the minister's involvement in the bank's administration. The minister appoints the chairperson of the board and the president. Speaking of instruments, the government seems to be creating an instrument for dispensing patronage. According to clause 21, the minister will be able to control the bank's functions by using his influence with the people he appointed, perhaps by persuading them to approve loans in cases where they would have been reluctant to do so. That is a real danger.

In Quebec under the Liberals, they gave $950 million over ten years to the Société de développement industriel as a political favour, which often happens just before an election. The Premier intervenes and says: You are going to approve this loan.

People appointed at the pleasure of the minister or the Prime Minister do not dare refuse and so grant the loan, which they would not otherwise have done. Gradually, Quebec was left with a bill for $950 million because of principles just as laudable as those our colleagues opposite were talking about: helping development and helping small and medium size business become big business.

This new mission does not come about because of popular demand. We saw no one come before Parliament demanding a change in the purpose of the Federal Business Development Bank. The whole idea came from ministers' offices, the Privy Council, old friends who got talking and decided to change the vocation of the bank. We are creating an instrument of patronage.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, it being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

NATIONAL REGISTRY OF DRUGS AND IMPLANTED MEDICAL DEVICES

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should begin consultations with the provinces and territories to establish the parameters for a national registry of drugs, medical devices (implanted in the body for more than one year) and various forms of biotechnology.

She said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to move this private members' motion today calling for a national registry of drugs and implanted medical devices.

Many Canadians assume that any such drugs or medical devices that are used are safe and have been well tested. I am sure that in the majority of cases this is true, but there are some glaring exceptions which I will discuss later in my speech.

The motion under discussion today is taken directly from a 1992 report by a House of Commons subcommittee on the status of women entitled: "Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions". While at the time the motion was meant to address the problems associated only with breast implants, the subcommittee recognized that a registry of many other medical devices would be a great step forward in protecting Canadian consumers. L'Association coopérative d'économie familiale du centre de Montréal made a call for a similar type of registry at that time.

I would like to say at the beginning that a national registration system would have to be voluntary and that privacy laws would have to be respected. At this point, we would be looking at something that both physicians and patients would have the choice to participate in.

Why do we need to consider such a national registry? What would it do for Canadian consumers? There are two issues. The first is that a national registry of medical devices would allow men and women who experience problems to notify a central data bank and document their complaints. The 1992 subcommittee suggested that Statistics Canada might be used to house such a registry.

The second value of such a registry is for those who might have some complaints about a drug or device to simply note who is on such a registry and do not necessarily have complaints. That would increase the long term safety of consumers by putting in place mechanisms to notify patients of potential problems or complications that arose or knowledge that came forward after the use of such drugs or devices.

As well, a registry could assist physicians in tracking those patients who may have experienced problems. It would open the door to more expansive research studies that could help to protect consumers.

At the moment, one of the problems is that there is no central data bank for researchers to collate information on people who may have had either devices or drugs. This kind of information is extremely important to consumers. It is an opportunity also for physicians to pass on new information to patients that may come to light and to better access long term risks and advantages of such medical practices. A national registry could certainly help Canadians to make more informed choices about their medical treatment and the options available to them.

• (1735)

If we look at the Canadian experience with medical devices and compare that to other consumer practices, it is clear that the Canadian system for medical devices lacks some basic resources. Canadian consumers can register complaints about automobiles, business transactions and the houses they buy. However, there is still no comprehensive and central system in place for things like breast implants, heart valves, pacemakers or other medical devices and drugs people use.

With new technologies and new drug products coming on the market all of the time, it is increasingly important that consumers have an opportunity to access information on the possible complications and risk factors associated with these new devices and drugs. As it now stands the monitoring of medical devices in this country is based on the notion of voluntary compliance by the manufacturer. In other words the manufacturers will comply voluntarily with both health and welfare regulations and the parameters of their own health standards.

Ultimate responsibility for the safety and efficacy of medical devices rests on the assurances that manufacturers provide to Health and Welfare Canada. The role of Health and Welfare Canada is still largely an auditing role to ensure that market tests and studies have been carried out by the manufacturers.

Many Canadians probably assume and not necessarily correctly, that there are independent studies done by Health and Welfare Canada on the whole range of medical technology, but on the whole its role has been to monitor and to assess. It is the role of Health and Welfare Canada to ensure the safety of Canadians. The government obviously has to have responsibility for giving Canadians confidence in the kinds of medical devices and medications they take.

Although there are many successes in the Canadian system for monitoring such medical procedures, there are some instances and some very serious ones that clearly indicate how the system has broken down. One issue that is currently in the news is that of breast implants which has been discussed in the House many times.

Members will know that just yesterday a settlement against the American manufacturer of the Meme implant was reached on behalf of Quebec and Ontario women through a class action suit. It has been a long time in coming and of course it is still one more step in the battle of Canadian women for compensation. What is important in both the Dow Corning decision in the United States and the Bristol Myers decision is the fact that settlements have been made. This indicates that the manufacturer is accepting some responsibility and admits that these medical devices did cause problems to some of the women who used them.

My office spoke to a lawyer involved in the case just recently settled. He pointed out that one problem is that only the women involved in the class action suit benefited. There is no way of knowing if other women in Ontario or Quebec might have benefited who might have been a part of that case if there had been some way to contact them and make the resources available to them.

It is estimated, and it is just an estimation, that there are about 150,000 women across Canada who have received a breast implant since their introduction in the mid–1970s. They made that choice on the advice of physicians, governments and manufacturers that the implants were safe. Women were routinely told not only that they were safe, and I am talking now specifically about the silicone gel implants, but that they would also last a lifetime and there would be no problems.

• (1740)

I might also add that there are now options to those silicone gel implants. The same assurances are being given and with the same lack of real data on the health risks associated with these implants.

For many women unfortunately the safety factor has not met the reassurances given by the manufacturer. For many it has been a nightmare. If members had been at many of the meetings I attended, they would have heard about women who had suffered a number of medical problems from outright rejection of implants causing massive infections to scarring. In some cases, women are reporting a variety of physical symptoms from chronic fatigue to autoimmune diseases. Even more, women are having difficulty in having their symptoms recognized as being legitimate symptoms. Many women were referred for psychiatric and psychological services. Their complaints were not taken seriously.

It was only when women came together that they began to realize their experience was not unique. Finding out there were other women who had similar experiences, they were able to approach physicians to tell them that there was a common thread and a problem. However, as in many areas of women's health, often the symptoms women present are not taken seriously. Looking at this simply in financial terms, the cost of multiple operations, the psychiatric and psychological counselling, apart from the personal devastation to these women who have had problems with the implants, is phenomenal to the health care system.

As the research has continued it is clear there are many symptoms including fatigue, skin lesions and neurological dysfunction that many women have experienced.

Just last month an Alberta study of 2,500 women with silicone gel implants reported preliminary findings showing a link between the implants and the way that a woman's body processes fat. I believe later this summer a report is expected on the association of implants and autoimmune diseases.

There clearly is a demonstrable connection between the implants and the complications reported by women. These court cases which we have seen successfully settled in favour of the women underline that there clearly was a problem. Long before we had to prove a problem this is where we come to the importance of adequate research being done, adequate data being kept and the responsibility of the federal government's health protection branch to ensure that Canadians are adequately protected in these areas.

In the case of the breast implants, there are still a lot of outstanding questions. There certainly is some dispute among physicians and researchers as to exactly what the effects have been. Of course there are women who have not had any symptoms. Having said that, I think this is one of the reasons that a national registry is so important. It could be useful in helping women to answer some of the questions they have about this issue.

Despite all the evidence women have had countless symptoms. Those symptoms while being increasingly recognized are still by no means accepted by all physicians and all of those involved in the field. To the personal and family lives of those women, the trauma they have suffered both psychologically and physically is very real.

We do not really know how many people have experienced complications because adequate mechanisms are not in place to monitor complications or long term effects of these and other implanted devices. Consequently, there is no way to adequately and specifically identify the number of implants done and those that are in use at this time, the possible range of problems or indeed the level of satisfaction associated with these devices.

A national registry such as is proposed in this motion would go a long way to helping women assess their risks not only for silicone gel implants but also for the new versions, such as the saline implants now on the market.

• (1745)

Today I have used the example of the breast implant to highlight the importance of a national registry system. Clearly the system would be a great benefit for consumers in other instances as well. It would help researchers track patients over a long period of time in order to provide for a clearer database for better research. It would give Canadian men and women a greater opportunity to access information and to be aware of potential problems.

There has been much written on the issue of health care in Canada, specifically about the increasing lack of confidence people have in the ability of the federal government to ensure the safety of drugs and products routinely used. The breast implant issue came to the House only as a result of certain members' raising the issue; they made it an issue. The Minister of Health at the time finally after much discussion and a lot of pressure did put in place a moratorium.

All this took place after the federal drug administration in the United States had made its findings. Most people may agree we are very reliant on the research of other countries to determine the level of safety for products used in Canada.

I do not want to suggest for a moment the health protection branch and its members are in some way at fault for this. Funding cutbacks to the system have affected the testing of new devices and drugs on the market with a greater reliance on secondary research as opposed to primary research by the department.

There is no doubt in the minds of Canadians they rely on the federal government, the department of health and welfare, the health promotion branch and the health protection branch to ensure certain standards. Most Canadians probably assume any product in this area which they take or is implanted has gone through a rigorous set of tests and is safe without question. It would be naive to assume anything can be safe without question since it is not a perfect science.

I urge support support for this motion. It is not a panacea to all the things that need to be done to ensure greater safety for the Canadian consumer in health related areas but it would be a positive step toward the protection of consumers, access to information and providing and assisting the maintenance of a database which would assist in the research of long term consequences.

I hope all parliamentarians will seriously consider this issue. I hope the Minister of Health will seriously consider this issue. It would be in the interest of all Canadians, men and women, and would provide Canadians with greater faith in our medical system.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the motion placed before the House by the member for Yukon is certainly worth considering. Any proposal that would contribute to maintaining and improving the health and safety of Canadians deserves thoughtful discussion.

There is some ambiguity in the member's motion. Does the hon. member want a national registry of drugs and devices or a national registry of patient profiles and adverse reactions to those drugs and devices or both?

The fundamental question regardless of what the member means is would setting up a national registry of drugs, medical devices and various forms of biotechnology protect the health of Canadians better than the system we have in place? Before we review that system we should consider the context of the motion.

In 1992 a resolution by the subcommittee on the status of women called for such a registry. In its report, "Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions", the subcommittee said one of the problems with breast implants in particular and medical devices in general is adequate mechanisms are not in place to monitor the complications and long term effects of implanted devices. The resolution called for a national patient adverse reaction registry through which patients would be able to register any problems, complications or ill effects.

• (1750)

No one disputes this but the resolution on which the motion is based was conceived in response to a specific problem, the need for women to have accurate information regarding the use of breast implants.

The subcommittee had heard wrenching testimony by women who said they had been scarred and made ill as a result of breast implant surgery. In its report the subcommittee concluded a crucial factor for women facing these decisions was the need for accurate information regarding the risks and possible complications associated with the use of implants, hence the idea of a national registry.

The report says: "We see the lack of such a registry as a major inadequacy in our current system. Without such a mechanism physicians and surgeons can easily lose track of patients who have breast or other implants. This complicates their ability to pass the new or emerging information on possible problems with implants".

This specific resolution and the motion go well beyond implants to take in drugs and various forms of biotechnology. Whatever the merits of a registry for breast implants, Canadian women and Canadians in general are at present well served when it comes to the safety and efficacy of medical drugs and devices.

Many Canadians and the hon. member may be unfamiliar with the co–operative system administered by federal, provincial and territorial governments which ensures medical drugs available in Canada are safe, effective and of high quality. I will limit my remarks to mostly drugs, and my hon. colleague will discuss devices.

The department's health protection branch through its drugs directorate not only approves all drugs offered for sale in Canada before they go on the market but monitors their use after they are on the market so that any drugs sold in Canada must meet the requirements of the food and drugs regulations.

Once a drug has met these requirements the department issues a notice of compliance, an NOC, and assigns a drug identification number, a DIN, to the drug. The drug directorate maintains a database that includes information on all the drug products assigned and the identification number. This database now contains information on approximately 22,000 drug products sold in Canada.

In addition, Health Canada makes information on drug products sold in Canada available to the public in a variety of ways, including the drug directorate's electronic bulletin board system which we can access through modem. The building blocks of a national drug registry are already in place through the co–operation of all three levels of government.

In addition to registering drugs and giving public information, the drugs directorate through its bureau of drug surveillance promotes and supports the safe and rational use of drugs after they enter the market and are in the public domain. This bureau ensures drugs are manufactured according to regulations and internationally recognized good manufacturing practices and standards, ensuring the safety of market drugs.

An important part of the bureau of drug surveillance is the adverse drug reaction monitoring program. Canada has had a system to gather information on adverse drug reactions since 1965. Under this program health professionals report adverse drug reactions voluntarily. Reporting by pharmaceutical manufacturers is subject to control by the Food and Drugs Act and regulations.

To enhance the value of spontaneous reporting in Canada the adverse drug reaction program has established a series of regional reporting centres across the country, serving as a front line for this reporting program.

There are four centres fully operational right now: the B.C. adverse reporting centre located at the drug and poison information centre at St. Paul's hospital in Vancouver; the Saskatchewan adverse drug reporting centre located at the drug information centre at the University of Saskatchewan's college of pharmacy; the regional drug information service for the Atlantic region at Camp Hill hospital in Halifax; the Quebec regional adverse drug reaction centre located at the Centre d'information pharmaceutique at Hôpital du Sacré Coeur de Montréal.

However, in my experience as a physician I believe voluntary reporting may not be as accurate as it should be. There should be mandatory reporting by physicians of adverse drug reactions.

What I am really trying to say is this building block will provide the basis for future evolution of national drug programs.

• (1755)

The initiatives involve the federal, provincial and territorial governments as well as industry and a number of professional health organizations, including the Canadian Co–Ordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment, CCOHTA, the Canadian Institute for Health Information and the Patented Medicines Review Board. CCOHTA is an excellent example of the way the federal, provincial and territorial ministries of health work together and jointly fund it. CCOHTA collects, analyses, creates and disseminates information concerning the effectiveness and cost of technology and its impact on health.

Currently CCOHTA is conducting pharmaceutical evaluations to provide information on the relative therapeutic and economic value of medicines and alternatives.

Referring back to the original resolution on which the motion is based, we can safely say that when it comes to medical drugs we do have national mechanisms in place to ensure our medical drugs are safe and effective. Patients and physicians are educated about the side effects and use, and adverse effects are reported, albeit voluntarily, which is the weak link in a very strong national chain.

Would mandatory reporting by physicians of adverse drug reactions instead of the current voluntary system be the only step needed to put in place a complete system of drug and medical device safety? If so, the question to be asked of the hon. member is whether this motion is redundant.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to motion M–375 brought forward by the hon. member for the Yukon. This motion proposes that the government begin consultations with the provinces and territories to establish the parameters for a national registry of drugs, medical devices implanted in the body for more than one year and various forms of biotechnology.

This motion deals mainly with the serious problem of breast implants and the deleterious effects they have on the health of those women who have them.

An estimated 150,000 women, in Canada and Quebec, have had silicone breast implant surgery between 1969 and 1992. Approximately 75 per cent of these implants were for purely aesthetic reasons, and the remaining 25 per cent for post–surgical reconstruction of the breast. Although the use of breast implants is strictly voluntary in both cases, medical considerations compounded with cultural factors turn this procedure into a complex source of concern for women's health.

Today, many women are confronted daily with the disastrous results of silicone leaking into their body. These leaks cause immune deficiencies. The implants contract and the body tries to reject this foreign substance, creating massive scar tissue.

Some women develop problems like the hardening of their breasts, chest pain or loss of sensitivity. Others have more systemic problems like pain in the joints, kidney trouble, infections, sclerosis, chronic fatigue, etc. All these complications are part of what we now call the silicone–related syndrome.

Canadian women are worried. Some scientists still refuse to admit the dangerous effects of silicone. Officials and representatives of the federal health department do recognize that some women with breast implants experience health problems, but they quickly add that no link has yet been proven between these health problems and the fact that they have received these silicone–filled prostheses. However, the potential health hazard of silicone has been a proven fact for a long time now. Hundreds of American women have sued and won their case against the makers of silicone gel breast implants; American courts have recognized that this product is dangerous and the victims have received substantial compensation.

• (1800)

In 1992, the House of Commons Sub–committee on the Status of Women released a report entitled *Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions*. Although this study was originally on breast cancer and the breast implant that was called Même at the time, developments on silicone–based implants led the sub–committee to expand its study and to make several very significant recommendations concerning breast implants.

One of the greatest problems the sub–committee recognized was the lack of a satisfactory mechanism for monitoring the development of complications and the long term effects of these objects implanted in our body. So, it is now impossible to tell the number of breast implants that were used, the range of potential problems or the rate of satisfaction with these implants.

The lack of a national registry is a major flaw in the current medical system. Doctors and surgeons may easily lose track of people with breast or other implants, and this limits their ability to give their patients new information or updates on problems that may arise from these implants.

It also makes it impossible to follow up on patients for prolonged periods to produce the scientific data bases required for proper methodological research. A national registry would also make it possible to identify problems and complications related to implants or inquire about the incidence of complications related to the use of implants and other medical procedures.

At present, consumers can lodge complaints about business transactions, cars they buy or service contracts, but surprisingly enough, there is no equivalent for products such as breast implants, cardiac valves, artificial hip joints and what not.

This recommendation to establish a national registry is not new. It has already been made by several groups. For example, ACEF, the Montreal Association coopérative d'économie familiale, published a report on breast implants last year. In it, ACEF again urged Health Canada to provide women with adequate information on the subject and to establish a national registry of women with silicone gel breast implants to facilitate and ensure efficient medical follow–up.

In a study conducted in 1992, the Sub–committee on the Status of Women made further recommendations. It felt that "women have a fundamental right to accurate information regarding the risks and possible complications associated with the use of implants".

The sub–committee recommended that the Canadian Society of Plastic Surgeons and the Canadian Society for Aesthetic Surgery prepare in coordination with the appropriate government officials information sheets that accurately reflect current knowledge and debate around the possible effects of breast implants.

The sub–committee also requested that the federal government, in co–operation with the provinces, identify alternatives to breast implants and outline the conditions under which such surgery should be considered.

To develop properly, society cannot do without women or ignore women's issues and the problems they face.

• (1805)

Women's health is one of the factors which have a direct bearing on the place of women in our society. Here, as elsewhere, we must take effective action. Women's health has always been neglected. There is never enough money allocated for research are always inadequate. There are major problems with research related to breast cancer, gynaecology and obstetrics, chronic and degenerative diseases, mental health, violence, occupational diseases, particular needs of immigrants and ethnic groups, teenagers, elderly women, etc.

When she first took office, the Minister of Health explained how she intended to promote women's health. She told us about the programs which her government was going to implement to correct the imbalance affecting women in the health care system. So far, not much has been done. When will a true health program will be developed for women?

If the Minister really cares about women's health, now is the time to act and support motion M–375. In doing so, she would make a concrete step toward that goal.

[*English*]

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the motion is fairly broad and the mover actually took some pains to narrow the focus of her motion. I am going to do the same. I have respect for the mover. The member for Yukon has a significant and specific interest in this subject.

The hon. member did take the time to focus on silicone breast implants and went on to say that this motion would be a voluntary motion where physicians and patients would voluntarily comply, that it would help with notification and the tracking of those individuals who had medical device problems.

If we look carefully at the issue of silicone breast implants we could say that a registry of these devices would have been a help in tracking those women who had them implanted. As it turned out it was consumer groups that took up the slack, women who had advocacy groups set up to take that information. Today that is still the case. Whether a government registry would have been the most cost efficient and best mechanism for this, I am not convinced. I leave that as a question I cannot answer.

As the member spoke about silicone breast implants, she suggested that it was the FDA in the U.S. that was really the instigator of our regulatory process here in Canada. Because this is a subject of great personal interest to me, I went back and researched very carefully the genesis of this problem. I am not sure I agree with the member on this specific issue. Let me tell this House what I found on silicone breast implants.

One of the very first individuals in the world who expressed concern about silicone breast implants was a scientist of our Canadian HPB. This scientist went to the manufacturer of the Meme implant and found manufacturing techniques that he said were completely unacceptable for a device to be implanted in the human body. He came home to Canada and made that public

over a fair portion of time. I have copies of his original memo saying that he had grave reservations and he advised the HPB to discontinue the certificate of compliance for the Meme implant.

What happened to that scientist? He was fired. The HPB, through pressures that went beyond the scientific data, fired him. That scientist, a Canadian, was not at all convinced that he was wrong and he went to the FDA in the United States and asked if it had any concerns. He was personally instrumental in getting the FDA to move toward the moratorium that subsequently was established.

• (1810)

If members who were not part of the debate in this House on the breast implant issue want to go back and look at a fascinating series of documents, I invite them to do that. It sounds like a spy story with manufacturers making claims, the health minister making promises, the regulators involved in the middle and finally, a big moratorium established. Most people know the subsequent events of the manufacturers having been accused of some inappropriate behaviour and lawsuits are now on the table.

I go back to the regulatory process. A scientist in a very good department said there was a problem and he was fired. What has happened to him since? Has he been honoured in Canada? Has he been elevated on a pedestal as a hero of the regulatory process? Not a chance. Today that scientist is still vilified by his record from HPB.

I think that someday Dr. Pierre Blais will stand in this Chamber to be recognized for his contribution to the health of women in this country. Someday he will be recognized for the visionary scientist that he was, the man who put his reputation on the line, who put his avocation on the line, who said that it is more important to tell the truth than it is to go through a process of saying that it is okay.

I direct all my comments to: Is our regulatory process in Canada effective and efficient? Is it the best regulatory process? Politicians, and I include myself in this group, should only be certain the regulators are doing their job.

I have watched with great interest BST. What is happening to BST? It has become a political hot potato. Forces from three different directions are coming at us on BST.

I simply say that when members of Parliament start to think they are scientists, that they are regulators, they are stepping beyond their purview. We, as politicians, should be making sure the regulatory process is perfect, as best as it can be. When the scientists make their decision to make certain that new data, new information is readily available to them, then politicians should get out of the regulatory process.

I considered this motion carefully. I have not decided fixed in my own mind that all the things this motion asks for would be suitable for Canada. I do believe that a registry of medical devices makes good sense and I will limit my support to that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak this afternoon on Motion M–375 moved by the hon. member for Yukon.

[*English*]

More than one million Canadians have some type of surgically implanted medical device. Some implants such as heart valves and pacemakers are life sustaining devices. The recipients will not survive without them. Other implants, such as intraocular lenses, joint replacements and breast prostheses improve the quality of life.

In considering the merits of a registry of implant patients, let me first discuss the question of therapeutic implants.

Recent widely publicized problems with some implants, such as heart valves, pacemakers and teflon coated jaw implants have highlighted the need to track implant recipients so that they can be quickly notified by their physicians in case of serious problems.

[*Translation*]

A better option would be to set up a national registry of medical devices implanted in the body, similar to the one already in existence in England for high risk cardiac implants.

• (1815)

Such a registry would provide all the required information to track down the patient.

[*English*]

It would also provide additional data needed to develop risk management strategies and valuable feedback, including earlier warnings about device failures to clinicians, manufacturers, Health Canada, and provincial health ministries.

A national registry could be administered by a board of directors made up of representatives from the implanting surgeons, manufacturers, Health Canada, and provincial ministries of health. The board will be responsible for managing the collection, storage, analysis, and dissemination of the data. All information in the registry will be deemed confidential. To protect the privacy of registered patients rules will have to be established by the board of directors for the use and release of information contained in the registry.

[*Translation*]

There is strong support for the creation of such a registry from the Canadian Orthopaedic Association and the Ontario cardiac care network. Medical device manufacturers have also shown a keen interest, because this registry would allow them to meet mandatory standards on the replacement of medical devices.

In short, what is being suggested is the creation of a new program to improve the follow–up on all implants and medical devices used in the human body.

[*English*]

Since medical services are delivered and funded by the provinces and territories, the authority of the different levels of government to require patients to register or to require surgeons to register their patients will have to be explored, as will the authority to collect change of address information from provincial or federal records. The federal government could coordinate the involvement of provincial health ministries across Canada to ensure that the registry will meet the requirements of all participants.

The major drawback of the establishment of implant registries has been the lack of money. The start–up costs would be about $200,000. These will include the costs to develop the computer database program and data entry forms, negotiating participation in the registry, setting up a board of directors, developing a long–range plan and operating procedures, and establishing longterm funding.

[*Translation*]

Since about one million Canadians now have implants or medical devices, the annual costs would be $20 million.

[*English*]

Maintenance of a registry of implant patients is estimated to cost about $20 per patient per year. There are approximately one million Canadians with medical device implants, resulting in a total annual cost of $20 million.

[*Translation*]

Cost sharing will have to be considered with the federal government, the provinces and territories, manufacturers and patients.

[*English*]

The medical device industry and the provincial governments already spend resources on implant monitoring. It may be possible to redirect these funds to a national implant registry.

Let me now address the special case of a registry for breast implant patients.

In 1992 the Minister of Health instituted a moratorium on the use of silicone gel breast implants and commissioned an independent advisory committee to examine their safety. One of the key recommendations made by the committee in April 1992 was to create a national registry of breast implants. The proposal was for a confidential continuing registry of consenting recipients of breast implants in Canada.

Since most cosmetic surgery is not funded by provincial health insurance plans and provinces would therefore not have health records on breast augmentation procedures, the only way to collect information on such patients will be by voluntary participation of the patients.

It was recommended that start–up funding be provided by manufacturers and that the registry be operated by a national not for profit organization.

[*Translation*]

The initial cost of this national registry could be anywhere between $120,000 and $190,000, with an estimate of 5,000 new patients each year. After that, annual operating costs could be covered by a $10 registration fee.

[*English*]

The drawbacks that will be encountered in setting up a breast implant registry are the difficulty in the collection of patient information and inaccurate patient information, since many breast implant recipients do not know the type of implant they have or the manufacturer. These deficiencies will limit the usefulness of the registry.

After completing its preliminary assessment of the issue, the department believed it was not feasible to implement a breast implant registry for recipients who had surgery more than a few years ago because of the high cost and inherent difficulties in collecting complete and accurate information.

In summary, a registry for patients with therapeutic implants that is funded by provincial health insurance plans will have advantages for federal and provincial regulatory agencies, manufacturers and patients, provided that financial, legal, and organizational problems can be solved.

[*Translation*]

The benefits of such a national registry would be: a very quick way to trace the women concerned, when problems are discovered following the insertion of such implants; the gathering of useful data on the value of such products for clinical practitioners, manufacturers, Health Canada, as well as the health departments of the provinces and territories. Moreover, it would be possible to analyze the long term evolution of these implants.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 6.21 p.m. and there being no more members rising for debate and the motion

not being designated as a votable item, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper pursuant to Standing Order 96(1).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Committee; and of Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Chambly. You have seven minutes left.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank you for giving me the floor again.

[*English*]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I understood the Chair correctly, you said we would resume debate on the second set of motions. That suits the government quite well, but is it the second set or are we going back to Group No. 1?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry. It is Group No. 1.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lebel: Madam Speaker, I was thanking you for giving me the floor after interrupting me so abruptly earlier. I do acknowledge your sense of fairness.

Earlier, before I was interrupted, I was saying that this new Business Development Bank of Canada will be used for patronage and propaganda purposes, including the promotion of federalism by the members opposite. I urge them not to make the same mistakes as did the former Quebec government with the Société de développement industriel. Indeed, we recently learned—with the arrival of a responsible provincial party in office—that $950 million had been wasted on all kinds of unnecessary projects, because of the intervention of some ministers who were urging the corporation to grant loans which should never have been made. However, because of the authority exerted then by the responsible minister, or the Quebec Premier, over that agency, it ran up a bill of $959 million. So, there is a real danger.

That danger also exists with Bill C–91 now before us. For example, if you look at clause 6, you will see that the minister appoints the chairperson and president.

• (1825)

I am tempted to say that I support this bill, because it will make the number of independentists swell. Indeed, this is the kind of legislation which explains why an independentist such as myself is here to speak on Quebec's behalf. I have seen too many measures like this one.

I read literally every bill tabled in this House and I realize that the government, although it has not publicly said it and will not do so, is currently trying to destabilize the provinces and really infringe on fields of provincial jurisdiction. I am not referring only to Quebec. The other provinces are also affected. However, the danger is greater for Quebec than for the English speaking provinces, because the infringing authority if you will is English–speaking.

Westerners and easterners recognize this government as their primary government, while Quebecers, because of their different language as well as other factors such as culture, consider the Quebec government their primary government. The fact is that the Quebec government did not only do bad things, quite the contrary. Just think of the Quebec Deposit and Investment Fund, created in 1964. We literally got rid of the Canadian capitalists who were using the pension plans of Quebec workers, both in the public and the private sectors. Some people have become immensely rich playing with the money of others like that, without our governments paying any attention to the security of the investments made.

So, the Quebec Deposit and Investment Fund was established, as well as the General Investment Corporation of Quebec. The government has created several instruments that have met their objectives. We now have before us Bill C–91, with its Federal Business Development Bank renamed Business Development Bank of Canada. When we say that there is duplication in personnel, that is what is happening. One can only wonder what changing the role of the FBDB to give it complementary status is meant to achieve.

I can remember, back in my days as a notary, when I was very involved with business financing, seeing people go to the FBDB although their investment was no less safe than others. The bank refused to lend money when it knew the project would not get off the ground. The exception, I must admit, was slightly out of the ordinary projects, where the entrepreneur wanted to set up a business in an area less familiar to traditional bankers but still had a fair chance of being successful. Then, the FBDB got involved.

We are now debating a bill to turn it into a complementary bank. We know the criteria used by banks. For instance, in business financing, you do not lend more that 75 per cent of the investment value. Does complementary mean lending the remaining 25 per cent? Will the bank lend 75 per cent and the Business Development Bank the rest? I think not. At least, I hope not, because it would be terrible.

Giving the bank this complementary status will mean that anyone who wants to market or commercialize a new product and, as a last resort after being refused everywhere, goes to the Business Development Bank will get the answer: "Sorry, friend. Your application was rejected everywhere else. Even if we wanted to, we could not help you. We are no longer qualified". I can understand giving a complementary role to this institution,

but it is a bit difficult to complement what does not exist in the first place.

• (1830)

I do not want to accuse the people who tabled this bill of having bad intentions, but I do have to say that this will serve only to increase political intervention in loans, which would not have been granted by any other institution anyway. Talk about political intervention—

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Oh, oh.

Mr. Lebel: I know that the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood just yelled something, but I am not accusing him of having bad intentions, far from it. Sometimes, politicians, and especially politicians in power, feel the need to intervene in areas only because of the next election and in order to get the Canadian economy going, I think.

Ministers are people too, like you and I, and they are not impervious to lobbying. Chairpersons and presidents are also human and also have to deal with ministers twisting their arms, saying: Think about it, in such and such a sector, in such a place, will you not reconsider your decision? Will you not thoroughly review the issue, to see whether you can swing it?

If this were to happen, it could very well have unfortunate outcomes. I would have suggested that the chairman and the president be appointed by the House of Commons, by the government and not by the minister himself. Then, you and I would have to assume responsibility for the appointment. Then, in the future, if it did not work out, if we did not have a good president, we could blame everybody, not just a certain minister or hon. member. This was the issue I wanted to speak about.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Madam Speaker, it may be the first time since I have been a member of this House that we have actually been critical of name changes. Usually, this is a mere technicality. A name will be changed to make it a little more modern or more precise, but in this case, when we see the Federal Business Development Bank being renamed as the Business Development Bank of Canada, it is clearly all part of this vast strategy of a federal government that has decided, in its wisdom, that it is going to run the show.

I would put this on a par with the agreement on internal trade in Canada, where again, a bill is being used to let the federal government penalize the provinces that do not comply with the agreement by cutting funding in their social programs, and I am referring to Bill C–76, where in any case it wants to intervene in sectors that are not its responsibility. In the case of the bank, which is going to be the Business Development Bank of Canada, if the House ever passes this bill, personally, I think the name is rather pretentious.

Canada has quite a few financial institutions that are involved in development. There are other banking institutions that may be involved in a positive and occasionally in a negative way in development and which are very much part of the process. There cannot be just one business development bank of Canada, unless there is more than meets the eye here.

I am also somewhat amazed at the direction in which this bill is going. During the first few months I was in the House, I was a member of the industry committee. At the time, members from Ontario were looking for ways to make the banks more sensitive to the problems of small entrepreneurs. They were interested to see what Quebec had in the way of institutions that provide complementary financing. I am thinking for instance of the Centre d'aide aux entreprises, the Mouvement Desjardins, the FTQ Fonds de solidarité—the CNTU is about to develop a similar fund.

It was clear Ontario had had a difficult time during the last recession and there was this feeling of hostility towards the banks.

• (1835)

Now with this bill, this feeling seems to have disappeared. Does it mean that the bank lobby was successful? Does the fact that they contribute very generously to the Liberal Party of Canada make a difference? I do not know for sure, but there is something strange going on here.

This decision also seems to be part of a broader strategy I would like to explain very briefly. When the Liberals came to power, there was a network referred to as business development centres. It was decided to amalgamate these with the community futures committees. Now that these two bodies have been amalgamated, they are attached directly to the Federal Office of Regional Development.

Therefore, the whole community development element set up by the community futures committees will, in my opinion, lead to the systematic and progressive dropping of the community development mandate over the next few months, since the transfer to the FORD takes place on September 30.

There was already one regional office per administrative region, but the Federal Office of Regional Development will try through the Business Development Bank of Canada to set up a network of branch offices to catch bigger service points across Canada in the web.

What is particularly sad is that two networks are being set up in parallel, one beside the other. Neither Quebec nor Canada has the means to pay for a double network. A choice has to be made. Quebecers will have the opportunity this fall to decide once and for all who they want to serve them.

Do they want Canadian banks—like the Royal Bank, for example? Is this the network we want to look after our interests in the future? Or do we want a network that belongs to us much more and that is under our complete control? We must not forget that Quebec has found itself in a very bad situation in relation to the federal government on a number of occasions in the past.

What about the time they wanted to limit the number of CN shares that could be purchased. Each time Quebec capital tried to get in, it was foiled. This seems to be very much the approach of the Business Development Bank of Canada.

Another rather paradoxical element in the current bill is that the government, which claims to be in favour of a free market environment, is directly infringing on the Mouvement Desjardins, among others, and the banking institutions. All of a sudden, the government takes a step backward and decides that there will be an additional competitor.

Just what is this complementary loan? It is not very clear and we are not sure of the result which will be achieved. How will it be integrated into the Canadian banking system? One can understand the concerns of those who already corner the market.

Before changing the mandate of an agency such as the Federal Business Development Bank, we must take a close look and see if we can afford more duplication. I doubt that there is a single Quebecer or Canadian who thinks so.

If the federal government dismisses the solutions which will avoid such duplication and wants first and foremost to ensure its presence in every province and in every sector when there are already other stakeholders involved, it will only follow the pattern set a long time ago, particularly during the Trudeau years. Remember the sign war, when the federal and Quebec would each claim to have made the largest contribution to a given project.

• (1840)

There was some kind of blackmail going on at that time, which we all paid for in a way. Today, answers are sought much more in terms of guidelines and comprehensive solutions. In that regard, this bill will not solve anything as it only increases duplication. What is happening here is the same thing that happened to the Federal Office of Regional Development a while ago. The FORD's mission was changed by taking away the resources that allowed it to play an active role in the Quebec economy, while at the same time increasing the number of service points, when services were already available from the Quebec ministries of tourism as well as Industry, Commerce and Technology.

That is what happened to the FORD. The same thing is now happening to the Federal Business Development Bank, and I think this is a bad move on the part of the government. It reflects the old belief that Ottawa provides, that it has the answer to whatever problems the people of Quebec, British Columbia, the maritimes and elsewhere may have, when the fact of the matter is that tools are already in place in many regions.

Therefore, the federal government should review its bill to make sure that it will not result in the interference that the implementation of the Business Development Bank of Canada Act will bring about.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in the debate this evening. I listened with interest when the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, made his presentation.

I must say from the outset that for many years I have listened to my hon. colleague from Broadview—Greenwood and I have learned from much of what he has had to say. I have appreciated the sincerity he has always brought to the debate. I appreciate his personal commitment to small business and the funding plight it faces. I have never heard a more pathetic explanation in terms of why the government has done something.

First I want to take him off the hook. I cannot imagine that what he was saying was his own idea. I can only assume that he has been given marching orders from cabinet. As an advocate of small business funding he has stood in the House for years urging the previous government and encouraging the present government to take action. He has led the way on a number of initiatives in terms of support for small business. He has been actively involved in the development of the report called "Funding for Small Business" which had a whole set of recommendations. To make this proposal is not the kind of initiative he would take.

When I first saw Bill C–91 I was elated. I was encouraged because after years and years of the Liberals saying we had to take dramatic action to provide funding for small business here was the opportunity. I read the bill. I suggest we should make another name change.

The bill at the moment is entitled "an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Small Business Bank of Canada". Probably a more accurate title would be an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank with an inadequate mandate, with a pointless mandate, with a wimpy mandate. We could use whatever word we like because in my judgment we have missed a real opportunity, looking at Bill C–91.

At the moment we are talking about the name change. Most members of Parliament were elated when they saw that the government had listened to the committee and had decided to call the Federal Business Development Bank the Small Business Bank of Canada. We could hear cheering from coast to coast to coast. We could hear small business organizations, chambers of commerce and boards of trade saying that finally the federal government had acknowledged the fact that something needed to be done in the country to provide funding for small enterprises.

I am talking about the kind of enterprise that requires a $10,000, $20,000, $50,000, $75,000 or $100,000 loan. All of us have countless cases on our desks that we have worked on over the years. We know small enterprisers, small entrepreneurs or small business people have a difficult time obtaining capital for their operations, to start a new venture or to expand a venture. If they need $20,000 they might as well forget about it because they just cannot go to the traditional lending institutions, the big banks.

• (1845)

We are not here to assist the big banks. Headlines the last few days read: "Banks on track to record profits. The earnings for the first half of 1995 exceed even last year's $4.25 billion pace". In other words, the chartered banks are doing just fine. As a matter of fact they have never done so well. They can take care of the large enterprises, traditional enterprises and so on.

However, we are not here to facilitate the chartered banks. They make profits for their shareholders and that is it. We understand their mandate. We are here as members of Parliament for something else. We are here to provide opportunities for that job creating sector of the economy called the small business sector.

In my judgment, having looked at Bill C–91 for many days, clause by clause, we have missed an incredible opportunity. Part of the opportunity we have missed is betrayed by what the government is now asking us to do. It said it first came up with a winning idea based on the recommendations of the committee to call the FBDB the small business bank of Canada. I say, right on, government. It has done the right thing. However, it now says: "Hold it, we want to change that. We are going to call it the development bank of Canada". What does that mean? What kind of a signal does that send?

By changing the name of this bank, a tremendous cost will accrue to change every bank sign across the country, every letterhead, envelope, and all kinds of other things. It is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps even millions, to call it the development bank. We do not need another development bank. We have the large chartered banks. We have other federal lending institutions that are able to provide that kind of capital. We need something to assist the small business sector. The name the small business bank of Canada would indicate a new initiative or a new direction or a new mandate for the FBDB. God knows it needs it.

However, according to the legislation this is the purpose of the bank. It reads: "The purpose of the bank is to provide Canadian entrepreneurship by providing financial and management services—in carrying out its activities. The bank must give particular consideration to the needs of small and medium size enterprises".

I have read wimpy legislation and legislation that meant absolutely nothing and this legislation says absolutely nothing. It states that the bank will give some consideration to small and medium size businesses. Well big, bloody deal. What does that mean? What kind of a mandate does that give the bank? What requirements does it give the bank? Absolutely none.

What was going to be called the small business bank of Canada and not called the business development bank of Canada will be just like the Royal Bank of Canada or the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. It will be lending to the very secure borrowers, the larger businesses and so on. Those small entrepreneurs and small business people will still have to be scraping and searching to find capital for their new enterprises. This is wrong. This is a missed opportunity.

I wonder if there is any sensitivity to the fact that we have to encourage the bank to carry out a fair lending practice across Canada so that one region does not benefit over another. Acknowledging that 85 per cent of the new jobs in the future are going to be created by small businesses, will that same business be created in the eastern, central and western part of Canada? No, not with this legislation. Every single cent of this new bank could be put into one province, into one region, into a few cities. Is that the kind of bank we want? Absolutely not. It is a disgrace and a disappointment.

I do not hold my hon. friend from Broadview—Greenwood responsible for this wimpy initiative. I hold the government and the cabinet responsible. I am pleased to see that representatives of the cabinet are here because they have not only done a disservice to the small enterprises of Canada, but they have done a disservice to the incredibly excellent work done by that committee which worked hard for months on end to incorporate diverse points of view and had an excellent set of recommendations. Then the cabinet and the minister said: "We don't care about the work you have done. We don't care about the research that has been done. We don't care what the witnesses said. We want to simply put our stamp on this legislation". That is wrong.

I do not think this is a good piece of legislation. I do not think this is a good amendment. When I vote later tonight I am not going to be voting to do away with the name the small business bank of Canada and replace it with the business development bank of Canada. It is wrong and bad. It sends the wrong signal. It says we do not care about those enterprises that create jobs, that

we want to continue to support the GMs, the Nova Corporations, the big corporations.

• (1850)

I know my friend across the way, the member for Broadview—Greenwood, was making a valiant attempt to explain the government's initiative when he said that the small business title limits and restricts loans, that the government wants to encourage the leading edge technologies to seek funding through this federal bank. So they should.

The fact that small business does not exist in the present name does not preclude small businesses from seeking loans. Calling it a small business bank does not preclude a medium size business from seeking loans. We will do the entrepreneurial sector of Canada a disservice if we pass this amendment.

I call on my colleagues from all sides of the House, from the Bloc, from the Reform and particularly those members of the government that have some sensitivity to small business and some respect for the work of the committee, to give some respect to the people that come into our offices day after day seeking capital to assist their small business enterprises. In other words, listen to the people just once.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 1. The motions have been declared read. In Group No. 1 we are covering Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6, 26 to 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred and the recorded division also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

In Group No. 2 pursuant to an agreement made earlier Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 are deemed moved.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-91, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 8, on page 3, with the following:

"4. (1) The objects of the Bank are to promote and assist in the establishment and development of business enterprises in Canada by providing, in the manner and to the extent authorized by this Act, financial assistance, management counselling, management training, information and advice and such other services as are ancillary or incidental to any of the foregoing.

(2) The Bank in carrying out its objects shall give particular consideration to the needs of small business enterprises."

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-91, in Clause 14, be amended by adding after line 23, on page 6, the following:

"(1.1) The total amount of all loans made by the Bank shall not exceed $18 billion."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-91, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 2 and 3, on page 7, with the following:

"are offered to a person only if such services are not otherwise available to that person on reasonable terms and conditions."

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-91, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 8, with the following:

"made or given by another person, other than a Crown corporation, if".

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-91, in Clause 17, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 35, on page 8, with the following:

"(*a*) business planning services; and

(*b*) management counselling and training, including seminars, conferences and meetings."

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-91, in Clause 22, be amended by deleting lines 25 to 27, on page 10.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-91, in Clause 22, be amended by replacing line 29, on page 10, with the following:

"any entity by any means, except an entity that is a trust company, insurance company or dealer in investments or securities;".

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C–91, in Clause 28, be amended by adding after line 29, on page 13, the following:

"(1.1) The yield of hybrid capital instruments issued by the Bank shall not be fixed according to the profits of the Bank."

Motion No. 20

That Bill C–91, in Clause 31, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 27, on page 14, with the following:

"parent of a director,"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 29, on page 14, with the following:

"parent of a director, or

(*d*) the father, the mother, the sister or the brother of the spouse of a director."

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C–91, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 14 and lines 1 to 29, on page 15, with the following:

"32. The Bank shall not grant any assistance, whether in the form of a loan, investment, guarantee, purchase or lease, to an applicant who is an interested person or, if the applicant is a firm or corporation, to a firm or corporation where a partner of the firm or a shareholder, director or officer of the corporation is an interested person."

Motion No. 22

That Bill C–91, in Clause 35, be amended by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 15, with the following:

"35. (1) Five years after this Act comes into force, and every five years afterward, the".

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 23

That Bill C–91, in Clause 36, be amended

(*a*) by replacing line 28, on page 16, with the following:

"Tax Act;"; and

(*b*) by replacing line 30, on page 16, with the following:

"whom the information relates; or

(*e*) for the purposes of a committee of either House of Parliament."

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That clause 37 of Bill C–91 be amended by substituting the following:

"Except with the consent in writing of the Bank, a person must not in any prospectus or advertisement, or for any other business purpose, use the name of the Bank, the names "B.D. Canada", "Federal Business Development Bank" or "Industrial Development Bank" or the initials "B.D.B.C." or "F.B.D.B", in English, or the names "Banque fédérale de développement", "Banque d'expansion industrielle" or "B.D. Canada" or the initials "B.D.C" or "B.F.D", in French."

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Bill C–91 be amended by adding after line 5, on page 17, the following new Clause:

"39. The Governor in Council may, by regulation, define "hybrid capital instrument"."

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Group No. 2 includes Motions Nos. 7 to 11, but Motions Nos. 2 and 5 are not in that group. They were in Group No. 1 which we just dealt with.

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, Motions Nos. 2 and 5 are not among the motions which you mentioned earlier. Since these are motions tabled by a Bloc Quebecois member, we expected to vote in support of our two proposed amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 are in Group No. 1.

• (1855)

A vote will be taken on Motions Nos. 2 and 5 if Motion No. 1 is lost. These motions are included in Group No. 1. You may refer to the Speaker's ruling, which explains this clearly.

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, from what I gather, this means that we will not have to vote on the two motions, unless two others, before them, are lost.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): That is correct. As I was saying, Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 are in Group No. 2.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am supposed to discuss Group No. 2 on behalf of the official opposition.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): You are right, dear colleague. I apologize.

Mr. Rocheleau: We are slowly but surely getting to the heart of the matter, Madam Speaker. This important bill will significantly change the operations of a Canadian institution which has proven successful, both from a financial point of view, as well as in terms of fulfilling the federal government's role.

However, I draw your attention to the fact that the government is not only working in secret, but is also using misleading terms. The title of the bill itself is confusing and does not adequately inform the reader as to its scope.

Indeed, Bill C–91, An Act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, alludes to the new name, but not to the new purpose of the bank.

This legislation changes the role of the former Federal Business Development Bank, which will soon become the Business Development Bank of Canada. The mandate is changed because, in the past, the Federal Business Development Bank was formally recognized as a bank of last resort.

Last year, when the committee looked at the role of the FBDB, it is the Bloc Quebecois which, along with the other members of the committee, in an attempt to convey the notion of last resort, proposed the term "complementary". That term was accepted by the committee. The word "complementary" therefore defined the role of last resort bank under the act.

Today—I do not know how to qualify it, and some words may be a little too strong—but there is definitely something wrong. The word 'complementary" completely changes the bank's mandate and completely obliterates the concept of last resort.

The Federal Business Development Bank is switching leagues and is more or less going into direct competition with the current network of chartered banks and the network of Caisses populaires Desjardins.

Last resort implied that the whole outlook of the Federal Business Development Bank was geared to concern about regional development, expressed through *ad hoc* financial aid for small and medium size businesses. It assisted small and medium size businesses which had higher than usual risk factors because of their capital outlay or the economic sector in which they operated.

Therefore, the bank's mandate, under the legislation, was to look at cases which had already been rejected by at least two conventional financial institutions. That was the last resort mandate. Consequently, the whole outlook was geared to regional development.

• (1900)

Today, the bank will soon be competing with conventional institutions and this may perhaps fulfil needs in the rest of Canada. Although the operation seems quintessentially political, the changing of names is a perfect example—without condemning too harshly the people from the Langevin Block and the minister's office—of the government's desire to fill existing market needs in the rest of Canada.

But, this will also affect institutions in Quebec which have already carved out their niches, which have solid reputations and have been successful in filling the needs of the market. In particular, I am thinking of the Mouvement Desjardins, which is very concerned, by the way, by the federal government's approach, and of the Fonds de solidarité de la FTQ and the Société de développement industriel du Québec, which, together with the Caisse de dépôt and the Banque nationale, worked and contributed to making it possible for businesses in need in the various regions of Quebec to obtain loans.

Therefore, we had cultivated a last resort mentality, and I am personally very upset when I hear people at the Federal Business Development Bank say that it will no longer be a bank for losers. We have to see things more objectively.

Life in the business world is not always rosy. It is difficult at times. There are nuances. It is absolutely necessary to have a lending institution like the Federal Business Development Bank with a mandate to review the situation of businesses which are different from others, out of an almost socio–economic concern to ensure that businesses which otherwise would not be backed by conventional sources will find backing in the public sector.

I often heard the president of the FBDB refer to the case of Lassonde, in Quebec, a company that today is thriving and at the time had access to funds from the federal bank when traditional institutions could not, I suppose, justify approving a loan because the risk may have been too high, but the federal bank, acting in the public interest, did, and the rest is history.

There has been one obvious change. The clause on last resort financing has been eliminated, and the new Business Development Bank of Canada will, as a result, be competing directly with traditional institutions.

There are some subtle changes as well, because the Federal Business Development Bank has a new way to raise funds. So far, the bank has been operating only with public funds. From now on, it will be able to turn to private financing as well. The private sector will be able to lend money to the new Business Development Bank of Canada through what are commonly called hybrid instruments.

The bank's mandate has changed in two ways. Formerly, the bank only had to break even. Today, when it deals with the private sector, it will have to be a good investment in terms of interest yields on investments by the private sector. So it will have to pay attractive rates which, we must assume, will be based on the bank's profits. This is no longer about breaking even. The yield will be based on profits. The bank's focus on regional development will have to change. The bank will have to change its culture, its vision and gradually become a strictly commercial bank. This is a profound change in the bank's mission.

Finally, I am worried. Let me explain. As our NDP colleague said earlier, 52 per cent of the loans approved by the Federal Business Development Bank were for $100,000 or less. Once we no longer have this philosophy that the bank should promote genuine regional development by small business but instead operate on a more commercial basis so that it can offer

attractive yields to private investors, where are these loans going to come from, those 52 per cent?

• (1905)

Who will approve these loans worth $100,000 or less which represent 52 per cent of the FBDB's portfolio at the present time? We have every reason to be concerned about the future impact of these changes.

[*English*]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on a point of clarification. Do I understand correctly that the government has only one opportunity to respond to the opposition's motions?. The member for Trois–Rivières spoke on basically half of the motions in group 2?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are no periods for questions and comments or responses. The government can partake in the debate or lead off if the hon. members had been on their feet. On that point, I apologize to the member for Simcoe Centre.

[*Translation*]

In the case of the hon. member of Trois–Rivières, there is no precedent since he was one of the movers.

[*English*]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the amendments to Bill C–91 we are addressing this evening. I am pleased to do this because of my small business background.

As a small businessman for many years I had many sleepless nights looking for capital. Therefore I am very hopeful that the changes we are attempting to make to this bill will improve the access to capital for those new small businesses starting up.

The amount of time spent on the correct name bothers me to some degree. I do not think the name is all that important. What is in the bill is important to small businesses which we are trying to help.

I was interested in some of the comments coming from my colleagues in the Bloc, particularly the member for Longueuil when said he had been in business in Quebec and found that Quebec businessmen had to work twice as hard as the businessmen in Ontario. I had a little trouble with that because I challenge anybody to have worked twice as hard as I did in my business. If one is to be successful in small business today one must work hard.

In my business, the tire and automotive service business, I had occasion to come in contact with people in the same business in Quebec. At no time did I get from them that they were working or attempting to work twice as hard as I was. Those in business in Quebec I came in contact with were doing very well because they were working hard. That was the secret.

I listened to the comments about the FBDB and what is happening in Quebec. I look at the 1994 annual report from the FBDB and see that some 23 per cent of its portfolio is in Quebec. Its head office is there as well. At some point during the debate earlier I was wondering if the scenario was that people were being forced at gun point to borrow from the FBDB. It is not compulsory. If businesses want to go there they go on their own volition, as it should be.

I will briefly run through the amendments in group 2 and outline Reform's position on them. The first is Motion No. 7. Reform is opposing this motion because the term financial assistance is too broad, too sweeping and too general in terms.

When I read that I thought I would have really appreciated, when I went to my bank for funding, that I could say I wanted financial assistance and the bank manager would have been prepared to take it on that basis. Whenever I asked for financial assistance, the next question was how much financial assistance. The decision was then made on that. Therefore we feel it is too sweeping and we will be opposing Motion No. 7.

Motion No. 8 deals with limiting the bank's ability to go to $18 billion rather than $23 billion as is in the bill now. We think there should be a limit there. In our estimation the limit should be $18 billion. We will be supporting Motion No. 8

• (1910)

We are opposing Motion No. 9. The mandate of the bank in our opinion is still not satisfactorily defined.

On Motion No. 10, a Reform motion by the member for Edmonton South, we will be supporting it because it eliminates loans to crown corporations. I do not know whether that was anticipated or thought of at the time but it might appear to the public as a form of double dipping. We will be supporting the amendment to eliminate loans to crown corporations.

Motion No. 11 restricts the role of the bank to complementary activities not already provided by the private sector. We will be supporting Motion No. 11.

Moving into the grouping of Motions Nos. 14 and 15, Motion No. 14 we feel removes some restrictions we feel are necessary in the bill. We will be opposing the removal of those sections.

Motion No. 15 is also a Reform motion and we will be supporting it. It ensures the bank is not active in trust, insurance or security companies.

Motion No. 19 is proposed by the Bloc. We will be opposing it. Yield of hybrid instruments will reflect the profit and cost of borrowing.

Motion No. 20, a Bloc motion, does not change the potential for conflict. It refers only to disclosure. We do not feel it covers that and we will be opposing it.

Motion No. 21, a Reform motion which we will be supporting, refers to the conflict of interest that changes the requirement from disclosing conflict to not doing any business with an interested person.

Motion No. 22, a Reform motion, will be supported and I see it was adopted at committee stage. Motion No. 21, a Bloc motion, we will be opposing because the motion appears to be unnecessary in our estimation. Motion No. 24 we will be opposing for the same reasons as were outlined on Motion No. 1; because it refers to the name change.

Motion No. 25 requires a definition of a hybrid capital instrument be included in the bill. Reform put forward this motion and we will be supporting it.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will deal with the motions and then with some of the comments members of the opposition parties have put forward.

We will be supporting Motion No. 20 put forward by the member from Trois–Rivières. We will also be supporting Motions Nos. 24 and 25. Motion No. 24 is ours and Motion No. 25 is put forward by the Reform Party. All other motions in this section we will be opposing.

I will deal with some of the concerns the member for Trois–Rivières put forward and some of the concerns expressed by our colleague from Simcoe Centre. Before I do, I will deal with some of the comments made by the hon. member for Kamloops.

The member said earlier the government has missed a tremendous opportunity to move this bank forward with a very specific mandate to help small business.

• (1915)

We will not miss that opportunity. Even though in the committee we felt strongly about the name that was on the bill—it was changed today—there is one thing we will make sure the Business Development Bank of Canada does: we will make sure that its marketing thrust will be centred around the small business sector.

Make absolutely no mistake that as sure as I am standing here, if there is one issue this Prime Minister continues to be committed to with all the energy and passion he has—and I say that straight out—it is the small business sector.

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the opposition members and especially to the member for Kamloops, who, like myself, has campaigned vigorously in this House in opposition and in government, we have not let go and we will not let go. And we will not let the executive of this government forget that we were given the trust 20 months ago due in large part to the Prime Minister's commitment and the Minister of Finance's commitment even before the red book that we were going to be the government that championed small business and we were going to be the government that took on the financial institutions of this country, the chartered banks.

There is not a member on this side of the House who will stand up and defend the chartered banks of Canada and say that they are doing a great job for small business. If anyone can find a member on the government side of the House who will stand up and say that the banks of Canada are doing a great job for small business, name them. I certainly could not find one. We talk about this among ourselves and in our ridings. We are committed to that sector.

Getting back to this bill, this Business Development Bank will be committed to small business. I want to read into the record a note from the newly appointed chairman of the board of this bank, which I just received. He has been listening to this debate. I was summoned to the phone by him and I received a letter. We are going to make him accountable for this letter by reading it into *Hansard*. It is from Patrick J. Lavelle, the chairman of the board of the Business Development Bank of Canada:

> In passing this legislation, the House is giving the bank expanded powers and greater responsibilities. The implementation of which will test the mettle of the banks directors and its management.
>
> This House isn't giving the bank a blank check. The mandate calls for the bank to increase its activities in the new economy of Canada, in telecommunications, biotechnology and other technologies of the future. We must not abandon the declining sectors but we must see change and progress in the new ones.
>
> The determination of the banks portfolio should reflect the country in that all regions: the Atlantic, Ontario, as well as Quebec and the West see increases in the availability of capital; after all that is what the bank is supposed to do.
>
> The new bank with its new name should be visible and accountable. And we are going to bring the banks management before the committee to gauge what actions they are taking to fulfil their new mandate as quickly as possible.
>
> Make no mistake the expectations for the bank are high and it will take extra efforts on the part of the management and its directors to achieve the promised results.

I want to deal specifically with the concerns the Bloc Quebecois has. They talk—

• (1920)

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the reference the hon. colleague has made to the communiqué by the new bank chair is appropriate. I wonder if it would not be appropriate for my hon. friend to seek unanimous consent to append that letter to be part of *Hansard* today.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: Please refer to Sessional Paper Number 8530–351–37 in today's Journals]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I would just like to take some of my personal notes off it before we append it to *Hansard*.

I would like to deal with the remarks I put on this note to the member for Trois–Rivières. We can see what the concerns are of the Bloc Quebecois. Make no mistake about the fact that the Bloc Quebecois does not in any way, shape, or form support the Government of Canada presence in the province of Quebec. They object to this instrument. As the Bloc Canadien on this side of the House, we believe this instrument is there to help small business.

The Bloc Quebecois does not want this instrument in the province because it is going to show Quebecers, small business men and women, that the people and the Government of Canada play a vital role, a central role, an integral role in their development as a part of Canada.

Make no mistake about it, we intend to use this bank to make sure that the Government of Canada presence is alive and well in the province of Quebec.

I cannot speak for the cabinet here, but as a committee and for those of us who believe in Canada, we would be encouraging the new Business Development Bank of Canada to have many locations in the province of Quebec, just as many as we hope to have in all the other provinces across Canada.

Quite frankly, I would find it very hard to imagine that the small business men and women in the province of Quebec would reject that kind of financial support, and not just financial support but counselling assistance. We must make sure that we understand that this Federal Business Development Bank of Canada now has another unique feature attached to it. It supplies counselling assistance for small enterprise and for entrepreneurs, both men and women. What better way to show the new and emerging entrepreneurs in the province of Quebec that the counselling assistance provided by the Government of Canada is alive and well?

This Business Development Bank of Canada I believe will play an integral role in helping to galvanize this spirit of Canada from coast to coast, including the province of Quebec. I would encourage members to support the government's amendments on this section of motions.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, again I am pleased to have an opportunity to make some remarks regarding this grouping of amendments to the bill regarding the new federal bank's name and some changes in the mandate.

• (1925)

I listened with interest to my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood when he said that the government will not miss that opportunity—and I suspect he is obviously implying the bank will not miss this opportunity—to provide an increased level of service to the small business sector. I am pleased when he reminded us that the new chair of the bank is listening in and is obviously getting a sense of the feeling among members of the House.

The member goes on to say that we can be assured that the new marketing thrust of this newly revised bank will be taking into consideration the needs of the small business sector. I will not even qualify it by saying probably, because I know he speaks the truth. I know this is what he wants to do. But why could we not have a little clearer direction actually in the legislation to guarantee that? We have seen tonight, in my judgment, that what the hon. member wants and what the executive wants can be two different things.

So let us acknowledge that, yes, it is good to say these great things and it is nice to comment on all the things the government plans to do, but we also remember the government's plan to abolish the GST. I suspect that probably somebody in there actually meant that at one time. They also said that they would abrogate the free trade agreement, and so on. It goes on and on.

There is some hesitation for us in opposition to become enthusiastic when we hear these commitments, verbal as they are. Mind you, the government even had the abolishment of the GST and abrogating free trade in their red book. These were actually written down, and they obviously have set those aside.

However, let us be positive this evening and assume that the member is accurate and that the new chair listening in will hear us and will take this bank in the right direction.

I listened with interest to my hon. colleague talk about the sensitivity the bank will have to ensure that adequate provision is given to small business enterprises in all the regions of Canada. We applaud that.

I just want to point out that my hon. friend refers to the west. I know he is from Broadview—Greenwood and I know that he recognizes the realities of western Canada. I want to remind my friend that the west includes two regions: the cordillera regions of British Columbia and the Yukon, and of course the prairie region. So let us be sensitive that we want to balance that B.C. and Yukon is actually a region that ought to get their fair share separate from the prairies and so on and so forth. That is just a little sensitivity from us across the mountain range.

I got a little shaky when my hon. friend was up talking about the letter from the new chair that said we must provide special consideration for the newly emerging technologies, biotechnology and telecommunications and so on. No one would dispute

that. I question whether or not this is the small business sector we are talking about here tonight in large part. It may be.

When I think of biotechnology and telecommunications, I often do not think of the person making the loan for $20,000 or $30,000. I would call for a little extra sensitivity. Yes, we would applaud that the bank ought to be leading a lot of the capital and funding initiatives into these sectors, but also we are talking about small business that is quite often apart from these two sectors.

We want to see expanded powers. Again, I will be looking carefully at the new initiatives. My hon. friend can simply nod at this, but I think he said that the chair of the bank wanted to come before the committee with his directors and meet with the committee to develop some of these ideas further. I think that is what he said. I applaud that initiative and look forward to that opportunity.

On behalf of my party we will be supporting with some enthusiasm Motion No. 7 by my colleague from Trois–Rivières. We will also be supporting Motion No. 10, by my friend from Edmonton Southwest. We will also be supporting Motion No. 20, Motion No. 21, Motion No. 22, Motion No. 23, and Motion No. 25.

I want to make a comment about Motion No. 23, and that is the addition in the legislation of the line "for the purposes of a committee or either House of Parliament" as the possibility of reviewing what the bank is doing. I do think that is an appropriate initiative if in fact that inclination is there.

Again, these are very thoughtful amendments. Some do not receive our enthusiastic endorsement. I appreciate the reasons people are bringing them forward, but I do not see the necessity and some of them I find actually rather regressive. We are being positive here tonight, so I will keep my statements on the upbeat and positive note.

• (1930)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Arseneault: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was my understanding that you called the division and indicated that the nays carried it and there were not five members standing.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I saw five members standing when they said nay. I will deem the motion deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you might find unanimous consent to consider that the divisions on the rest of the motions in Group No. 2 have been demanded and deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We now move to Group No. 3. Motions Nos. 12 and 13 will be grouped together for the purpose of the debate and the division on Motion No. 12 will apply to Motion No. 13.

• (1935)

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–91 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–91 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak for the last time at this stage, following the impassioned speech by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry, whom I would like to congratulate on his candour. We no longer hear from Liberals who are proud to be Canadian and proud to tell Quebecers what it means to be Canadian at this time and what Canada will become.

We have seen the passion of the member for Broadview—Greenwood in defending the Trudeau vision of post–referendum Canada. I almost feel like congratulating him, because it helps us understand the scope of the present debate, the role foreseen for the Federal Business Development Bank, the Business Development Bank of Canada, in this post–referendum Canada.

In particular, the Bank will be able to meddle, and this is the aim of clause 20, in regional development throughout Canada, and particularly in Quebec. The legislation provides that the new Bank will be able to do business with so–called "provincial" agencies, despite the fact that, in Quebec, however, there is a law that provides that provincial government agencies must deal with the Government of Quebec, which then does business with the federal government and subsequently authorizes its agencies to act as it sees fit.

Ignoring the presence and the existence of the Government of Quebec, the bill provides that the federal government will now deal with provincial agencies. This raises the whole leadership problem. Who is primarily responsible for regional development in Quebec? In our opinion, it is the Government of Quebec. The federal government could perhaps support it, but it does not have to try to duplicate it, as it is currently doing.

Quebec has established so many agencies. With the SDI, the regional development councils, the solidarity funds, the deposit fund for major matters, and so on, Quebec's regional development organization is well structured.

We refuse to permit waste of public funds and competition between officials, as we have too often seen in the past, or between two groups of officials, which compete with each other, instead of helping each other, and will be encouraged to compete more. We all know that the new Bank of Canada will back the Federal Business Development Bank, which has become merely an empty shell since its mandate changed.

And it is about to start adding its energies to those that the departments of Industry and of International Trade devote to exporters, mostly high tech companies. They are going to supply them, like an agent of federal interventionism, through the Federal Business Development Bank in total disregard for the regional development infrastructure already in place in Quebec.

I feel that this describes the mentality prevailing in this government. They use clause 21 to spread it, which I will read to you:

> 21. The Bank may carry out duties or functions that may be assigned to it by the Designated Minister in relation to the administration of any program supporting Canadian entrepreneurship, to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions.

Therefore, having changed the mandate, they are not only mobilizing to try to develop entrepreneurship in Canada by any means they feel are good means, but they also want to develop programs. We asked this question in committee. What programs? What does business administration mean?

That is a very vague catch–all term which the federal government could use to give itself any mandate or to assume any responsibility without consulting with either the provincial government in Quebec, for the time that we will remain a provincial government, or the other provincial governments.

This demonstrates the mentality behind this bill and how urgent it truly is for Quebecers to realize how serious the situation is and to realize that, in the Langevin Block, people are drawing up the Canada of tomorrow which will be centralized and unified like Pierre Elliott Trudeau always wanted it to be.

• (1940)

Except that the process does not allow for debate or consultation and all of the other provinces are being tricked, along with Quebec, in an anti–Quebec referendum strategy. They are pulling a fast one

on the other provinces. I personally find it dishonest to make lofty speeches on the Canada of the future instead of really debating this bill. Alas, this is a small–time short–sighted Canada, run as if it were a chip truck.

That is what we are in for. I can feel it, the measures are already in place. And if Quebec makes the catastrophic decision to vote no, this is what Canada and Quebec will have to endure. They will have to live in this Canada or Quebec, which, as it is, is not recognized as a province that is different from the others; they will have to yield to the bulldozer that they are setting in motion in order to build the Canada of the future, and I hope that this kind of measure will make Quebecers think twice.

[*English*]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the last grouping of amendments on Bill C–91, Motions Nos. 12 and 13.

I am very much impressed by the comments of the member for Broadview—Greenwood about his dedication to small business and the government's dedication to helping small business. I hope the sincerity and dedication extend beyond access to funding.

There are many other important areas that are really big factors to small businesses. Certainly they are looking for relief from the tax burden they are under and their customers are under. It is number one on their list, as well as the government bureaucracy that is on their backs. These are two areas we have to address to encourage not only new businesses but small businesses to expand and grow as we know we need them to do.

The Reform Party will be opposing both Motions Nos. 12 and 13 because they remove some restrictions from the bill that we feel are important and should remain in there.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is the last grouping. The government will not be supporting these Bloc amendments.

I listened carefully to the member for Trois–Rivières. I was surprised he would suggest that the business development bank would be perceived as an anti–Quebec initiative.

The member referred to the Langevin Block. He indicated that the bill was some scheme for the pre–referendum exercise. Being a former assistant to Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and having worked in the Langevin Block, I say that he is giving them too much credit. The bill was really the work of all members of the industry committee.

The member for Trois–Rivières does not believe in Government of Canada presence in the province of Quebec. That is fair ball; he is entitled to that opinion. That is the hon. member's ideology. However, the member knows that all the other members on the committee are not anti–Quebec. The member cannot stand in the House and say I am anti–Quebec.

• (1945)

I cannot imagine that a Quebecer listening tonight to the critic for the Reform Party or to the hon. member for Simcoe Centre would say this debate was anti–Quebec.

This debate is about assisting and supporting small business men and women who represent the greatest hope for putting Canadians back to work. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Ramsay: Will the bill work?

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): An hon. member opposite asked if the bill will work. I do not know the answer to that question. Are we to stay with the status quo?

This work was the result of members of the Reform Party, members of the Bloc and our members listening to dozens of small business men and women. We listened to bankers. This was not the government's idea. This was not an idea conjured up in the Langevin Block. This was a bill designed by all parties for the small business men and women of Canada.

With the deepest respect to my friend whom I have enjoyed working with from the Bloc Quebecois, please reflect between now and the vote tonight. I ask him to reconsider his position and get behind the government bill in the interests of putting the unemployed people of Quebec back to work. That kind of spirit will have a ripple effect throughout Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Group No. 3, Motions No. 12.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

An hon. member: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 12 negatived. Therefore I declare Motion No. 13 negatived.

(Motion No. 12 negatived.)

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the bill now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until 11.30 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

• (1950)

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I have a ruling by the Speaker on Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act.

[*Translation*]

There is, on the Order Paper, a motion to amend Bill C–82, an Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, at the report stage.

[*English*]

The motion is substantially similar to an amendment previously moved and defeated in committee. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(5), it has not been selected and we will now proceed to the concurrence motion at report stage.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE

Hon. Jon Gerrard (for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Gerrard (for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C–82, a bill which will enable the Government of Canada to replace the $2 note with a $2 coin.

The bill was recently studied by the Standing Committee on Government Operations. I am pleased to say all witnesses appearing before the committee supported the introduction of a $2 coin as a cost saving measure. This confirms the results of earlier surveys conducted by the Royal Canadian Mint whereby Canadians strongly approved of the new coin given the substantial savings that accrue to the government.

Clearly Canadians appreciate any step their government takes to reduce the deficit and save money.

[*Translation*]

Representatives from the vending machine industry confirmed their support for the proposed coin, even though they expressed some concern regarding the date of introduction of this coin. They fear that they will not have time to adjust the mechanisms of all their machines by the introduction date.

I can assure hon. members that we are sensitive to these concerns. In response to these concerns the Royal Canadian Mint, the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada will co–operate with the individuals and groups involved, and especially with the vending machine industry, to ensure a smooth introduction of the new coin on the market, in order to minimize sale and business disruptions.

There will be a public awareness campaign to promote acceptance and use of the $2 coin by the Canadian public.

[*English*]

The government intends to introduce the new $2 coin in early 1996, as announced by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech in February 1995. We cannot afford to delay this budget item because we all stand to gain from the introduction of this new coin.

By replacing the $2 note with the coin, Canadians will save approximately $254 million over 20 years from the reduced production and distribution costs of the $2 coin as compared to the note.

The average life span of a note is one year while the average life span of a coin is twenty years. The cost to produce the note is 6 cents per unit compared to the estimated cost to produce the coin at 16 cents per unit. This combined with the savings the government will generate by changing the metal composition of the lower denominations will result in total savings of $500 million over 20 years.

• (1955)

Some have suggested that half a billion in savings is small change. We disagree. In our fight to eliminate the deficit we believe every dollar saved is a dollar earned. No saving is too small or insignificant.

As the Minister of Public Works and Government Services explained to the committee members, we need five pennies to make a nickel, five nickels to make a quarter, and four quarters to make a dollar; every penny counts.

The government takes deficit reduction very seriously. Any member of the House elected on a platform to reduce or eliminate the deficit must support this initiative. As we all know, the deficit cannot be eliminated through program cuts alone. Innovative ways must be found to cut government expenditures. The introduction of the $2 coin to replace the $2 note is an innovative cost saving measure.

[*Translation*]

Some people wonder why we did not simply do away with the $2 bill. They say we would have saved even more money, but we disagree.

Canadians use $2 notes in a large number of transactions every day. Because they are so heavily used, these notes tend to be in poor condition. The coin is a practical and far more durable alternative to the note. It allows the government to save more money than it would by simply eliminating the note.

If we eliminated the $2 denomination, we would not reduce the number of coins in the purses of Canadians, on the contrary. Studies have shown that the combination of $1, $2, $5 and $10 values is the most effective in reducing the number of coins and notes required. Without the $2 note, more loonies would be needed and Canadians would carry even more change in their pockets. Two loonies weigh 14 grammes, compared to 7.3 grammes for the proposed $2 coin. If we eliminated the $2 denomination, we would have to mint more $1 coins and that would cost an extra $23 million over a period of 20 years.

[*English*]

Some others might wonder why the government is proposing to introduce a $2 coin at a time when more and more people are using credit and debit cards. A $2 coin might seem a step backward to a time before paper money instead of a step forward toward more plastic. Cash cards will not mean the end of cash in society.

For the foreseeable future cash will be a necessary requirement. Like credit cards and debit cards, cash cards will find their own market niche for people who prefer to manage their cash in this way. However, there will always be a need for cash. This was also confirmed during the hearings of the government operations committee.

The presentation by the Canadian Federation of Independent Grocers revealed that debit cards are not being used as often as anticipated. The extent to which cash cards may replace coinage is at this time only a matter of conjecture. However, even if cash cards replace a significant percentage of transactions most of these will be of higher value and not coinage.

Coins will continue to play a role in commercial transactions. Already coins are used to acquire numerous services such a mass transit, telephone calls, washing machines at the laundromat, video and pool games, parking meters, even showers at campgrounds. The vending machine industry is presenting us with a greater variety of products and choices. These changes reflect the nature of the vending machine industry and of our economy in general.

• (2000)

The only constant is change and in the modern world, the process of change is rapid, wide reaching and never ending. Businesses must constantly adapt to new technologies and new practices.

As an aside, I want to point out to my colleagues in the House that representatives of the vending industry, including the president of Coca–Cola, clearly stated the costs of converting vending equipment would not be passed on to consumers.

Some people have suggested that we should compensate the vending machine industry for the expense of altering their machines. In an era of fiscal restraint, we simply cannot afford it. We must use our limited resources very strategically in ways that result in the greatest possible benefit for the greatest possible number of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, the Royal Canadian Mint, the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada will co–operate with the industry to ensure a smooth transition. Studies conducted by the Royal Canadian Mint have shown that 79 per cent of Canadians approved of this initiative when told that it would save the government millions of dollars.

Moreover, the disappearance of the $2 note does not seem to worry Canadians too much. Forty–five per cent said they were not very concerned, while only 19 per cent felt some nostalgia but no real concern. In concluding, we believe that to be practical a currency system must adapt to change. We must stay in the lead and be an example to others.

This bill reflects the will of the Canadian government to accept change in areas where others avoided it. Change is never easy. We believe that it is by making choices that we show leadership. Sometimes, making choices means letting go of some traditions to turn with confidence towards innovation and renewal.

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on the subject of Bill C–82. Unlike Bill C–91 and other bills introduced by the government, which are opposed in Quebec, this bill is not. It does, however, prove conclusively that the government has blocked its ears and that it is ready to do anything when the time comes to have its bills adopted.

We have heard a speech by the minister's parliamentary secretary that was full of errors and had little to do with reality. For example, it is not right to say that the business people most affected by the issue of a $2 coin were in favour of it. It is not true. They were not in favour of it. Not a single representation was made by businessmen in favour of a $2 coin being issued. A representative of the Coca–Cola company told us they were indifferent, that is, they were prepared to make the adjustment and they, like all the other business people, asked that the government at least delay the issue of the $2 coin for a year so that the industries most affected could adjust.

This is the least we can do for the business people, industries, vending machines and companies most affected by the issue. The government plugged its ears. Companies are not even being given a year to get ready for the new coin.

• (2005)

Why is the government in such a hurry?

An hon. member: It is a matter of money.

Mr. Marchand: Yes, it is definitely a matter of money. It is incredible how little time the government took to consult people.

The member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier, or seemed to imply, that, in fact, people had been consulted and were in favour. A look, however, at the government's so–called survey reveals the extent to which it was manipulated. It is not a real survey. Some people were asked if they were in favour of a $2 coin being issued if it meant a saving of $300 million.

Half the respondents were opposed, really opposed. One cannot be opposed in principle to the government saving money, but in its survey, the government did not even discuss more economical alternatives, like maintaining the status quo or eliminating the $2 bill. The people were not consulted. In fact, the public in general does not even know, in principle, that the government is planning to put out a $2 coin. This measure is slipped through, as though they wanted to impose it. Well, that is what they want to do.

Mr. Bélair: It was announced in the budget.

Mr. Marchand: The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior is telling me it was announced in the budget. Spoken like a true Liberal. Whatever the minister or the Prime Minister says, we will vote yea.

Regardless of the fact that the business community is asking for the decision to be deferred and is against the idea, the Liberal members are all for it. Furthermore, this is the conclusion reached about Liberals in an article in the *Ottawa Sun* written by Douglas Fisher. When it comes to proposing bills, it is "Forget constituents, forget personal belief—" and, I would add, forget public opinion, forget all the people who might have something to say about the bills. "Being a Liberal MP begins with always saying yea at the leader's command".

They blindly follow the leader, unable it seems to express their own opinions. For all I know, maybe they are not capable of expressing their own opinions, they lack intelligence. Bill C–82 certainly does not show any signs of intelligence, just the government's indifference.

It shows that this government is not listening. It could not care less. The bill smacks of arrogance, of disregard for public opinion. The government could have consulted the public, it could have informed people that it was planning a $2 coin and really tried to find out if they were in agreement or not, but this was not done. The public has not been prepared for this soon to be introduced change.

Having done nothing to pave the way and shown little interest in public opinion, the government is going ahead. As I said, even the best informed people, those most affected by the introduction of a $2 coin, who know that it is coming, are concerned about the speed with which it is being introduced. Why the haste? Why not give the business community time to adjust?

The member for Cochrane—Superior tells us that the government will co–operate with business people in introducing the coin. This government is making empty promises. Furthermore, we were already promised consultation on this matter.

• (2010)

When members of the business community presented their report to the public works committee, they said that the government had promised them that after the reception given the loonie, there would be consultation when it came time to discuss the introduction of a $2 coin. There was no such consultation. If the government were truly interested in the opinion of business people or in public opinion, it would take the time to talk to them, to provide them with adequate information and to ensure that they understood the importance of issuing this coin. And if there was opposition, the government could at least have suggested alternatives, which it has not done.

It is presenting the $2 coin and saying that it will lead to huge savings. This suggestion is a joke, because any way you look at it, it would not create any savings. And there are costs involved. Admittedly, the government will save approximately $250 million, like the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier, but it will probably cost the business sector twice that amount to make the adjustments necessitated by this $2 coin. It is almost as if they are claiming that the introduction of the $2 coin will have no effect, no impact, that it will not bother anyone and that co–ops and IGAs will not have to change their cash trays and that vending machines will not have to be adjusted to make allowances for the $2 coin. All coin–operated devices will have to be updated.

Elementary math shows that the introduction of the $2 coin could cost business up to $400 million within the first year.

Mr. Bélair: Eighty million.

Mr. Marchand: Four hundred million. The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said $80 million. That figure is only for one industry. There are 200,000 vending machines in Canada and it costs between $300 and $800 to adapt them to accept a new coin. For this industry alone, the total cost will be between $60 million and $160 million.

The hon. member just told me that it will cost the vending machine industry $80 million, but that is not important because the government will be saving $200 million. But the cost will be between $60 million and $160 million for the vending machine industry alone in Canada.

Some hon. members: No. No.

Mr. Marchand: Yes it will. There are 200,000 of them in Canada. Who is going to foot the bill? The A.F.I. Automatic Vending Company, perhaps, which objected to the bill when it appeared before the Standing Committee on Government Operations?

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier that all businesspeople supported this move. In a letter to the members of the committee, a representative of the vending machine industry said: "The government's cost savings is my expense". He is not in agreement. If you read the letter, you notice that the representative of the industry is opposed to the introduction of a $2 coin. Once again, he suggests that he will not only incur expenses, but also that he is aware that the bottom line is that consumers will end up paying the $60 million to $160 million that the vending machine industry will have to shell out. Ultimately, consumers will end up paying.

• (2015)

Consumers will have to pay. This is only the beginning. Imagine, every cash register in every store across the country will eventually have to be replaced to accommodate a $2 coin.

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior and our colleague from Manitoba do not realize that. They do not see that. This is the down to earth stuff, but they are up there in the clouds, they hear no evil and see no evil but they listen to their minister because he said: You are going to vote for this bill, come hell or high water.

How many cash registers? In Canada, probably half a million. All stores have cash registers, every cornerstore and every IGA. They will all have to change eventually. First they will have to adjust to the changeover but eventually they will have to replace them.

The representative for this association, and this for the benefit of the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior, appeared before our committee to say no, we do not want the $2 coin because it will cost us a lot of money. I will have to buy another cash register which costs between $100 and $150. They do not come cheap.

An hon. member: You do not have to take them.

Mr. Marchand: No, of course not. People in northern Ontario will put their $2 coins in their piggybank or in another box, I imagine. That is one way. We have responsible people who are listening, people who know about these things, who are professionals and who know that cornerstores and shops will have to spend $100 and $150 to buy another cash register. This is another $75 million people will have to spend. And who is going to pay? The consumer, Mr. Speaker. You and me and the people watching us on television. They are going to have to pay. This is only the tip of the iceberg. Eventually, we will also have to change the parking meters, as the hon. member pointed out earlier, and all types of vending machines.

There are administration costs and conversion costs. Costs the government did not take the trouble to calculate, because it could not care less.

As for the cost of handling coins as opposed to bills, for example, the representative for Canada's grocers explained that to us. I think the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior was there, and if he was, he was not listening, because the hon. member for Ottawa Centre and the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester were there, and they will be able to confirm this: introducing the new coin will cost more and it will be heavier to carry. We will have to pay someone to count the coins. There are additional costs. In his own store, he figured that introducing the new $2 coin would cost him between $10,000 and $15,000 in administration and conversion costs. And if we multiply this by 500,000 stores, it starts to add up, and quite a bit. Millions of dollars consumers will have to pay.

When the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior tells me the government will save $250 million by introducing the $2 coin, I think he is pretty gullible.

• (2020)

Because, in the end, who is going to pay for it? Consumers will pay two or three times more. It is too bad, because the saving we are talking about is the one the Royal Canadian Mint could theoretically make. This is the only saving we are talking about. There is no mention of all the costs that will be generated by the issue of this coin. Even here, when we look at the savings mentioned by the member for Cochrane—Superior of $250 million over 20 years—not $250 million next year—they amount to $12 million a year over 20 years. We realize that the issue of the $2 coin will cost industry and the Royal Canadian Mint dearly, because, for the Mint, it will mean producing these coins, which cost a lot more to produce than a bank note.

A $2 bill costs six cents to produce. A $2 coin costs 16 cents. In the first few years, it will cost the government and the Mint a lot. The government will have to borrow money to produce the coin. The $250 million will not be saved in the first year. The savings will be made over the long term. The turning point will come after five, six or seven years. Over time, the value of money changes. You know just as well as I do that saving a million dollars today is not the same as saving a million dollars twenty years from now, because the million in 20 years will not be worth the same as this year's million. That is a fact.

So, when the government and the member for Cochrane—Superior tell me we will be saving $254 million over 20 years, when 20 years have passed we will realize we have not saved a cent. We will, however, have forced industry, business, companies, corner stores, the IGA and everyone affected by the issue of the $2 coin to spend money immediately, next year, after the coin is issued. They will have to pay right away. Consumers are going to have to pay up front for this change.

The most absurd thing about this bill is that, as the member indicated in his presentation, the time is near when the money of the future, electronic money, will be introduced. He seemed to want to say that it did not matter. After all, we will continue to have coins, hard cash.

But if the government had taken the trouble to read up on the magnitude of the current currency revolution, it would realize that indeed times are changing. Many changes are already under way. The government does not really have to impose more costly changes that will ultimately be for nothing when, in five years perhaps, coins will be replaced with chip cards. A few days ago, on June 19, 1995, *La Presse* was reporting what a smart wallet the chip card was.

• (2025)

It was introduced in Canada on May 12 by the Royal Bank and a few other institutions under the name MONDEX. Let me read you part of the article: "A plastic card containing a microchip, the MONDEX wallet can be refilled at automatic teller machines and through certain telephones. The MONDEX package also includes an electronic safe about the size of an electronic memo pad. This safe can interface with a bank account through telephone circuits. It allows the chip card to be refilled without having to use communications channels. It will be widely available this summer".

This is taking place in Canada. The article goes on to describe how the introduction of electronic money will revolutionize the way we pay for what we buy. It is already in use in Europe. In France, money is no longer used to pay for telephone calls; they have been using cards for over ten years. In my riding, I can even pay for my newspaper with my card. The technology exists, here in Canada as well. But, apparently, government members do not read papers or magazines.

MONDEX. There a lengthy article on the subject in the June 12 issue of *Business Week*. That is quite recent. It is the feature article of this issue entitled "The Future". They refer to MONDEX as "a new kind of electronic money known as E money", adding that: "Digital money is the ultimate and inevitable medium of exchange for an increasingly wired world".

Earlier, I got the impression from the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior that he could see into the future and predict that coins will always be used, that there will always be a need for our $2 coins. It seems that others have a different opinion. It is possible that we will use less real money, that we will replace it with "E money", electronic money, and that may be happening very soon.

According to the experts who wrote the article, it could happen within the next five years. The "E money" revolution could take place that soon. This does not surprise me. In our rapidly changing world, the idea of using an electronic card to replace money does not surprise me. In fact, I would not be surprised if we more or less stopped using money, and if most people were to start using cards.

Ten or fifteen years ago, who would have thought that the use of credit cards would become so widespread? If people had been told then that, five or ten years later, they would use credit cards to pay in any hotel or store, they would not have believed that.

Sometimes, we have to open our eyes and ears to see and to understand. The government has obviously not done that in this case. We are about to enter an era which will see the introduction of a new form of money. According to experts, electronic money is definitely the way of the future, and it is also what businespeople, merchants, bankers, corner store owners and grocery owners want.

Even if it may cost them more, they are prepared to invest in this new system, because it reduces their handling costs and their losses, it eliminates fraud and NSF cheques, it simplifies the system, and it is also a step in the right direction.

• (2030)

Business people are ready to invest in such a system, but not one of them supports the issuance of a $2 coin. As the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior knows, all the witnesses and all the business people who appeared before the committee were against this measure.

However, since the government will go ahead with it anyway, these business people have asked for at least a year to find new cash registers. It takes some time to change 500,000 cash registers as well as all the vending machines.

This bill provides for the issuance of a $2 coin by January 1996, which is just a few months away. The bill has not been passed yet, but the Royal Canadian Mint has already called for bids to produce the $2 metal coin.

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior may deny it, but on May 31, 1995, the *Ottawa Citizen* ran as a headline "Government calls standards for two dollar coin". It is written in black and white. Another headline read "Industry seeks help with coin flip". All the same, the government has already received several bids. We called and were told that the bids must be in by October 31, 1995.

If we need to take another five minutes to try to hammer some sense into these people, we will do it. We will at least take the time to explain these things that the government members unfortunately still do not understand.

Again, the government has called for bids to produce the $2 coin. It wants to start production on October 1, 1995, in a few months, and start distribution on January 1, 1996. This is fast, very fast.

All those affected by this measure say that things should not go so fast, that they do not totally agree with the introduction of the new $2 coin, that they want a year to adjust. But the government is not listening and still wants to go ahead with this initiative.

What is troubling me is that there are no solid arguments justifying the introduction of a $2 coin. The savings that will result from the introduction of this new coin are not a sure thing. We cannot say that savings will be achieved when we know that adjusting to the new coin will cost our industries money and that, ultimately, these costs will be passed on to the consumers.

Is this a good time to introduce a $2 coin? The government has not taken the time to consider the alternatives. Domtar, which produces our present $2 bill, has proposed to make it more durable. Right now, the life span of the bill is said to be only a year. Domtar has offered to produce a bill that could last up to three years, which would represent considerable savings. The government has not considered this alternative.

There are also other alternatives that it has not considered, such as maintaining the status quo or even eliminating the $2 bill. If the government really wanted to save money, eliminating the $2 bill would be a good way of doing it. It would not cost anything.

• (2035)

The government could really save money. Industries, tuck shops, municipalities would not have to adapt to a $2 coin. This is an alternative. I am not saying that it is the solution, but why rush? Why not wait a certain time, one or two years, and see how the electronic card is being integrated into people's lives? The elimination of the $2 denomination could be considered. It could always be put back in circulation later on if needed, but why now and why so fast?

The government is incredibly irresponsible because, really, nothing truly justifies a new $2 coin. If this government were really serious about saving money, I could suggest to the public works minister several ways to achieve real savings. He could have saved $300 million right off the bat this year by eliminating ACOA. This is $300 million he gives to industries. He could have supported, for instance, bills to give people in his own department the right to speak up and disclose abuses, which are numerous.

The member for Cochrane—Superior is well aware of this. The government has no control over contracting out. The government is wasting billions of dollars. But the minister will not support such bills, and yet they would be real money savers. This Minister of Public Works has also made the news with some ill considered projects, and occasionally some almost shady deals.

He had a wall, the famous Dingwall that cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars, built on a campus in his riding in Cape Breton. That was part of a $600,000 envelope squandered. I could give examples of the considerable sums of money wasted by the Minister of Public Works.

Examples of questionable spending involving the Minister of Public Works are legion and involve millions of dollars. The member for Cochrane—Superior has just said that this is a minister interested in savings. I have my doubts. This cannot be the main reason for presenting this bill with such haste, when the people actually affected by the introduction of a $2 coin want at least a year to prepare for the transition.

I would not give you $2 for this bill. In conclusion, I would say that the MP's role is often an empty one. Here we all are debating, giving speeches and arguing as reasonably as possible, but we know that the power rests with the people across the way and power often has a dulling effect. It also corrupts.

• (2040)

Absolute power corrupts absolutely; power just corrupts. We have examples of this. If we had the time and if it was worth the trouble to list the instances of corruption, we would do it, but I would rather conclude my comments on Bill C–82 by saying that the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of the government saving money. But we are in favour of real savings. We have suggested all kinds of ways for the government to really save money, from taxing family trusts to taxing banks. We have also made many suggestions to the Minister of Public Works regarding how he could reduce wastage of all kinds. We from the Bloc want savings. On this point, we agree. But, there is no proof that Bill C–82 will really create savings. On the contrary, it will be costly to business and consumers. People are not prepared.

There already are some 40 to 50 million $1 coins which are out of circulation. We could easily encourage the circulation of loonies which are not being used. We would have preferred that the government consider at least delaying this bill and doing its job, which is to consult with the public and to think of alternatives, such as eliminating the $2 denomination. I am not saying that this is the best option, but they could at least consider it, because there are apparently more savings to be had by dropping this denomination then by issuing a new $2 coin. They could even decide to keep up the status quo.

There are at least a few alternatives worth examining, which the government did not take the time to do. Once again, the government is not doing its job, it did not take the time to consult the public, it did not listen to the concerns and worries of the business community, it does not really have any solid arguments for introducing Bill C–82 and certainly has no solid arguments for doing it so quickly.

That is why the Bloc opposes Bill C–82.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes we hurry through our days without pausing to give thanks to people. While I listened to that amazing speech just past, it occurred to me again that because much to my regret I am unilingual English I would not have understood a word of it if it were not for the interpreters. I think they did a fine job in translating not only the words of the hon. member but also the emotion with which he spoke. I would like to thank and congratulate the interpreters.

We are here today to discuss Bill C–82, which would permit the government to introduce the $2 coin. When we come to the question of the $2 coin, of course when we hear of the savings that will be made it looks at first glance like an excellent idea and one we should wholeheartedly support. However, in the Reform Party we are accustomed to asking questions about these initiatives of the government. We always begin by asking what it will cost and what the net effect will be to the taxpayer.

• (2045)

We were sent here, all 52 of us, primarily on the platform of fiscal responsibility and the desire to balance the budget. We need to get into perspective how totally inadequate the initiatives and priorities of this government are. Here we are in the closing days of this session and this government is invoking closure and extended hours in order to put through all of this really important legislation before we are all sent home to our constituencies to do our work there.

Among all the things the Liberals have deemed to be a high priority, we have this $2 coin. Of course anyone hearing the member from the government speak earlier would have said this is indeed important; we are going to save $254 million. We could make it sound like even more by saying a quarter of a billion dollars. Instead of saying we are going to save that over 20 years, we could say we are going to save a billion dollars in 80 years. That would make it sound much more significant.

The fact of the matter is that this government speaks of this as such a huge priority, which will keep us here late at night debating and voting on these issues, as if this is going to save the country. Frankly, I wish it could. I really do. I would then be so strongly in favour of this motion that I would just say let us go for it, let us get it done, let us not wait until tomorrow, let us pass it and get it under way.

However, we need to ask what the real effect is. We need to be aware of the fact that in proportion to the total indebtedness of this government, this is really, although I hesitate to say it, a drop in the bucket. I suppose we could say it is a drop in the ocean. Unfortunately, we are taking as a priority this one little drop and allowing the big one to slip away from us. While we are worried about the cup of water that spilled off the cupboard, as the people in southern Alberta would know firsthand from their experiences, the basement is full of water from the flood. This is what the relationship is in our debt's picture.

It is very important for all members and all Canadian citizens to be aware that this saving of some $254 million over 20 years comes down to about $12.7 million per year. If we also consider that every day we are increasing our indebtedness by about $110 million, then we become aware that the saving of $254 million over 20 years is just a little over the amount by which we are increasing our indebtedness in two days. That is a shame. I hope this is not unparliamentary, but I think this is a crime.

I am not accusing the government of committing a crime, but it is derelict in its duties. It is not focusing on the picture of having to balance the budget and get government spending down in a real way.

As a matter of fact, as the House will hear in the next few minutes, this savings the government is getting is really a form of a hidden tax, as I will show in the next few minutes. The savings that are derived are so derived by increasing the costs to taxpayers, and thereby the real saving to the government is simply a form of taxation on the already overburdened taxpayer.

• (2050)

The question we need to ask and have answered is, as I have already indicated, why this should be such a high priority. Even though it is a significant amount of money to any individual, in balance with total government spending it is not significant enough. We ought not to be chasing this rabbit when we should be out hunting bear.

There is a big challenge out there, and we are being detracted by something glistening on the side of the road. We are being detracted while our country is going into the ditch.

I would like to ask a few questions and talk a little about the answers the government has given to some of the questions. It is important for us to become aware of what is happening here.

The first question: What is the total plan of the government in terms of currency? We are told that for the present, at least for the next five years, this is probably the only change it is going to make, with four coins being changed at the same time. Again we need to be aware that the change in metal content to the nickel, the dime, the quarter, and the 50–cent piece has nothing to do with the bill. It is just being done at the same time.

If we are going to add a $2 coin, it is wise to do it at the same time so all the coin recognition systems in coin operated machines will not have to be changed twice. It can be done all at once. We must commend the government for deciding that if we are going to make a change, let us do it all at the same time. However, we should ask whether we should be doing it at all. Is it really a saving to the taxpayer? My contention is that it is not. Here is my reasoning.

If one divides the total savings projected by the government, the $12.7 million per year over 20 years, one does not have to be a math whiz to compute this. There are approximately 29 million Canadians. Using round numbers, quite clearly we are going to be saving less than half a dollar for each one of the 29 million Canadians. As a matter of fact, it is very close to 44 cents.

If we can save $12.7 million per year, should we not be doing that? My answer would be yes, if it were a true saving. However it is a fairly safe assumption that every Canadian would use a coin operated machine a minimum of five times a year. If that is true and if the cost of retooling machines in order to recognize the new coins is included in the new cost to the vendors, say at a nominal rate of 10 cents per purchase—a 90–cent chocolate bar going up to $1, which would be typical and we can probably expect that—then for every person who uses a machine more than five times per year, which is a safe assumption, it is going to end up costing more. They will pay less in taxes but more in services. Right off the bat the equation is counterbalanced. The saving disappears when we look at it from the point of view of the taxpayer.

In addition, there is the scenario that there is going to be an accrued value here because with the old $2 bill the banks were permitted to return the surplus currency for a credit. I remember reading somewhere that the total value of being able to return the currency to the Bank of Canada, even at 5 per cent interest, worked out to a benefit of approximately $80 million per year.

• (2055)

There is a saving there to the government because under the rules of the banks coinage is not eligible to be returned to the bank when it is in surplus. The banks have to hold it. Consequently, there is an $80 million cost there that will go to the banks.

I suppose we should not perhaps worry about that too much, because the banks would then have an opportunity in some tangible way to contribute to our government's coffers. It would be an indirect tax, which would require no bookkeeping or anything. It is just an expense, for which they could no longer get reimbursement.

However, the banks, like other businesses, are there to make a profit and retain their earnings. Undoubtedly they will recover that cost as one of their additional costs in other ways, which again will come out of the pocket of the consumer. There is a saving to the government, which will be taken out of the consumer's pocket in another form.

Then we heard about the issue of seigniorage. This of course is very important. The difference between the value of the coin and the cost of its production is really quite significant. These new $2 coins are projected to cost around 16 cents each to produce, but of course their face value is $2. Therefore the difference, $1.84, is seigniorage. For every coin that is produced there is $1.84 benefit to the government. Here again the government's briefing notes to us included the fact that this is a large benefit to the government and they are expecting around $400 million of seigniorage.

Let us ask ourselves the question. If we can do that by producing some 244 million coins and we can give a benefit to the government of almost half a billion dollars, the temptation arises to ask why we do not produce about 10 times as many of these coins. If we did that we could pay off $5 billion worth of the government's debt. Maybe we should do a hundred times as many coins and pay it all off. Then we would not have to pay any interest.

The fact is that the seigniorage is another form of tax. The government issues a coin to a bank that pays $2 for it to the government. That is true. That is currency, which is really a representative value of each citizen's proportional share of the assets of this country. That is really what it is, because the coin in itself does not have the value. It is not a gold coin that is worth $2 in metal. It has a couple of components in it. It is nickel and things like that. The total value of the coin is 16 cents. So the coin has no inherent value. Hence, in a way very similar to our printed currency, it is a promissory note. It is a coin of value against the assets of the country.

If you increase the number of coins, then really you simply divide the value of the country among all the citizens. You would say that is done with the $2 bill right now. That is absolutely correct. If we take the $2 bills out of circulation and put the $2 coins into circulation, then there is no difference. The fact that we claim seigniorage on it is a magical rabbit trick, which tries to tell people that we now have more value to the Canadian government when we do not.

I would like to talk a little about the changes that should be made to this bill.

• (2100)

As was indicated at the time we started to debate the bill today, we tried to introduce an amendment because we were concerned, as were all members of the committee. I hasten to remind members of the committee that we shared a concern regarding the implementation of the new currency. Even though it is outside the concern of this bill and outside the study of the committee, we were concerned about the implementation and the introduction of all the new coins: the new dime, nickel, quarter and 50–cent piece. Very few coin machines recognize the 50–cent piece. Most of them recognize nickels, dimes, quarters and loonies.

When the new coins are introduced every one of them will require a coin recognition system for the three new coins. Two nickels, two dimes and two quarters will have to be recognized by the machine because they have different weight properties. Just that change would require an alteration to the mechanism that recognizes coins for all coin operated machines.

In addition, the machines have to recognize the new two–dollar coin as well as the old loonie. Whereas the old ones had to recognize only four coins, the new mechanism will now have to recognize eight different coins.

It is important to recognize that this change is a very costly one. There are some devices out there right now which, with a minimum of adjustment, will be able to accommodate the new machines. We have heard in committee testimony some estimates as low as $70 per machine. However there are many machines with mechanisms that will be obsolete. Individual owners of the machines will either be forced to replace them entirely or simply take the machines out of business. In some instances perhaps the individual will simply stop the business of coin operated machines.

We have no idea how many machines are out there. We are talking about food vending machines, pop machines, cigarette vending machines and lottery machines. By listing the machines I am not indicating in any way my approval of them but they are out there. We also have telephones and parking meters.

I know there was some giggling on the other side when the member from the Bloc was listing these items. That represented a lack of concern for all businesses, and there are many of them, that make their livelihood in this way.

I received a letter from a person in an adjoining riding to mine. I assume he felt he would perhaps get a little better hearing from me than from his Liberal MP. Perhaps he wrote to me because I was on the committee and in opposition. It was not Edmonton Southeast; it was a different riding adjacent to mine and with a Liberal representative. We can all figure it out if we know the geography.

The person said that he was in this business. He had a number of coin operated machines and because of his business he had a number of change making machines, machines which were geared up to making change for a two–dollar bill, a five–dollar bill and a ten–dollar bill. He said those machines would have to be changed. Either he would have to change his vending machines to recognize the two–dollar coin or he would have to change his change making machines to recognize the two–dollar coin. He also said it would cost a minimum of $750 each to alter the machines. This was how he made his living.

The total cost of his small family business was $138,000. He said: "This is a tremendous cost to me. If you just dump it on me it is far more than I can afford to take in one year". Among all other considerations for going slowly on making these alterations that is another reason. He would have the opportunity to amortize the cost over a greater length of time without incurring huge interest costs.

• (2105)

We talked earlier today about lending money to small business people. I am sure he would have to borrow the money if this measure were implemented quickly. There is a cost that is very real and it is a large amount of money to him.

There is another reason for giving a little better time line. Businesses cannot produce overnight the new coin identification devices. There must be time for research and development. We heard in committee testimony that the mint had not submitted true industrial quality samples of the coins. That is rightfully so because it has not been approved by Parliament. They need to get all the coins. They need to have all the nickels, both the dimes and both the quarters. The loonie stays the same but they need the new two–dollar coin. They need samples of the four new coins before they can begin their research and development into the design of the new mechanism.

After that they have to build a prototype and go through sufficient testing to ascertain that those coin recognition devices are accurate and dependable. The last thing we want to do is to arrange the affairs of the country in such a way that the recognition devices of all business people who directly depend

on our coinage system and its acuity, size and weight will not clearly discriminate between them.

Let me explain that. There are two kinds of errors the machines can make that are both very detrimental. The first error is that of not recognizing a legitimate coin. If a customer goes to a machine wanting to make a purchase and his new quarter and new two–dollar coins are rejected, he gets upset. We are told by people in the industry that when people submit a coin which is rejected several things happen. First, some of the rejections result in jamming so the person does not get the product or his coin back. Therefore the mechanism must be very reliable in recognizing legitimate coins. It must not jam. It must recognize them and accept them.

Another thing that frustrates the customer is if he submits the coin and it goes straight through to the coin return pocket. He wants the machine to accept the coin because he wants to buy the product, whatever he is after. If he cannot get it because the machine will not accept the coin, he will probably kick the machine. The industry people told us that in committee. They say their coin recognition machines must be highly reliable because if they fail to recognize legitimate coins their machines are subject to a lot of vandalism.

• (2110)

We would not want to impose that on people who depend upon the Canadian government's coinage system. That is why they have to be given ample time to research and develop coin recognition machines.

As I said there are two types of errors. One is failing to accept a legitimate coin. The other is failing to reject an illegitimate coin. That is every bit as important. Coin recognition devices must also have the ability to recognize a slug from the electrical department or a washer or something that is not a legitimate coin. The devices must reject those or the merchant will be ripped off. The devices must be very reliable.

It is not realistic for us to pass Bill C–82 at the end of June and give the government the right to introduce these new coins in early 1996. That is less than a year away. It is just over six months away. That is not adequate and the industry has told us so.

I will not make several pejorative statements to the government. I will rather try to appeal to its common sense and concern for the business people that we have heard expressed often. I am challenging the government to put actions to its words. I appeal to its business sense and to its sense of caring for Canadian people. That is what we are here for.

A very legitimate concern is that the coin recognition systems have to be developed. They have to be brought into production. As I said that requires a research and development phase, a testing phase of the prototypes and then full production. After that the devices get shipped out. In some cases they will be retrofits for existing mechanisms. In other cases they will be actual replacements. The merchants will have to take the old device out of the machine and replace it completely with a new one. Sometimes that will involve changing from some of the old mechanical devices to the new electronic devices. It may mean wiring changes. It can mean all sorts of different things. In some cases it will mean the changing of the solenoids that actually operate the delivery systems.

We have to give industry time for the research, the development, the testing, the production and the installation. If we in the House believe that by snapping our fingers and passing a law it can be done overnight, it is not realistic. I appeal to members opposite to do it right.

I remember a colleague at the technical institute where I worked who used to have a little placard over his desk that read: "If you don't have time to do it right, when will you find time to do it again?" That is the issue here. If we do not do it right we will produce a lot of frustration and anger. Right now we are already facing that. Many small business people I talk to keep crying about the GST. A lot of the vending machine operators are in that category. They landed up picking up the tab for GST out of their own pockets. They were opposed to it. They are still opposed to it. They are saying: "The government said it would eliminate it and it is still here. When will that happen?"

There is already a deep anger across the country about the GST and other unfair taxes. If we add this frustration and difficulty for the same people again it will further erode the respect of people for the government and their willingness to participate in our economy through our voluntary tax system. Without that, the whole system would fail.

• (2115)

We need to make certain we do this right. If the government is going to go through with this despite my previous pleading that it is not economic and should not be done, then at least it should get the timing right. That is very important.

In my previous speech I asked the minister a number of questions. The minister was kind enough to give me a written response. In his covering letter he said: "Thank you for your letter". After the speech I received a phone call in my office. I was asked to submit my questions in writing and the minister would provide answers to them. He said: "I trust these responses will satisfy your concerns and that you will now be in a position to support Bill C–82".

Frankly I am appreciative of the minister and his staff taking the time to answer my questions. They covered about five or six pages.

I regret the answers are insufficient. For example, I asked what was the estimated total impact on the retail sector, including items such as cashier trays and coin counting machines. Basically the answer was that one year ago the industry estimated it would cost $25 million. Since then they have raised their cost to $80 million and the last line is: "The cost of adjustment will vary". In other words, the government does not have the answer. That is not good enough. Until we have those answers it should not jam this bill through.

I asked what the effect would be on the economy. Again, some answers were given but they were very general. No real work has been done. Consider the soft drink industry.

Again we urge the government to consider not having a new $2 dollar coin. If it costs too much to print $2 bills, just eliminate them. I know there are two sides to the argument of eliminating the $2 currency. We do this for values less than $1. If you look at our currencies for less than $1 we go from 1 cent to 5 cents. Why can we not go from a $1 coin to a $5 bill? It is exactly the same. I am not going to repeat myself but I insist it is absolutely the same. If you go from 1 cent coin to a 5 cent coin that is parallel to going from $1 coin to a $5 bill.

I am not going to repeat what I said in my previous speech. If anybody is interested in this I urge them to read it since I gave a really good, well thought out, well documented speech when this bill was debated previously. I raised the same point then that with the weight of these coins we are talking about the difference to a person of having to carry an extra one–half ounce. That is the difference.

Some members opposite may disagree. For a small fee I will give a math lesson after hours. I would have to ask the government to seriously consider that as an option. It would not cost a great deal to implement that change, only the cost of producing the currency. If we are going to stay with the $2 currency, there is one thing that was not properly considered: the use of a more durable substrate. That has not been studied.

The current $2 bills wear out very rapidly. That is because the quality of the paper provided is not adequate for the kind of circulation these $2 bills get.

We talked to suppliers of the substrate for the printing of the bills. They said with the new plasticized material they could produce a $2 note that could last two to four times as long and it would only cost marginally more to produce. Has that been studied as an alternative? As far as we know it has not and we think it should be.

We had many other questions. I would concede that some were adequately answered. When I asked if dropping the $2 denomination was considered, the government simply answered that eliminating the $2 coin was considered and rejected. It then went on to say that Canadians depend on the $2 note for a great number of their transactions. I believe that to be true because it is there.

• (2120)

However, if the next denomination in paper were $5 we would still only be required to carry four coins in order to produce the $4 and the next one would be the $5 and then we would have the change in between as well.

With all that being said, the message I want to give to the members opposite is one that is very clear. I appeal to their common sense to reject this bill but failing that, I would like to at least have it amended. The work of this Parliament is to pass good laws. Is that not our prayer at the beginning of each day: "Help us to pass good laws?"

However, included in that definition is that we must reject bad laws or we must amend bad portions of laws before we pass them so they will be good laws.

Therefore I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following:

That Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Government Operations for the purpose of reconsidering clause 1.

That clause is with respect to the issue of the timing of the bill.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the members opposite that I will not be long, but it is only fair that having seconded an amendment that I speak briefly to it. I assure members opposite, who I know are concerned about the time, that I will be the only Reformer speaking on the amendment.

All across Canada, Canadians are doing business today. They were buying and selling. They were working and travelling. They were caring for kids and patients in hospitals. That is the real Canada. In here we are debating minting a $2 coin in place of a $2 bill when this country is going $100 million a day in the hole. That is a really sad case to consider.

I just want to briefly outline why we suggest that a January 1996 implementation date is not a reasonable and fair imposition on small business, which is the engine of our economy.

In the bill the government has failed to address the actual cost to the industry of the conversion to a $2 coin. My hon. colleague from Elk Island has given us 101 on the cost of implementing this bill and certainly a 101 course on vending machines and the problems involved in converting them to accept $2 coins in the new regime that is being planned by the Canadian Mint under the supervision of the minister of public works.

The cost to the industry will be substantial and in all likelihood these costs will be passed down to the consumer. As just an example for comparison, when pulp prices increased there was an increase in the price of newsprint resulting in an increase in the price of newspapers which was then passed on to the consumer. The same will happen with the vending machine industry.

Three organizations have asked the government to reconsider this proposal and, in particular, the implementation timetable for Bill C–82. They are the Canadian Soft Drink Association, the Canadian Automatic Vending Merchandising Association and the Canadian Bankers Association. The CSDA represents manufacturers and distributors of soft drinks across Canada. Members distribute their products through approximately 100,000 vending machines. The CSDA, along with all vending industries, is requesting that the federal government delay by one year the introduction of the new coins to provide adequate time to convert existing coin mechanisms to new ones.

• (2125)

Paulette Vinette, president and CEO of the Canadian Soft Drink Distributors Association estimates that it will cost its industry $200 per machine to convert existing mechanisms to accept the new coins and as much as $600 to replace an existing mechanism. The total cost to the industry would be approximately $30 million.

The Canadian Automatic Vending Machine Association estimates that changes to pop, potato chip and candy machines will cost between $75 and $800. The total cost of conversion to the industry, according to Canadian Automatic Vending, will be as much as $80 million. This $80 million cost also includes the government's plans to replace the metal alloy used in pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters and 50–cent pieces with cheaper plated steel coins.

They also bemoan the fact that the proposed date of implementation will not provide the industry with enough time to develop and implement the required modifications. That is a real problem. The industry has yet to receive sample coins from the Mint so that it can develop coin recognition equipment.

Vending machine operators are asking that the federal government provide compensation to help defray the cost of conversion to some 200,000 pop and candy machines. These operators insist that they are unfairly bearing the burden of cost cutting by the government.

In 1967, when the government fiddled with the metal content of the coin, the government agreed to compensate vending machine operators for half the replacement costs of the coin mechanisms. That is not the case in this bill, therefore more time should be offered to the industry.

Cash registers will also have to accommodate the extra coin. Instead of having five slots for coins, the registers will have to have six. This will result in additional costs for the cash register users.

The Canadian Bankers Association also has concerns with the introduction of the $2 coin, as I pointed out during second reading. The Canadian Bankers Association has proposed a total abandoning of the $2 coin as mentioned by my colleague from Elk Island.

The banks have anywhere from $30 to $50 million in excess loonies sitting in the vaults and as the government has refused to take back the surplus coins, the banks are unable to earn interest on that money. This is likely to be repeated with the $2 coin.

The government is so confident that the Commons will approve the $2 coin that it has asked manufacturers for quotes to deliver 25 million blanks by the beginning of October 1, 1995.

The Reform Party proposes that the government reconsider its decision to delay the introduction of the coin for a year. This will allow vending operators the time needed to convert the machines. Ideally we should scrap the coin but if that does not happen, we should certainly delay its implementation.

Mark my words, there will be big problems if the government pushes this ahead too quickly. The minister of public works has not shown good judgment in the past and he is not showing good judgment now by insisting on ramming this legislation through before the industry and small business people have time to adjust to its consequences. I would appeal to the minister to be more considerate.

In closing, I want to update the House. In my speech at second reading I recognized that the government was probably going to ram this bill through. We would prefer that it did not ram it through but it probably will. We would prefer if it was to ram it through that it would consider some amendments.

If it is going to go through, those members have said that they want suggestions for what should be put on the $2 coin. I made a suggestion at second reading and surprisingly enough it is getting a lot of support from across the country.

I ask that the minister of public works consider putting a replica of the Hanson buck, a white tailed deer on the $2 coin. I did that to deal with some disparity in the images and the representations on our bills.

I have to be careful not to use props in the House but I am using real notes. We have a $20 bill which was actually donated by the hon. member for Simcoe Centre to the Heart Foundation for me to ride a bicycle to raise money for the Heart Foundation this coming weekend.

It has on it a replica of the common loon swimming in a pond.

• (2130)

We have the $10 dollar bill with a replica of the osprey. It is a beautiful animal. May I have a donation to my cause by from the hon. member from Kingston and the Islands? I appreciate that he donated five dollars for me to ride this bike on the weekend to raise dollars for the heart foundation.

The $5 dollar bill has on it a belted king fisher, a beautiful animal as well. Then we are to get rid of the two dollar bill. It has on it a very nice picture of two robins. I guess we will have to say goodbye to the robins and have a new coin.

We have the loonie in existence already and it has a loon on its tail side. The quarter has a caribou. The loon actually is from the wetlands; the caribou is from the north. Our next coin is the dime with the *Bluenose* on it, representing the history of the Maritimes and the wonderful history surrounding the *Bluenose*.

The next denomination is the five cent piece with a beaver on it, representing the development of Canada when the fur trade occurred and the country was inhabited by trappers and traders looking for this pelt. The penny has a maple leaf.

It so happens the prairies were overlooked in all these symbols and so I have recommended to the minister of public works and to the Canadian mint that they consider a replica of the Hanson buck on our new $2 dollar coin should they go ahead with it. I have a lot of support for this idea. I have had support from people from Halifax to Montreal. Fellow members of Parliament have supported this.

A newspaper report said I wanted to put a dead deer on the $2 dollar coin. I do not know if that beaver is alive, but I know the Hanson buck was and was a beautiful animal. It represents a world champion record for the nicest antlers of any white tail ever taken. It broke an 80 year old record held by the Americans and certainly it would be a wonderful replica, a wonderful image to put on our $2 dollar coin should we pass this bill. It is elegant. It has been represented in paintings, in photographs. It represents an animal that has been an environmental success through proper conservation practices.

If the minister goes ahead with this $2 dollar coin, please delay its implementation. I ask the minister to consider putting the Hanson buck on the coin.

I encourage entrepreneurs who might be listening to invest and start manufacturing men's suspenders because our pants will weigh a lot more with our pockets full of $2 dollar coins. Women's apparel manufacturers may need more shoulder shoulder pads and probably stronger purse straps.

Mr. Lastewka: Mr. Speaker, being a new member I would from time to time like to get clarifications on using props in the House. I wanted to make sure I understood for my future speeches that flaunting the rules, bending and breaking them every which way is permissible. Is there a rule on that?

The Deputy Speaker: I was watching the member like a hawk and he did not turn any of his coins or his bills, as far as I could see from here with my fading eyesight, in the direction of the camera. It is a question of holding it up to the camera. I watched him and he was quite careful.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): I know that the government will go ahead with Bill C–82 and introduce the $2 coin. We also know that the business community, which will be most affected by the introduction of this coin, would prefer to see its circulation postponed for at least a year, so it can adjust.

That is why the Bloc Quebecois will support the amendment presented by the Reform Party.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (2135)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Amendment negatived.)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the main motion.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–65, An act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, there are 16 motions in amendment on the Order Paper for the report stage of Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, and 16. Motion No. 13 will be voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 2 will be debated and voted on separately. Motion No. 8 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 10 and 11 will be grouped for the purposes of debate. A vote on Motion No. 10 will apply to Motion No. 11.

[*English*]

I will now propose Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C–65, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 1, with the following:

"recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the Lieutenant Governor of each province in Atlantic Canada and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold of–".

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C–65, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing line 16, on page 2, with the following:

"Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally consides cultural matters.

(2.1) The Board of Directors shall include representatives of the various regions in Canada."

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C–65, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 2, with the following:

"Council as provided in section 4, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

3.1 The Council shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada."

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be unanimous consent so that all these motions you are about to read be deemed to have been put, thereby giving more time for debate instead of reading motions.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C–65, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 28, on page 5, with the following:

"the recommendation of the Corporation, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters, ap–".

Motion No. 6

That Bill C–65, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing line 19, on page 6, with the following:

"ister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) The Board shall include representatives of the various regions in Canada."

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C–65, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 7, with the following:

"required, to the government of each province and to other ministers on the emer–".

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C–65, in Clause 46, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 12, with the following:

"ed in section 19, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) The Board shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada."

Motion No. 12

That Bill C–65, in Clause 54, be amended by adding after line 16, on page 14, the following:

"(3.1) The members, the Chairperson and the Vice–Chairperson shall be appointed following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to this Act."

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–65, in Clause 54, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 25, on page 14, with the following:

"(*c*) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

(*d*) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region; and".

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–65, in Clause 54, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 14, the following:

"(4.1) The members appointed under paragraph (4)(*e*) shall represent the various regions of Canada."

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C–65, in Clause 57, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 18, on page 15, with the following:

"appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) the Board shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada."

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C–65, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 17, with the following:

"Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the Governor in Council and the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold office during pleasure for".

The Deputy Speaker: We will now debate Group No. 1.

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. As we are all aware, the government is proposing to get rid of many boards and commissions and reduce drastically a great number of them for greater efficiency and as a cost saving measure.

One of the agencies which interests me greatly is the National Capital Commission. The bill proposes the membership of the National Capital Commission be composed as follows: two from the city of Ottawa, one from the city of Hull, one from a local municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, one from a local municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, and eight from Canada generally, other than from the cities or municipalities just referred to. Clauses (c) and (d) give me great concern, the ones that refer to a local municipality in Ontario and a local municipality in Quebec. I shall explain.

• (2140)

I would like to replace this with my motion:

That Bill C–65 in clause 54 be amended by replacing lines 22 to 25 on page 14 with the following:

(c) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the national capital region

(d) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the national capital region.

My explanation for this is it has been the practice to have representation from local municipalities around the capital city of Ottawa. In Ontario a local municipality could be Sarnia, Kapuskasing, Smiths Falls, Kingston or a variety of other places. We have like in the province of Quebec, regional municipalities such as the Muncipalité régionale d'Ottawa–Carleton, and we have, du côté de l'outaouais, la Municipalité régionale de l'Outaouais.

[*Translation*]

Just like Montreal has the MUC, the Montreal Urban Community. I may add that these regional municipalities represent several local municipalities.

So when the definition refers to a local municipality, this is not the same as a regional municipality. In this particular case, we must remember there is a difference between a local municipality and a regional municipality, which could be, Kapuskasing or Hearst, for instance. We should refer to the National Capital Region. And to justify this explanation, we consult the—

[*English*]

The National Capital Act, chapter N–4, section 2, gives a description of the national capital region. It gives a description of all the municipalities surrounding the national capital, Ottawa. In the description it talks of Gatineau, Aylmer, Hull and on the Ontario side it talks of Gloucester, Cumberland, Nepean and a dozen other local municipalities.

The reference here is that in the National Capital Act it is well defined what is meant by a local municipality. People do not juggle from one act to the other. When governments change and commission memberships change or board memberships change I would not appreciate seeing errors made and instead of having a representative from a local municipality of the national capital region, having a local municipality within the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

And now there will be representatives from the Province of Quebec. The last part mentions eight members from Canada generally. Ontario, of course, will not be left out. It will also have a representative among the additional eight.

[*English*]

The government is proposing the national commission should be reduced from 20 to 15 members appointed by the governor in council, which translates into a reduction of five members. It is something I agree with but, as I was stating, it is extremely important that the local municipality in the region be respected.

[*Translation*]

We have the city of Gloucester, for instance, where 52 per cent of the land belongs to the federal government. This means that there is a lot of negotiating with the federal government. Activities within the Greenbelt or at Ottawa Airport, for instance, are very restricted. Infrastructure projects always require agreements between the municipalities and the NCC.

• (2145)

If you go from Ottawa to Cumberland, you have to go through Gloucester, and if you want to build sewer mains or water pipes, you have to negotiate agreements with the NCC. That is why it is so important for local municipalities within the National Capital Region to be included. The same applies on the Quebec side. For instance, we have Gatineau and also Aylmer, which is involved in the National Capital Region.

My motion reads as follows:

"(c) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

Paragraph (d) would read:

(d) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

I appreciate the support I received for this amendment from the Minister responsible for the Privy Council and Intergovernmental Affairs and the government. This proves once again that the government is very flexible when it introduces legislation, and that it listens to government and opposition members when they make reasonable suggestions. Personally, I believe it is entirely reasonable to make sure that the wording of the bill is clear.

The way the bill was worded originally, my local municipality in Ontario was confusing and a local municipality in Quebec was confusing, and by ensuring that the local municipality is within the National Capital Region, either on the Quebec side or the Ontario side, we comply with the National Capital Act's definition of the boundaries of the region. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to explain the reasons for my amendment.

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking on the motions in Group No. 1, and I may have something to say on the other groups later. Thank you. I am pleased to speak once again in the debate on Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

As I mentioned in my last speech on this bill, Bill C–65 changes and reorganizes 15 federal agencies by reducing the number of their members. It also dismantles seven other federal organizations. I say dismantles, because their function becomes incorporated into a sector department, in certain instances, or is amalgamated with that of another organization.

There are 16 motions for amendment to this bill; 11 are from Bloc members, four are from the Reform member for Elk Island and one is from the Liberal member for Carleton—Gloucester, who has just spoken to us. I would first like to express my unequivocal support for Motions Nos. 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, and 16 tabled by the members for Trois–Rivières, Chicoutimi, Châteauguay, Québec–Est and Joliette, respectively.

In essence, these motions recommend that the main appointments to the boards of government agencies be made only after consultation with the government of each province, not only Quebec, but of all the provinces in Canada, and with the approval of the standing committee of the House normally charged with matters concerning the sectoral department responsible for these agencies. In this case, Heritage Canada, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Industry and other departments are involved with certain agencies.

I invite the members of the House to also support Motions Nos. 4, 5, and 6, which I proposed and for which notices were given on May 15.

• (2150)

These motions propose, respectively, that the appointments of the chairperson and vice–chairperson of the Canada Council, the executive director of the Canadian Film Development Corporation and a maximum of ten members including the chairperson of the Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board be made only "following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters—in this instance, the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

The idea of cutting political appointments by order in Council, in reality by the Prime Minister's office, is aimed at reducing the arbitrary decisions and the waste of public money. This bill tries to put an end to patronage and too high a number of what I would call almost honourary appointments.

However, *The Globe and Mail* has revealed over the past year that, despite Bill C–65, under the Liberal government, political appointments are being made with renewed vigour. In several instances, the elimination of any legal reference to advisory bodies leads us to question the genuineness of the Liberals' commitment to administrative transparency.

Will the House of Commons have a say regarding appointments to advisory bodies which will no longer have a legal status? Whither transparency? This question is central to the whole debate; Bill C–65 provides only a timid answer.

Under its present form and without the amendments brought forward by the Bloc Quebecois, we cannot support this bill. The motions brought forward by the Bloc Quebecois are aimed at making clearer and more transparent the appointment process to the boards of the bodies mentioned in there.

We are in agreement with Motion No. 13 presented by the member for Carleton—Gloucester to the effect that a member of the National Capital Commission, other than the chairperson and vice–chairperson, must come from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa—and the member adds—from a municipality wholly or partly within the National Capital Region.

Also, under the motion presented by the member for Carleton—Gloucester, a member of the Commission must come from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull—and the member adds—wholly or partly within the National Capital Region.

What would be more normal than having commission members come from the area covered by the National Capital Commission? We believe that this proposal is important and should be accepted. In a few minutes I will deal with the other groups.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my debate on Group No. 1 by saying that in general we in the Reform Party believe the provinces ought to be more involved in issues that affect them directly.

In general, we agree with the impetus of the motions in this group put forward by the members of the Bloc. I would like to qualify that agreement and also ask a question about the reasonableness of this in terms of the total amount of bureaucratic and administrative time that would be taken to administer these things as they are proposing.

They are basically saying that before the governor in council appointments are made they should be approved by the various provinces. Although I said that in general we agree the provinces should be more involved in the workings of our country, I do not believe it should be done in this way.

They speak of contacting the lieutenant governor in each province. If we stop to think about it, the lieutenant governor is an appointed, unelected position, so this is not necessarily going to get the democratic input from the people. That would probably be the greatest reason for us to oppose most of the motions in this group.

• (2155)

I would like to speak about several of the motions. The hon. member from the Liberal Party who spoke earlier talked about the necessity of having input into the board of the National Capital Commission. He was quite concerned that there should be more representation from areas around the region. In other words, if they are not a part of Ottawa they should be included if they are adjacent to Ottawa.

There are two parts to the administration of the different functions. Whether it is the National Capital Commission, one of the museums, or something else, these people do two things. They generally oversee the administration of the facilities. And they are wonderful facilities; I do not want to minimize them in any way. However, another aspect of this, which is so important and which is overlooked, is that the taxpayers come from across the entire country.

I did not have the privilege of visiting the canal during the winter festival, but I was told by someone who went there that every garbage can has NCC written on it. In other words, the National Capital Commission owns the garbage cans. I suppose that is good. If there are people skating on the canal they have to have garbage cans, and if it is under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Commission then they should be identified. However, the question occurred to me: What possible fiscal interest could any voter living more than 100 miles away from Ottawa have in buying garbage cans for the city of Ottawa?

I would be opposed to the idea of concentrating more heavily the representation on the board in terms of the people who want to spend the money and try to increase it for those who are more distant, who would have a greater interest in trying to save the money.

It is sort of a spend versus save conflict we have, and it needs to be balanced according to the different regions. There is no doubt in my mind that the formula should specify very clearly which regions of the country the members should come from. I do not think it should necessarily be the lieutenant governor in the province who should be involved in the consultation. There should be a better mechanism for that. Perhaps it could be the choice of elected legislatures putting forward a slate from which people could be chosen.

While we appreciate the general principle the Bloc members are after, we would be opposed to most of the amendments on the basis of their practicality.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take the floor on Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

My motion deals more specifically with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, or ACOA, and reads as follows:

> That Bill C–65, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 1, with the following:
>
> "recommendations of the Minister, following consultation with the Lieutenant Governor of each province in Atlantic Canada and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons, that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold of–"

The goal of this motion is both simple and two fold. We would like that the government of each of the Atlantic provinces, as well as all the members normally interested in such matters, that is the members of the industry committee, be involved in the appointments.

• (2200)

This would make for a better climate in government and fulfil a need. We know that it is rewarding to be a Liberal, as the *Globe and Mail* showed, but our amendment would avoid situations like the one we are experiencing, where the minister responsible for ACOA recently nominated political organizers to the board of a federal agency based in his riding.

This is the kind of thing we want to correct or at the very least avoid.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the comments made on these amendments.

The Deputy Speaker: Excuse me. There are two other members who wish to speak. Would the member wish to wait until everybody else has spoken on these amendments? Is that acceptable? Very well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on the amendments proposed by the official opposition to Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. As you know, this bill amends the statutes that establish fifteen federal boards, agencies or commissions, in order to reorganize them or to reduce the number of their members. The bill also dissolves seven federal organizations.

Since the bill received first reading on December 14, the official opposition has been emphasizing the importance of using this opportunity to improve the democratic process in the public service. Indeed, we feel it is important to democratize the appointment process for office holders within the organizations affected by this legislation. We want less patronage and more transparency. It is in that spirit that the Bloc is presenting a series of ten amendments.

I want to concentrate on the amendment which deals with subclause 25(2) of the bill. That clause amends a provision of the Emergency Preparedness Act. More specifically, the bill seeks to increase the ministerial responsibility. To that end, it more or less replaces Emergency Preparedness Canada by the minister himself. In other words, the minister will assume full responsibility with respect to the development and implementation of civil emergency plans.

It is in regard to the implementation of these plans that we want to make a suggestion to the government. Subclause 25(2) of the bill currently reads:

> The responsibilities of the Minister with respect to the implementation of civil emergency plans are
>
> (a) to monitor any potential, imminent or actual civil emergency and to report, as required, to other ministers on the emergency and any measures necessary for dealing with it;

We feel that the minister should also have to report to the government of each province. An emergency situation, whether potential, imminent or actual, is never something which takes place in isolation. It may be potential or obvious, but it always concerns a specific place, community, region or province. This is why we feel that provincial authorities should be informed of the measures taken by the federal minister responsible for emergency preparedness.

This is too good an opportunity to miss. I would like to refer to a civil emergency that has forever scarred my riding, the electoral district of Châteauguay. The events of the summer of 1990 were officially classified as a provincial emergency under the Emergency Preparedness Act as a matter of fact.

All the hon. members will remember that, on July 11, 1990, armed warriors withstood a tactical operation carried out by the Sûreté du Québec in the Oka area. Following this, another group of warriors blocked access to the Mercier bridge linking the greater Châteauguay area to Montreal Island. As a result of this coup de force, more than 80,000 commuters were unable to cross the bridge, with implications that are still underestimated. Peaceful people were the victims of this action. Businesses were closed, jobs were lost and incalculable time was lost because of detours.

• (2205)

We know that the handling of this crisis was a disaster. This lack of initiative was one of the main reasons why the Liberals were defeated in the last provincial election. That government was weak. This was a government without backbone or vision and dependent on this Canadian constitution which no longer meets modern–day needs.

This government which has seen one of its cabinet members fly off to Ottawa after losing the last provincial election is now advocating the constitutional status quo like its leader. This status quo, however, could well plunge the city of Châteauguay into another crisis, since this constitution contains no specific division of responsibilities between the parties involved. After having demanded, with her former leader, constitutional changes, how can a former Quebec minister stand for the status quo? Moreover, no effort has been made to set up real negotiations between the native peoples and the federal government on their respective rights and responsibilities.

At least the federal government did not step in on its own initiative. It only acted at the request of the Quebec government, fortunately. We can easily assume that if the federal government had stepped in on its own, it would have messed up things even more.

Now, to get back to the case in point with Bill C–65. According to this piece of legislation, the minister would only have to report to his or her fellow cabinet members. Everybody will agree with me that, in such circumstances, it would be unthinkable for the Quebec government not to be officially informed of the measures taken by the minister.

This is a good example that shows the need for the amendment to Bill C–65 moved by the Bloc Quebecois. We think it is important that the federal minister be required to report to his provincial counterpart when he implements civil emergency plans and more particularly when he monitors any situation of potential, imminent or real crisis. Public security requires positive discussions between all governments and public authorities.

The federal government should not overlook its responsibilities when it reorganizes or abolishes any of its agencies, as it does under Bill C–65. That is also true of the minister who becomes responsible for Emergency Preparedness Canada. His duty to co–ordinate with provincial and local authorities must not be limited to the development and implementation of civil emergency plans. He must also report to all public authorities concerned by the actions he will take in matters of civil defence, including provinces.

It is a question of good co–ordination but also a question of transparency. The federal government is concentrating powers in the hands of the ministers. This concentration increases the risk of abuse, discretionary decisions, partisan treatments and arbitrary choices. Therefore it is increasingly necessary to establish transparency mechanisms in order to preserve the integrity of the government.

The Auditor General of Canada keeps asking for such accountability mechanisms. They are even more necessary when power is placed in the hands of fewer people. This is what is happening now within the federal government, and Bill C–65 is another move in that direction.

This is why the Bloc Quebecois is presenting amendments asking for more transparency. This is what we want when we ask that the minister responsible for civil preparedness be accountable to the provinces, when we ask that the lieutenant governor in council of each province be consulted before some of the appointments, when we ask that the appropriate standing committee of the House approve some of the appointments and when we ask that each provincial government be consulted before certain appointments.

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C–65 received a lot of publicity. The minister responsible for the bill had announced very proudly that it was very important because it would have the effect of eliminating several government agencies that had become useless and cutting back others.

• (2210)

There is no need to exaggerate the importance of this bill financially since we are talking about savings of only $4 million. For the people who are listening to us, it takes only about an hour and a quarter for the Canadian deficit to absorb $4 million.

Through this very important bill on the streamlining of some agencies and the elimination of others, the government will have made it possible to pay for an hour and a quarter of the Canadian deficit. This is not as important as the minister would have had us believe when he made the announcement.

On the other hand, there is something that could have been more important than the amount of money. We agree with trimming the government, and when it comes to savings, even a paltry $4 million, we must seize the opportunity. This is not the reason why we are criticizing the government. If we criticize the government, it is because while saving these $4 million, it could have taken the opportunity to improve the appointment process in these governmental agencies.

In its red book, chapter 6, the Liberal Party promised to restore integrity in our political institutions. One of the recommendations to increase this integrity is to have a thorough review of order in council appointments.

During all the years they were sitting in opposition, the Liberals were always criticizing the political appointments made by the Conservative government and they were promising to review the whole appointment system for people sitting on boards, commissions and agencies.

Unfortunately, in this bill, the government is not proposing anything radical to change this appointment system which allows the government to reward its friends. If the Liberal Party had wanted to keep its promise, it would have added a clause specifying that all appointments should be approved by a parliamentary committee.

The government did not have the courage to do that. It preferred to maintain an unclear partisan appointment system. Its decision to simply reduce the number of board members is only a diversion tactic. The appointment process in itself remains the same.

To prove it, I would like to quote major changes made in this bill. For example, let us take the Petro–Canada Limited Act. Section 64 to be amended by the bill reads as follows:

"There shall be a Board of Directors of the Corporation consisting of the Chairman of the Board, the President of the Corporation and not more than thirteen other persons".

This was the old section. The new clause reads as follows:

"There shall be a Board of Directors of the Corporation consisting of the Chairperson of the Board, the President of the Corporation and one other person."

The only fundamental difference between these two versions is that the number of directors is reduced from 15 to 3. I can see savings related to the attendance fees paid by these corporations to directors.

The second subclause deals with the way directors are appointed to the corporation. Under the old section, the thirteen other directors of Petro–Canada, for example, were appointed by the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to hold office during pleasure for a term not exceeding three years.

The new clause provides that the director still to be appointed, since the chairperson and the president of the corporation are ex officio members, the director who is neither the chairperson of the board nor the president of the corporation shall also be appointed by the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to hold office during pleasure for a term not exceeding three years. Therefore, nothing has changed.

• (2215)

When we look at both texts, we realize that the only thing changed is the number of board members. Nothing at all has been changed in the vague and partisan process of appointing people to these boards. That is why we say that this system must go. Measures have to be taken to put an end to the patronage system.

Let me quote, as an example, a very well–documented article published in the *Globe and Mail* of February 7, under the headline: «Liberal loyalty being rewarded with jobs, jobs, jobs». The article explained the philosophy of the Liberals on party friends. According to the article, more than 100 persons close to the Liberals were appointed over the first fifteen months of the Chrétien government: former candidates; a nephew of the Prime Minister; a fundraiser for the party; an organizer, and mostly, more than 15 defeated candidates who have all been generously rewarded for services rendered to the Liberal Party, out of the public purse. This is the function of crown corporations.

The recent appointment of Jacques Saada, Liberal candidate defeated in La Prairie, is one of the most obvious examples of patronage. Mr. Saada, who is a friend of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was hired to implement a communication plan for CIDA.

Since Mr. Saada is a translator by trade, we have a hard time figuring out where he acquired the experience and the expertise required to prepare a communication plan for CIDA. Moreover, his contract amounts to a tidy $99,150 for one year. What a coincidence. It is just under the $100,000 limit over which the government has to call for tenders, in which case Mr. Saada would likely not have won because of his lack of experience and expertise in that area. The name is Saada.

Sometimes we have difficulty understanding when friends are involved. We can easily forget their names, but I am glad to remind the House of it. That explains the importance they wanted to give to the bill. These are the savings to be made. But fundamentally there is nothing changed. Friends of the government will continue to be appointed to the boards of large crown corporations et large para–governmental corporations. They could at least have done things differently.

Many of those large agencies, and this is another feature of this bill, have an impact on the taxation of provinces and many of those agencies and boards in the bill definitely have an impact. Nowhere in the amendments proposed by the government are provinces consulted nor do they take part in the decisions which are taken. This is why we have proposed an amendment, a motion. That is Motion No. 16 that I moved, seconded by my colleague for La Prairie, which reads: "That Bill C–65, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 17, with the following:"

The board members I spoke about earlier should be appointed by the minister to hold office during pleasure, but not in a discretionary way; they should be appointed by the minister following consultation with the government of each province, since these corporations have an influence on the administration of the provinces, and with the approval of the governor in council and, moreover, of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry.

If we want to practice openness to improve the situation, if we want to fundamentally change what is not working properly, we must be straightforward and honest and deal with the real problems.

I hope this amendment will be supported not only by my colleagues of the opposition, but also by my Liberal friends across the way.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to the bill and to respond to some of the comments made by the members of the Bloc Quebecois and the member for Elk Island.

The amendment moved by the member for Carleton—Gloucester is a constructive amendment which the government accepts. It is the kind of amendment which contributes to the nature of the bill in recognizing that regional interest must be served.

• (2220)

We do not think, however, that regional interest should be served specifically in the bill on a national basis. The member for Carleton–Gloucester moved that regional interest be recognized on a local basis in the national capital region. That seems appropriate, but regional representation is only one element of the qualifications for boards and agencies.

In a broader sense the amendments offered by the member for Elk Island and the members of the Bloc Quebecois fall under two categories. The first is that the provinces must play a larger role in appointments. Appointments made by the federal government under federal government legislation should be subject to provincial approval.

The point raised by the member for Elk Island is a very sensible one. This is a cumbersome, costly and time consuming process. Moreover, reciprocity does not exist. The provincial governments do not offer the capacity for the federal government to approve provincial government appointments made by their lieutenant governor in council. Surely some reciprocity on this basis must exist.

In this respect the bill is to simplify federal government agencies. It is part of a process begun in the budget of February 1994. What has occurred since that time is that we have eliminated 150 patronage positions with the bill. This is the first stage of agency review. The second stage will take place later in the fall and it will eliminate 350 so–called patronage positions.

When we look at the total numbers, this is the first time I can recall since the second world war that there has been any reduction in patronage positions. This is a radical reduction and it is something to be commended.

The member for Joliette said that the reduction amounts to only $4 million. I am sure the member for Elk Island will agree that this is not a meagre amount. It is a significant contribution and it is a pattern for the process the government is going through under agency review and in the budget itself.

In terms of the standing committees the Bloc amendments tend to emphasize the need for standing committees to approve of the appointments. The standing orders currently allow committees to review appointments made by the governor in council to non–judicial bodies.

We are not seeking to revise the parliamentary system in the bill. Certainly in terms of standing committees there may need to be in the future some revision in the work they do. However, in this bill we are working to simplify, we are working to do it quickly, and we are working to deal with what we have now. In that respect the amendments offered are not constructive at this time.

I emphasize that this is a bill to simplify government, to make it more efficient, and to fulfil the aims we have expressed in the red book and in the budget.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division stands deferred. This also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 13 stands deferred.

• (2225)

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C–65, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 2, with the following:

"the Corporation consisting of two directors, not including the Chairperson and the pres–".

He said: Mr. Speaker, once again we have the challenge of persuading the government members since they outnumber us. In the next few moments I will try to persuade them to our point of view.

This motion specifically concerns the CBC and its board of directors. We are all aware that Bill C–65 reduces the number of directors from 15 to 12. We have the horse headed in the right direction and somebody will have to slap its rump so that it gets going.

To go from 15 to 12 directors, we barely started doing it. We want to be a little more dramatic in our cutting of the CBC board because we feel the functions it performs could be efficiently carried out by two members, a chairman and the president.

It is unfortunate we do not have full freedom in the House to do whatever we want. Maybe that is okay, it helps to limit us from bizarre decisions. The amendment we would have really liked to make would be that CBC be privatized or sold to private interests.

We think it is time CBC make money for the country, that its shareholders should make a profit and should all pay some taxes instead of taxpayers funding the broadcasting organization.

In saying this I am certainly not speaking against the CBC. I am one of many Canadians who enjoys the CBC and certain parts of its programming. It is not all bad, it is not all useless. It has a lot of very good public service time. Some of its musical programs are excellent.

We object to its being such a sinkhole for taxpayers' dollars. CBC radio operates without commercials and I guess we could argue that if we listen to other radio stations we pay for them through the products we buy. We indirectly pay for the advertising costs those producers incur by advertising on other radio or television stations.

CBC television, on the other hand, has ample advertising. It has such a large share of the market potential. It was in there ahead of the game and taxpayers funded a great deal of hardware for it. They gave it the inroad into many markets not originally viable financially.

Why in the present day of modern technology with very efficient and excellent ways of communicating electronically with people can this organization not now be turned around and made into a profit producing organization?

As long as it stays under government control with government subsidization most likely this will not happen. That is why we favour privatizing the CBC. We believe good solid entrepreneurs could turn it into a real money making machine.

A person who started a small television station out west told me a few years ago that having a television station was like having a printing press to print money. It was very lucrative 20 years ago. He has had difficult times more recently.

We want to support a substantial reduction in the size of the board of directors. If we had had the total freedom to do what we wanted we would have reduced them to zero with the recommendation to privatize. However, we were told that would be outside the limits of this bill and would be ruled as an illegal amendment. So we compromised. We knew we already had them going in the right direction by reducing the number of members from 15 to 12, so we should just take 10 more off and we would be down to two and that would do the trick for now and would give a very clear message as to the direction in which we would choose to go.

• (2230)

We also want to indicate that the CBC, as other crown corporations, must get the message very clearly that they have to become more efficient. They need to operate with lower costs and wherever possible with as large a generation of income as possible. That is the message that goes along with this amendment. It reflects the Reform Party's position that we ought not to be taking by coercion money from Canadians via the medium of taxation in order to fund a particular point of view. We believe that the marketplace would carry that through.

It has been enlightening in the last little while to find that the CRTC has been giving approval to some types of broadcasting companies that before this would not have been considered. So there is that move anyway, and we feel that this would hasten it.

We are the stewards of the money entrusted to us by the Canadian taxpayer. Consequently, in promoting and encouraging support for this motion we are simply strengthening that message. I urge all members opposite, who by their majority have the power to determine how things will be, to think very carefully and do the right thing here.

We know that the deficit and the debt need to be cut. The CBC, with its access to the Canadian taxpayer dollars of over a billion dollars per year, has to undergo a very rapid restructuring.

With that, I simply urge the people to support this amendment and get the show on the road. Let us get that horse moving.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Canadian provinces would greatly appreciate being consulted about the appointments to all agencies mentioned in Bill C–65.

I would like to mention here two of those representatives to whom I wrote recently. Ken Rostad, the Alberta minister for federal and intergovernmental affairs, had this to say: "We appreciated greatly being informed of the suggestions you made in this debate concerning consultation with provincial governments".

Let me quote also Mr. Stephen Kakfwi, the minister of intergovernmental and aboriginal affairs of the Northwest Territories: "We do not oppose this fundamental principle of consultation. If your motions recognize territorial governments for the purposes of consultation, the Northwest Territories government could support those motions".

These quotations speak for themselves.

Concerning Motion No. 2 moved by the hon. member for Elk Island, I have to say we do not support it, because it involves reducing from twelve to four the number of directors on the CBC board. We all know that this kind of board is often a haven for political friends, and that real decisions are made by the chairman and the president and chief executive officer under the approving eye of the minister. Bringing down to four the number of board members, as in the case of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, would risk turning it into even more of select club where, between friends, they would decide on the allocation and use of taxpayers' money.

We have to change that practice and ensure better provincial representation, better representation for Quebec. The number of members on the CBC board of directors has to be kept to twelve, with a fair representation for Quebec.

• (2235)

I would also like to take this opportunity to make a few comments on the three other motions put forward by the hon. member for Elk Island. The Bloc Quebecois is in favour of and supports Motions Nos. 10 and 11 put forward by the Reform member. The Bloc wants to maintain a National Archives of Canada Advisory Board, and to ensure that a committee of the House of Commons composed of two members from the government party and three members from opposition parties be authorized, as required by Motions Nos. 10 and 11, to select seven out of the ten members of this advisory board. That is the price for openness, and we will thus prevent the government from politicizing the operation of this National Archives of Canada Advisory Board.

One could wonder how this kind of advisory council, with such a technical mandate, could have any political influence.

In April 1986, the federal government ordered the destruction of a large part of the archives kept by the Canadian Unity Information Office, which would have helped to determine the rather obscure role the federal government played in the 1980 referendum campaign and the full amount of funds invested beyond what the Quebec legislation allowed.

Nevertheless, since the documentation has been destroyed, we have estimated that the federal government spent about $17.5 million on the NO campaign during the 1980 referendum. An advisory board partially composed of members from opposition parties might have avoided the destruction of these archives, which was done only for partisan purposes, to hide the role Ottawa played in 1980 and the excess amount the federal government invested at that time.

To conclude, I just want to add that we are in favour of amendment No. 8, put forward by the Reform member, which provides for Emergency Preparedness Canada to submit an annual report to the House of Commons.

Three of the four motions moved by the hon. member for Elk Island seek to give Parliament better control over the management of government operations and to allow opposition members to monitor more closely the operations of the National Archives of Canada. We support Motions Nos. 8, 10 and 11.

If Bill C–65 is passed, Emergency Preparedness Canada will come under the Minister of Defence. Emergency Preparedness Canada will no longer be a separate agency for budgetary purposes. Why then should a service under the Minister of National Defence have to table a separate annual report in the House of Commons? We agree that Emergency Preparedness Canada should be accountable to Parliament and the best way to ensure that this happens is to have the agency table in the House of Commons an annual report which would then be directly examined by Parliamentarians. So, we support this motion put forward by the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the comments of the member for Elk Island on the excellence of CBC programming. I share his views in that respect.

The difficulty with this motion by the member for Elk Island is that the proposal to reduce the CBC board of directors from twelve to two plus the president and the chairperson to form the board would in effect render the CBC's programming excellence that we just heard complimented operationally dysfunctional.

Secondly, there is a more technical reason why this amendment cannot be supported by the government. The statutory committee structure of the CBC board of directors would be rendered redundant. Under the Broadcasting Act the corporation has to have two permanent committees on English and French programming, plus an audit committee of at least three directors. With a board of two directors of course these committees would again be operationally dysfunctional. Therefore a subsequent amendment to the Broadcasting Act would be required. Naturally that is a separate exercise from this bill and one we did not intend in the presentation of this bill.

Finally, the regional representation would be dramatically affected. With only two directors it would be impossible to recognize all of Canada's regions and diverse interests and therefore it would completely undermine regional representation.

It is therefore impossible for the government to support this amendment.

• (2240)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Debate is on Motion No. 8, Group No. 3.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C–65, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 8, with the following:

"26. The Act is amended by adding the following after section 6:

"6.1 The Minister may, with the approval of"".

He said: Mr. Speaker, we spoke about the proposed changes to Bill C–65 to reduce the number of members of the board.

Motion No. 8 is a little different. It has to do with the Minister of Public Works and his requirement to oversee emergency preparedness in the country. That is a very important role. In this instance, we feel there is one small change that would be required. I would like to persuade members opposite this time by appealing to the red book.

The red book has become the standard by which we gauge whether or not legislation is effective and whether it is going in the right direction. The red book said there would be more openness, more accountability, and a renewed trust in government. This amendment is very small, but it is in that direction. I do not think it is so dramatic an amendment that members of the Liberal Party could in any way be against it. It does go in the right direction and it does not go so far that they should be frightened by it. It simply requires that the minister report annually on his activities and on the degree of emergency preparedness that is in place. That is a very important aspect for the security of the country, for a country that is ready to deal with emergencies of all kinds, whether they are civil insurrections or natural disasters.

We are simply asking the minister to open up a little and report annually. I do not know whether members know what is involved. For example, the minister has the power to require that the railroads have a one–year supply of fuel on hand, so that if for some reason the normal supplies of fuel are destroyed by some disaster, either natural or through some sort of an act of war, we would still be able to operate our railroads for a reasonable length of time. It is good for Canadians to know what kinds of arrangements the minister has made in this area.

What we are asking is very simple. I plead with members opposite, in order to fulfil the promises of the red book, to vote in favour of the amendment. It would provide a little more openness, a little more accountability, and a little more transparency. It would go a long way in undoing some of the criticism that has been levelled at them in terms of their being secretive and too closed.

I will abbreviate my comments because of the urgency of the day. I will gladly stop speaking in exchange for the commitment of Liberal members to support the amendment.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken most eloquently about the need for transparency

and openness. He has also spoken often in the House of Commons about the word "economy". In the case of this motion the two purposes are in conflict.

• (2245)

I say this with respect to the hon. member's amendment. This motion seems to perpetuate the requirement that the minister lay before Parliament an annual report on the operations of the act.

The rationale for eliminating annual reports is government-wide. It is an attempt to lower costs and is focused on reducing associated preparation costs. We intend to provide new mechanisms such as expanded Part III estimates, and most important, new department outlet documents will be provided to parliamentary committees for this review.

In this case the argument for economy is a very cogent one. There are other means through which transparency and openness will be provided.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 8 stands deferred.

We will move to Group No. 4 with debate on Motions Nos. 10 and 11.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-65, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing lines 10 and 11, on page 13, with the following:

"49. Subsection 9(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:

"9. (1) The Minister shall establish a board to be known as the National Archives of Canada Advisory Board, consisting of the Archivist, the National Librarian, the Director of the Canadian Museum of Civilization and not more than seven other members appointed, from among persons who are experienced in archival matters, by a committee of the House of Commons composed of two members from the government party and three members from opposition parties.""

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-65 be amended by deleting Clause 50.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am having a busy evening but I am still smiling. I have to concede it is somewhat frustrating to have such well thought out amendments, which I sincerely believe are defensible, decided against by the members opposite. It is a bit of a rebuff but I will try to live with it and I will recover by tomorrow. The Liberals now have an opportunity to redeem themselves by supporting Motions Nos. 10 and 11.

The National Archives have a problem. The amount of material to be saved keeps growing. It grows and grows. Until now to dispose of things the administration of the archives had to consult with the members of the board. These members, who are GIC appointments, held the archivists responsible for not destroying records which should be kept.

It is almost like having a Senate, a place of sober second thought, but a real one. It is a case of: "Here is a decision to throw something away. Do you agree?" Perhaps the judgment of one person could be flawed. Perhaps that person could miss something that is important. It would be an advantage to have more people involved to provide for checks and balances against discarding material which others would have the insight to recognize might have value in the future and should be kept.

In this instance the amendment would only require a very small expenditure. It says that the national archives advisory board should not be eliminated entirely. This is a change in the system. Sometimes members of the Reform Party are charged with only wanting to cut, cut, cut. We want to cut in the right places. We want to manage the fiscal affairs of the country so that we do not have cut in areas where cuts are unwarranted. This is one area where we want to retain the powers.

I want to give an example. We presently have in the country and in Parliament a very sharp division on what is important. The members of the Bloc Quebecois are very interested in taking their province out of the country and the rest of us want to keep Canada together.

The individual looking at the archives' records may have a certain historical perspective and even a certain present political perspective. It could cloud the decision of whether certain documents should be kept or destroyed. That is why we are strongly recommending that the decision not be made by an individual, but that there should be consultation involved. This small board would have a very real and very important function.

• (2250)

Consequently I am recommending that the backbenchers in this instance exercise their powers of thinking and cogitation to consider very carefully the argument I have made and notwithstanding anything they have been led to believe earlier today, think of the weight of the arguments and vote in favour to the amendment.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a very important matter.

I believe the member for Elk Island raises some important points about the retention of certain records and the importance of the decision prior to destruction.

Currently the situation is that all proposals for destruction under the care of the archivist must be reviewed internally. There will be an examination of all contractual and legal obligations, the importance of the records in relation to the mandate of the National Archives, and that the National Archives acquisition policy must determine if these specimens or copies are held in other depositories.

I am inclined to agree with the member for La Prairie that it is deplorable that some records have been destroyed in the past which fall within the purview of historical records of importance. It is important that a board of this kind recognize at all times the importance of the historicity of records.

I do not think this amendment responds to that need. The current board of voluntary users effectively scrutinizes historical records. Moreover, the archivist has undertaken to establish a voluntary panel of experts on archives matters which will represent a cross section of interests across Canada, representing users, institutions and archival communities. This board will preserve historical records as is necessary.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8) a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 11.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Human Resources Development) moved that Bill C–54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find in the interests of expediting the business of the House that the time between now and 11.30 p.m. could be divided among the three parties in the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to begin third reading debate on Bill C–54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Allowance Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I am pleased to do so for two reasons. First, as chair of the House of Commons committee on human resources development I had the opportunity to review the legislation in detail when it went through clause by clause consideration. I want to thank the members of that committee on all sides of the House for their careful work in examining the provisions of this sometimes complex and very technical bill.

• (2255)

Second, I thank the officials of the human resources development department, the income security programs division, for their patience in explaining the complex, technical aspects of these programs.

Particularly I thank those groups who came on short notice and made representations to the committee on behalf of seniors and Canadians with disabilities who are most affected by this legislation. I especially to thank the Council of Canadians with disabilities and the one voice, the Canadian Seniors Network, for their valuable contribution to the work of the committee studying Bill C–54.

Second, I am pleased to speak to the legislation as a regular member of Parliament for whom sorting out difficulties with the various components of the Canada pension system is an important part of my regular constituency work.

By and large these difficulties are of two types. First of all, it is financial, questions about the adequacy and the timeliness of benefits, conditions for entitlement, sudden or unexplained

changes to the level of benefits and other matters of that sort that bother the seniors or those who are dependent on this stream of income for their income security.

The second category of difficulties with elements of the Canadian pension system that members of Parliament are frequently called on to deal with are administrative in nature: the mechanisms for applying for benefits, rules pertaining to the delegation, the splitting or the reassignment of pension benefits or credits, appeals dealing with errors and overpayments sometimes which are caused by the bureaucracy, and finally, matters of security and confidentiality.

It is primarily this latter set of concerns that are addressed by Bill C–54. The bill improves services to clients. It allows for improved co–ordination and more efficient program administration and service delivery. It increases the consistency between the old age security and Canada pension plan programs. It also reduces administrative costs. It minimizes duplication and paper burden to clients and various departments, and it will also help members of Parliament to better assist their constituents.

According to estimates by the Department of Human Resources Development, the proposed amendments to Bill C–54 would benefit about 1.4 million senior citizens with no net cost to the taxpayer. Expected savings from the amendments will total approximately $10 million annually, largely as a result of more efficient program administration.

I would like to go through in the time that is available some of the aspects of this legislation for the House this evening. For nearly 1.4 million seniors, many of whom are women, at present they must reapply annually to receive the guaranteed income supplement and spouse's allowance benefits. At that time they must make a statement of income even though the income of many does not change significantly from year to year, being limited to old age security and perhaps Canada pension plan benefits.

Payments for the new fiscal year cannot be made until the application is received and approved. As a result, each April up to 100,000 low and middle income pensioners may suffer hardship when benefits are delayed due to late application or a need to verify the information on the application.

This legislation allows the Minister of Human Resources Development to waive the requirement for annual renewal applications for GIS and SPA benefits for any month or months in the following year. The proposed sections of the bill would require the minister in situations where he or she had waived the requirement for an application to give written notice to the pensioner when a subsequent application was required.

• (2300)

The minister would have to meet certain time limits in this regard. These changes would avoid an interruption in benefits for those pensioners and would improve service and administration. There might also be implications for benefit overpayments and underpayments.

Generally what this legislation does is eliminate the need for inconvenient and costly reapplication when that is not necessary because for the most part the information is already in the possession of the department.

The second category has to do with reconsiderations and appeals. Clause 16 of the legislation allows a person to satisfy, with a decision or a determination relating to the payment or the amount of the benefit, to make a request to the minister within certain time limits for reconsideration of the decision, after which the minister could confirm or vary it.

A person dissatisfied with the minister's decision could appeal it to the Canada pension plan, old age security review tribunal established under the Canada pension plan. Where the basis of the appeal was an incorrect ministerial decision about the income of the applicant, the beneficiary or spouse of either of these, the appeal can be referred to the Tax Court of Canada. This legislation thereby facilitates portions of the appeal process.

Another category is retroactive payments. Clients often apply for OAS–CPP retirement benefits at the same time. If application is made after age 65 retroactive old age security benefit payments are made but the Canada pension plan provides for an actuarial increase in the value of the benefit. The result is that benefits that begin to be paid after age 65 are treated differently by the two programs.

With clause 3 of the bill, the section on the Old Age Security Act, section 2(a), periods of retroactive payments to the two programs would be harmonized. The period would be set at a maximum of one year, a reduction from the present maximum of five years in the case of old age security benefits. In the case of retroactive payments a streamlining takes place as a result of the bill.

In this area the council on disabilities made an important contribution to the legislation which I acknowledge. In this case the council led the standing committee to adopt an amendment to the bill which provides for retroactive, early retirement benefits for some recipients of CPP disability benefits. The provision is intended to mitigate to some extent the loss of income for a person no longer eligible for a disability benefit and to assist that person to reduce the amount of overpayment which must be returned to the program. This provision was always intended to be optional for the client.

The government never intended to reduce the options available to clients but the council pointed out the wording of this provision in Bill C–54 would be construed as requiring the client to take the early retirement pension.

To address the concern raised by the council, the government moved an amendment accepted in the standing committee. The government listened to the concerns expressed by the council and these concerns are now reflected in the revised wording of this provision of Bill C–54.

There were numerous other areas in which amendments were made to the bill in response to the input by these groups representing Canadians with disabilities and seniors affected by this legislation.

The bill, which streamlines in many ways the administration of this legislation, is vital to seniors and to those people dependent on these programs because of the complexity this legislation by necessity has to be designed to accommodate in so many different circumstances. Seniors, many of whom live in isolated communities, cannot afford to have their payments disrupted by administrative processes very often far beyond their understanding.

• (2305)

By working to simplify the legislation and streamline the process for applying, for reconsidering, for splitting, for delegating benefits that apply to seniors and to persons with disabilities through the Canadian pension system, we are helping Canadians facilitate access to this very important aspect of the Canadian safety net.

That is the nature of the changes in Bill C–54. They reflect the government's concern for making this vital component of the Canadian social security system accessible to those who depend on it for their livelihood, for their basic fundamental income security and in that respect enabling seniors in Canada to have a greater assurance and confidence that as they move into their old age they will be able to count on secure and regular support from the Canadian government.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: According to our agreement, the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau now has the floor for 12 minutes.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I had prepared a 40 minute speech, but given the requests of our whips, I agreed to cut down my time on the floor.

I would like to speak to the House regarding Bill C–54 and I will focus on the act to amend the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan. The official opposition proposed several amendments to this bill in order to protect seniors from injustice.

First, in Motion No. 1 we proposed the following amendments. In summary, this amendment by the Bloc Quebecois aimed to keep the appeals processes for the Canada pension plan and the old age security program separate.

What was the answer we received on May 8 to this first amendment we proposed regarding Bill C–54? The Minister of Human Resources Development went on a violent, undignified and even indecent rampage, calling our amendments bizarre, incomprehensible and absurd. According to the minister, I have a twisted mind and I take a perverted pleasure in complicating the lives of seniors.

The minister wound up with the comment that our amendments were the strangest, most bizarre and most incomprehensible amendments that he has seen in a long time in the House. He also mentioned that if I had truly understood Bill C–54, I would not have proposed such absurd amendments. Unfortunately for the Minister of Human Resources Development, he confused Motion No. 2 with subclause 2 of Motion No. 1.

Bill C–54 integrates the appeals process for the Canada pension plan with that of the old age security program. On May 8, when this amendment was introduced in this House, I reported what the attorney general had said: "The two–tiered appeal process for Old Age Security permits the satisfactory settlement of the few cases there are. The process is simple, fast and informal, and cases are heard in the regions where the appellants live".

Furthermore, the auditor general openly criticized the three–tiered appeals process of the Canada pension plan. So, why propose to integrate the two appeals processes and to use the process under the Canada pension plan, which the auditor general deems to be deficient? Clearly, they are not simplifying the appeals process. In what way will this improve client services?

Lastly, the Pension Appeals Board was authorized to appoint temporary members. At the present time, someone who is not satisfied with a decision made under the Canada Assistance Plan has the right to appeal at three different levels.

First level appeals are to the Minister of Human Resources Development. Second level appeals are heard by review tribunals established under the Act. Finally, third level appeals are heard by the Pension Appeals Board. Why change an appeal process which, according to the Auditor General, works well to replace it with a more complicated one?

• (2310)

The Bloc Quebecois disagrees with this streamlining of appeals under the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan because it is not an improvement.

Let us not forget the importance of this amendment since statistics reveal that in 1993–94, there were 23,046 first level appeals, an increase of 0.5 per cent compared to the previous year. Of that number, 83 per cent concern disability benefits. A total of 27,077 appeals were processed during those years.

On Motions Nos. 4, 13 and 15 I supported my colleague for Mercier since the Bloc Quebecois cannot support the provisions of Bill C–54 intended to change access to certain information since the government can increase the number of departments, agencies or even individuals that will have access to information for the purpose of implementing the acts modified by this bill. Agencies having access to information according to the previous act were: the Departments of Revenue, Finance, Supply and Services, Employment and Immigration Commission, Statistics Canada and provincial authorities.

These agencies can have access to the information as long as it deals solely with the entitlement of beneficiaries or the amount of benefits, or if their disclosure is essential to the legislation's application.

When I supported these amendments, I said that we have to be extremely careful when giving personal information on senior citizens since it could be used for other purposes. We have to protect our senior citizens against potential abuse. The government did not prove that disclosing this privileged information was essential and necessary.

I said also that governments are becoming more and more intrusive. This government has the gall to claim that it is a good thing to include Canada Post on the ground that, through the use of new techniques, it could help accelerate the processing of pension cheques.

We noticed time and time again that the government cannot deal with its own administrative problems, and we recently had the best possible example of that when some seniors had trouble getting their income supplement cheques. We cannot condone government intrusion in the private lives of senior citizens and citizens in general.

This major change, even if used in accordance with the present provisions of the Privacy Act, is an intrusion that the Bloc Quebecois cannot accept. Moreover, we proposed in Motions Nos. 5 and 6, amendments which did not seek to remove Clause 23 entirely, but to amend it. For example, they would have kept the one year delay before collecting overpayments and forced the minister to remit the debt in the cases mentioned. For example, in section 37 the one–year statute of limitation is maintained.

The government is incapable of dealing with these matters within a reasonable time frame. The abolition of this clause, which accordingly does away with the limitation or claim on the overpayment, is an obvious example of the government's loss of control.

I repeat here the remarks of the auditor general in his report to the effect that pension fund overpayments amount to between $120 million and $220 million a year. He said: "Past efforts to prevent and detect overpayments have been minimal and largely ineffective". I am quoting the auditor general's report for 1993, at page 486.

The auditor general also indicated that over 90 per cent of appeals concerned applications for disability benefits under the Canada Pension Plan.

• (2315)

Does the provision that would permit the minister to stay benefits during the appeal process together with the increase in the number of unjustified appeals by the department not in fact cover up a shameful way to reduce overpayments?

Clearly, at some point or other, many old people will be faced with administrative errors by the government. They may have received money they were not entitled to, without necessarily realizing it. How can seniors repay a significant amount all of a sudden and budget accordingly?

That is why the Bloc Quebecois proposed, in order to remedy this situation, that the one year limitation on overpayments that are not the result of fraudulent acts be imprescriptible so as to force the government to improve management of the program and to not unduly penalize seniors, who could have to pay back significant amounts a number of years after an error was made.

Bill C–54 provides that, in these cases, the minister may "remit". We have proposed there be no discretionary power in the above cases, to protect the interests of seniors. I have also proposed in Motion No. 12 the following amendment, which is of prime importance: "That Bill C–54 be amended by deleting Clause 38", which reads as follows:

> "Where a decision is made by a Review Tribunal or the Pension Appeals Board in respect of a benefit, the Minister may stay payment of the benefit until the latest of [three dates]".

The amendment proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, the official opposition, is intended to not allow the government to stay payments during appeals, because these appeals are the result of the government's inability to manage these programs. I assume the Minister of Human Resources Development also finds this amendment bizarre. How do we tell seniors that they may enjoy their rights, but are not entitled to receive the money they need to live on during the proceedings?

I made a presentation on seniors' incomes when I introduced my motion on May 8. Clearly they are not rich. I conclude here with the question, why must we insist on reducing the deficit on the backs of the most disadvantaged, on the backs of seniors? I repeat my question to the Minister of Human Resources Development.

[*English*]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the House tonight to speak to Bill C–54, an act to amend several social programs, including the Canada pension plan.

Tonight I would like to speak in some detail about the Canada pension plan, the amendments proposed to it in the bill, and more generally about the policy direction of the Liberal government and the minister on CPP.

The bill is nothing more than administrative housekeeping. It is designed to improve minor flaws in the current system, but it ignores, as the government has ignored, the very severe problems our social programs face.

The Canada pension plan is a nightmare. The unfunded liabilities of the plan rival our national debt. Those liabilities were estimated to be $491 billion in 1993. That is $491 billion that must either be taxed from future generations, our children and our grandchildren, or it may mean that seniors will have to forgo some of their benefits. Neither scenario is pleasant.

The Superintendent of Financial Institutions reported in February that CPP will be out of funds in just 20 years. Realistically, we have very little time to act to correct the situation. We have been here a year and a half, yet the Liberal government has offered us only a bill written by the bureaucracy for the bureaucracy.

In the past year CPP ran its first deficit, seemingly a small amount in comparison to the many billions of dollars of benefits paid out. The government dipped into the contingency fund for $650 million.

• (2320)

Suddenly the bureaucracy woke up. Even though the contingency fund is over $40 billion, the not so astute central planners had invested all the funds in 20–year loans to the provinces with low interest. As anyone can see, this means that only approximately $2 billion is actually liquid in any given year. Therefore, last year panic set in as human resources development bureaucrats suddenly realized that one–third of the available cash in the contingency fund was going to be used up meeting benefit obligations.

The story does not end here, however. Benefit payouts are projected to increase faster than premiums can be collected. In the next few years we may face a crisis as deficits climb past the point of sustainability. Change must come quickly if we are to preserve the integrity of the social programs for those who depend on them.

Many Canadians are confused about the reasons the Canada pension plan is not financially sustainable. It is really quite simple. Unlike private pension plans or other savings plans, the premiums paid are not invested and then returned to the individual with interest upon retirement. Rather, the premiums paid are used to fund current beneficiaries, with a small portion going to the contingency fund. This would not be a totally unreasonable situation if the demographics of the population never changed. Canada has an aging population. An increasingly higher percentage of the population depends on CPP for their retirement. Correspondingly, a lower percentage of Canadians are left in the workforce to fund the retirees. This situation will only worsen as the baby boom generation reaches retirement age.

If members think this plan sounds irresponsible, I agree with them. I imagine that most members on that side of the House have no problem with this. After all, the Liberals have done exactly the same thing with their budget. They overspend today, taking on debt that future generations will have to pay back. They force future generations to pay for this generation. Some might even call this financial abuse of children.

The Canada pension plan is no different. Today's working mothers and fathers are directly subsidizing today's retirees, and our children and grandchildren will be forced to subsidize us. Based on the current projections there will be no CPP for my children and grandchildren. It will only exist for this self–serving generation. Serious reforms are necessary and are needed immediately to fix this problem. However, we have a lack of leadership from this government.

There are some good improvements proposed in Bill C–54 for the Canada pension plan. There is some streamlining of the appeals process, a possible reduction in overpayments to recipients. There is simplification in the delegation of authority, simplification of the division, reinstatement and assignment of benefits. These are good and worthy benefits to be approved by this House. It will help Canadians and reduce a few costs, but it fails to deal with the most important aspect of pension reform. It fails to deal with the imminent bankruptcy of the system.

What good are administrative reforms like those in Bill C–54 if the whole system goes bankrupt? It does not make any difference how quickly a pensioner receives his cheque if the amount is zero dollars and zero cents. The government of the day would probably wish its system were not quite so efficient if it is going to be sending out cheques like that. This bill represents a baby step when a giant leap was needed.

The priority of this government should be to put CPP on a firm financial footing. A proposal the government seems to keep floating is that premiums should continually increase to fund deficits in the plan. This is plainly unacceptable to a large majority of Canadians. It is no different from increasing taxes, and Canadians have said they are taxed to the limit.

Another suggestion is to cut benefits. There may be some savings to be found in the myriad of benefits paid out, as I will point out in a minute, but these savings will not fundamentally alter the main problem, which is that the plan is actuarily unsound.

We plainly cannot cut benefits to those retirees who currently depend on them, and it would be cruel to cut them significantly for those who are about to retire. The only persons we can cut future benefits for are those who have enough time left before retirement to make alternate arrangements.

• (2325)

I would like to tell of two different constituents of mine who have come to me with stories of problems they have experienced with CPP. The first constituent complained to me about waste in the survivors benefits category, commonly known as widows and orphans benefits. My constituent was concerned that after marrying a widowed woman and adopting her two children the survivors benefits continued to flow. He had to pursue his case through the department all the way up to the minister to get the benefits cut off.

Why is this unacceptable situation continuing to the present day? Clearly if one is no longer a widow or an orphan they should no longer collect a widow's or orphan's benefit. Savings to be found in this area may be in the millions of dollars.

Another constituent complained to me about the overly high benefit payout she is receiving from CPP for her retirement. This constituent had paid in a grand total of $143 in premiums over her lifetime, yet is receiving monthly benefit cheques of $25. Although $25 a month or $300 a year does not seem to be an amount that will bankrupt the plan, think what overpaying many other Canadians hundreds or thousands of dollars a year does to our balances. It is unsustainable and cannot be justified. We must make the plan actuarially sound and financially stable for those who have to depend on it.

The Reform Party has promised to be a constructive alternative in Parliament, and on this issue, like most others, we have laid out our plan. We believe that our approach must be financially sustainable, fair, promote individual responsibility, and must help relieve government of its massive fiscal problems.

We believe that the registered personal savings plans coupled with registered retirement savings plans are a large part of the solution for Canada's working generation. We laid out our plan in our taxpayers' budget prior to the release of the federal budget. We detailed how Canadians would be encouraged to plan for their own retirement without government interference or financial bungling. We showed how individuals could make choices that best suit their needs and we showed how it could be done without incurring additional liabilities for the government.

Reformers demonstrated leadership in the area of pensions and the Liberals have yet to move on the issue. Yet it is the Liberals who have the power to effect the changes necessary to save these programs. If the Liberals refuse to act then I believe the Canadian people will choose leaders who will bring the needed reform, and I believe they will choose Reformers to do that job.

In closing, I want to read the comments of another member from another debate on a similar bill from the last Parliament, which only tinkered with the Canada Pension Plan and failed to effect any meaningful change. I quote:

"I simply want to use this opportunity to draw the attention of members and hopefully of the government or a future government to the fact that the reform of the pension plan system has to go beyond just tinkering, fixing some immediate problems. We may have to come to grips with a lower level of pension benefits that will be available as each generation of Canadians reaches retirement age. I would suggest that the problem is that we should be projecting the profile of what our Canadian population will look like 10, 15, 20 years down the road and designing our CPP to meet that problem so that future legislators will not have to scramble to face a much broader problem or large scale insecurity because we at the present time did not exercise our responsibility of stewardship to make sure that there would be enough of a benefit base to satisfy those needs. Similarly, I also find it of concern that the number of real problems that have been identified in the implementation and administration of the Canada Pension Plan are not being fully addressed in this bill."

The comments were made by none other than the author of this present tinkering bill, the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The leadership and changes the Canadian voters are so desperately looking for will have to wait until the next federal election, when Reform will form the government.

• (2330)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2345)

And the bells having rung:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the table informs me we would now normally be voting on third reading of Bill C–54. However, given that most members are under the impression we will be voting first on ways and means Motion No. 29, I think you would find unanimous consent that we commence with voting on ways and means Motion No. 29 and then follow on the order and terminate with third reading stage of Bill C–54.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

EXCISE TAX ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

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

(Division No. 319)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chan
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godin
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mercier
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Reilly
Paré
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Proud
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Caron
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Langlois
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—198

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Forseth
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Williams—37

Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Epp
Frazer
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West)

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

● (2355)

During the taking of the vote:

Mr. Malhi: Mr. Speaker, I vote with the government.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The first question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on Motion No. 1 will also apply to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

[*Translation*]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 will obviate the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 2 and 5. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 1 will necessitate the question being put on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find that there is consent that the members who voted on the previous motion, as well as the hon. member for Bramalea—Gore—Malton, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. The Liberal members will vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc members vote against this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote no on the motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 320*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock	Campbell	Catterall
Allmand	Anawak	Chamberlain	Chan
Anderson	Arseneault	Clancy	Cohen
Assad	Assadourian	Comuzzi	Copps
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Cowling	Culbert
Bakopanos	Barnes	DeVillers	Discepola
Beaumier	Bellemare	Dromisky	Duhamel
Bethel	Bevilacqua	Dupuy	Easter
Bodnar	Bonin	Eggleton	English
Boudria	Brushett	Fewchuk	Finestone
Bryden	Bélair	Finlay	Flis
Caccia	Calder	Fontana	Fry
		Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
		Gallaway	Gerrard
		Godfrey	Goodale
		Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
		Grose	Guarnieri
		Harb	Harvard
		Hickey	Hopkins
		Hubbard	Ianno
		Iftody	Irwin
		Jackson	Jordan
		Keyes	Kirkby
		Knutson	Kraft Sloan
		Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
		Lee	Lincoln
		Loney	MacAulay
		MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
		Maheu	Malhi
		Maloney	Manley
		Marchi	Marleau
		Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
		McCormick	McGuire
		McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
		McTeague	McWhinney
		Mifflin	Milliken
		Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
		Mitchell	Murphy
		Murray	Nault
		O'Brien	O'Reilly
		Paradis	Patry
		Payne	Peric
		Peters	Peterson
		Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
		Pillitteri	Proud
		Reed	Richardson
		Rideout	Ringuette-Maltais
		Robillard	Rock
		Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
		Serré	Sheridan
		Simmons	Skoke
		St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
		Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
		Telegdi	Terrana
		Thalheimer	Torsney
		Ur	Valeri
		Vanclief	Verran
		Walker	Wappel
		Wells	Whelan
		Wood	Young
		Zed—145	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Althouse	
Asselin	Bachand	
Bellehumeur	Benoit	
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	
Blaikie	Bouchard	
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	
Bridgman	Brien	
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Bélisle	
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)	
Crête	Cummins	

Dalphond–Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Riis
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—90

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St–Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

• (2400)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33 inclusive carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 321*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Bachand
Bergeron
Blaikie
Brien
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—53

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond–Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
McLaughlin
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Riis
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hayes

Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Williams
Young

Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Johnston
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Simmons
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood
Zed—182

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find that members who voted on the previous motion should be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc Quebecois votes no on this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes, except for those who may wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes no on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 322*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Forseth
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Williams—37

Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Epp
Frazer
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West)

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chan
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Daviault
Deshaies
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélisle
Calder
Caron
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen
Copps
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
DeVillers
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English

Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—198

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would again find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote nay on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 323*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Mercier
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—49	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak

Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringuette-Maltais	Robillard
Rock	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—186

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc Quebecois is also against this motion, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members vote yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 324*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Althouse
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Johnston	Manning
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Riis	Schmidt
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Paradis	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Richardson
Rideout	Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—194

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

• (2405)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 11.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 8 to be applied to the motion now before the House, as well as applied to report stage Motion No. 15.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 322.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost. I also declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 9 to be applied to the motion now before the House.

I think there would also be unanimous consent to apply the same vote to Motion No. 19 and, in reverse, to Motion No. 25.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motions Nos. 14 and 19.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 323.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 14 and 19 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 20.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pay particular attention as this is different from what was anticipated. I think you would find consent for the result of the vote on ways and means Motion No. 29 to be applied to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 319.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 21.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 10 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 324.*]

• (2410)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 1 in reverse to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 325*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Althouse
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Riis
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—90

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peters
Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Peric
Peterson

Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—145

Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 7 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 321.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 23 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 24.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

Perhaps I could indicate that I believe you would find consent to apply that result in reverse to report stage Motions Nos. 16 and 18.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members will all vote no, even those who would have liked to support the motion.

Some hon. members: Ah, ah.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no on Motion No. 24, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. On Motions Nos. 16 and 18 they will vote in reverse as the government whip stated.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yes and agrees to the application of the other two votes as suggested by the whip of the government party.

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was agreed to on the following division):

(*Division No. 326*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan

Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—149

Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—86

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 25.

(The House divided on the Motion No. 25, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 327)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes

Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock

Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Johnston
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rompkey

Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Williams
Young
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Simmons
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood
Zed—186

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Daviault
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—49
Bachand
Bergeron
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent
Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 25 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 328)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Daviault
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—86

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi

Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—149	

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 16 lost. Accordingly Motion No. 17 is also lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 18.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 328.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 lost.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in and read the second time.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 1 to be applied to the motion for concurrence.

• (2415)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 320.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at the third reading stage of Bill C–82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you find unanimous consent to apply the result taken on report stage Motion No. 1 of Bill C–91 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 320.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

[*Translation*]

The first question is on Motion No. 1. The vote on Motion No. 1 will also apply to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 9 of Bill C–91 to the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 323.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16 lost.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 20 of Bill C–91 to the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 319.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the division on report stage Motion No. 8 of Bill C–91 to the motion now before the House.

• (2420)

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 322.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of report stage Motion No. 24 of Bill C–91 in reverse to report stage Motion No. 8 now before the House as well as to report stage Motion No. 10. If you were to reverse that again you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of concurrence at report stage of Bill C–65.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 328.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 8 and 10 lost. Accordingly I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 326.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada pension plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on third reading of Bill C–54.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 24 of Bill C–91 to the motion now before the House.

I thank my colleague whips of the other parties, including the New Democratic Party, for their kind assistance tonight.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 326.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 12.25 a.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 12.25 a.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 22, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board to the governments of the United States and Canada for the period October 1, 1993 to September 30, 1994, and the 1994 state of Canada's forests annual report.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, there has been a delay in the receipt of the documents this morning. Perhaps we could revert to tabling of documents after the presentation of petitions. I expect the response to petitions to arrive momentarily.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Duncan: Madam Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to table, in both official languages, the joint report of the ad hoc parliamentary committee on light stations.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I have just returned from a conversation with the government whip about another matter and I did not hear what happened with respect to petitions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We have not reached that point.

[*Translation*]

SAFETY IN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this morning I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the report by the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act Review Commission.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. In this 15th report, dealing with the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Program, the committee makes a series of recommendations to the National Transportation Agency, the Department of Transport, and the Treasury Board.

• (1005)

Appended to this report is the dissenting opinion by the official opposition containing the two following recommendations. I quote: "That the Department of Transport assess the impact on employment of abolition of the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance (ARFA) subsidy. The government should then emphasize job creation programs in the affected regions in a way that reflects the Department's findings".

There is also a second recommendation: "That the government review the amounts allocated under the 1995 Budget as compensation for abolition of freight subsidies, so that the assistance provided represents the same compensation:subsidy ratio for the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Program".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint–Denis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, dealing with refugees, immigration and gender. In recent months, the committee has considered the extent to which gender can prevent women from obtaining refugee status in Canada.

[*English*]

Our report encourages ongoing sensitization of those involved in the refugee selection process and considers how to reduce the systemic barriers which deny women an equal opportunity to obtain protection in this country.

[*Translation*]

In closing, I would like to thank all the members of the committee, as well as the staff of the House, for their contribution to this report.

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois is tabling a minority report dealing with refugee status claims made for gender related reasons, as was proposed by the Bloc Quebecois members of the committee.

[*English*]

Even now we agree with the main orientation of this majority report. We cannot agree on its contents because it is too vague in the wording and too weak.

[*Translation*]

In particular, we cannot agree with the immigration tax. We would also like gender to be included in the legislation as a sixth prohibited ground for discrimination against women.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food examining the impact of the elimination of the Western Grain Transportation Act, the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act, the Maritime Freight Rates Act and the Feed Freight Assistance Act.

The report is entitled "Dismantling the Crow: Curbing the Impacts".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food have appended a dissenting report to the report that my colleague from Malpèque has just tabled. We wanted to table a dissenting report in order to highlight the inequity that now exists between western and eastern farm producers in Canada.

One thing we pointed out was discrepancies in the abandonment of rail lines. For example, in the west, the public interest is the criterion for closing a line, while in the east, economic cost effectiveness is the criterion. For several reasons of that sort, we had to append a dissenting report.

[*English*]

CUSTOMS ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.): moved for leave to introduce Bill C-102, an act to amend the Customs Act and the customs tariff and make related and consequential amendments to other acts.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

• (1010)

EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-103, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act and Income Tax Act.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): When shall the bill be read a second time?

Some hon. members: Later this day.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-345, an act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act (qualification of directors).

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this private member's bill is to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act to limit to 10 the number of concurrent directorships that one person can hold at any time.

The responsibilities of a director are broad and very serious and as such there must be a point at which one cannot fully discharge those responsibilities without jeopardizing the interest of investors, the company or its employees.

Therefore I look forward to debating the bill with my colleagues in the House.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

BELL CANADA ACT

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–346, an act to amend the Bell Canada Act (construction charges).

He said: Madam Speaker, this bill specifically addresses inequities faced by many rural Canadians and stipulates that telephone service will be provided for customers up to 1,000 metres from existing lines and to recover their construction costs to provide that service only if the service is provided beyond 1,000 metres, and that an upward limit be established for that fee.

It also allows that subscribers be entitled to recoup their costs through rebates of additional customers signing up to the service for a period of up to 10 years.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

COMPETITION ACT

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–347, an act to amend the Competition Act.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to afford consumers protection against sudden, unexpected and unexplained increases in the retail price of gasoline by providing a set notice period in advance of any significant increase at the pumps.

The bill would not regulate gas prices or infringe on the ability of oil companies and retail gasoline distributors to conduct business. It would, however, provide consumers with the means to be made aware through the notification provision by the oil companies to the Minister of Industry within 30 days of the an impending increase in the price of gasoline over the 1 per cent current price, when the increase will take effect and the reason or reasons for the increase.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

• (1015)

PETITIONS

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and the privilege to present to the House a petition certified correct by the clerk of petitions.

My constituents humbly pray and call upon Parliament to do two things: to immediately direct available moneys toward the funding of agencies and services to provide assistance to the increased number of people coming forward whose lives have been affected by sexual abuse or assault; and second, to immediately undertake a thorough review of the court and judicial processing of crimes involving sexual violence.

[*Translation*]

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral (Laval–Centre, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is with confidence that I table today a petition signed by some 1,600 voters, mostly of Armenian origin.

The petitioners request that now, eighty years after the genocide of the Armenian people, the Government of Canada, like the legislative assemblies of Quebec and Ontario, officially condemn the atrocities committed against their people early in this century. On their behalf, I therefore ask Parliament to show leadership in defending democratic principles and human rights.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present today on behalf of the people of Medicine Hat.

The first calls on Parliament to support laws that severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of a crime and to support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions that recognize and protect the rights of law–abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms.

DEFINITION OF FAMILY

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the second petition calls on Parliament to oppose legislation that would directly or indirectly redefine family, including the provision of marriage and family benefits to those who are not family as designated in the petition.

REFORM PARTY

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the third petition calls upon Parliament to preserve Canadian unity, parliamentary tradition, and to protect the rights of all people of Canada by prevailing upon the Speaker of the House of Commons to recognize the Reform Party of Canada as the official opposition during the remainder of the 35th Parliament.

In this they have my wholehearted concurrence.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I would ask members to be brief. We have only 15 minutes allocated to petitions. Forming personal opinions is part of debate.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wish to table a petition signed by the constituents of Lambton—Middlesex, duly certified by the clerk of petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners call upon Parliament not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality.

CANADA POST

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting three petitions.

The first one calls upon Parliament to request the federal minister responsible for Canada Post to consider bringing in legislation requiring all unsolicited mail and flyers to use recyclable materials and amend the Canada postal act so that Canada Post will have to comply with no flyer signs at personal residences.

DIVORCE ACT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, my second petition calls on Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to include a provision similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code, which states that in no case may a father or mother, without serious cause, place obstacles between the child and grandparent, and failing agreement between the parties the modalities of the relations are settled by the court.

RAILWAYS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, the third petition is very large, collected by the UTU, and calls on Parliament to be fully aware that they are strongly opposed to any initiatives to sell or merge CN or CP Rail or to dismantle CN Rail by way of the disguise of the commercialization of CN Rail.

[*Translation*]

CANADA EMPLOYMENT CENTRES

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table a petition signed by over 1,000 persons in the constituency of Gaspé. The member for Gaspé is absent because there has been a death in his family.

• (1020)

This petition is a foretaste of a general outcry because it is strongly critical of the government's current reform of Canada Employment Centres, and urgently requests an overall evaluation of the repercussions of that restructuring on the regions, as well as implementation of that restructuring to reflect specific regional characteristics.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to table five petitions signed by people from the counties of Lunenburg, Queens, and Shelburne in my riding of South Shore in Nova Scotia.

Two petitions containing a total of 131 signatures oppose the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act and the extension of the privileges heterosexual couples enjoy to same sex couples.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): I have two petitions containing a total of 92 signatures opposing assisted suicide.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): The final petition, Mr. Speaker, contains 35 signatures and supports the protection of human life at the pre-born stage.

DIVORCE ACT

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions.

The first calls upon the House to amend the Divorce Act to include provisions similar to article 611 of the Quebec civil code and to amend the Divorce Act to give grandparents who are granted access to a child the right to make inquiries and to be given information as to the health, education, and welfare of the child. This petition is signed by roughly 100 constituents.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): The second petition calls upon Parliament not to amend the human rights code or the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation. This petition is signed by approximately 100 constituents.

[*Translation*]

VOICE MAIL

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Madam Speaker, allow me, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to table petitions from the constituency of Argenteuil—Papineau, the constituency of the Prime Minster, and the constituency of many citizens of the province. These petitions contain 835 signatures and come from two groups: the Association féminine d'éducation et d'action sociale (AFEAS), and the Association des retraités de l'enseignement du Québec (AREQ). These petitioners are opposed to the introduction of voice mail for senior citizens.

[*English*]

CUSTOMS

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions.

The first one is signed by a number of residents from the community of Don Mills, Ontario, which is in Toronto. It calls upon Parliament to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale, and manufacture of killer cards and to advise producers of killer cards that their product, if destined for Canada, will be seized and destroyed.

CRTC

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): The second petition, Madam Speaker, is signed by people in the communities of Trenton, Belleville, and Frankford, Ontario. They call upon Parliament to ensure that the CRTC recognizes that Canadians do not need to be shocked to be entertained and that foul language, excessive violence, and explicit sex are not necessary on television to provide quality entertainment.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Finally, Mr. Speaker, from residents of the community of Simcoe, Ontario, I have a petition calling upon Parliament to pass legislation that would remove section 745 from the Canadian Criminal Code.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, today I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of residents of the Vancouver area. This petition reflects the deep concern of a great number of Canadians.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that provide for the inclusion of the phrase of sexual orientation.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have here a petition of which I am very proud. The petitioners are young people from three schools in my constituency: École Lavallée, Windsor Park Collegiate, and Nelson McIntyre Collegiate.

These young people recognize that Quebec is a founding partner of Canada, that Quebec is unique in several regards including language, culture, population and size, and that Quebec enriches the lives of all Canadians.

They also recognize that, despite the divergent views we have heard for years, we have always been able to accommodate each other. They recognize that a separation would diminish the quality of life for all Canadians, including young people, and could jeopardize their future. They are therefore asking parliamentarians to work very hard for a united Canada. They do not want adults to make decisions that would be harmful to them.

• (1025)

[*English*]

VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is with respect to violence.

The petitioners recognize that there has been some gain in this area, but that unnecessary violence and abuse of all forms, be it verbal, physical, or other, in society in general has become a growing concern to all Canadians. They believe that abuse and violence is not necessary to educate, inform, or entertain. These petitioners ask government, by way of the CRTC or other mechanisms, to regulate it on television and in other situations. These petitioners applaud the gains but they want more.

[*Translation*]

RECOMBINANT BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table in this House a petition from a group of over 500 readers of the magazine *Vie et Lumière* indicating their opposition to the introduction of recombinant bovine somatotropin, a hormone.

In addition, I am personally opposed to the introduction of this hormone, which, in my opinion, should never—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, but personal comments are part of debate and are not allowed following the tabling of a petition.

[*English*]

CANADIAN FORCES BASE CALGARY

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of the citizens of the city of Calgary.

These citizens are concerned about the proposed closure by the government of CFB Calgary. They point out that for a number of economic and equitable reasons this is not a good decision and call upon Parliament to refrain from closing CFB Calgary.

[*Translation*]

NORTHERN QUEBEC

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table in the House two petitions containing the signatures of several thousand voters in the constituency of Charlevoix.

In the first petition, the petitioners are asking the government to change municipalities in the regional county municipalities of Charlevoix–est and Charlevoix–ouest from area 16 in north central Quebec to area 25 in northern Quebec, for the purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility.

Since most jobs available in area 16 are seasonal, the petitioners are asking to be made part of area 25, which is better adapted to the kinds of jobs they are seeking.

LA MALBAIE EMPLOYMENT CENTRE

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners ask the government not to downsize the staff at the employment centre in La Malbaie, which would have the effect of jeopardizing the services provided.

Like most regional offices, the office in La Malbaie is crucial to the population of what some people wrongly describe as—

[*English*]

ALCOHOL

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present today on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre.

The first petition concerns the use of an illegal defence that has become known as the drunk defence. The petitioners believe that in committing the act of choosing to consume alcohol the individual must also accept all the responsibility for their actions while under the influence.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the second petition involves section 718.2 of Bill C–41.

The petitioners are concerned that naming some groups in legislation will exclude other groups from protection and that sentencing based on the concept of hatred is very subjective and will undermine our justice system.

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the final group of petitioners are requesting that the Government of Canada not amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners are troubled about defining the phrase sexual orientation. They have a legitimate concern—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, I have to ask members to be brief.

[*Translation*]

EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and the privilege to table petitions signed by 97 persons opposed to euthanasia and assisted suicide.

[*English*]

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, my first petition asks that this Parliament ensure that the present provision of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be vigorously enforced and that Parliament make no changes in the current law.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the second petition asks that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to give this protection.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the third petition asks that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act, or the charter of rights and freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

WITNESS RELOCATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the last petition asks that Parliament enact Bill C–206 at the earliest opportunity so as to provide statutory foundation for a national witness relocation and protection program.

CURRAGH RESOURCES

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have several petitions here.

The first petition is from residents of Faro, Yukon, who did not receive vacation pay, severance pay, or pay in lieu of notice when the firm Curragh Resources was declared bankrupt.

• (1030)

Therefore, the petitioners request that the Minister of Human Resources Development investigate the situation and take the necessary steps to ensure that this worker and other workers who are laid off do not have severance packages, including earnings in the final calculation of UI benefits.

FORESTRY

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second petition is from a number of residents of the Yukon who are concerned that the harvest levels of Yukon forests are not economically or environmentally sustainable. They petition Parliament to mandate an immediate return to traditional timber harvest levels in the Yukon.

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, the third petition regards BST. The petitioners from different communities in the Yukon suggest that Parliament desist from passing legislation legalizing the use of BST or rbGH in Canada.

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Madam Speaker, the final petition which I wish to present urges the government to table amendments to the Criminal Code to prevent the use of extreme intoxication as a defence in cases of assault.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the Calgary, Alberta area.

The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for pre–school children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by numerous residents of Kingston and the Islands who call on Parliament to refrain from taking any action involving recognition of the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia until such time as its government renounces the use of the name Macedonia, removes objectionable language from its constitution, abandons the use of symbols implying territorial expansionism, ceases hostile propaganda against priests and adheres fully to the norms and principles of the Organization for Security and Co–operation in Europe.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Questions Nos. 175 and 190 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 175—**Mr. Grubel:**

Concerning the announcement in the last budget of a decrease in the number of civil servants by 45,000, what number of these positions are expected to be eliminated by (*a*) not refilling positions which are now vacant, (*b*) the commercialization of government activities like airports, (*c*) early retirement and (*d*) voluntary quits (attrition)?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister Responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): The February budget announced a reduction in the size of the public service and the federal sector as a whole, including the military, separate agencies and crown corporations, as a result of program review. An estimated 45,000 positions will be affected over three years.

The figure 45,000 is not on its own a target but is the result of the government's program review decisions, whereby a number of programs and activities are being reduced, eliminated or re–engineered. It is an estimate based on the overall savings targets established in the budget and the structure of program costs.

During the government's program review some estimates were derived of how the downsizing is expected to unfold, broadly speaking.

For example, about 6,000 jobs will be transferred to the private sector. There will also be some natural attribution through voluntary departures and transfers.

Two separation programs have been put in place to assist organizations to cope with their personnel downsizing: early retirement incentive, ERI, and early departure incentive, EDI. Projected take–up for each program is included in the tentative allocation of projected reductions in personnel set out in the following table.

EDI take-up	13,000
ERI take-up	4,000
Block transfers	6,000
Natural attrition	10,000
Agencies & crown corporations	5,000
Military	7,000
Total	45,000

Question No. 190—**Mr. White (North Vancouver):**

With respect to the unemployment insurance program for the calendar years of 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994, (*a*) how many cases of fraud were reported each year, (*b*) how many convictions for fraud were secured each year, and (*c*) how many frauds were there as a total of overall claims?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Human Resources Development Canada, HRDC, has the option of penalizing unemployment insurance, UI, fraud by imposing an administrative penalty under section 33 of the UI act or by prosecuting under UI act or the Criminal Code of Canada. The vast majority of UI fraud cases are administratively penalized. Prosecutions are initiated only in the more serious or flagrant cases of fraud and in those cases that would have a special deterrent effect.

With respect to UI fraud the control branch of HRDC has provided the following statistics in response to the questions posed.

Cases of fraud each year:

1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
143,070	126,117	154,149	152,563	113,090

Totals include fraud penalized by administrative penalty and by prosecution.

Convictions for fraud in courts of law each year:

2,035	1,254	640	865	525

Fraud as percentage of overall claims:

1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
3.9%	3.2%	4.0%	4.2%	3.9%

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I would also ask that Questions Nos. 109, 167 and 201 be made Orders for Return.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 109, 167 and 201 be deemed to have been made Orders for Return?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 109—**Mr. Mayfield:**

From January 1, 1993 to September 1, 1994, how many people from British Columbia have been appointed to federal government boards, agencies, commissions or Crown corporations and what is the name and city/town of residence of each appointee, the name of the board, agency, commission or Crown corporation to which they were appointed as well as the duration of the appointment?

Return tabled.

Question No. 167—**Mr. Epp:**

With respect to public opinion contracts awarded by the government in the periods between (1) April 1 and December 1, 1994, and (2) December 1, 1994 and the present, (*a*) what was their total cost, (*b*) what is the name of each department requesting the poll, (*c*) the name of the polling company, (*d*) the value of each contract, and (*e*) were any of the contracts awarded by public tender offering and if not, why not?

Return tabled.

Question No. 201—**Ms. Beaumier:**

With respect to the new procedure for determining eligibility requirements for the receipt of the disability tax credit now being employed by Revenue Canada officials, (*a*) why are individuals who received the disability tax credit from 1991 to 1993, and who no longer qualify, required to repay the government of Canada the amount received in those years in full and (*b*) why weren't individuals told that they may have to repay the disability tax credit when it was initially granted to them?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might revert to the Tabling of Documents, as agreed earlier in the Routine Proceedings.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 13 petitions.

* * *

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS MOTIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in the interest of clearing up matters on the Order Paper, I think you would find unanimous consent to allow for the withdrawal from the Order Paper of Ways and Means Motions Nos. 9, 10, 19, 22, 24 and 26. These have all been superseded by events and they are no longer required on the Order Paper. I have consulted with members opposite and I think you would find consent to allow those to be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motions Nos. 9, 10, 19, 22, 24 and 26 withdrawn.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved that Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to address the House at third reading of Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

• (1035)

The issue of MPs' pensions is, of course, of interest to all members of this House and to Canadians in general.

This is an issue that demands leadership. However, in showing leadership, the government and members must carefully consider all aspects of MPs' and senators' remuneration.

The issue itself is complex and contentious, a fact that makes it hard to address in a partial or even a general manner. That said, during its election campaign our government made certain promises it intended to keep once it came to power. The red book emphasized two aspects in particular of the MPs' pension scheme that were to be the subject of reform.

I shall take the liberty of quoting directly an excerpt from page 92 of the red book: "The pension regime of members of Parliament has been the focus of considerable controversy. —We believe that reform is necessary".

Our government has now taken action. The changes we planned to the MPs' pension scheme will be made when Bill C–85 is passed. The red book stated, and I quote: "A Liberal government will reform the pension plan of members of Parliament to end "double–dipping". MPs should not be able to leave office and receive a pension from the federal government if they accept a new full–paying job from the federal government. In addition, we will review the question of the minimum age at which pensions will begin to be paid". The Liberal government had made a commitment to keeping those promises.

[*English*]

However, the government has gone further. It will put into place a number of additional changes that will enhance the needed reform of MP pensions, changes that will provide for former members who have become disabled, equitable support for common law spouses, the option for members of this Parliament to determine their continued participation in this plan, which is a direct result of the request put to the Prime Minister on January 21, 1994 by the Reform House leader on behalf of his party.

Furthermore, a direct savings of millions of dollars due to a 20 per cent reduction in benefits to all MPs will be realized.

[*Translation*]

Let me be clear. This government consulted; this government listened; this government acted. Here are the facts: double–dipping eliminated; minimum age set at 55 years; optional participation offered to MPs in this Parliament; and $3.3 million saved for the government—in other words, 33 per cent lower costs to Canadian taxpayers.

On February 22, 1995, immediately before the Minister of Finance tabled the Budget that would strike a mighty blow to the deficit, the President of the Treasury Board announced that our government intended to reform the MP's pension scheme. He also tabled Bill C–85 on April 28, 1995, and spoke when that bill was tabled for second reading on May 4, 1995. The President of the Treasury Board also testified before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on May 30, 1995. As well, I was given the opportunity of speaking to you when this bill was tabled for third reading.

This debate, which has continued for eight months, has also included a full day of consideration by the House of a motion made on this matter on Opposition Day and, of course, the appearance of expert witnesses before the Standing Committee. Over 20 hours of debate—and I must say it was often tough debate—have been devoted to this bill thus far.

• (1040)

The official opposition has presented some interesting and quite often constructive ideas on this issue, which is a thorny and difficult one.

[*English*]

The third party is engaged in often rancorous debate and highlighted a number of issues that are of importance, particularly the issue of salaries. Because we are in an area of fiscal restraint it is vital to note that Bill C–85 only deals with pensions. We will not and cannot act to raise the salaries and other benefits of members of Parliament at this time.

We will respect the legislated salary freeze on employees and continue to demonstrate leadership in putting Canada's fiscal house in order.

Members of the standing committee heard testimony from expert witnesses, including a taxpayers' group, that had the same theme. The issue surrounding the greater issue of compensation must be addressed, pensions must be reduced and salaries increased.

This was also the viewpoint expressed by the pension experts from the private pension consulting firm, Sobeco, Ernst & Young. It was the same as that of Professor C.E.S. Franks of Queen's University, a member of the Lapointe commission. It was the testimony of a former member of Parliament and actuary, Paul McCrossan. It was supported by Robert Fleming, a former administrator of the Ontario legislature. It was even put forward by the very group that puts hundreds of little plastic animals on the lawn of the House.

This total compensation approach is supported by the government in principle. However, as I mentioned at the outset, in practice we must carefully consider all elements of compensation. Salaries cannot and will not be increased.

At the risk of repeating myself, I will again state that the government has demonstrated leadership by reducing pensions for MPs, by going beyond what it had promised. This will have the net effect of reducing total compensation. Unfortunately this is the reality Parliament must face in today's economic climate.

[*Translation*]

I would now like to focus on the major elements of Bill C–85, and perhaps to correct some of the errors of interpretation that have crept in. I certainly would not want the honourable members on the other side of the chamber to voice their views about the bill without having accurate information.

Bill C–85 restricts double dipping. It will apply to any future appointment, to any renewal of an appointment, and to any contract signed after the date on which the bill obtains royal assent.

Former senators will be subject to this restriction in the same way as former members of this House. The clause on double dipping in Bill C–85 provides that any former member who is receiving a pension will be required to notify the appropriate minister when he starts to hold federal employment or enters into a federal service contract.

The notification will have to be made within 60 days after the date of the appointment or the signing of the contract, and the member will have to report how much he is earning or expecting to earn. Every year he will have to report all sums of money received from the federal government as long as he holds the employment or continues to execute the contract.

[*English*]

Any member whose earnings exceed or are expected to exceed $5,000 annually would have their pensions abated dollar for dollar by the amount of their remuneration. For example, if a member receives $30,000 in pension and earns $45,000 in a federal position, his or her pension will be totally suspended. If the member earns $25,000 he or she would receive $5,000 of their pension. That is because they earned a $30,000 salary.

I am taking the time to illustrate these examples because it is important to note that only federal parliamentary pensions and federal salaries comprise the double dipping provision.

• (1045)

The second component of Bill C–85 I would like to address is the red book commitment of the minimum age. Age 55 will be the minimum age at which former MPs and senators can collect a pension. This government agrees with the age 55 recommendation put forward by the Lapointe commission in the report entitled: "Democratic Ideals and Financial Realities".

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, the third point I would like to raise is that of optional participation.

[*English*]

As I mentioned earlier, within days of entering Parliament, the Reform Party House leader stood before this House and asked the Prime Minister if the government intended to continue to force MPs to participate in the MP pension plan. The Prime Minister's response was to the point: If members do not want to contribute to the pension plan, then administrative arrangements would be made to ensure they would not be part of the plan. Bill C–85 explicitly responds to the Prime Minister's promise to the Reform Party. Members will be provided with the option to choose whether or not they wish to continue to participate in this pension plan.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, there are people shouting over there because they do not like to hear the truth. They prefer exaggeration so that they can make a little political hay. That is what they do when they have problems with the electorate.

[*English*]

I am confident members of the Reform Party will recognize this change adequately reflects what their party has sought. However, I would urge all members including those of the government and the official opposition to carefully consider their personal and family retirement needs prior to making this decision. Political motivation and party discipline should not play a part in this important choice.

This government has a clear view that retirement savings should be supported as they are through the income tax system in providing benefits through RRSPs or registered pension plans by employers providing for the legitimate retirement needs of their employees. The Government of Canada provides pensions for its public servants, the military, the RCMP and we should certainly provide pensions for our parliamentarians.

I would like to put forward some figures which were first presented to the standing committee. I understand they were useful to the committee members for the analysis of this proposed legislation. According to the Statistics Canada 1992 publication "Pension Plans in Canada" only 9 per cent of people who are in employment related pension plans are in plans that match contributions or are similar to RRSP type plans. The remaining 91 per cent are in defined benefit plans which provide a set formula to determine benefits. This type of plan provides better certainty and security for employees and planning for retirement because their ultimate benefits can be anticipated without being subject to the prevailing interest rates at the time the annuity becomes payable.

My colleagues in the opposition are taking great risks. If they continue to make noise, my voice can be much louder than theirs.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, the Statistics Canada publication I just mentioned reveals that in general, in the context of these defined benefit plans, private sector employers contribute about 60 per cent of the costs while in the public sector the employer's proportion is 60 per cent.

Naturally enough, in the case of special plans, the share of the costs assumed by the employer is considerably higher. For instance, in the case of the Canadian Forces the employer's contribution is $2.70 for every dollar contributed by an employee.

I have taken the time to state these facts because I think it is important that we have enough knowledge about private or employer–sponsored pension plans in Canada generally, if we want to evaluate this particular pension plan logically and rationally.

The final element I want to discuss is the question of pension accrual or pension benefit rate. Bill C–85 reduces the benefit rate for members' pensions from 5 per cent to 4 per cent of their annual salary per year of service. This is equivalent to a 20 per cent reduction.

• (1050)

Combined with the introduction of a minimum age, this reduction will make it possible to reduce by 33 per cent the amount the taxpayer contributes to the members' pension plan. This is a significant saving, in line with our government's deficit reduction strategy.

Clearly the government has gone even further than it promised it would in reforming members' retiring allowances. We have markedly reduced the costs that the Canadian taxpayer has to pay.

[*English*]

In addition to outlining the important elements of Bill C–85 I would like to address one concern that I have in effectively communicating the impact of pensions. Private interest groups and members of this House have put forward what I would call, and I want to underline it, misleading information of potential payments to MPs. It is not just government MPs that have been mentioned. The exorbitant amounts reportedly to be paid to young cabinet ministers and long serving MPs are based on misleading and incorrect assumptions.

For example, the 5 per cent inflation assumption is certainly out of whack with what the Department of Finance calculates, which is a standard of 1.5 per cent. Even Reform will understand that there is a difference between 1.5 per cent and 5 per cent.

Additionally to state that a pension figure is based on an MP retiring today and collecting a pension immediately until age 75 fails to recognize the effects of Bill C–85. They fail to recognize it because it is convenient to them. Particular attention should be paid to clause 11 of the bill which will introduce the minimum age of 55. The assumptions also ignore the ministers and MPs are not retiring today. In fact they are making active contributions to the Canadian political landscape and will continue to do so for many years.

It might be useful by way of example to demonstrate the nefarious effects of such outrageous and incorrect assumptions. The price of a $2 loaf of bread considered in future dollars would cost according to these assumptions which include compounding and high inflation $3.20 in 10 years and after 20 years about $5.30. That is the kind of gimmickry we are engaged in. Simply put, these comparisons do not accurately reflect what a former member may receive in pension. They are extremely inaccurate and misleading.

In conclusion, Bill C–85 is an accurate response to the concerns expressed by Canadian taxpayers. They have asked for reduced contribution on the part of government. Bill C–85 delivers a 33 per cent cut in that contribution. Electors have asked that we fulfil our stated commitments in the red book. Bill C–85 does that and goes further.

[*Translation*]

Our public servants, the members of the Canadian forces and other employees affected by the wage freeze are expecting us to respect the same rules as they do.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Before we continue on the debate, I know the subject is emotional for a lot of you. Our constituents, right across this country, are listening. I think they would like to hear what people have to say. Could I ask that we give them that much respect.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to address the House at third reading of Bill C–85 on reform of members' retiring allowances. I rise as the official opposition critic on parliamentary reform.

I would like to say right off that the objective that we in the Bloc Quebecois and the official opposition wished to achieve in the reform was twofold. First, because we shared the concern of all taxpayers in Quebec and Canada, we knew very well that a pension plan that allowed members to collect both pensions and federal civil service salaries could not continue. We also knew that the absence of a specific age limit for qualifying for a pension was unacceptable, because taxpayers were seeing people after just six years of parliamentary service getting an immediate pension at the age of 30 or 35 or 40. It was unacceptable. It was unfair.

• (1055)

So those aspects were our two targets, shared by the taxpayer, and I think that Bill C–85 is confirmation that both have been met.

However, I would like to recall that we tabled an amendment to this bill that was designed to prevent former members who were currently double dipping from continuing to do so. The government preferred not to incorporate our amendment. Instead, the restriction on double dipping will come into effect only when the bill becomes law, thus leaving plenty of government employees drawing both their pension and their salary. I am thinking, among others, of the ambassador to Paris, Benoît Bouchard, who gets both a pension and a salary.

I think it would have been very useful if the government had agreed to make the system fair for everyone immediately.

I would also like to add, in the course of these remarks, that in the end the total value of members' pensions strikes me as a small matter in comparison with a more useful way of recovering money and reducing government expenditure: the abolition of the Senate, the other House. If the $45 million and more that goes on salaries and services for the Senate could have been tackled, we could have saved an enormous amount of money.

One of the distinctive things about the western world is its democratic systems of government. Universal suffrage is indisputably the element in a revolution that at the start of this century allowed a number of western societies to achieve, rapidly, unprecedented economic development and to experience the emergence of the mass consumer society we know today.

However, western democratic society has not eliminated all inequalities, nor does it really hold the promise of a better world where all men and women would be equal, a society where poverty and misery would no longer occur. Social classes continue to exist, with their different levels of wealth, their injustices. We live in the very heart of economic liberalism. If democracy is a synonym for political freedom, it is also the home of economic freedom.

There are members of Parliament in our society, certainly, but there are also professionals, welfare recipients, people without jobs, CEOs of big and small companies, civil servants, tramps. We do not all have the same lot in life. We live in a society with social classes. And it is an illusion to think that everyone is treated equitably.

The debate on members' pensions, in my opinion, serves as a way of avoiding a much more fundamental debate that needs to be held on poverty and power. We have to expose the illusory democracy that screens us from the human misery in our societies. We have to attack the system's real profiteers. There are profiteers in the Canadian parliamentary system, and to focus exclusively on members' pensions, without calling among other things for abolition of the Senate, is serious political irrelevance and evidence of boundless bad faith.

The cost of the parliamentary pension plan is insignificant compared to what has to be paid out of the public purse to maintain Senate appointments and the institution itself.

One of the Reform Party's main election promises was to make cuts in what the party calls the "three Ps": members' pay, pensions and privileges. The Reform Party calculates that a significant reduction in members' pensions would result in savings on the order of $1.5 million over five years.

According to Jean Dion, columnist for *Le Devoir*, "the savings that could be made by slashing members' benefits are hard to calculate".

• (1100)

Following the last election, the pensions to be paid to defeated members were estimated at $109 million over 20 years, or a quarter of 1 per cent of the deficit for 1992–93 alone. Now, the total budget for senators is $42.6 million a year. Over 20 years, if you consider the costs of upkeep for the premises the Senate occupies, the cost to the taxpayer is, by comparison, more than $1 billion.

That is what I would call shameless exploitation of a country's citizens, who pay out of their taxes the salaries and pensions of people they never elected. A senator is a member of a political species that lives off the poor in our society. The Senate is nothing but a pretext for whatever government is currently in power to reward its cronies, be they Tory or Grit.

The Senate is an institution with no democratic legitimacy. Its members are appointed by the Governor General, who by convention acts on the initiative and advice of the Prime Minister, who submits a list of names to him. Because senators are not elected, the official opposition, the Bloc Quebecois, considers the Upper House a political anachronism and convincing proof of the obsolescence of the Canadian federal system.

We in the Bloc Quebecois have grasped that one of the great weaknesses of the Canadian parliamentary system is not the members' pension plan but rather the very existence of a Senate. The existence of the Canadian Senate is a vestige of the traditional elitist form of representation that is supposed in some way to balance the democratic legitimacy of the elected members of the House of Commons.

From 1925 to 1963, the average age of a senator was 69. In 1975 it was 64. A Senate seat, as the whole world knows, is a prize for someone at the end of his career. He will not need to fight to keep his seat, because the salary is guaranteed until he reaches 75. That is what I call a golden retirement. That is what I call the real problem. That is the real scandal of the Canadian parliamentary system and the democratic system in which it has developed.

I think that the government in power, the Liberals, and the Reform Party too, should have gone after the really pointless expenditures. Lacking the courage to attack the Senate, which represents a pointless expenditure, they referred instead to cut members' pensions. We recognize that they accomplished what they set out to do, and that it is an improvement, but as I have shown, the money they hope to recover is just a little more than a million dollars over twenty years.

If we got rid of the Senate, we could save over $42 million a year. The goal of reviewing sessional allowances or members' pensions can never, in any way, be a means of putting the country's finances on a sounder footing, or fighting the deficit, or achieving the great collective ideals of equality and wealth in our sacrosanct democracy. This debate is just something to placate the people, and bills making changes to members' retiring allowances—remember Bill C–270, brought in by the NDP, Bill C–236, brought in by the Liberals, Bill C–208, brought in by the Conservatives—are just ways for this House to assuage its conscience.

On July 20, 1994, the Commission to Review Allowances of Members of Parliament tabled its report. It made the following points: the number of former members receiving a pension is not what is commonly believed. To go by the press, every parliamentarian who ceases to sit gets a retiring allowance. But in fact only half of the members who retired over the past decade received an allowance. Since 1984, only 42 per cent of retirees have received an allowance.

The report goes on to state that the public sometimes has the impression that parliamentarians who retire do so with an excessively large pension.

• (1105)

In fact, most pensions paid to parliamentarians in the past decade were between $10,000 and $40,000. Actually, 57.2 per cent of them are below $30,000 and 90.4 per cent are below $50,000.

"One might also think, the report goes on to say, that a disproportionate percentage of retirement benefits are paid to persons below the age of 55. But this is absolutely not the case since only 13 per cent of retired MPs receiving benefits are below 55".

According to the report, the Canadian parliamentary pension plan is quite comparable to those in other western democracies. Admittedly, this plan is one of the least demanding with regard to the minimum age at which benefits can be collected, but one of the strictest with regard to the contribution rate of the beneficiary; and it falls within the average with regard to the maximum authorized benefit.

As can be gathered from the report of the Commission to Review Allowances of Members, there is no reason to hold a real debate on the matter and it is no secret that the parliamentary discussions about MP pensions are merely a way of avoiding the real debate on the fundamental questions which are increasingly undermining the credibility of western democracies.

The Reform Party lays it on a bit thick. The great number of amendments which they tabled at the beginning of June look more like an insurance policy negotiated downward than an effort to prepare a serious piece of legislation.

I repeat, Bill C–85 on the reform of MP pensions in its present version responds entirely to the two main concerns of taxpayers in Quebec and in Canada with regard to equity.

First, the age at which a former MP can collect his pension is now set at 55. Secondly, a former MP can no longer receive both a pension and a salary paid by a government agency. The bill is unequivocal in that regard.

With this bill we have therefore attained the basic objectives which we have in common with taxpayers, but we would have liked the government to accept our amendment and apply it immediately to those in government and in the public service who currently benefit from double dipping.

I remind this House that we would also have preferred to deal effectively with the expenses of useless institutions like the Senate, which costs us tens of millions of dollars per year. All this for an institution which serves no useful purpose. It is simply a place—and the real place—for a golden retirement. A place to which men and women who have rendered or could render services to the government are appointed with a salary which is guaranteed until age 75. That is what I call an unacceptable golden retirement and that is where we have to get the money that is needed.

In closing, I remind this House that in this matter the official opposition is concerned about equity. We fundamentally believe that our amendments contained all that is needed to achieve this equity, namely two basic elements: the setting of the minimum age at 55 years and the elimination of double dipping.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary–Ouest, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. I would first like to say a word about the position of the Bloc Quebecois. The Bloc Quebecois has explained well the problems with the Senate and with ambassadors' pensions, for example.

• (1110)

But the fact remains that the Bloc supported the government in this matter in order to keep their pensions from the Parliament of Canada just before the referendum on independence. I remind this House that the members of the Bloc have the option of not participating in this plan. They must explain their participation to their constituents.

[*English*]

I have given a lot of thought to what I might say today. There has been a lot of emotion in the debate and I must admit that I share in a lot of the emotion. Because I like to avoid a lot of emotionalism, I probably will avoid some of it in my speech today. This is not because I think I should but because, perhaps in my state of mind at the moment, I would be better to stick to some of the facts and to try to make some arguments that hopefully a few on the other side will listen to at the last minute.

I will not get into the statistics about the generosity of the plan. Those are well known now by the public. We have a very rare occasion here. In supporting a government bill we have a coincidence of a lack of intelligence and a lack of integrity at a single time which I would not say is unprecedented but should give members cause for reflection.

Let me review some of the headlines in the newspapers of the last couple of weeks on this topic. According to the Montreal *Gazette*: "Voters won't forgive MPs for keeping lavish pensions". From the Ottawa *Citizen*: "Pension issue certain to haunt Liberals". My personal favourite in my favourite newspaper, the Calgary *Herald*: "MPs pensions still too rich".

All of us in the House have been around long enough. Even those who have not been around very long have been around long enough to know that not everything we read in the newspaper is true. However I believe in this case there is a certain correlation between the reality and the reporting.

Let us take a little time to go back to the testimony we heard before the procedure and House affairs committee studying the bill and to some of the comments of my friends across the way. It is important to do this so that after the next election, when we look back at the day this bill was passed, we will see just how prophetic many of the commentators and experts were when discussing the bill.

I had done some teaching before I came to the House and this is an opportunity to do a little teaching here about what will happen if self–interest overcomes principle.

One witness before the committee, Mr. Robert Fleming, had written extensively about the compensation of elected officials as well as the broader issues that universally face legislatures across the world. I will read Mr. Fleming's closing remarks to the committee. Perhaps the House will pay closer attention to these than committee members did. I do not repeat Mr. Fleming's remarks because I agree with all he said. In fact he is more sympathetic to the bill than I am. Nevertheless Mr. Fleming said:

> All I'm saying is that I don't think you're listening to some of these issues—Regardless of what the President of the Treasury Board or anyone else says, they are flying in the face of public opinion if they don't put this into the hands of the broader community to debate and examine.
>
> I'm not talking about the traditional form of commission conducted, as we are, in this forum, but I'm talking about a way for sensible people, who are fair and include knowledgeable parliamentarians and actuaries getting together to look at the whole picture and saying this is what should be done. Again, I believe if you permitted this at this point pretty darn soon, before it gets out of hand, that without credible results you probably would come out smelling like roses and with much better results.
>
> If this doesn't happen, I feel, and I've talked to very reasonable and sensible Canadians about this, who I think have their heads screwed on and not the sort of people who are going to jump to conclusions. But they definitely feel that you are quoting your own counsel, pushing your own show ahead. And it's going to be to the detriment of the Liberal Party of Canada, the Government of Canada, and it's definitely going to be to the detriment of the people of Canada. I think this has to be taken into account.
>
> Again, as somewhat of a political scientist, the Liberal Party of Canada has had a marvellous go at it since October 1993. But I think the thing risks becoming unravelled if this kind of situation is not dealt with in a totally and utterly open manner. This applies to everything concerning the administration of the House of Commons.

• (1115)

Broadly speaking there was consensus among all of the witnesses the committee heard that Bill C–85 is a bad idea for all sorts of reasons and certainly politically a very bad idea.

This witness also pointed out: "The fact that 81 qualifying members are Liberals and only 14 belong to other parties suggests that the government should tread warily and wisely in advancing legislation. This is an area which has become a political minefield". The government has made very little attempt to get cross party consensus on this.

Former Conservative MP and actuary Paul McCrossan had something to say on this also. According to him Bill C–85 is bad for members, bad for Parliament as an institution and bad for Canada. Mr. McCrossan went on to explain how Bill C–85 will hamstring Parliament, how it will destroy any legitimacy the government has or might have had in redesigning Canada's national retirement income and medical care system, just when these changes are most needed in the face of Canada's flourishing debt and aging population. We know about the government's plans in those areas.

Mr. McCrossan talked about the need for Parliament to act with integrity and to redesign our national social plans rather than let a future crisis arise and dictate their reform. He talked about the effect that passing the bill would have on generating immense public outrage for protecting privileged positions just when reductions in national benefits are being proposed for other Canadians.

This witness talked about the public's feeling toward politicians. We have all heard this: "They are all crooks". He told the committee the underlying cause of this attitude, and I agree with him, was politicians have consistently established one set of rules for themselves and one for the general public.

Referring to the potential passing of this bill without amendments he said: "Once again, in that case you deserve the public's contempt". I agree with that.

Mr. McCrossan recently published an article in *Benefits Canada*. In it he describes the Conservatives' attempt to reduce the generosity of the plan. The Conservatives promised this in 1984 and never delivered on it. I will read the excerpt once again:

> Wilson asked me to help him present his proposals for changing MPs' pensions to the last PC caucus meeting before the 1988 election. He wanted a mandate to proceed before the election was called so that the new Parliament could start with a new plan. A riot broke out. For about 20 minutes Wilson tried to explain either the problem or its solution. He was not allowed to speak. Member after member shouted him down. Whenever calm was restored and Wilson tried to speak, bedlam erupted. Finally he gave up.

Can we not see it happening all over again, this time in the Liberal caucus? We all know about the press reports.

I understand the minister also tried to bring about some significant reforms which were ultimately thrown out of caucus and of cabinet. Who will pay the price for this? The price will ultimately be paid by first term backbench MPs sitting across the way who really do not support this plan, probably really do not understand it, but who will go along with the whole Liberal government group think thing. I hope they will at least consider opting out. I will address that again later.

The voters may forgive them if they opt out, but that is the only way they will be around long enough to qualify for this plan. What it is interesting is they will end up supporting this plan, it will be their votes which pass it, it will protect and enlarge the pensions of the most senior members of the government and they will end up out of their seats with no pension whatsoever.

During the report stage debate on the bill the chief government whip asserted there was nothing wrong with this plan, that outflows matched inflows and had for years. This is an example of some of the misquoting of statistics that has gone on around here.

What the chief government whip did not mention was the size of those inflows, or the source, is exclusively tax dollars and the vast majority does not come from the members' of Parliament pay cheques.

• (1120)

Second, the vast majority of the outflows has yet to come and the inflows are to cover the future liability streams created by this pension plan.

Let me quote again from Mr. McCrossan's article as he refers to Don Mazankowski's half hearted attempts at reform: "Even well informed MPs like Don Boudria, the chief government whip, continued to assert in debate that the government's chief actuary had said the MPs pension plan was actuarially sound". That has been repeated in this debate. "In his latest report published prior to the 1991 House of Commons debate the chief actuary pointed out the plan had only $27.9 million in assets to cover about $182.7 million in liabilities. Also, the normal cost of the plan was rising". To cover the actuarial liability we now have these huge inflows each year.

During the one day of witness testimony—the committee never did study the bill—at the procedure and House affairs committee, the government whip made some other enlightening comments. He talked about his situation and how well off he would be if instead of having the MP pension plan he had participated in an RRSP plan with contributions matched dollar for dollar by his employer, ostensibly the House of Commons.

He said that under the MP pension plan he would enjoy a benefit if he retired today of somewhat less than $30,000 year. According to our calculations it would be closer to $36,000 a year, but $30,000 under the new proposal. Remember this does not apply retroactively and so he would be getting $36,000 a year.

My office did the calculation. The government whip said he had calculations but never tabled them. I have done the calculations according to the assumptions outlined by the government whip. I see some truthful aspects but his answers still required scrutiny.

He said he would be eligible for a pension of about $27,000 a year already under a matching RRSP arrangement. He forgot to mention that under an RRSP plan like other Canadians are eligible for, contributions of the size he is talking about fully matched by an employer would be illegal. Our 11 per cent plus an 11 per cent match make 22 per cent, which is well above the legal limit. No other Canadian would be allowed to shelter that much of their income from tax and have it grow without paying taxes on the income it generates. An investment of this type would not have the expensive advantage of full indexation offered under Bill C–85.

As the member for Mississauga West pointed out several times during the committee's hearing, the government may decrease the contribution for limits on RRSPs in any case. Where would that leave MPs? It did not seem to bother her that

this would affect millions of other Canadians negatively. This is an important point.

Applying the Income Tax Act in the same way it applies to other Canadians lowers the government whip's expected pension benefit from $27,000 to only about $22,000, which is not a bad pension considering he has only been on the job here since 1984.

Compared with a fully indexed pension of $35,000 to $36,000 which he would collect if he resigned tomorrow, this may not look quite so inviting. Fully indexed as provided for under this plan at the current inflation rate, this $35,000 would grow and would be worth approximately $82,000 in tomorrow's dollars by the time he was 75.

An annuity purchased with an RRSP would still be worth only $22,000. In other words, in 30 years or so he would find his pension is worth only $5,000 or $6,000 in today's dollars. This is a very different case and we start to see why this plan is so costly to taxpayers.

Let us be serious. Will the member and the government really try to tell ordinary Canadians they could have a $60,000 salary for 10 years and retire for the rest of their lives with a pension that would support their every need and more? Seriously, Canadians do not live in that kind of world. We should not invent those kinds of numbers.

According to one witness, Mr. Brian Corbishley, to provide the benefits promised under this bill would take an investment of about $34,000 for each year of service; this is for the ordinary, backbench member of Parliament, not someone with an additional salary they can contribute like the government whip. Basically Mr. Corbishley is saying it would take a matching contribution of 26 per cent of a member's salary to fulfil the government whip's assertions.

• (1125)

Several government members have indicated they believe the 9 per cent contribution level in the bill is too high. Obviously it is not nearly high enough to provide the benefits the bill provides.

The government did, I believe inadvertently, make an important point. A plan with matching contributions, properly invested over a long period of time, even one that was legal under the Income Tax Act, would help to provide a reasonable retirement income and would save the taxpayers a bundle.

The cost for a one to one plan like we proposed, about 9 per cent MP salary matching, would cost about $1 million. That is about $6 million less than the government's contribution costs, to which it must add $23 million in interest charges it has to fork out for the present plan. That is a saving of about $29 million a year and clearly there is no comparison whatsoever in the cost.

I hope my speech has cleared up what is maybe some honest misconception regarding the plan with members opposite. We know the debate has at times been very emotional. There have been all kinds of accusations levelled. My hope is in talking about these personal cases that I not bring it back to that level but use them as examples to put forward some of the honest problems the public finds with the bill.

Unfortunately it does not appear we will solve this problem in the House. My position and that of my party is we must bring in a plan which is no more generous than the average private sector plan and that we need an independent body to do it and there must be full disclosure of all the benefits.

There seems to be some confusion on what a normal pension plan is. The President of the Treasury Board gave some statistics when he appeared before the committee, which the parliamentary secretary repeated today. I will go over them because they talked about misleading statistics. The President of the Treasury Board has presented statistics about what a normal pension plan is. Let us go over a normal pension plan.

Normal for most Canadians is no employer pension plan at all. According to Statistics Canada, as of January 1, 1992 only about 47.5 per cent of employed paid workers were fortunate enough to belong to an employer pension plan. About half of those were workers who belonged to pension plans in the public sector.

The minister told that committee 44 per cent of all pension plan members have some form of automatic indexing. What he neglected to mention was in the private sector less than 12 per cent have any automatic protection from inflation, and full protection of the kind offered to MPs in Bill C–85 is virtually unheard of even in the public sector.

The minister indicated as well that about 95 per cent of all pension plan members are in defined benefit plans which provide a set formula to determine benefit payments. According to Statistics Canada, only 43.7 per cent of all plans are of this type. Some of the larger plans have this but over 50 per cent do not. Those who do not have an employer benefit plan are almost always in a contributory plan, not a defined benefit plan.

The minister did not present any comparative statistics on benefit rates, and with good reason. While his proposal gives MPs a benefit rate of 4 per cent per year of service, only 2 per cent of all pension plan members have a benefit rate above half of that.

One departmental official, when I asked how many other Canadians had this kind of benefit rate, conceded none to his knowledge. There could be the odd chief executive officer with a special deal but none he is aware of.

Similarly, the President of the Treasury Board did not bother to present any statistics on the minimum age for collection of benefits, which is 55 in the bill. However, in over 90 per cent of all registered pension plans the normal age of retirement is 65. A hearing is going on today just down the street in the federal court, the Information Commissioner versus the Minister of Public Works and Government Services. The government has asked that the hearings regarding the release of information on MP pension benefits be held in camera. It does not even want taxpayers to hear its argument for not releasing the information.

• (1130)

I would have thought if it had some reasonable reasons for suppressing the information, and I cannot imagine what they would be, it would want the voters to know what the reasons might be.

In my opinion it is in the best interests of the public for the information to be readily available. It will affect who is elected. That will affect the quality of government. Voters have a right to know how their tax dollars are being spent.

As I pointed out previously in the House, individual member's salaries and expenses are printed in the public accounts. Why are their pension benefits or at least the cost of those benefits not available to the taxpayers? So much for more open government. So much for government with integrity. On this kind of issue we might as well have had Brian Mulroney and his Tory party sitting across the way.

An hon. member: It might be an improvement.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): Let me talk about the opt out once again. I want government members, even though they are going to march in here and vote for the bill, to seriously consider the opt out. The opt out is not ideal. I have said this before and I will say it again, the ideal situation is a fair pension plan for members of Parliament, not nothing but not too generous. Since those are the choices, I would suggest we opt out.

What the government is doing to convince the public that this is okay is simply not working. I have made some reference already to the tactic. One has been to misquote figures, to try and rationalize this as somehow not really better than what anyone else is getting. Nobody believes that. Not an expert in the country will come forward to verify those numbers.

The other attempt to rationalize this has been to basically slander various Reform members of Parliament. For example, the member for Beaver River is opportunistic in opting out. There have been other slanders and fabrications against her which I will not get into.

It is also said that ex–military members are double dipping. This is an interesting definition of double dipping. Suddenly all Canadians, who after having had a career and qualifing for a pension in a normal way and who enter a second career, are somehow double dipping. Now we have hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are now defined as double dippers.

There was the great one members actually thought they had going for a few days which was that the member for Calgary Centre had advocated massive pay increases when, in fact, what he was suggesting was that the government be transparent about the salaries the MPs are actually being paid, taking into consideration all the benefits, all of their untaxed allowances and all their accrued pensions.

What is interesting about all of these things is that they are not in the bill. That definition of double dipping is not in the government's legislation. The government, while it continues to raise the compensation issue, did not raise it in the legislation. It is only a bill on MP pensions.

There has been a lot of talk about the pay issue but I want to get something on the record because my views on the pay issue are a little different than most of the people in the House and probably a little different from some members of my party. This party has consistently said: "Cut the pension to normal with no pay increase whatsoever". We tabled amendments to that effect and the Liberal members all voted against them.

However, let me talk about the process of determining pay. There have been commissions to study the pay issue. In fact, one thing we noticed when we had the committee hearings for one day was that the commissions appointed by this federal government such as the Lapointe or Sobeco study, had considerably more generous views of remuneration than some of the commissions that had been appointed in the provinces. All of them had concluded that MPs or ex–MPs were basically underpaid and they gave some reasons for that which deserve study. However let us be very clear about how they arrived at that conclusion.

First, all these commissions proceed by essentially asking members of Parliament and former members of Parliament what they do, how much they could earn elsewhere and how much they think it is worth. That is essentially how the commissions operate. They then come up with a recommendation that we are all underpaid. They accept the stories that all members of Parliament tend to tell, which is that prior to coming here they had brilliant careers and were earning hundreds of thousands of dollars somewhere else. Some were. As we all know, the member for Calgary Centre was. The Minister of Justice was. There are some other members who had very brilliant careers both in this House and in the previous Houses.

• (1135)

However, that is not always true. Before I was elected, I worked around here and I know about some of the brilliant careers.

The second story told is that all members of Parliament do valuable work while they are here. They work long and hard hours all the time, on critical tasks of great importance to the nation and their constituents.

The third story told is that through no fault of their own, members suddenly find that when they are turfed out of office, despite their previous brilliance and their brilliance while here, they find themselves virtually unemployable and can find no work.

There are elements of truth in all of these statements but I do not think we should accept them at face value. Some of these commissions should have examined this a little more closely. I will not talk about careers. As I say, some people clearly have had good careers and some people, depending on their occupational background, have an chance at adjusting back into the workforce. I know the member for Halton—Peel and I have discussed the fact that certain occupations are given to readjustment to the workforce while others are not.

I would like to talk for a minute on this one point about the valuable and hard work because it is important. It is time we started calling a spade a spade around here. Have we worked hard this week? You had better believe it, Madam Speaker. We have worked bloody hard. We have been up every day this week until midnight and 1 a.m. voting on bills.

What about those votes? Those votes were all predetermined. There were no surprises in any of them, although there were a couple of little surprises, but all of these votes were predetermined. In fact, they were so predetermined that half of the time people did not even know what they were voting on. However, they certainly did not need to know what they were voting on even if they did.

The question that the taxpayers should be asking is not whether this is hard work, because this is hard work, but whether it is valuable work. They should be asking whether staying up all night to go through these rituals has been worth a hell of a lot of money to them.

Let me mention another example. We sat in a committee all day. We had flown in witnesses from across the country to study the MP pension bill. They came in early in the morning and we sat there all day, morning, afternoon and evening. Did we stop for five minutes to review or discuss any of the committee testimony to determine whether there was anything in it that might apply to the legislation? No. We proceeded to clause by clause consideration and did the bill in 12 minutes. Therefore, we went through the ritual of flying these people in and hearing from them.

The question once again is: Hard work costs a lot of money. Was it of any value? The truth is, and this is not a phenomenon restricted to Canada but certainly one that has become worse here, that many MPs play very little or any real legislative role. It does not matter whether they are ignoring their constituents' views, their election commitments or their personal principles and knowledge, we know that most MPs will simply vote with the party no matter what the bill is about and whether they have read it or not.

What really is the value of that? What really is the equivalent to that? Is that equivalent, as some would tell us, to being a senior executive? If that is the way the government and others believe the House of Commons should work, maybe MPs are regional sales reps for their political parties. Maybe that is the comparison we should be making.

I am just giving another point of view. An independent commission should look at those kinds of issues. Maybe it would end up not looking at how we are remunerated but what we are doing around here and whether we can make it more effective.

There is one little item of which I have to make some mention. I normally do not talk at all about my personal life but let me digress for a second. In the committee meeting, the President of the Treasury Board said, and the parliamentary secretary repeated it today, that before we opt out of these pensions we should consult our families. He said that we were really doing our families wrong by doing this. It was a valuable suggestion.

• (1140)

I got married just after I came to the House. I have been married a year and a half. I am starting to understand this marriage thing. I said: "Before I opt out I should really consult my wife. It concerns the future and our future". I thought it was the right thing to do to opt out but I thought: "Yes, this wise advice. I should consult my wife". The treasury board president, the expert on family values that he is, advised me to do this.

I talked to my wife Laureen and explained that this potentially could be very expensive for us. I tried to explain it to her. This point is important because in the riding she talks to people. She is in touch with her family. She is not in this cocoon. She said to me: "There may be some truth in what you are saying but the reality is that both you and I know that the pension plan is way too generous. We know what the public thinks about it and we know what it is". She said: "You did not get elected to rip off the taxpayers. Frankly, if you or I ever find ourselves in a financial situation on the job or any other job where we are doing that, then we had better find other work". That is the only way to look at this.

Reform MPs in opting out are not making a political point on a particular day. Let me be very clear to Liberal members about this, those who are thinking of participating. In opting out we are making a solemn pact with the taxpayers. The pact is the following. This pension plan is not reformed satisfactorily. It is

not an acceptable plan. By opting out we have no stake in it whatsoever.

The government can refuse future opt outs and it can grandfather the present recipients if it wants but if we form the government we have no vested interest whatsoever in this scam. When we have the chance to put in a plan, if this is not changed, there will be no grandfathering. There will be no trough regular and trough lite. We will take every legal step necessary to cut benefits that were not adequately contributed to by members of Parliament. We will lead by example in reforming the fiscal situation of this country. We will start here and we will not spare the people who made the decision to opt into that plan. That is our commitment.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on third reading of Bill C–85, which proposes amendments to the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act.

Before I begin, I want to highlight the points that I wish to make during my comments. First, it has to do with the question of total compensation. Most members would agree that the pension plan is an integral part of the compensation of any employee. When an employee looks at a position that pension plan is part of the compensation in this debate and in the comments made by hon. members.

They know very well that they are dealing with pension plans as a stand alone item without reference to the total compensation package. That is the first point.

The second point is that the salaries of members of Parliament have been frozen since 1991 and will be frozen and have been designated to be frozen until 1997. That is the commitment the government has made and members of Parliament have made, to have their salaries frozen for seven years.

The third point is that independent consultants have been asked to assess the total compensation offered to members of Parliament. Their conclusion was that the total compensation of members of Parliament was not out of line with comparable work in other sectors.

The fourth point that I am going to make has to do with this bill and what it does. The bill reduces the value of the pension plan that members of Parliament presently enjoy. It eliminates things called double dipping. It sets a minimum age that must be reached before a member can start collecting. It also reduces the accrual rate. This bill reduces the value of the pension plan. To defeat this bill would mean that the existing plan would stay intact. As a result it is clear all members of Parliament will be supporting this bill, if not at least in principle.

• (1145)

I am going to touch on the two options that have been suggested particularly by the Reform Party. I intend to demonstrate that the actual cost of those options would be more to the Canadian taxpayers.

Some individuals and organizations have waged a constant publicity battle against the bill and its provisions as being too generous. They have targeted the earned pension entitlements of individual members. Some of this outside criticism has involved exaggeration that treats pensions in isolation removing them from the total compensation context which is where they properly belong.

The independent study conducted by Sobeco Ernst and Young and tabled in this House in March of last year did not find MPs' total compensation package to be overly generous but I emphasize that it did recommend a redistribution of the various elements of that package. Sobeco Ernst and Young recommended increases in direct compensation with corresponding decreases in indirect compensation including pensions.

This is point number one. We are talking about total compensation. In fact the total compensation is not overly generous but the distribution of that income between the various forms of income should be readdressed.

The Lapointe commission report which was tabled last July also recommends changes. Among other things it recommends that pensions should not be payable before age 55 and that basic indemnities should be increased once the salary freeze is lifted. Again an independent commission has recommended, and the government has accepted the recommendation, that pensions not be payable until age 55 or later and that the basic components of the total compensation should be dealt with but not until the freeze on salaries is lifted. It would be inappropriate at this time to increase the basic salary of members and reduce the pension. We are going to respect the salary freeze that has been accepted by all the civil service and all members of Parliament.

A variety of views have been expressed during the course of debates on the pension issue. Some members no doubt would like to stay with the status quo while others seek radical change. I doubt that there is a single member who has not been affected by all the criticisms that have been made. One thing I am certain of though is that we have all heard from our constituents and we have listened to them.

The government has paid particular attention to what Canadians have had to say on the issue. Bill C–85 fulfils our commitment set out in the election platform with respect to double dipping and the minimum age at which pensions will begin to be paid. It further fulfils the President of the Treasury

Board's commitment made in February of this year to table legislation before the end of April.

I believe that the amendments proposed in the bill are balanced and fair both to the taxpayers of this country and to members of Parliament. The proposed changes show Canadians that the government has taken note of their concerns and has acted upon them.

At the same time the government is conscious of the fact that in periods of deficits and public sector salary freezes, it would not be ethical to increase members' basic indemnities as recommended by the Sobeco Ernst & Young report. Consequently it would be inappropriate to implement the recommended cutbacks to MP pensions at this time.

As I have said, the changes proposed in this bill are reasonable and fair. Nevertheless not everyone will agree with them. There will be criticism within and outside this House that the changes do not go far enough. This said, I think we will all do well to remind ourselves that no matter how hard we try we cannot please everyone. I do believe that this bill represents a fair and justifiable compromise that seeks to accommodate various points of view.

• (1150)

I would like to go briefly through the main changes to the pension plan proposed by Bill C–85. The new minimum pensionable age will be 55. In the future, senators and members of Parliament who earn over $5,000 a year from an appointment, employment or other personal service contracts in the federal public sector will see their pensions reduced on a dollar for dollar basis by their earnings. The pension accrual on future service will drop from 5 per cent for each year of service to 4 per cent. The contribution rate on future service for members of the House of Commons will drop from 11 per cent to 9 per cent of salary. Common law spouses will be recognized for survivor benefit purposes just as they are under the public service, Canadian forces and RCMP pension plans.

In keeping with the generally accepted practice in Canada that when changes are made in pension plans they do not reduce benefits accrued to date, all of these changes, with the exception of changes to the survivor benefit arrangements, will apply only to pensions or portions of pensions earned on service that occurs after the date this bill receives royal assent. This represents a fair and equitable approach. It means that members who have organized their financial affairs taking into account the pensions they have earned to date will not see rules changed midstream leaving them potentially adversely affected.

As I have said, it is simply not possible to please everyone. Consequently, those members of Parliament who do not agree with the changes and reductions proposed by Bill C–85 or who do not believe them to be far reaching enough will not be obliged to continue participating in the plan. As the Prime Minister promised, all members of Parliament will be given a choice. They will have 60 days from the date this bill receives royal assent to exercise an option to stay in the plan.

Having touched briefly on the main changes proposed by Bill C–85, I would now like to focus on the issue of the new minimum age for payment of members' pensions. As we all know once a member has six years of service, the present provisions see the pension commence as soon as the member leaves office. I would like to repeat that because some of my constituents have understood it differently. There is no pension payable when a member completes six years. Six years is the earliest date at which a member could collect, but he or she must have left office to commence receipt of pension payments.

I do not believe this provision was the result of some arbitrary decision. There were sound philosophical and practical reasons behind it. The provision was introduced so a member would have an immediate income on which to draw to assist him or her in the often difficult transition from public to private life. This is the only immediate income available to a member with an immediate pension entitlement. There are no cash settlements, no lump sum severance benefits. In fact, members of Parliament do not qualify for unemployment insurance benefits under the current legislation.

I would remind those who believe the immediate payment of a pension is indefensible that not a single member of this House enjoys any kind of job security. There is absolutely no guarantee of a career as a member of Parliament. Every four or five years we must seek re–election and many of us find our tenure in this House brought to an abrupt end.

Nevertheless, despite these considerations a general consensus was reached that the minimum pensionable age should be raised. In addition, after considering recommendations from both the Sobeco Ernst & Young and the Lapointe commission reports, the government accepted the recommendation that 55 was a reasonable pensionable age.

This new age will only apply to pensions or portions of pensions earned after the bill receives royal assent. This means that any pension earned prior to royal assent will still be payable according to the existing rules, that is, as soon as a member leaves office. Once again I should emphasize the government believes this to be a fair and equitable approach and one that is consistent with generally accepted and legislated pension practice, namely the protection of accrued pension rights and benefits.

I know full well there will be critics who say we are not going far enough, that possibly the minimum pensionable age should be 60 or 65. To such critics I would again emphasize the precarious nature of an MP's career and the likelihood of a member suddenly finding himself or herself unemployed. We all know it is not easy to switch careers in midstream and once a person has turned 50 years of age it can often prove impossible to find new employment. Therefore, I would suggest that it is

not unreasonable to propose in future MP pensions should go into pay once a former member reaches age 55.

• (1155)

How does age 55 compare with the pensionable age under provincial pension plans for members of respective legislative assemblies? The government's proposal of age 55 appears to be very much in keeping with the majority of those plans. Let me give some examples. Age 55 is the earliest pensionable age for MLAs in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

Some provinces have adopted a formula approach. In Newfoundland the pension starts when age and service total 60. In Ontario it starts when a member's age and service total 55. British Columbia has a combination of straight minimum age and a formula requirement. The pension is paid when a member reaches age 55 or when age and years of service total 60. Quebec has a similar arrangement whereby the pension goes into pay when a member's age and service equal 65, but the member must be at least 50 years of age.

Only the province of New Brunswick still has no minimum pensionable age. Alberta has terminated the MLAs pension plan and Prince Edward Island has discontinued its pension arrangements for its present MLAs, although new arrangements are under review by an independent commission. The recent election in Manitoba was to see the existing pension arrangements terminated and replaced by a registered retirement savings plan, to which both MLAs and the province would contribute.

If we look at the pensionable age for elected representatives in some other western democracies, we also see a variety of practices, some of which contain a service component, some of which are based on age alone once the pension is vested. For example, in Australia a pension is paid after 12 years of service or at age 60 with at least eight years of service. In Belgium the minimum pensionable age is 55 or age 52 with eight years of service. In France the pension is based on age alone, age 55, while in Sweden it is based on service alone being 12 years. In the United Kingdom the pension is payable at age 65, or age 60 if the age and service equal 80. In the United States it is the age of 62 or age 50 with 20 years of service or 25 years of service with no age qualification.

I would suggest that these various combinations of age alone, service alone, or age and years of service together have been developed in recognition, and I stress in recognition, of the uniqueness of service as an elected representative, in recognition of the fact that there is no guaranteed career as such. I would suggest that the government's decision to set age 55 as the new minimum pensionable age is well within the range of those generally accepted for elected representatives of the countries I have just mentioned.

We have looked at the pensionable age ranges for the MLAs of the provinces and we have looked at the arrangements for elected representatives in some of our fellow western democracies. I do know there are some people who will ask how a pensionable age of 55 compares with the pensionable age for ordinary Canadians. I go back again to the unique and specialized nature of our employment here on the Hill and I point out that it is not unusual to tailor pension plans to meet specific career needs to accommodate career patterns that differ from the norm.

I would light to highlight the special early retirement provisions that have been put in place for air traffic controllers, members of the Canadian forces and the many police forces across the country. These all recognize the vagaries, demands and requirements on career patterns that do not correspond at all to career patterns of the majority of Canadians.

I would like to go back and look at the options Reform members have presented to the House. I should like to address the general feeling of many of their speakers that pensions of members of Parliament should have the same provisions as those applicable to the private sector.

• (1200)

One aspect of private sector pension plans to which those members have not given consideration is the vesting differential. Vesting is the point at which the contributions of the employer become the property of the employee. As an example, in many plans in the private sector companies have plans which allow members to start accumulating pension benefits after only two years of service, whereas presently members of Parliament do not have that kind of provision.

If we were to adopt two years of service before vesting began, each and every member of Parliament who has served in this place would qualify for a pension, when in fact less than half of members of Parliament ultimately qualify for pensions. On that basis alone, to simply change that aspect of a pension plan would mean that the cost to the Canadian taxpayers would double.

There are some differences. For instance, members of Parliament are required to pay 11 per cent of salary and the basic salary for a member of Parliament is $64,400 a year. Eleven per cent of that salary or some $7,000 per year must be paid into the plan. No private plan requires 11 per cent. Most plans only require about a 3 per cent contribution rate to a maximum of some $3,000 to $5,000. In terms of the actual contribution on behalf of members, it is substantially higher than we see in private plans.

The vesting for members begins after six years, whereas private plans begin vesting after two years and employees could qualify for a pension after only two years of service.

Members of Parliament also have their eligible RRSP contributions reduced by the amount of pension benefits accrued in the plan. Should a member not qualify for the pension, the funds they have contributed would be returned to the member, but the RRSP limits that were forgone because of the MP pension plan are not recoverable.

Members can qualify for pensions after 19 years of service of up to 75 per cent of their salary. Many plans pay up to 90 per cent. I give examples of teachers, school boards and firefighters.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre said that members of Parliament should not receive any expense allowance and that they should be paid $150,000 a year. That is the wrong time to increase members' salaries.

I simply close by saying that I have no hesitation in supporting Bill C–85 which brings into effect important changes that can be fairly and reasonably implemented at this time.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I notice members opposite making fun of the tie which I happen to be wearing. The tie is for the benefit of members opposite. It is what is commonly referred to by many of my constituents as the piggy plan, not the pension plan.

At the outset I inform the House that I will be splitting my time with one of my colleagues.

Why is the Liberal government changing the MP pension plan? We would think it would be doing it for reasons of integrity. The Liberal government is only addressing MP pensions to try to deflect public criticism. It knew Canadians wanted real changes so it made red book promises. However the promises were minimal and the government is doing the absolute minimum to barely meet those promises.

What were the promises? They were to end double dipping and to change the minimum age for collecting an MP pension, two of the many things that have outraged Canadians. The bill includes provisions to change those two things, which I commend, but the plan needs a major overhaul. This is just a start.

When questioned about the continuing generosity of the MP pension plan most Liberals throw up smoke screens and whine about how underpaid politicians are. They do not understand that the salaries of working MPs are unrelated to how much retired MPs should be making.

• (1205)

Over the past decade whenever the public has called for MP accountability and questioned the unsustainable and bloated pension package, the government has protected the plan and met the criticism by freezing MP salaries in major PR campaigns. It seemed to work before but not any more. Canadians are looking at the pension plans. Let us stick with the issue and not talk about low MPs salaries to defend high MP pensions.

Today the Liberals are pointing to studies that say MPs are underpaid while they are working. They respond by retaining this overinflated pension plan. Next year or the year after they will point to the same studies and say: "Gosh, look, we are underpaid. The studies prove it". They will pull out the sob stories and gain public support for salary increases. Just as they have refused to discuss the real issues on MP pensions now, they will refuse to discuss the MP pension plan then. That is because it is indefensible.

The government members go to great lengths to talk about anything but why they should be entitled to a two–tier pension plan. However some members of the government do not deny that the plan is generous. Just last Friday the hon. parliamentary secretary to the leader admitted:

> The pension plan was generous. It is generous, and remains generous. However, the members of Parliament who entered the lists for the election in 1988 and in all previous elections did so on the basis that at the end of their term of office they would be compensated in some way that was generous but was designed to make up for the loss of income they suffered in being elected to Parliament in the first place.

He continued:

> Most people enter a career looking at the remuneration package and seeing what it is like.

I think I speak for my colleagues on this side of the House when I say that Reformers did not switch careers and enter politics for the remuneration package. We came to Ottawa to represent our constituents and to make some long overdue changes. Altering the platinum plated MP pension plan is just one such change.

It saddens me to think that the main reason some of my hon. colleagues across the way entered politics was for the promised pension reward following their retirement from public service, and this is by their own admission. I would like to believe my colleagues opposite are honourable so I return to my first question. Is the Liberal government committed to making significant and necessary changes to the MP pension plan? Will those changes bring it into line with other Canadian pension plans?

Mr. Mills (Red Deer): Of course not.

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): That is right. The simple answer is no. One would think the government with its penchant for political correctness would want to do the right thing. Unfortunately when Liberals are doing the right thing it

means they are only addressing public perceptions, not reality. These are the Liberal code words for entrenching inequality.

The last time I heard someone use those words in the House it was the Liberal member opposite from Halifax. She said that her government was doing the right thing when defending the inclusion of special protection based on sexual orientation in Bill C–41.

First the Liberals argued that jail terms and community service were supposed to be deterrents. They then told judges to increase sentences if the victim fell into one of the categories listed in section 718.2, such as having a different sexual orientation than the person committing the assault. If longer and harsher sentences are supposed to be a deterrent and certain victims incur those longer sentences, does that not sound like special protection? Does it not smack of inequality when some Canadian lives are worth more than others?

The Liberals are now doing what they call the right thing with MP pensions. They are making cosmetic changes and protecting their own fully indexed MP retirement funds at the same time as they are talking about reducing RRSP contribution levels for other Canadians and pondering how long the Canada pension plan will survive. That sure sounds like a two–tier pension system to me. Every time I hear the phrase doing the right thing from a Liberal it means make some people more equal than others. In this case it is retired MPs.

When a Reformer talks about doing the right thing we mean equality for all Canadians. This means equal protection before the law, equal pay for the same job, equal opportunity and equal treatment of pension plans under the Income Tax Act. Why should MPs be exempted from the pension rules they impose on other Canadians?

• (1210)

During the review of Bill C–85 in the House procedures committee only seven witnesses were heard. I find it incredible that the committee tried to prevent the National Citizens' Coalition and the Canadian Taxpayers Federation from attending. These groups have spent considerable time reviewing MPs pensions and were instrumental in drawing the excesses of the plan to the attention of the media and the public. To deny them the opportunity to speak is unconscionable.

In fact only six witnesses were invited. Not to be thwarted, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation showed up in any event. The committee had no choice but to hear the association or be faced with a major media scandal.

The amazing thing is that even the carefully selected witnesses all agreed this was an extremely generous plan. While proposing an MP RRSP plan one witness said:

> You live by the same rules you make for other Canadians.

If MPs were reliant on a similar RRSP pension plan they might be a little more cautious about the laws they pass that will affect all Canadians.

According to the Income Tax Act pension plans must comply with certain criteria to be valid. One such criterion is a limit on the accrual rate. It can be no more than 2 per cent of the final three–year average salary. It is also only payable after the age of 60.

The government is acting as if it has made major concessions in the MP pension plan and in Bill C–85. As the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister proudly pointed out, the pension plan will reduce the existing accrual rate by 20 per cent. At first that sounds great. All it really means is that the accrual rate was dropped from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Yes, that is a 20 per cent reduction, but it is still 100 per cent more than the 2 per cent accrual rate all other Canadians are allowed under the Income Tax Act.

Further, the Income Tax Act states that such a pension scheme is only payable after the age of 60. The government has decided that only applies to other Canadians. Members are eligible at 55.

In the past MPs who served six years were eligible to collect the pension no matter how young they were; 36–year–olds could collect. I would hardly consider that selfless service in the interest of the public good. How many other Canadians receive a substantial pension after six years in the job? Surely it is an indication that the plan has been exceedingly generous for far too long. Moving the age of eligibility to 55, not 60 like the rest of Canadians, is considered a significant step by the government.

I applaud the government on increasing the age of eligibility to age 55, but why did it not go that small step further to 60 so that the MP pension plan complies with the Income Tax Act?

Apparently it will save taxpayers $3.3 million in the first year. How much more will be saved in the future because all Reformers will opt out? More important, the government is acting like taxpayers will continue to realize significant savings. Under the plan taxpayers will contribute $3.60 for every $1 an MP contributes.

There is one promise we intend to keep. When Reform is elected government following the next election, we will really be reforming this travesty into a pension plan that is completely compatible with that of the private sector, and we will be making it retroactive.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened attentively to the member's remarks. I point out a couple of items that I believe the member did not include in his speech.

I think all members would agree that serving in the House of Commons is a real privilege and a real honour. If we could afford to be here and work for nothing, I am sure 99 per cent of us would do that. The fact of the matter remains that most of us

need an income to sustain two homes. Most Canadians do not realize that what we make as MPs—

• (1215)

Mr. Silye: The pension does not pay for your home.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): I am going to get to the pensions, just bear with me. I have a couple of minutes here.

Members of Parliament make approximately $14 an hour. By the way, I for one happen to support the member from Calgary, and I say this with no shame, who believes that we are worth $30 an hour. I support that position. But what the Reform Party is missing is that most members of Parliament do not retire from this place. They are defeated.

When you are a defeated member of Parliament, you are usually defeated because you took on causes, went against the wind, and there are a lot of people in your own community after you are defeated, with all your education and previous experience, who will not readily hire you.

I for one have seen many good men and women who have served this House who have been defeated brutally, not through their own work but through party work, and who are out there walking the streets with absolutely no income. I believe that Canadians do not want to see members of Parliament who have served this House well go on welfare after they are defeated. I do not think they want that to happen.

I am all for reviewing the pension fund, but if the Reform Party is going to be straight with Canadians its members have to include, as the member from Calgary has included, in this debate the fact that maybe this plan in some respects could be perceived to be a little generous, but when you take all factors into account after you have been defeated, what bank in Canada or business doing business with a bank would want to hire you after you are defeated in this House?

Being a good member of Parliament in this House means you have to take on causes and go against the wind. The Reform Party, in fairness to this debate, is not including all factors.

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments.

I listened in this House to his defence of this gold plated plan. He seems to believe that when members are ultimately defeated, retire, or quit they end up on skid row. I do not know of any retired MPs who are on skid row or on welfare rolls. I would be interested to know their names if the hon. member is aware of some.

Further, he addressed the whole issue of the salary and the total remuneration package. I said in a speech on this bill that if we are going to address the salary issue, let us address it separately. Let us not confuse pension with salary. That is what the members are saying.

I beg to differ. My hon. colleague from Calgary did not suggest that we should be paid $30 an hour. He suggested that we make the system transparent, that we roll everything in and do not have any special concessions built into the wage package. He said he does not believe we should have tax free allowances, that we should all be the same. That is what he was trying to drive at, and I support that. Let us make the system that pertains to MPs exactly the same as for all the rest of Canadians. Let us have a transparent system. We pay taxes the same as everyone else, and we should not have a two–tiered pension plan in this country.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, this debate is not about money. So far all I have heard is about money and how much this will save the taxpayers. This debate is about integrity, and integrity means honesty.

The Reform Party of Canada is the only party in this House that says the pension plan is still too generous, notwithstanding the changes. It is four times better than the private sector, seven times better than any other public sector pension plan. Because of this and on principle, we are opting out. It would be hypocritical of us to accept it after having criticized it. We believe in what we are saying and we are prepared to act.

The Liberal government's feeble response has been Bill C–85, which effectively ends double dipping and raises the qualifying age for a pension to 55. It also increases the amount of time an MP has to serve to receive a maximum pension of 75 per cent—5 per cent better than the private sector—of the best six years of earnings. In 19 years MPs will now get 75 per cent of their salary in pension, rather than 15, as it was before, rather than the 35 to 40 years it takes anybody in this gallery, anybody who is not down at this level, to receive a pension plan. That is the difference, and that is why it is too lucrative.

• (1220)

The generous pensions MPs are paid are almost universally viewed as reasonable compensation for the fact that we do not pay members of Parliament enough in salaries. This is the Liberal government view, and this is the view that has resulted in two undesirable patterns in Canadian politics. First, it is difficult to attract top calibre candidates because the pay is not high enough. Forget about idealistic arguments that elected office is a higher calling and that people should be prepared to make sacrifices to serve. The reality is that they have mortgages to pay and families to feed too.

Second, big pensions at the end of the rainbow tend to make politicians acutely aware of the need to be re–elected. That generates more survival mode thinking and less commitment to tackle the tough issues and do what is right for constituents and the nation.

I would like to read a letter to the editor that I saw in the *Financial Post* written by an individual named Paul Arnold, from Victoria. This was on the heels of my comments during debate on this bill at second reading when I talked about how we should be looking at the whole remuneration package, not just the pension separately and justifying the high pension based on the low salary. This is "Some straight talk on MPs' pensions":

> We should extend thanks to Reform Party MP Jim Silye for having the courage to expose the deceptive way in which MPs pay themselves with our tax dollars, and for opening the door to a long overdue public debate on this sensitive issue.
>
> Professional politicians such as Jean Chrétien and Sheila Copps often grumble about how hard they work and how underpaid they are. Neither, however, likes to talk very much about their tax free expense accounts, their litany of perks and special privileges or, above all, their lucrative gold plated pension plan that in Copps's case will be worth millions of dollars.
>
> Silye is simply saying that MPs should be compensated fairly for the work they do. They should receive a salary that is comparable to others in both the public and private sectors with similar workloads and responsibilities. Their salaries should be transparent and all hidden tax free expense accounts, perks, privileges and gold plated pensions should be eliminated entirely.
>
> Most Canadians do not object to paying our elected officials well for doing what must be a very demanding and stressful job. They want MPs to plan for their own retirements by investing in RRSPs, just like the rest of us. What Canadians detest is the underhanded way that MPs feed at the public trough and the way the taxpayers keep retired MPs living in the lap of luxury for the rest of their lives.

There are 205 rookies in this Parliament. It is not their fault this pension plan and its method of distribution is in its current state. However, it disappoints me that the 205 rookies in this Parliament could have done something about it. I cannot believe the rookies on that side allowed 70 veteran MPs to walk away from this House and within 30 days of leaving they will start to receive their pensions. Why are they not ruled the same way? Why is it the class of '88 gets to opt out, our class gets to opt out, but future classes do not get to opt out? All future MPs should have the choice to opt out as well.

A transparent, taxable salary could replace the current compensation or remuneration of an MP. Here is this low salary that MPs receive that the President of the Treasury Board uses to justify this high goldplated pension plan. This is what he says is too low and why we need this pension plan. Here is what MPs receive: a taxable salary of $64,400; a tax free allowance of $21,300, which is equivalent to a pretax value of $42,600 if we make it transparent and taxable; the tax free travel status of $6,000. These are tax free benefits. In the private sector, of which I was a part two years ago, my company and I had to pay taxes on these benefits.

We in this House do not have to pay taxes on the following benefits: free VIA Rail pass; free personal long distance telephone calls; free health and dental package; free parking; free air travel for family; free insurance policy with spouse and dependent children; free second language lessons; a severance payment of $32,000 when defeated or retired; a re–entry allocation of $9,000 when defeated or retired.

• (1225)

On top of that is the lucrative, double standard, gold plated MP pension plan for a six–year member, worth between $500,000 and $4.5 million, depending upon the years of service, and valued at $28,000 per year by the independent consulting group Sobeco, Ernst & Young in February 1994.

This is why I believe MPs, notably the class of '88 and the class of '93 and all future classes, should have the right to opt out. A remuneration committee should be struck, with no MPs on the committee, and the mandate of the committee on behalf of all Canadians should be to set and establish a transparent taxable salary for MPs, which includes all expenses that can be receipted, and a pension plan of a certain amount that MPs will themselves look after.

The mistake I made when I gave a dollar figure of $150,000 was that that is self–serving. It is not my place and it should not be my place to set the amount. It should be done at arm's length by an independent body. There are some good groups out there that could do that. That is why I criticized the 205 rookies—or the 150 rookies, because Reform rookies are doing what they said they would do.

Let us fix it. The Liberals have an opportunity to fix it, and that would be the way to do it. We would get the public off the backs of MPs. We would restore integrity to politicians, because they would be paid a salary and benefits the Canadian public agrees with. They would not set it themselves; it would be set by an independent body. That would include the salary, benefits, and a pension plan that MPs could look after. That is how the problem could be solved, and we would not be yelling across the floor at each other about what is going on.

On an overall compensation and remuneration package, we have argued long and strong on this side of the House that the pension plan is far too generous. It has to be reduced and brought into line with the private sector. That is what Canadians and Reformers want. That is what Reformers are promising and that is why Reformers are opting out. We are putting our money where our mouths are.

We really believe that all members who do not opt out, those who had the opportunity to opt out, will be voted out, because they are treating themselves on a different level and on a different standard from the rest of Canadians. We are no better than the rest of Canadians. We are serving Canadians. If we

really want to serve Canadians, we should accept the amount that would be given by an independent board.

I think the MP pension plan should definitely be looked at and reviewed and brought into line with that of the private sector.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest and I want to address at least one point the member has raised.

He continues to suggest in the House that the expense allowance members of Parliament receive should be doubled and added to salary. This is absolutely a wrong approach. The member is slowly back pedalling. He has said in the House on many occasions that all the benefits should go away and members of Parliament should be paid $150,000 a year. He justifies that by saying that the expenses somehow should be doubled to be on a pretax basis and added to salary.

In fact what the member has failed to realize is that if expenses were added to salary it would be the same as telling a travelling salesman who received a $5,000 reimbursement for his housing, travel, and lodging that somehow he should get $10,000 added to salary instead of being reimbursed for the expenses.

Members of Parliament do have legitimate expenses: a second housing allowance, travel, food, et cetera, all of which are part of doing this job. They are reimbursement of expenses.

Perhaps the member would like to calculate what the equivalent pretax would be. What he has failed to do is understand that all the expenses incurred by members of Parliament would be deductible for tax purposes against that salary. In fact the amount of $150,000 represents a 30 per cent salary increase to members of Parliament as proposed by the Reform Party.

• (1230)

I simply ask the hon. member for Calgary Centre if he would explain to the House why he believes we should change our pension plan to make it the same as the private sector's and why is the Reform Party recommending a 30 per cent salary increase to members of Parliament?

Mr. Silye: Madam Speaker, we have an issue where, on the basis of a low salary, the government tries to justify a high pension. I have tried to take a look at the complete remuneration package of MPs, which includes the so–called low salary and the pension. If we add them together what do we get? It is too low on the one end and too high on the other. Why not bring them together and look at it that way?

As far as the doubling up of expenses, that $21,300 is called an expense allowance but all the members who live in Ottawa and the surrounding area get it and they do not have two residences. I use all the expense money because I live in Calgary and I have a residence here. According to Sobeco, Ernst & Young, not all of that expense money is used up. However, that is not really the issue.

The issue is we should come clean and say: "To be a member of Parliament this is your job description and this is the head office. You come from all across Canada to work in the head office. If you come here we will pay you this much in a transparent taxable salary. Receipt your expenses and we will reimburse you. Within that benefit package we will give you some of these benefits, like a life insurance policy, a health and dental policy, parking, and the value of that is determined by—"

Mr. Szabo: Why are you recommending $150,000?

Mr. Silye: I should not have recommended a number. If it were $150,000 the net amount we would get is $75,000 to look after everything, all expenses, the second residence and everything else.

What the hon. member gets right now is about $72,000 net. He is within $3,000 of that same figure. I can show that based on the total compensation package.

The solution is not to keep defending this gold plated, trough regular, trough light and trough stout plan. Even members of the government do not understand the pension plan. They keep defending it rather than asking how they can fix it. I have put forward a suggestion and a solution. The pension plan is too generous. Get rid of it. Make it no better than the private sector's. That is what Canadians want. That is what we have to do. Listen to what Canadians have said and do that.

If we do that there is a problem with the rest of the equation and we will have to fix it. However, there will be another time to talk about remuneration. We have to bring one down and bring out all of the perks which are under the table.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it was not my intention to participate in this debate but as I was listening to Reform members I could not believe they were not discussing some of the other relevant factors in the debate.

Before the member for Calgary Centre leaves I would like to make sure I understood his quote accurately that the person who wrote the article said members of Parliament should receive a salary commensurate with what they would receive in the private sector. The member nodded that is what this article stated.

• (1235)

That is an interesting point to debate. From the same *Financial Post* last week we saw a list of the top 100 executives in Canada and what they made. For members who did not see the article I will give some highlights. The top executive in Canada, my former employer Mr. Stronach from Magna, made approxi-

mately $14 million. The last one on the list received approximately $1 million.

Of the top 100 executives in Canada, the men and women given judgment by their peers to be the top 100 in terms of their business accomplishments, achievements and contributions to the community, the lowest paid makes $1 million and the highest approximately $14 million.

In no way, shape or form do I want to suggest the salaries in the House should be commensurate with the top 100 executives in Canada. However, I believe the work we do in this board room is every bit as important as the work those executives do in the private sector. Our responsibilities are as great. There are a lot of men and women in the country who if they were in the private sector would probably be in that top 100.

There are men and women in the Chamber whom I have watched in committee and in the House. I have watched them travel the country and the world. They work harder than a lot of the top 100 executives. A lot of the top 100 executives could not keep up with most members of Parliament.

The Reform Party is trying to depreciate the contribution the men and women of the Chamber make on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of their country. The member for Calgary Centre said let us have integrity, let us be transparent. He talked about free rail passes, that we have plane tickets to travel Canada and that we have a telephone code in order to make long distance calls. He tried to spin that these are perks.

These are not perks. These are tools the men and women in the Chamber need to do their job. How many of us in the Chamber have ever used our rail passes? This is my second term as an MP and I think I have used my rail pass once to go from Ottawa to Toronto. I would like to get on the train instead of taking a fast ride to Vancouver to give a speech. I would love to have the luxury of taking a week to get there and a week to get back on our rail system, what is left of it. However, a lot of us do not have the luxury to enjoy the rail pass the way the member for Calgary Centre tried to insinuate.

This whole notion of depreciating the work members of Parliament do is really not fair. It is fair to debate the notion the pension plan might be perceived as too high or too generous but I do not when we consider the whole package involved.

• (1240)

On the notion in the *Financial Post* which someone in the private sector wrote to the member about salaries being commensurate with the private sector's, what member of Parliament will lead the campaign that we want $.5 million a year for all members of Parliament? They would be dead.

I have had a lot of experience in the private sector and I have met most of those people in the top 100. A lot of members of Parliament are worth every nickel of the $.5 million a year if we want to compare them to the contributions those top 100 executives make.

If we are to be fair and constructive in this debate we should include all factors and we should not mislead Canadians. Rail passes and plane passes are not there as perks. They are there for us to go out and give speeches, listen to people in all parts of the country. We do not serve only our own communities in the Chamber, we serve coast to coast. That is why we have those instruments. To spin them as perks I do not think is responsible.

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to participate in the discussion on Bill C–85, a bill which lives up to our red book commitments and goes beyond.

The bill makes important reforms to MP pension arrangements and has the effect of lowering the costs to taxpayers of the plan by some 33 per cent. The bill proposes a package of what are essentially cutbacks to one element of parliamentarians' compensation, our pension plan. Because the other elements of our package remain frozen they could not be used for any offsetting adjustments.

Members today are being asked to accept a pensionable age of 55 and a 20 per cent reduction in our pension formula for our future service. I believe this is a fair bargain. I hope members will join me in supporting the bill.

The changes to the pension arrangements contained in Bill C–85 are being proposed after somewhat long and careful study. Part of this was carried out through the review process set up under the Parliament of Canada Act. Under this act a commission is required to be established after each federal election to review the adequacy of MP compensation and allowances.

The most recent commission established in January 1994 was headed by the Hon. Charles Lapointe and made its report in July 1994. Even before the Lapointe commission report, however, a special study of parliamentarians' compensation had already been commissioned by the prior government. This study was carried out by Sobeco, Ernst & Young, a reputable Montreal consulting firm. Its report was tabled in Parliament in February 1994 and was then referred to the Lapointe commission for review.

[*Translation*]

Sobeco, Ernst & Young examined several elements, including the questioning of the basic principles governing parliamentarians' pensions. They also suggested a number of discussion topics, such as tying sessional indemnities to parliamentarians' private income and rates of pay to their performance.

The government welcomes these two reports on the whole issue of parliamentarians' compensation and allowances. As part of this study, not only were extensive consultations carried out with citizen groups, business associations, compensation experts and other stakeholders, but present and former members were also consulted. Throughout the process, the objective was to come up with a series of changes which would be fair and, while alleviating taxpayers' concerns, would continue to meet the needs of members.

Let me first quote a few of the recommendations contained in the independent report presented by Sobeco, Ernst & Young, which reviewed the entire parliamentarian compensation scheme.

[*English*]

This study looked at each aspect of our compensation package, from sessional indemnities through pensions, insurance, health benefits and travel. A value was assigned to each component which in turn allowed the consultants to value the total package. The components and package were then compared with the compensation packages provided in other Canadian jurisdictions, public and private, and in selected international jurisdictions. When total compensation is taken into account and compared to similar occupations in private and public sectors, the study noted that MPs' compensation exceeds that of managers in all companies but as was pointed out it is still less than executives.

• (1245)

Both the general feelings and the formal comparisons arising from the study support the position that parliamentarians' basic salaries are relatively modest but our pension arrangements are overall too generous.

The study recommended a realignment of our expense allowance to include an accommodation allowance and an accountable expense portion. It recommended minor changes to the travel benefits, insurance benefits and career transition provisions. At the same time it recommended that the pension plan be scaled back essentially to levels more commonly found in the private sector. The study also recommended increasing the salary of an MP from the current $64,400 to $88,500.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the consultants recognized however that it may not be the right time, in the present situation, to vote the salary increases they were recommending. At any rate, they indicated that the proposed decrease in the retirement plan, if approved, would necessitate an increase in wages so that the overall compensation level would remain the same.

[*English*]

A true pension plan must have a retirement pension goal guaranteeing a revenue replacement target at retirement which does not depend on investment return over the accumulation period, salary increases or in some cases, age of retirement. Such an objective may be reached only through a defined benefit plan because employer's contributions can be applied to level the fluctuations in retirement pensions resulting from variations in investment returns over the years.

The consultants' bottom line recommendation on this issue is that if the Canadian public's concerns were that pension costs were too high, the solution should be to reduce the cost by reducing benefits rather than to replace the plan with a retirement savings plan which had no clear income replacement goals.

[*Translation*]

As the hon. members probably noticed when they read Bill C–85, this is the solution advocated by the Treasury Board president. The measures contained in this bill will help reduce costs to taxpayers substantially.

Sobeco, Ernst & Young also made recommendations on double dipping. As the hon. members know, the bill before us provides for major restrictions in that regard.

The pension payable to former members who receive, in respect of a federal position, a salary or fee paid through the CRF or appropriations will be reduced or cancelled if they earn more than $5,000 per year from that job.

[*English*]

As my final comment on the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report, I would like to read what the consultants considered an important goal in setting parliamentarians' compensation: "MPs' compensation should contribute to making members proud to serve their country and convinced that their financial reward for doing so is fair and to making Canadians in turn satisfied with the levels paid to their representatives". I think all members can endorse this goal.

As I indicated earlier, the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report was subsequently referred to the Lapointe commission. Traditionally that commission has not looked at issues such as pension benefits. Nevertheless, it did so on this occasion. The Lapointe commission made recommendations in two main areas, first, the area of MPs' and senators' compensation and second, in the matter of the public's attitude about parliamentarians' compensation overall.

Like the Sobeco study before it, the author noted that there was a great deal of misunderstanding and lack of knowledge about the compensation paid to parliamentarians. Like Sobeco, the Lapointe commission also recommended an increase in sessional indemnities to take effect as soon as the salary freeze is lifted in 1997.

The commission recommended replacement of our tax free allowances with fully accountable capped expense accounts. As hon. members know, the bill before us adopts the recommendation of the Lapointe commission and sets age 55 as the pensionable age under the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. The Lapointe commission agreed with Sobeco that incidents of double dipping would be greatly reduced through imposition of a pensionable age and that no additional measures

were needed. However, our government does not agree. That is why Bill C–85 has a provision which eliminates double dipping.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

These studies should be a great source of inspiration. They identify all the factors to consider and the areas where adjustments are required. However, the fact that fiscal restraint is still the order of the day gives the President of the Treasury Board little leeway in making changes to the members' compensation scheme. Not only would a decrease in our retirement benefits be unfair to us if it were not offset by some adjustment, but it would make public office much less attractive in the future.

[*English*]

On this side of the House we believe that the proposed reduction in our future benefits of 20 per cent and the reduction of taxpayers' costs by one–third have gone a considerable way to reforming our pension plan in a period when the government is committed to maintaining the wage freeze for parliamentarians.

The Lapointe commission's final pension recommendation concerned the contribution rate to the pension plan which it recommended should be reviewed. Bill C–85 recognizes that members' pension benefits will be reduced in the future and sets a revised member contribution rate of 9 per cent of session indemnities and additional salary if applicable.

In conclusion, it is clear that Bill C–85 meets many of the objectives outlined in the Lapointe commission report. We could have gone further but I believe we have met our red book commitments and gone beyond them. Maybe it is not to the satisfaction of everyone, but we have accepted much of the advice of many who have spoken on the reform of MP pensions. This bill is proof positive that we have kept our promises.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a very wise man once said that when you are in a hole and you want to get out, the first thing you should do is to stop digging. It is interesting to hear members opposite speak today and try to validate the change to the MP gold plated pension plan when in actual fact what they should probably do is to just stop digging. Some members and Canadians have deemed this to be an unjust and unfair form of remuneration, when in actual fact it should be a pure pension plan. We should separate salary and pension.

I would like to ask the member a question regarding the actuarially sound propositions in the pension plans, the old and the new proposition being put forward for consideration of the House.

The Liberals have done some things. They have reduced the rate at which the benefits accumulate from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. They have also reduced the amount members actually pay into the pension plan from 11 per cent to 9 per cent.

In looking at the plan we should try to figure out if it is actuarially sound. I think all members of the House and all Canadians would agree that something we at least owe the public of Canada is to make sure the program is actuarially sound. Witnesses stated before the committee that to make it actuarially sound we should be paying in close to 30 per cent. I believe the figure was between 26 per cent and 30 per cent.

How can the member square this with his constituents when what we are doing with this plan is making the taxpayer pick up the difference? We should be paying approximately 26 per cent to make it actuarially sound.

Mr. Discepola: Madam Speaker, I have no problem standing here before my constituents and supporting Bill C–85 because during the election we campaigned on the question of pension reform. I will save members the trouble of reading the red book commitment, and hopefully they have read it. Two issues came up time and time again.

One was the age. I agree totally that no one should be able to retrieve a pension right after leaving office, despite the fact that the average tenure in the Chamber is less than six years. In private industry the normal vesting period is two years. In our case it is six years and the majority of us do not receive the pension plan. The Bloc Quebecois, for example, has stated categorically that it is not interested in the debate because its members do not plan to be here in six years.

• (1255)

The contribution which we make as MPs has been substantially reduced. It has decreased from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Our contributions have been decreased from 11 per cent to 9 per cent. That will save taxpayers over $3 million a year, which amounts to 33 per cent of the cost.

We have done our share. I will have no qualms justifying that to my constituents in the next election campaign. I will be proud to stand and justify my contribution to the constituents of Vaudreuil. I guarantee to members of the Reform Party that I will be here after the next election because my constituents have confidence in me.

It is not a single issue which will dictate whether a member will return to the House. The Reform Party has chosen minor issues such as this one to make big political gains. It might work. I wish Reform members luck. But by George, if we had expended half of the energy that we have in this debate on the real

problems which face the country, such as job creation and growth, we would have been much better off.

I am glad this is the last day of debate on the bill. I wish Reform members a merry summer as they travel to the east exploiting some aspects of the bill for their own political gain and I wish them luck in their recruitment process for the Reform Party.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak on Bill C–85. I will be splitting my time with the member for Fraser Valley West.

Major problems exist in Canada. There is the debt and the deficit. There is the criminal justice system and all the reforms which are necessary. There is parliamentary reform, which rates fairly high with Canadians. We certainly need to look at the other place; all of us would agree many changes are required there. Free votes. Recall of MPs so we can get rid of the bad ones. Referenda. Those are the issues people are talking about. The other things they are talking about are things which are not compatible with what they see as being fair. Certainly MP pensions fit into that category.

Canadians are now very aware that over the last number of years we have built a $553 billion debt and that the debt deepens by $110 million per day. By the time the next election comes the country will be another $100 billion in debt.

When those are the problems, Canadians do not want us to waste our time talking about things like pensions and how we are going to take care of members of Parliament. We have wasted our time talking about things like gun control, quotas, the $2 coin and the minor changes we will make to the pension plan. People are saying there are some big problems which we should be addressing. Canadians are asking us to get on with the job of addressing those problems.

When talking about the pension plan Canadians ask how the Liberals can justify the pension. How do they do that? What do the Liberals say when they are in the House of Commons to justify their pension plan? Let us look at the kinds of things we have heard during the debate.

First, we have heard about the red book. The red book says that we are going to change the pension plan. The Liberals say they have done that. They have made the eligibility age 55. The rest of the country of course is looking at 65, 67 and a much higher age in the future. Double dipping is not allowed any more. "Big deal", is what most people will say about that. They say they have gone further than what they had planned. I think the Reform Party can take some credit for that.

• (1300)

We hear: "When you leave one job, you are going to have a hard time finding another one". I believe that if one has done his or her job here one will probably have an easier time finding another job. The people here who have done a good job will be sought after by industry.

What about job security? That is a little hard to sell as well. In what other job does one find security any more? If people do their jobs they will have security, which is what we should have here.

Members have said that when they leave their jobs this pension is compensation for a low salary. It has been made very clear by the member for Calgary Centre that there are other parts to this job. All Canadians are asking for is to have things up front. They want to know what MPs get.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that Bill C–85 is such an important issue, I wonder if it might be in order to ask a few of the Liberals to attend in this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The hon. member knows very well that we do not refer to the presence or absence of any member. I would like to reiterate something I mentioned this morning. Because of the emotional issue we are dealing with, we could deal with it more calmly.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Madam Speaker, I do not see a quorum.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I do not see a quorum.

And the count having been taken:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Mills (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, it is amazing how that works. It certainly is nice to give a speech to somebody. It makes my point about democracy and how little there is of that in this House as we have gone on.

I would like to go back to the pension and how Liberals justify it. I have pointed out that this attempt at justifying the pension plan is going to fall on deaf ears. I think to the next election and about bringing up the trough charts that will be available as we show who is at the trough and what sorts of benefits there will be.

I also think about that PC candidate who is going to say: "I cannot opt out of the plan". I think of the Liberal and NDP who will say: "Our party did not opt out of the plan". I also think of the position we are going to be in when we say: "We all opted out of the plan when given that opportunity".

An article in today's *Gazette* is interesting. It states that the voters will not forgive MPs for keeping their lavish pensions. This is where it is really at. By voting themselves reduced but still lavish pensions this week, many Liberal MPs might be signing their own political death warrants. I guess we should say

hurrah for that and right on because that certainly is going to help our campaign.

The public is not stupid. The public knows what is happening. The public has sent the message that it should come from the constituency to Ottawa and that is where the message has to be. It is a clear message. The message on pensions is that they are too rich, too gold plated. Eighty per cent of Canadians are saying that. That is what the polls are saying about the MP gold plated pension plan. They do not believe that the party knows best. They do not believe that this is a fair item.

For the member for Kingston and the Islands who brings out his green book, his little, little green book, I have a little, little red book. If I might paraphrase from this little, little red book concerning the topic of punishment of backbenchers, it says that MPs must learn to stop listening to the views of their constituents and remember their loyalty is to the party. That is exactly what the message in the pension plan is, loyalty to the party.

• (1305)

So we will quote from this little, little red book because this little, little red book—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Could I ask the member to keep his objects on his desk please.

Mr. Mills (Red Deer): The member from Kingston certainly holds his little, little green book up. I thought with all of his experience I could do it as well.

This lack of democracy, this lack of listening to people, is probably the biggest concern I have. Let us look at the pension plan without mixing it up with salaries and other things. Its clause by clause study was done in 12 minutes.

Look at the committee hearings where so much is done. We invite selected guests and give them one day to tell us what we want to hear. They would not even tell us what the government wanted to hear. So there are no amendments of substance and if there are they are defeated by the powers that be, by the Madam Speaker dictatorship that rules this House.

We now have a two–tier system being proposed, a trough lite and a trough regular. The trough regular gives us figures that are unimaginable. We have members who would get $4 million if they were to retire and live to age 75. They could never get that in the private sector. The pension plan is three and one–half times greater than one could get in the private sector.

The public is not saying that members do not deserve a pension. They are saying we should make it the same as we could get in the private sector. They are not saying—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have to sometimes apologize for my colleagues because I want to give credit where credit is due. Some credit should be given to the Liberal Party.

When I was flying to Ottawa a couple of weeks ago I met this fellow on the plane who said: "I want to give credit where credit is due to the Liberals because they made me a millionaire". I said: "A millionaire, so why are you so sad and forlorn? What were you before?" He replied that he had been a multimillionaire. It brings me back to this pension plan to ask: "Who is becoming the millionaire, the businessman or the member of Parliament from the Liberals or this separatist group over here?"

I am wearing an appropriate tie today. It has some little piggies on it. It reminds me of the poem I learned in grade three when I was 22 or so. It goes:

This little piggy went to the pension market over here
And this little piggy can buy a new home
And this little piggy buys the best of roast beef
But all these little piggies will ultimately get none

That is my little piggy story. If the government thinks we are kidding it had better bear in mind the word retroactive because when the next election comes and the present government is out, we will be back visiting Bill C–85.

I have listened to a lot of things in this House of Commons during this past session. The other day when the Prime Minister—he has done this numerous times but I am speaking of recently—stood up in the House of Commons he had the nerve to compare himself with a hockey player to justify this fat cat pension plan. It was absurd for the chief politician in Canada.

• (1310)

Why these folks over there try to mix salary and pension is beyond me. There are people like the President of the Treasury Board, who should know better and who also will pick up a good pension. Why are they not listening to the people, through the Reform Party, through all the contacts that they have, through all the organizations in this country, about pensions? I will never know. It is certainly not a populist organization at all.

One member recently in making a comment to one of my colleagues suggested that my colleague should resign if he does not like the pension plan. I think the shoe should be on the other foot. This group should resign for putting in the pension plan. If they will not resign we will be back talking in a couple of years through an election.

For years as I was growing up I was concerned about political remoteness. When I lived in Atlantic Canada I heard that when I was a young man and later when I moved to British Columbia. Everyone you talk to talks about political remoteness and how Ottawa does not resemble what is really going on in the country.

This pension plan is just so representative of that political remoteness.

During the election campaign in my riding there were three big issues: the economy, the criminal justice system and the pension plan. Even before the election, I decided to opt out of the pension plan, as my colleagues have. I still kept thinking about this political remoteness.

When we talk about things here in the House of Commons from day to day, you cannot understand for instance these separatists who come into this House wanting and agreeing with a pension plan. I think it is absurd enough that they are getting a salary, much less asking for a pension plan at a cost to hard working Canadian citizens.

I also wonder why it is that the Liberals keep hanging on to this and why it is they try to keep mixing it up with the statement that we are not paid enough, we need a future, we need a pension plan. I cannot understand how they are missing the boat. I guess it is political remoteness. They just do not understand.

Three bills have just gone through the House—this is the last one—where the government has restricted debate and enforced time limitation. They were Bill C–68, the gun law; Bill C–41, commonly known now as the hate law, and sex crimes too if we consider sexual orientation; and Bill C–85. All three are on very important issues and the government has the audacity to limit debate.

Some of the other bills which have gone through are just plain useless but government members debated and debated and debated. When it comes down to the three important bills which the government has goofed up on it limits debate. When we talk about political remoteness it is here in this House.

If the government thinks for a moment that this Reform Party is going away, it is just starting and it is growing. It is growing in Ontario, it is growing in Atlantic Canada. The government can stick to its polls. It tried that in the last election and there were 52 Reform MPs brought here. The government can stick to its polls but it will not work. The Liberals are going to the same Jurassic Park as that other group did. That is where they are going.

What is wrong with a plan that is no better than other people get; a one for one contribution? What is wrong with that? Why must they have more? What is in it for them? What is not in it for the taxpayer? People in my community do not understand it, yet Liberals say they represent people all across Canada. It is political remoteness.

• (1315)

I have seen here problems with ethics, problems with integrity and problems with arrogance to the hilt. However the real problem in the House is a four–letter word called greed. It can be called nothing better than that.

An hon. member: It is a five–letter word.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): That is what I should have said, five. I am only an accountant. I guess these things do not add up for me. That is how one gets out of it. That is why I have colleagues here. Accountants kind of get off track.

What really irritates in the whole discussion is when government members opposite have been known to say that the member for Beaver River is opportunistic in opting out or not opting into the plan. That is about as low as we can get from members opposite.

The individual is personally going to be out probably a couple of million dollars. That is not opportunistic. That is real commitment. That is the kind of commitment and principles one gets from this side, not the hogwash we have been hearing over there. They were the very people, when the Conservatives were over there, who stood over here and said: "You don't have any ethics. You don't have any integrity".

What is happening today? It is the same old story. Liberal, Tory, the same old story. The two words I want to talk about in the final analysis are my five–letter word and I do not even want to say how many letters are in retroactive. It does not matter.

The word retroactive will be indelible in the minds of Reformers. When we move opposite we will make a change. There will be changes to Bill C–68. There will be changes to Bill C–41 and there will be changes to Bill C–85. They had better remember the word retroactive.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it goes without saying that the issue of members' pensions is of interest to every member of Parliament as well as to Canadians in general.

[*English*]

Many have strong opinions as can be seen by the debate in the House today with members speaking both in support of and in opposition to Bill C–85.

There is one thing all members of the House can agree on: the bill before the House is an improvement on the existing pension plan. It is a step in the right direction. I understand hon. members opposite think it should go further, but it is a step in the right direction.

The basics of it are that we are living up to our red book commitment. Our red book commitment in the election campaign said that we would end double dipping: the practice of members leaving the House or leaving the Senate and getting another job on the federal public payroll or an appointment and being able to collect their pension and a salary at the same time. That is now over. That is over with the bill and it is over with the practice the Prime Minister instituted in Parliament in an

informal fashion prior to the bill formally being adopted and coming into law. That is covered.

Canadians are concerned that there be a minimum age, that members of Parliament leaving in their forties not be collecting a pension at such a young age. The age was reviewed by a commission of Parliament, the Lapointe commission which recommended age 55. A consultant study that was commissioned by the previous federal government also recommended age 55, and that is what is being implemented in Bill C–85. Again we have lived up to the commitment that was made in the election campaign to deal with the matter of a minimum age.

• (1320)

We have gone beyond that because we have recognized in this time of fiscal restraint, this time of needing to reduce the cost of government, that we should take a leadership role and therefore we have by reducing the benefit rate for pensions collected by retired members of Parliament. In doing so I have been able to cut the cost to the taxpayer by some 33 per cent. A 33 per cent reduction in the cost of the pension plan for members of Parliament is again an improvement, a step in the right direction.

We also have to look at the pension plan in the context of overall compensation for members of Parliament. That has been raised not only by the Lapointe commission and by the consultant study which said that we should go up in the salary and down in the pensions, keeping the overall remuneration level the same. Not only has it been suggested by them and by various witnesses who have appeared before the Lapointe commission, but it has also been a point that the Reform Party through its whip has particularly highlighted. The whip of the Reform Party was suggesting that we should perhaps be going up in salaries far in excess of what they are today, which would amount to increases in the neighbourhood of 100 per cent to 130 per cent.

We just cannot afford to do that. For the Reform Party to suggest in this time of fiscal restraint that we should have those kinds of salary increases is a terribly unreasonable position and not one that I am sure would be supported by the taxpayers at all.

We have to look at the total context of the compensation package here. Members of Parliament have chosen to pay more for pensions, for having that kind of benefit when they leave the House, and to sacrifice a higher salary level than the Reform Party whip and others have recommended.

While they talk about the pension being greater than what other people may get in the private sector, they fail to point out that members of Parliament pay a lot more. With any pension plan, whether it be private sector or public sector, one gets according to the amount of money one invests in it. Members of Parliament invest a substantial amount more. That is something they conveniently overlook.

In putting this matter in the context of total compensation, there are some words that are particularly important to note because they were used by a member of the Lapointe commission, Professor C. E. S. Franks from Queen's University. He later appeared before the standing committee of the House reviewing Bill C–85. I think he put the matter in a good context and it is relevant to quote his words. He said:

> The majority of ex–MPs have served too short a time, in fact less than six years, to receive any parliamentary pension whatsoever. In fact a great many ex–members not only do not have a pension but have a difficult time in finding employment and re–establishing themselves after serving as a member.

Professor Franks went on to say:

> The issue of MP pensions should more appropriately be considered in the context of overall remuneration of elected representatives. Members of Parliament are significantly less well paid than other Canadian professionals. International comparisons prove Canadian MPs to be among the lowest paid. If other factors were to be taken into account, like the length of sessions, the opportunities for other income generating activities, the likelihood of serving long enough to make a career as a politician and to earn a pension sufficient for support in old age, then Canadian elected representatives are even worse off than those of other countries. This low remuneration has effect on representation in Canada.

Professor Franks went on further in his testimony to indicate:

> A higher proportion of Canadian MPs choose voluntarily to retire from the House and not to run in an election than leave by any means, death, defeat or desire, than in Britain, than the United States or continental Europe.
>
> There is something deeply dissatisfying in the work world of the Canadian member of Parliament to create such a rapid turnover and desire to leave. It might be argued that this turnover does not matter and that a steady influx of new members is a good thing in the House, but what happens in Canada goes beyond what is a good thing.
>
> Comparative studies of legislatures and the legislative process have shown that a necessary requirement and precondition for a strong legislature, independent and effective representation, and strong legislative committees is a body of experience, experienced long term members who make a career in the legislature.
>
> The Canadian Parliament does not have this sort of long serving membership. The Canadian Parliament is correspondingly weakened in its ability to hold government accountable, in its efforts to obtain redress of grievances for citizens, and in its debate and investigation of important issues.

• (1325)

The important point illustrated by his words is that the failure to appropriately compensate members of Parliament weakens the institution and in turn is detrimental to Canadians.

He also noted, as did other witnesses, that half of former MPs go without any pension. We are talking about a situation where half the people in the House will never collect a pension. There is not an enormous cost to the Canadian taxpayer when we consider that. Members put in a lot of time and effort and do not receive any pension or contribution from the government.

The Reform Party prefers to point out that there are some members who might do well with a pension because of their length of service. They have even used some figures they obtained from the National Citizens' Coalition. I have looked at those figures and they are wildly out of line with reality. They are just not true at all.

For example, they used one figure of $2.5 million relevant to one member of the House when the actual figure is almost half that in terms of the accumulation of a pension collection over a great number of years. The assumption is that the member would be leaving now and collecting a pension until age 70. There is also the assumption that the inflation rate is 5 per cent. The inflation rate is actually less than half of that. The figures were grossly exaggerated. Again I point out that only half the members who leave the House receive a pension.

Professor Franks' comments, the Sobeco, Ernst & Young report, the Lapointe commission and the hon. whip of the Reform Party have all raised the question of why we do not raise the salaries. We just cannot. Members of Parliament have had their salaries frozen for some six years now. Public servants' salaries have also been frozen. In this kind of climate it would be a bad message and bad point of leadership to suggest that we should increase our salaries. I am sorry, I say to the whip of the Reform Party and other members who support him. We just cannot in this context deal with a salary increase.

Meanwhile, we have indicated strong leadership in terms of moving in the right direction, living up to our commitments made during the election campaign as printed in the red book, and reducing the cost of the pension plan to the taxpayers by some 33 per cent.

[*Translation*]

It is anticipated that the amendments proposed in Bill C–85 will result in annual savings of some $3.3 million.

[*English*]

This bill is a move in the right direction. It reduces the overall cost of the MP pension plan to taxpayers.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

I point out to the House at the outset that I am not pleased with the method the government is using to force this particularly biased legislation through the House.

• (1330)

The government cannot be at all comfortable with this legislation or it would allow members of Parliament free debate. That is not happening. What do we see? We see a government slipping this through as quickly as possible during the last day in an attempt to hide it from public scrutiny.

Canadians are not stupid. They will see through this strategy, through the government's attempt to put one over at the very last minute. They will not be fooled by this undemocratic strategy.

The Liberals, like the government before them, are underestimating the Canadian public. The new plan does not address Canadians' demands for a fair system of MP pensions. The new plan is hardly any better or any different from the old plan.

It provides for a few adjustments by taking from one area and adding somewhere else, all at taxpayers' expense of course. This plan simply raises members' take home salary by reducing MP contribution rates.

Liberals in the committee on procedure and House affairs excluded witnesses from coming forward to speak on the bill. The government claimed it would allow witnesses only who could prove they were experts in MP pensions in an effort to eliminate groups such as the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, which has been very outspoken in its efforts to push the government into bringing MP pensions in line.

The government's exclusionary tactics have denied ordinary Canadians the right to appear before committee to express their views. Who does the government think pays the MP pensions? The Canadian taxpayers do and they deserve a right to be before the committee and have their views heard.

The Liberals in committee also objected to witnesses who refer to the trough goers in derogatory terms unless they jammed all the witnesses into a one–day session. It appears when it comes to the greedy personal interests of members across the floor, there simply cannot be any discussion.

Regardless of general consensus against the new plan by witnesses, the Liberal majority on the standing committee after just 12 minutes of deliberations pushed the bill through with not one change at all, what a sham.

We now see why the ethics commissioners is only a figure–head. It is because there are no ethics regarding policies of the members opposite. Why should taxpayers have to continue to pay this ridiculous subsidy to members of Parliament?

One witness to the standing committee estimated the new pension plan is seven times more generous than the typical public sector plan and four times more generous than the typical private sector plan.

MPs are in a very privileged position. Unlike most working Canadians, they can set their own remuneration. MPs set their salaries, their perks and their pensions. This is a heavy responsibility which few are entrusted with, and with that responsibility comes a great deal of trust and expectation for fellow Canadians.

The very nature of this pension plan is an abuse of not only MP privileges but also an abuse of the legislation that governs Canadians. The plan is out of line with regulations and rules governing pensions in the Income Tax Act.

I make reference to the accrual rate. The Income Tax Act allows only a 2 per cent accrual rate. The previous MP pension plan allowed for a 5 per cent accrual. This plan drops it to four, still twice that of the Income Tax Act.

Why are MPs different? The Liberals say they are proposing to reduce the amount of pensions, raise the minimum age for collecting pensions and eliminate double dipping. They will not say the full extent of the plan and why it is so distasteful that 52 Reform MPs, all Reform MPs, and a few ethical Liberal MPs will have nothing to do with it and will volunteer to opt out of the plan.

In addition, the Liberals in their amendments to this plan have taken the liberty of giving themselves a better deal by reducing MP contributions from 11 per cent to 9 per cent. In doing so what have they done? They have actually given themselves a raise as their take home pay will be increased by the reduction in the contributions—here we go again.

It is obvious the self–serving interests of some members on the opposite side have dictated the contents of the bill. It would be far better for MP pensions to be set up by an independent body at arm's length to the government.

Obviously many members cannot handle this responsibility themselves. At least at arm's length the agency would be better able to make an objective assessment of MP pensions.

Members on the opposite side are arguing the new MP pension plan is fair just because they feel they work hard and deserve fair compensation. For many MPs it appears their definition of fair compensation should be much more fair than for other Canadians.

• (1335)

I am sure many Canadians would be more than pleased to receive such generous compensation packages they were allowed, but they cannot play by the same rules.

This plan is not realistic and cannot be extended to the public because if it did we would bankrupt the country. Members with any conscience will think twice before gorging into this tax trough and will opt out. Members here to serve Canada and not themselves will and should do the right thing.

It is not easy to give up a hefty sum of tax dollars but if members think this over carefully and weigh it in their conscience, those who have one, they will do the right thing and opt out of the plan.

This newly revised trough plan will become very evident to Canadians and they will demand their MP take the decent course of action and stop robbing their tax dollars. They will demand their MP take the high road and opt out. Many will see why the Liberals are attempting to push the bill through. This plan will make many of these politicians millionaires. These MPs do not want to give up such a lucrative fortune, let alone negotiate a normal pension. They refuse to be pressured by the electorate to get their hands out of the cookie jar and start doling out taxpayers dollars fairly.

However, the Liberals have failed to gauge the mood of the voting public, just as the Conservatives did. The Liberals will suffer the same fate for not listening. This is what the Liberals fear, reprisals from their own constituents. That is why the government will not allow a simple provision in the bill for MPs to opt out at any time, not just a once only window but any time.

The Liberals clearly want to protect their fortunes. They have no scruples to lay off public servants, cut back on medicare funding or social services as long as they can protect their own greedy little self–interest. They tell Canadians to cut back and make sacrifices, but sacrifices are easy when they are in somebody else's backyard or come out of somebody else's pocket.

It is time for the government to look in its own backyard and do what Canadians expect, offer an MP pension plan similar to that available in the private sector.

I support an MP pension plan comparable to those which Canadians receive in the private sector and which meets all the requirements for registration under the Income Tax Act. The bill does not accomplish this as it stands. I, along with most Canadians, will have no part of it. All 52 Reform MPs will be opting out of the plan and it will save Canadian taxpayers $38 million.

I want the members opposite to clearly understand that when Reform forms the next government, the Liberals can kiss their extravagant pension plan goodbye. Reform will retroactively adjust all present and past pensions for any living MP to reasonable levels. We will remove the porkers from the trough because the government, as reflected in Bill C–85, is incapable of doing what Canadians expect. Old style politics lives on. The Conservatives paid the price for not listening and the Liberals are about to suffer the same fate.

Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I remind my friend from Comox—Alberni his accusation of the government's not reading the mood of the people is quite interesting. The latest polls came out this morning, showing the Reform Party at a resounding 10 per cent. That is a drop of about about half from what it was at the time of the election.

I ask the hon. member if he has ever terminated employment at some time and tried to resume a career after that termination? The hon. member is probably not as old as I am and so he is probably more marketable as a commodity in the private sector than I am at my age.

• (1340)

A large number of his colleagues in the Reform Party will be facing that onerous challenge at the end of this term, the challenge of resuming a career in the private sector. Members of the Reform Party for the sake of the people who will follow them, some will be Reform members, should think seriously about that.

I have had that experience. Being self–employed I thought it would be the easiest thing in the world to terminate my career in Ontario politics and resume my previous career. It took four years to resume that income level, that level of activity. When I went back I was a different person. Many of my colleagues I have worked with and worked for prior to that time had gone on to other things and some had even died. It was a matter of starting all over again.

I respectfully ask the member, whose righteousness reflects his colleagues', if he has ever had that experience and if he really knows what it is like to go back.

Mr. Gilmour: Madam Speaker, on the first point on the polls, only one poll will count. The Conservatives found that in the last election and it will be the same poll for these people. They are on a downhill slide. Self–serving legislation like this will not do them any good at all.

On the second point of the hon. member's question, the purpose of coming to Parliament as an MP is not to set yourself up because you cannot get a job when you go out. If you were good enough when you came into this place you will find a job when you go back out.

I do not expect any guarantees when I go out of this place. I will not set myself up and use this place as a big trough to get in knee deep so that I can set myself up on the way out.

I will go out with a normal pension or I will go out with no pension at all. This is not the place to set ourselves up for the future.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member talked about our ramming it through. I wonder how he can say that when the bill has been around since the end of April. Prior to that Reformers questioned us for some period of time, when would we bring in the bill. They were so anxious to have it that when we finally brought it in they asked why we are putting it through.

The issue has been around since the last election. It was around during the last election. It has certainly been around through this Parliament. I do not understand how they can say we are ramming it through. As well, at committee they did not even move any amendments. I do not understand that. Perhaps he could explain that a little further.

Also on the question of the Income Tax Act, I do not understand it because this complies with the act. There is additional compensation but it is paid for by the members. I do not understand the member's—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, there is barely any time, 30 seconds. The hon. member Comox—Alberni.

Mr. Gilmour: Madam Speaker, if we are not ramming this legislation through why are we standing here on the last day of the session talking about it? If it has been around for so long, explain why we are here on the last day.

Good grief, that answers it right there. Give me a break.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to speak to Bill C–85, the government's bill to amend the pension plan for members of Parliament.

The Reform Party of Canada in response to pre–election demands of Canadians promised to make changes to the MP pension plan one of our highest priorities. We promised radical change to the plan.

The Liberals have waited a very long time. They are merely tinkering with this plan.

• (1345)

In my recent householder I conducted a poll of my constituents. Seventy–seven per cent of the respondents believed that members of Parliament should have a pension plan. Eighty–nine per cent said that the current MPs pension plan should be reformed so it cannot be collected until age 60. They also said that the rates and contribution levels should conform with private sector plans.

I would like to make this point very clear: I am opting out of the new plan, and it makes me very angry that this has to be done. Bill C–85 does not go far enough. It does not reflect what Canadians wanted. It is poor legislation.

In the 1990s job security has virtually disappeared across all sectors of the economy. MPs should not have a pension plan that tries to make up for periods of time when an MP becomes unemployed. The Liberals either do not understand that or they simply do not care.

The Reform Party was elected on a platform of fiscal responsibility. We will continue to pursue the Liberals in order to force them to respond to the desire of Canadians for leadership by example.

Bill C–85 does not propose a fiscally responsible pension plan. The opting out clause the government has provided can only be interpreted as an admission of a flaw in the new pension plan the Liberals have proposed. If the government had provided a pension plan that would allow members to contribute to their own registered retirement savings plan or a private sector company type of plan with a contribution system of one to one, everyone from all sides of the House would have supported that plan. All Canadians would have supported such a plan.

The Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act requires members of Parliament to contribute 11 per cent of their earnings. Seven per cent of the contributions go to the MP retirement compensation arrangement. Four per cent of contributions go to the retirement allowances account.

The opting out clause proposed by the Liberals is a facade. It is a no win situation for individual members of Parliament. If a member chooses to opt out he or she can roll over their entitlement, which is the 4 per cent, which is the contribution to the retirement allowances act, into a personal pension plan, an RRSP. That seems fair enough. However, the 7 per cent contribution to the retirement compensation arrangement must be taken by the member in a one time payout, a cheque, plus 4 per cent compounded interest. That one time payout is treated as taxable income in the year in which it is received by the member. Any accountant in the country would shudder at this punitive measure.

The Liberals are punishing members of Parliament for opting out of the plan. They can do this because the previous plan was one of mandatory participation, which is normal in any company pension plan. Under the previous plan members were unable to pay into their own RRSPs. Therefore, the opting out becomes a double whammy: number one, the 7 per cent is added to the member's annual income and is taxable in the year it is received; number two, the members lose the amount of time they spent in the old plan in terms of not being able to make up the lost contributions to their RRSPs.

As I said before, Bill C–85 is poor legislation. Again I will state very clearly that I am opting out of the plan. However, I am angry at the ramifications of opting out. The opting out clause is inequitable and unfair. There is no reason why it has to be this way.

Let me make it very simple for the Liberals across the way. Number one, make the MP pension plan reflect private sector standards. Number two, make the MP pension plan available to MPs upon their reaching the age of 60. Number three, if it is too difficult for the government to change the pension plan, simply scrap it. Let members contribute to their own registered retirement savings plans.

• (1350)

Where is the government's sense of responsibility? Where is their sense of morality in this proposed scheme? Where is their leadership? Where is the red book commitment?

Bill C–85 is a broken promise made to Canadians during an election campaign by the Liberals. This plan has not been changed in the way ordinary Canadians would have changed it. The government is putting this legislation on a fast track. The Liberals have placed a time limit on debate on this matter. But this issue is not going away.

It does not matter that the Liberals tried to sweep this one under the rug along with their sexual orientation bill and their gun registry bill. In their haste to dispose of the MP pension plan they have shown Canadians how careless they are with respect to this matter.

The Liberals will try to forget what they have done, but in their nightmares in the next election campaign they will be seeing their constituents vividly in technicolour holding up an MP pension placard and shouting "You broke your promise".

Ordinary Canadians are astounded that they supported the Liberals in the last election. The Liberals have not even come close in delivering on a promise of integrity and restoring confidence in the government.

When I look back to the image of the Conservative Party as pigs at a trough and remember the trouncing that party took at the ballot box, I have no sympathy for the Liberals. They are behaving in the same way as their predecessors. The Tories had two consecutive majority governments reduced to two seats in this Parliament because they would not respect the desires of ordinary Canadians. This Liberal government has not learned the lessons of the Canadian electorate taught by the Tories. This government has the gall to pass pathetic legislation by limiting debate. I can hardly wait for the next election.

The House of Commons, by its name, by its very nature, and by the history that has created this Chamber and our parliamentary system, is supposed to be an arena for the common person to voice his or her concerns before the state. All of us in this place are commoners. The Liberals do not understand that we are representatives of the people and at the same time we are one with the people.

The policies and programs coming from this place should be in line with the common will of the people. Bill C–85 continues to provide members of this Chamber with million dollar pension plans. There is nothing common about such a policy. The Liberals are continuing to ensure that this House of Commons remains a manor of millionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this legislation. I thank you for your time today.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke has misled people listening to the debate because he suggested the Liberal government in introducing this bill failed to honour the commitments and promises it made in respect of the pension plan in this country for MPs.

As he will acknowledge, I am sure, in his answer to this comment, the Liberal government promised two things in the red book: to end double dipping for members of Parliament and to install a minimum age for the pension plan so that members under a certain age could not collect. He knows the minimum age provided in the bill before the House is 55; he knows this bill ends double dipping. He should come clean with Canadians and admit that not only has the government fulfilled all of the commitments it made in the red book in respect of the pension plan, but it went further. It reduced the cost of the pension to Canadian taxpayers by one–third by reducing the contribution rate so that members are ineligible to receive the full pension after 15 years and now it will be 19 years. Why does the member do that?

• (1355)

Besides suggesting that, he is also pretending to be outraged on the part of the Reform Party with his pension and claims that he is not going to collect his pension. He will not for the very good reason that a member has to be elected twice to this Chamber to collect, and he will have grave difficulty doing that. He knows that in his heart of hearts.

Is he not doing what the other Reformers are doing, opting out of the pension in order to squeeze out of the required contributions and put that money in their pockets instead of facing reality and acknowledging that what other people are doing here is right, honest, and fair?

The Speaker: The hon. member has about one minute.

Mr. Hart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question.

I knew what I was getting into when I ran for election for the good people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. If I do not win in the next election, that will not be a decision made by you but by the good people of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member will please address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Hart: Of course I meant you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: That is even worse. You have 30 seconds to wrap it up.

Mr. Hart: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the pension plan itself and the Liberal commitments, I would like to make a few comments regarding the new pension scheme.

Under the current pension scheme members of Parliament pay approximately 11 per cent into their plan and under the new scheme they will pay 7 per cent. The witnesses who came before the committee were quite clear: they reported it should be 26 per cent. We should actually be putting in approximately $19,000 to make it actuarially sound.

The Speaker: My colleagues, I regret to intervene, but it being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

PEACEKEEPING

Mr. Harry Verran (South West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the recent opening of the Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre at the former military base in Cornwallis.

All of Canada should be proud of the centre and the ability it has already demonstrated to draw an international multidisciplinary clientele to the Annapolis Valley and to the riding of South West Nova. We hope this centre will continue the tradition of peacekeeping established by former Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, visiting us in the gallery today are the following dignitaries from South West Nova: the MLA for Argyle; the warden of the municipality of Argyle; the warden of Yarmouth County; the mayor of the town of Yarmouth; and the chairman of the Yarmouth Development Authority. I welcome them to this House.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it was five years ago today that the Meech Lake accord was dealt a death–blow. The member for Churchill and Clyde Wells, the current Prime Minister's accomplice, refused to ratify the accord.

"Thanks for the job", said the current Prime Minister of Canada to Clyde Wells, when he clutched him in his arms after becoming leader of the Liberal Party in Calgary.

On that day, thousands of Canadians told Quebecers: "No, you are not a distinct society. Even your most basic demands are unacceptable. You are a province just like the others. Shape up or ship out".

This has now become the Prime Minister's slogan. The choice for Quebecers is to either resign themselves or take control of their destiny. Quebecers will have to make a decision this fall, with the referendum on sovereignty.

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Jake E. Hoeppner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I requested information through the Access to Information Act concerning a briefing note to the Solicitor General from the RCMP officer who mishandled my request for an investigation into the Canadian Wheat Board.

The briefing note merely explains how my claims were mishandled, which includes the officer's error in not opening a separate file, and subsequent reports. No file or report exists.

The Canadian Wheat Board, on the other hand, insists on laying charges against individual farmers exporting grain without an export permit.

Farmers are merely trying to eke out a living and draw attention to the fact that somebody is ripping them off, yet the RCMP maintains an extensive file and reports on these farmers.

I ask: What is wrong with this picture?

* * *

ANTIQUE CARS

Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Automotive Museum in Oshawa will be hosting for the next year the McDougall collection of 21 antique cars. This collection has been declared Canadian cultural property by the Canadian Property Export Review Board.

It includes a rare supercharged 1928 Mercedes–Benz, the same year as the first car I had only it was a Ford which went for $15 scrap. I always buy the wrong model. Also included is an Issotta Fraschini once owned by the King of Spain.

For car buffs this provides a rare opportunity to see a priceless collection. For everyone else, come see us in beautiful Oshawa, the city that "motovates" Canada.

* * *

VESELKA UKRAINIAN CULTURE AND HERITAGE CHURCH

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Veselka Ukrainian Culture and Heritage Church in my constituency of Prince Albert—Churchill River is celebrating its fourth annual summer festival on July 7 and 8, 1995.

For many years this church has promoted, fostered and maintained the Ukrainian legacy and culture in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan and area. Its festival comes at an especially important time as the Prince Albert city council has declared the first week of July Ukrainian Festival Week. During this week there will be many events capturing the spirit and traditions of the Ukraine.

I would like to extend my most sincere congratulations to the Veselka Ukrainian Culture and Heritage Church for its commitment to excellence. Its members have proven through their hard work the benefits of a multicultural and diverse Canada.

On behalf of the House, I would like to wish them all the best for this festival and in the future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC REGIONS

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Canadian Heritage showed a lack of respect in this House for Quebec regions by using the expression "reculées", which means out of the way. The words used by the minister clearly show his lack of knowledge regarding Quebec regions, their vitality and their pride. People who live in distant regions, particularly in the Abitibi region, which I represent, cannot accept the message conveyed by the minister that these regions are backward.

The regions form the very core of Quebec's identity, an identity which is promoted on the international scene. To say that these regions are out of the way is to offend hundreds of thousands of Quebecers, particularly when that statement comes from another Quebecer who is supposed to represent them.

I urge the minister to show respect to Quebec regions by retracting the very derogatory comments he made yesterday.

* * *

[*English*]

LAC BARRIÈRE BAND

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in early May I asked some questions in the House regarding allegations of sexual abuse and misappropriation of funds at the Lac Barrière band. I got no answers on the first occasion and inaccurate responses on the second.

Therefore, my colleague for North Island—Powell River and I met with a segment of the band in late May and then visited the reserve yesterday.

Despite the minister's knowledge of concerns regarding sexual abuse of young band members and financial irregularities involving members of the Liberal Party at Lac Barrière for the past year, no apparent progress has been made in confirming or denying these allegations.

If there is substance to the allegations, they should be dealt with as soon as possible. If there is no substance, they should be thrown out to prevent further division in the community.

[*Translation*]

I demand that the minister initiate a judicial inquiry to shed light on the whole issue, so that members of the band can finally get on with their lives. These people are tired of the government's rhetoric: they want to see results.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS SECURITY SERVICES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere congratulations to the men and women of the House of Commons security services who are celebrating their 75th anniversary this year.

• (1405)

In 1920 the House of Commons passed a bill which brought about the creation of the protective service. This service was given responsibility for the protection of members of the House, of visiting dignitaries and of the countless visitors and tourists who come to see the Parliament buildings every year.

I am now in my 17th year as a member of Parliament and I can say that I have never once had a complaint about the very professional service provided by these very dedicated men and women.

On behalf of the NDP caucus, and I am sure all members present, I commend them for a job well done. May we never see the day when anybody entertains the idea of contracting out this service. We have lost too many good public servants that way already.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, Quebecers will celebrate Saint–Jean–Baptiste Day. I would like to send all Quebecers my best wishes for a wonderful day.

All Canadians who want to keep the country together and who wish to say "My Canada includes Quebec" truly value the richness of the francophone culture.

According to the polls, most Quebecers want the same thing: united, we are strong, and we can remain united in our diversity.

Canada is a country which is very respected abroad. People everywhere think that we are the last paradise on earth. In one week, Canadians are going to celebrate Canada Day: on that day we celebrate wide horizons, vast prairies, high mountains, enormous lakes and the multicultural communities in our exceptional country.

All these special gifts can be enjoyed throughout Canada, including Quebec.

I would like to ask my colleagues and all Canadians to celebrate Saint–Jean–Baptiste Day and Canada Day together, in a spirit of harmony and peace.

* * *

QUEBEC REFERENDUM

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as usual, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois did not wait for his separatist partners to make an important announcement.

Yesterday, during a press conference, the leader of the Bloc declared that, starting tomorrow, the referendum will be its focus. From then on, the referendum issue will be its only concern.

This came as no surprise since, in fact, the Bloc Quebecois has always put its concerns as separatists before its responsibilities as the official opposition.

After having forced the PQ leader to "change his position" and the young Mario Dumont to become an "associate", are we to understand that, by being the one to announce the beginning of the referendum campaign, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois has proclaimed himself the leader of the yes side.

* * *

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago on June 26, 1945, toward the end of the war that shattered nations and killed tens of millions of people, the governments of the world agreed to a United Nations charter.

With the hope of creating a collective security that would prevent future global conflicts, leaders envisaged the UN as the essential body for observing world peace. In exemplary fashion, Canada went to San Francisco committed to the dream of a world where swords would be replaced by ploughshares.

In co–operation with other nations, Canada has sought to realize the goals of the charter through a range of missions: from humanitarian aid to committing peacekeeping troops to troubled areas throughout the world.

As a middle power, Canada has earned world respect for its role in brokering peace agreements and in its unwavering efforts in fostering sustainable human development for those countries burdened by political and economic repression.

In this year, the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, I ask that all Canadians reflect on the values and principles of this body. Let us recall that the first words of the charter are "We the people". In truth, the UN is us, the dream of what we, the people, might best be.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FÊTE NATIONALE DU QUÉBEC

Mr. Laurent Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers will be celebrating the fête nationale du Québec on June 24.

For centuries, we have been celebrating the summer solstice with bonfires. In 1834, the newspaper editor Ludger Duvernay organized the first celebration symbolizing the struggle of French Canadians to survive. Over the years, this celebration has become an opportunity for Quebecers to show their determination to create a country for themselves.

Proclaimed fête nationale du Québec in 1977, June 24 has become a day for all inhabitants of Quebec.

This year, Quebecers are invited to celebrate their sense of community at over 700 sites throughout Quebec. Next year, if such is the wish of the people, we will be celebrating our country, our Quebec, on that day.

* * *

[*English*]

PENSIONS

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as the government passes the MP pension bill this afternoon may it ponder this poem called *The Man in the Glass*:

When you get what you want in your struggle for life
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself,
And see what that man has to say.
For it isn't your father or mother or wife,
Whose judgement upon you must pass,
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life,
Is the one staring back from the glass.
Some people may think you a straight–shooting chum,
And call you a wonderful guy;
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum,
If you can't look him straight in the eye.
He's the fellow to please, never mind all the rest,
For he's with you clear up to the end,
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.
You may fool the whole world down the pathway of life,
And get pats on your back as you pass,
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears,
If you've cheated the man in the glass.

• (1410)

MP pensions: Reformers opt out, Liberals cop out. Shame.

S. O. 31

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a saying around my farm that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. In other words, if something is running smoothly, do not tempt fate to try to make it better.

That is what is happening within the Canadian dairy industry as it relates to the introduction of BST as an enhancer of milk production. Our milk is among the purest. Our cows are among the highest producing in the world. However, there are those who would tamper with this system even though the economic gain to farmers is insignificant when compared to the damage it will do to the dairy industry.

I cannot understand, given the health of the industry, why it is necessary to even contemplate the introduction of BST.

The moratorium on the sale of BST will expire on July 1 unless extended by Health Canada. I would ask that before any decision is made to licence BST, the minister not only consider the damage that might be done to the dairy industry, but the possibility that the long term health of both animals and humans may be at risk.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VILLAGE OF OKA

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Argenteuil—Papineau, I rise in the House to speak on behalf of the people of Oka who met recently to discuss the catastrophic situation in their town, five years after what was referred to as the Oka crisis.

Every resident looks forward to the time when peace and calm will return to a municipality where all citizens can live together without fear, and those sentiments are shared by the vast majority of the Mohawks of Kanesatake.

The people of Oka want governments, both federal and provincial, to make a clear statement on all issues concerning aboriginal lands, so as to restore a normal social climate and public security, and to ensure that real estate values and insurance premiums revert to normal levels.

By requesting concrete political action on the part of both levels of government, the people of Oka want to recover their enjoyment of certain freedoms, a basic right that is part of the philosophy of all Quebecers and all Canadians.

[*English*]

CANADA POST

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as the Reform critic for the post office, I keep receiving disturbing reports of the unfair competitive practices of Canada Post in ad mail delivery and courier services.

Private sector companies and individuals are being undercut and destroyed by Canada Post, which uses its first class monopoly revenue to subsidize the operations in these competitive fields.

It is unconscionable that the very firms which try to earn a living for their employees and pay taxes to the federal government are now being annihilated by this predatory crown corporation.

A recent consultant's report shows that 75 per cent of Canada Post's overhead is charged against its first class letter mail while only 1.7 per cent of the overhead is charged against competitive operations, despite the fact that the first class mail is only 45 per cent of its operation.

We believe that it is wrong, wrong, wrong to use the clout of a huge government granted monopoly to wipe out small businesses. Where is the conscience of the government? When will it bring this immoral practice to a halt?

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to bring to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Anne Edwards, Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would also like to bring to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of the Rev. the Hon. Frederick Nile and the Hon. Elaine Nile, members of the Legislative Council of New South Wales.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

CHILE'S ACCESSION TO NAFTA

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of International Trade stated that, if Chile wanted to join NAFTA this would not require reopening the agreement and only technical changes would be necessary to admit a fourth country to NAFTA.

My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Would he confirm his minister's statement to the effect that Chile's admission to NAFTA would not require opening the agreement but merely some technical changes?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, according to the agreement, Chile or other countries can join NAFTA if they accept the terms negotiated by Canada, Mexico and the United States. The consent of Mexico, Canada and the United States is required if another country wishes to join. Provided Chile does not request major changes, the agreement provides that other countries may join, subject to the approval of participating members of NAFTA.

I know Chile is anxious to join NAFTA, and Canada is very supportive of Chile's bid at this time. In fact, this government has always maintained it did not want an exclusively bilateral agreement with the United States. We feel it is very useful to have an agreement that includes Mexico and other countries, since this would counterbalance the enormous power of the United States.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what I understood from the Prime Minister's reply is that if Chile meets the criteria for membership, reopening the agreement will not be necessary.

I want to ask the Prime Minister whether we can assume from what he said that the same scenario and the same reasoning will prevail in the case of a sovereign Quebec?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that depends on whether the parties to NAFTA agree unconditionally. Personally, I think I am answering a purely hypothetical question. I know Quebec will not become independent. Since Quebec is already part of NAFTA, why get out and then get back in, when you are already in?

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the question is not hypothetical, since the treaty exists and the parties felt the need to negotiate clause 2204, a clause of accession that opens membership to all those who wish to join.

I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he would agree that Canada alone does not have the power to prevent Quebec from joining NAFTA and that the only thing Canada can do is get out if Quebec becomes a member.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker. It is clear that Canada is a member of NAFTA and that Quebec is already part of NAFTA. If Quebec wants to get out of NAFTA, that is up to Quebec. However, if Quebec wants to get back in, the consent of all members is required, as in the case of Chile or any other country. A member may propose new conditions for membership, in which case NAFTA would have to be amended.

I do not know the status of current negotiations with Chile, but if Chile does not request changes to NAFTA, there will be no problem. If it requests changes to NAFTA, this will require the consent of Canada, Mexico and the United States. So it is certainly much better to be part of the agreement now, than to have to go and negotiate if you want to become a member.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answers do little more than give Quebecers cause for fear or doubt. The Prime Minister has already cast doubt on the rapid inclusion of a sovereign Quebec in NAFTA.

My question is very simple and as follows. Given that trade between Canada and Quebec is 153 times that between Canada and Chile, will the Prime Minister undertake to work hard to have Quebec included in NAFTA quickly, following sovereignty?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebec is a member of NAFTA. Everyday I work to ensure that Quebec benefits from NAFTA. So why ask me to work harder than I am at the moment?

However, if we are talking hypothetically, I am not sure the rest of Canada will want to retain the privileges farmers currently enjoy. If consumers in Ontario can get milk, butter and cheese more cheaply from the United States, if Quebec leaves, and since dairy production is not a question of French or English, but simply of providing dairy products, they will want to take advantage of the better price. So the best way to protect products from Quebec within the Canadian market is to remain Canadian.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Remaining Canadian means being a member of NAFTA. However, those who want to leap into the void may do so. But Quebecers know they are very happy in Canada and they want to stay here. This is clear, and I am convinced of it. I am all the more convinced because the Leader of the Opposition does not even have the courage to tell Quebecers the truth he told the Americans: "I am a separatist".

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, speaking of having the courage to tell the truth, the Prime Minister is in no position to tell anyone anything.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: We know that Quebec is a member of NAFTA, just like Prince Edward Island. Given that trade between Canada and Quebec is 153 times greater than it is between Canada and Chile—since we are talking figures here, it should be clear—and given that 250,000 workers in Ontario owe their living to the trade relations between Ontario and Quebec, my question is as follows. In the light of the stakes, will the Prime Minister tell us—yes or no—as the Prime Minister of the rest of Canada, after sovereignty, whether he will assume his responsibilities and see that Quebec's entry into NAFTA is facilitated?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sitting pretty now. The Bloc Quebecois, the official opposition, wants me to remain Prime Minister of Canada to defend the interests of Quebec. That is quite something.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice): Mr. Speaker, the best way for Quebecers to ensure I remain Prime Minister of Canada is to remain Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while Her Majesty's temporary opposition focuses on breaking up the country, our job here is to focus on issues essential to maintaining and advancing this country.

One of those issues is correcting deficiencies in the federal administration. The Minister of Canadian Heritage is lost in a cloud of conflict of interest. The defence minister is in the dark on Bosnia and Somalia. The minister of human resources has bungled social reform. The health minister has only band–aid solutions to health care. The minister of Indian affairs is sleep walking to a crisis in B.C. and the minister of public works is mired in patronage in Atlantic Canada.

Will the Prime Minister shuffle the chairs on the deck of the *Titanic* and relieve any or all of these ministers of their responsibilities over the summer?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): If the leader of the Reform Party really wants to become the leader of the second party, he should talk about something else because that issue is not producing a desirable effect. He is 10 points behind the Tories in the Gallup poll today.

I would give a little advice to the leader of third party. He should do what he intended to do just as he has done today. He scored more when he tried to create a better atmosphere in the House today when he agreed to proceed with the bill on DNA. That is the type of opposition that will increase the stature of the leader of the third party, then he would stop dropping in the polls. The rest of the time he chooses to repeat the same thing and he does not score with it. He should find a new tune.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the captain of the *Titanic* it is a short step from being on top of the mountain to being over the hill.

Let me turn to the fiscal administration of the government. The Prime Minister has been strangely silent on the fact that Canadian exports fell in April for the third month, that wholesale trade has dropped sharply, that employment levels have been flat since November, that retail sales are stagnant and that housing starts are at their lowest point since 1982. It is quite apparent there was a gross deficiency in the fiscal planning of the government and that the finance minister did not go far enough fast enough in his budget. The chickens are coming home to roost.

My supplementary question is: Will the Prime Minister now direct the finance minister to present this House with a mid-course correction and have it ready when we reconvene this fall?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, you are very generous with the nature of the supplementary questions today.

The leader of the third party forgot to say that the OECD report published this week said the economic performance of Canada will be the best of all countries in the OECD ratings. The Minister of Finance had a very good budget which was extremely well received. We are on target. Our target to reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of GDP will be met next year as we predicted. Investment will carry on. Interest rates are going down at this moment, which is significant. A two point lower interest rate will help to stimulate the economy.

I have a lot of confidence in the Minister of Finance. He is doing a very good job.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will not fix the cabinet nor will he fix the budget. So let us turn to the government's administration of the democratic process of this House.

Yesterday the Prime Minister was confronted with the broken red book promise on free votes. In reply the Prime Minister protested that he let government MPs vote on certain amendments earlier in the week. The Prime Minister said he let them vote. The MP's right to vote in this House is not some privilege granted to him by the executive. It is a right that comes from the people and MPs have the right to exercise their vote without threats of punishment or discipline.

Will the Prime Minister end this session on a positive and democratic note by turning to the backbenchers in his own party and assuring them of their right to vote their constituents' wishes without fear of threats or punishment from the Prime Minister or the whip?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the third party has a very broad shopping list today. He is trying to recuperate. Sometimes it is good to climb a mountain but do not try to do it backward. He has gone from 20 to 10 and is dropping. That is not the way to get to the top.

• (1430)

When I talk about the democracy in this party I do not have to add anything. The leader of that party has thrown critics out of different positions, three of them. He has done it. Now he is telling me that I am too tough.

When the question was raised in the House of Commons yesterday, Liberal members reacted very positively. We have an agenda as a government. We are respecting the agenda of the government and we will carry on. When it is time for an election, I will have my red book with me and I will be able to show all the progress we have made and all the commitments we have fulfilled.

I remember the Reform Party telling everybody that political parties should not accept any money from the government. Everyone took the refunds from the Chief Electoral Officer after the last election, contrary to the sanctimonious speech of the leader of the third party, which will remain the third party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT CENTRES

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Ignoring the real needs of the unemployed, who account for roughly 11 per cent of Quebec's workforce after five months without any job creation worth mentioning, instead of thinking about expanding the vocational guidance and counselling services currently provided to a mere 10 per cent of those who lose their jobs, the government is preparing to reduce from over a 100 to just 28 the number of Canada employment centres in Quebec.

How can the Prime Minister explain that the first thing the government does after limiting access to UI and hitting Quebec UI recipients with $725 million in cuts this year alone, is cut back the services provided to the unemployed?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to point out that no decision has been made concerning the CEC network in Quebec or anywhere else in Canada.

We are looking for a way to provide increased levels of service to our worker clients in the Province of Quebec, and I hope we can count on the hon. members' co–operation so that Quebecers can be provided with more efficient and relevant services. This afternoon, we will be meeting with Bloc members

to look at the services available and see what could be done to better meet the needs expressed.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after making numerous inquiries about the proposed reorganization, asking the human resources development committee for information and being assured that our caucus would be informed, we learned this morning that all CEC employees have already been told which ones will be closed, undergo changes or remain open. As for the Bloc, only this afternoon will it be informed.

How can the minister justify waiting so long to inform us, unless it was to prevent us from doing our job as the official opposition?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide a small word of advice to the hon. member not to get too excited, because no decisions have been taken. The decisions will be taken in order to improve the service. We have made the offer to her caucus to consult with them, which we will be doing this afternoon, to develop the best information.

I can guarantee this hon. member and all members of the House that the reorganization and modernization of the service centres will provide better service, particularly in the smaller cities and rural areas of Canada. I can make that guarantee to the member.

* * *

• (1435)

ECONOMY

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as much as the Prime Minister wants to say the economy of Canada is good, it is not.

In 1993 the government inherited promising economic growth in the country. What has happened? Instead of nurturing the recovery that was there the government continued on an old pattern of spend and tax Canadians. The only growth policy the government could come up with was to devalue the dollar, resulting in an unbalanced recovery that has been entirely reliant on exports to the United States.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Now that the U.S. economy is slowing and exports are dropping, what will he do to avert a recession, other than devaluing the currency?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development –Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member's statement does not coincide with the facts.

At the time we took office unemployment was at 11.5 per cent. It is now at 9.5 per cent. At the time we took office there were 433,000 fewer Canadians working than are working today. At the time we took office growth was anemic. The fact is that we have just come off one of the best years we have seen in a decade. In fact the OECD stated only yesterday that again this year Canada would lead all the G–7 nations.

The fact is that we have had a very good record, which is due to the policies of the government. We intend to continue those policies.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance can say what he wants. There was some good growth in 1994, but today it is down to 0.7 per cent, which is a multiple drop. The Minister of Finance should admit that.

What we need at this time is an economic statement from the government indicating that the government has a plan to eliminate the deficit. Can we count on the Minister of Finance to present an economic statement this fall so we can go to the people of Canada and say this is how the government will get rid of the deficit and bring in a balanced budget before the end of this Parliament?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development –Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made it very clear that it is our intention to eliminate the deficit. We have also made it very clear that it is our intention to put the country back into good economic shape. That means putting Canadians to work, it means preserving our social programs, and it means giving the country hope.

It is not the intention on this side of the House to bring in the kinds of scorch and burn policies the Reform Party would advocate. It is not the intention of this party to destroy the Canadian economy and the hopes of so many young. It is the intention of this party to do what Canadians want, and that is to make Canada live up to its potential. That means that we will take on anybody in the world.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DIRECT SATELLITE BROADCASTING

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Following the public hearings regarding the draft orders in council on satellite television, Liberal MPs abdicated their responsibilities as parliamentarians by giving a blank cheque to the federal government. Unless the minister follows up on the Bloc's recommendations, the government will now go ahead

with these made–to–measure orders for Power DirecTv, in which the Prime Minister's son–in–law has an interest.

Several witnesses heard during the public hearings strongly opposed the draft orders in council, because they will eventually make us lose control over the Canadian broadcasting system. Does the minister realize that, after the recording, publishing, video and film industries, he is about to hand over to Americans the last cultural stronghold still controlled by Canadians?

• (1440)

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after reading the communique released by the Bloc Quebecois this afternoon, I think that the party should be called the "blague québécoise", the Quebec joke. We held all kind of consultations, including public ones, and we received the report of a committee of experts, as well as several submissions, including some from groups such as the Consumers' Association of Canada, Friends of Canadian Broadcasting and the Conference of the Arts. Those groups urged us to accept the proposals made by the committee of experts. I should also mention the majority report tabled by the committee, as well as the report of the Senate, where the government does not have a majority. We are told that we did the appropriate thing.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Senate said that these orders were unconstitutional, but that the government could go ahead with them. This is some reference!

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage admit—assuming he can answer before it is too late, since things could change between now and this fall—that if he goes ahead with his draft orders in council, he will not only undermine the CRTC's integrity and independence, but will also postpone Canada's access to direct satellite broadcasting and allow Power DirecTv, which is an American company, to maintain and expand its illegal market in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think what all Canadians need to understand is how vital this part of the information highway infrastructure is going to be to Canadians. It is for that reason that we have been very concerned and very careful about ensuring that we see the creation of a framework within which we would have a competitive and open system.

The hon. member, who makes quite bizarre allegations on this issue, is trapped in her own rhetoric. The very groups that say the most about supporting Canadian culture have supported the approach the panel of experts recommended on this case.

What is clear to all Canadians is that we favour a system in which there will be licensing, competition, better choice and lower prices for consumers. The Bloc Quebecois favours monopoly. It is as simple as that.

TRANSPORT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport is determined to squander a billion dollars of the Canadian taxpayers' money.

Settlement of the unconstitutional cancellation of the Pearson contract will cost taxpayers between $400 million and $500 million. Even if the government manages to get Bill C–22 through the Senate somehow, constitutional experts have said it will be thrown out of court. On top of this, the minister is determined to pay additional money to Hughes for a contract that will provide less than contracted for and that is behind schedule.

Why does the minister not cancel the Hughes contract instead of the Pearson contract and save the Canadian taxpayers $1 billion in the process?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have tried to avoid doing in answering some of the questions from the hon. critic for transportation for the third party is to take courses in dealing with split personalities to try to cope with them.

Mr. Speaker, if you listened to that question you would understand that on the one hand he is suggesting that we are going to lose $400 million to $500 million as a result of the cancellation of the Pearson contract.

We are on the record as saying that we will compensate for reasonable out of pocket expenses, not one cent more, regardless of who thinks, including the hon. member, that we should be taking care of people who have not driven a nail or laid an ounce of concrete at Pearson by giving them up to half a billion dollars.

With respect to Hughes, we have gone to the Auditor General of Canada. We are negotiating with Hughes. We recognize that there was mismanagement in that contract, both on the side of the government as well as by Hughes. We recognize that. We have admitted that publicly. Now we will do with Hughes what we are attempting to do with Pearson, which is to protect the taxpayers of Canada, whether he likes it or not.

• (1445)

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Transport is to protect the Canadian taxpayer by paying more for less, no wonder we are in trouble.

Instead of doing the right thing, the government is trying to manipulate testimony going to the Senate. Members of the Canadian Bar Association were to speak very critically of Bill C–22 during the Senate hearings. The Minister of Justice called them to his office and told them to back off. The implication of penalty is obvious.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Did the Minister of Justice do this on his own? Was he directed to do so by the Prime Minister's office?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a member I hope in good standing of the Canadian Bar Association, I would want to explain to my hon. colleague that people have come before the Senate committee to discuss the issue of Pearson. Although I may disagree with them on some issues, we recognize the credibility of the group that came before the Senate to make its position known with respect to the constitutionality of Bill C–22.

It is highly irregular, if not totally improper, for the hon. member to come before the House and to suggest that members of the Canadian bar have been coerced by the government or anybody else. The hon. member should be aware that there are conflicting opinions on this, but certainly nobody has tried to manipulate the Canadian Bar Association. Had we done that, we would not have got the kind of testimony we got in the first instance with respect to the constitutionality of Bill C–22.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

If the use of somatotropin is authorized in Canada, consumers will demand that the milk produced using this hormone be labelled to distinguish it from unadulterated milk. Our children have the right to drink real milk with no hormones.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that if Health Canada authorizes the sale of somatotropin, either of two things will happen: citizens will either be confronted with a done deed and will have no choice but to consume the milk produced with the synthetic hormone, or they will have to pay more for the milk they are used to drinking in order to fund the cost of keeping two separate distribution networks for milk?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister explained yesterday that no decision has been made on the issue, that the moratorium is voluntary, and that, on July 1, the Department of Health will not be in a position to authorize the sale of this hormone to Canadian consumers.

The hon. member apparently made the suggestion that we should inform consumers if the use of the hormone is going to be allowed. But this is a purely hypothetical question, because the government has not made any decision yet regarding whether it will be authorized, if it ever is at all.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly excuse the Prime Minister for not being up to date on the issue. But, in fact, if Health Canada gives its approval, agriculture will need two years to set up a system. That is why the agriculture committee, in addition to the health committee, this morning, demanded an indeterminate ban on this substance.

Given that this is the last question we will be able to ask on the issue, I am going to ask the Prime Minister a genuine question, a simple question. Why must our children drink anything other than real milk, with no artificial hormones added?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is that, in Canada, at the current moment, the milk children are drinking has no artificial hormones. Artificial hormones are banned in Canada, and that is the current situation. If there is any change in the situation, we will inform the House and we will take appropriate measures. But, at this time, all of these questions are purely hypothetical because the hormones in question are not authorized for use in Canada.

The hon. member just said that this was the last time he would be asking a question. I hope that they are not going to devote all their efforts to the referendum and stop doing the work required of an MP. If they do, I hope they will give back their salaries.

* * *

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question concerns the minister of public works. A recent government report shows that a federal program to direct $1.5 billion a year in federal contracts to small business may not be necessary because this sector already gets its fair share of government business.

Could the minister advise the House on the relevance of the report and what changes the minister plans on implementing?

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has a strong commitment to small business in the country. The small business report to which the member refers confirms that 32 per cent of government services contracts are given to small businesses.

• (1450)

However, over the last few months a consultation process has been initiated with major industries, aboriginal businesses and political groups across the country on the desirability of having a set aside program. Preliminary reports show a clear message that we do not need a set aside program for small businesses as they can compete with larger industries. In contrast, the set aside

program for aboriginal businesses is strongly supported by aboriginal groups and non–aboriginal industries.

The ministers of public works, industry and Indian affairs are monitoring the situation very closely as they are considering to use these procurements to help small aboriginal businesses across Canada.

* * *

LITERACY

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I quoted passages from "Making Scenes Between the Lines" for the minister of human resources. He was rightly shocked by the obscene language in it and wondered where I got my reading material. I hope the minister has now had time to realize that this booklet was funded by the government for use in classrooms across the country.

If the minister has actually had time to read this booklet in the interim, does he not agree that "Making Scenes Between the Lines" has no place our children's schools?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to look into the allegation made by the hon. member for Beaver River.

The fact is that the whole program was being sponsored by 21 organizations across the country, including the Canadian Bar Association, the John Howard Society and the Salvation Army. Their attempt was to try to provide ways of linking the use of literacy to crime prevention and to provide a way of enabling particularly young people who are at risk with the law to find solutions.

One of the booklets was prepared by the young people themselves, expressing their concerns and their feelings. I want to point out to the hon. member that the booklet has never been distributed to any school. It is for adult use only and distributed by those organizations. I think it is time the hon. member withdrew her allegation.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the executive assistant in the senator's office who funded this said yesterday that it was for adult use only.

On the contrary, James MacLatchie, the chair of the organization, said to press and MPs alike: "This is to go to all schools across the country without respect to grades or age level". There are two different stories coming out there. James MacLatchie should answer those questions.

Whether it is for adults, criminals, dropouts or young people in schools across the country, would the minister agree that this obscene language is not good for anybody to learn to read and write? Will he obviously cancel it? Will he cut his losses, recommend to the senator responsible for it to cut her losses and cancel the booklet rather than cut their own throats and let it go ahead?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the hon. member for Beaver River did not consult with her own colleague, the member for Mission—Coquitlam, who attended the press conference at which the booklet and the kit were released.

At that time the member for Mission—Coquitlam congratulated the minister responsible for literacy on the presentation of the document and applauded the efforts to provide protection against crime by the use of literacy.

I would simply like to raise a question with the leader of the Reform Party. Is he going to ask the member for Beaver River to resign after such overt, obvious fumbling of the question she has raised?

* * *

[*Translation*]

FRENCH SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. After the news that funding provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for scientific journals in French had been cut by nearly 50 per cent, while scientific journals—

• (1455)

[*English*]

The Speaker: We only have five minutes to go.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, after the news that funding provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for scientific journals in French had been cut by nearly 50 per cent, while scientific journals in English were not affected, we heard today that the National Museum of Science and Technology will from now on publish its magazine on astronomy in English only.

What explanation does the Minister of Canadian Heritage have for this kind of decision by an agency for which he is responsible?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had an opportunity to comment on a sports–related case, and I emphasized the importance of maintaining the status of the French language and complying the official languages legislation.

My answer will be the same today. I intend to see that these rules are observed by all federal government agencies.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Canadian Heritage endorse this offensive remark by a spokesperson for the museum, and I quote: "If we want the public to buy our new magazine, we would have to offer them a high quality product produced by competent people".

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I always expect our national museums to have high quality products in both languages.

* * *

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question on May 8 from the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan about allegations of sexual abuse at the Lac Barrière reserve, the minister of Indian affairs responded that it was a criminal matter and police were investigating. The band states that it is not aware of any police investigation and a recent federal–provincial–band memorandum of understanding is viewed as pre–empting a police investigation.

Does the minister continue to state that there is a police investigation into sexual abuse when the band says there is not?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I came here today prepared to commend the hon. member and his colleague in the Reform Party who went up to Barrière Lake. I thought that was very broad minded.

I sat here and listened to the statement of the pair. The aboriginal people of Barrière Lake do not have the opportunity to stand in the House and I feel it is incumbent upon me to put forward their side on what happened.

I was handed a letter that was handed to the hon. member who put the question. They welcomed the hon. members up there. They wanted to show them their way of life. The hon. members chose the topics. They asked questions like: "Is the premier of Quebec the minister of aboriginal affairs? How do you become an elder?" They met with the accountant and they refused to listen to him. They wanted to take them to show them their forestry but they refused.

They ended up by saying: "We thought we were dealing with honourable people who wanted to learn about us. We forgot we were dealing with partisan politicians who are more interested in advancing their own political agenda than in hearing the truth. As I was saying at the beginning of this letter, I hoped this meeting would enlighten you. Apparently it didn't".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame, a real shame.

[*English*]

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister was further asked about allegations of misappropriation of $255,000 in legal fees to a co–president of the aboriginal committee of the Liberal Party, to which the minister responded that it was a criminal matter and up to the sûreté. According to the band, the RCMP has jurisdiction, not the sûreté, and the sûreté has done nothing. The RCMP has done little, if anything, other than a single brief visit with no follow up.

Is this a shell game or does the minister want to get to the bottom of the allegation?

• (1500)

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this allows me to clarify my answer on that date.

The investigation by the la Commission de la jeunesse is in relation to the sexual abuse. The member for the Reform Party stood up and basically under the protection of the House defamed a member of the Canadian Bar Association of Ontario. He did not have the guts to go outside and do the same thing. He should do that today. He has already received a letter from that lawyer saying if he does he will be sued for defamation.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade will be aware of the conflict between the Pinochet led army and Chile's democratic government over the arrest of two army officers convicted of murder.

Pinochet's action in Chile reminds us that unless there is a level playing field when it comes to political rights and human rights, free trade is a moral hoax.

Is the government now considering supporting the proposal endorsed by the International Democratic Union, the Liberal International and the Socialist International to create a UN based international court of human rights to bring those who have violated international human rights to justice?

Will the government indicate its intentions to work for a social and human rights clause in NAFTA and in the WTO so we can have a genuine playing field, not just with respect to tariffs but with respect to human rights?

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the terms with regard to the accession of Chile to NAFTA are set forth in the agreement. A country acceding to NAFTA must meet the terms of the agreement.

There are other forums in which we pursue the questions of human rights and we shall continue to do so.

* * *

PAGES

The Speaker: Colleagues, for a year now you have heard me refer to these people as my pages but in truth they are our pages. On behalf of all of the members of the House of Commons to you, our 42 pages, I thank you for helping us perform our duties here this year.

[*Translation*]

Perhaps the pages will be members of Parliament one day but, in the mean time, they will have made our life easier in this House. Their devotion and their diligence is, of course, a reflection of the rest of Canada's youth. Even as they leave us, I am sure they will take with them the fine memory of their invaluable experience working in the House of Commons.

[*English*]

As their terms come to an end I know all members of the House who have had dealings with our pages, our pages to whom we pay the highest compliments in all of our conversations, behind the curtains, in the lobbies and here in the House, treat them as if they were one of us; indeed they are.

My pages, our pages, thank you for being with us for one year. You have done a great service to us and to Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

• (1505)

PRIVILEGE

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

The Speaker: I will hear a question of privilege from the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. Is this arising from question period today?

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yes it is. During question period today the minister of human resources misrepresented facts to the House of Commons.

It is true the member for Mission—Coquitlam did attend the launch of the literacy and crime prevention program "Between the Lines". That is one I have been working on for six months.

However, after congratulating the government on what I felt was a very good idea, as there is a definite connection between literacy and crime prevention, we received the books which had not been opened by any of us before. As soon as we received the books and read them I released a press release. I would like to table it for the House in which I question the offensive language in that book.

The Speaker: The hon. member has made her point. I would let is sit as that. It is not a point of privilege.

The hon. member has asked if she can table a copy of her communiqué. May she present it?

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The answer is no.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to put this question in the House today. Would the House Leader tell us what is on the upcoming legislative agenda?

[*English*]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I join with the Chair in words of thanks and appreciation to the pages. We appreciate their efforts for us. We wish them well in their future endeavours.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

We really appreciate the efforts of our pages.

[*English*]

We will continue today with the business outlined in the projected order of business. During the day, as the hours go on, we will consult with our hon. friends opposite on the details of business for today and tomorrow.

On Monday, September 18, the day the rules say the House would ordinarily meet again, we will likely commence with items already at advanced legislative stages before we deal with second readings or references to committee before second reading.

I take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House for the courtesy and co–operation that have been demonstrated more than may appear from time to time in the House in terms of achieving the business of the country and to wish all a very good summer.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to that of the House Leader in thanking the Chair, first, for its excellent mediation and chairing of the sometimes turbulent and very intense debate on vital issues. It succeeded in maintaining the dignity, calm and democratic principles that must prevail in a legislative assembly. My sincere thanks to our elected Speaker and to you, Mr. Speaker, to all those who work with you and to those who work

with the Clerk of the House. I want to thank you for having preserved this institution, which must endure.

I would also like to thank the pages and ask them not to always go by what they have seen here, should they choose a political career, but to keep the best of it. As we well know, there is good and not so good. They should forget the not so good and remember the best.

[*English*]

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, somehow I have an idea we may not be spending too much time here before our summer break, perhaps not tomorrow at least.

I also extend my thanks to the pages. Their decorum and support of the members have certainly been appreciated by all members of the House, definitely by my colleagues in the Reform Party. We wish them an excellent summer and a wonderful future.

I thank those who have sat in the chair, yourself, Mr. Speaker, and your colleagues. I thank the clerks who sit around the table who have helped us and all staff on the Hill for their support. I wish all members a good summer, a bit of a break, and I know they will be continuing their responsibilities even though they leave here.

Certainly we have not accomplished all we thought we would to this point in the 35th Parliament. However, we have made some progress and for that we are thankful. I give my assurance we will come back on September 18 or whenever the government House leader calls the House back to pursue our responsibility as Canada's unofficial opposition.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the NDP caucus I join in congratulating the pages, giving our thanks to them and to all servants of the House including you, Mr. Speaker, and others who have occupied the chair over the course of this Parliament and wish everyone a good summer.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It is my duty, pursuant to section 21 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E–3, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, to lay upon the table certified copies of the 1994 reports of electoral boundaries commissions for all the provinces and the Northwest Territories.

Accordingly, these reports stand referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1515)

[*English*]

MEMBERSOFPARLIAMENTRETIRINGALLOWANCES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe mine is the last speech or close to the last speech we will be having on this issue prior to the vote later this afternoon. We will be on the MPs pension plan, the reduction in the pension plan as announced by the Liberal Party in the red book during the last election campaign. As a matter of fact, the bill on which we will be voting in about half an hour will reduce the MP pension plan benefits to an even greater degree than that which was promised in the red book.

I accept the announcement made in the red book. As the critic for government operations in my days in opposition, I contributed to writing some of these portions of the red book as well as many others that pertained to government ethics, lobbyists, contracting procedures, MP benefits and so on. Today the Liberal Party is delivering on yet another promise in the red book.

Some members across the way particularly in the Reform Party say it does not matter that is what we promised. It does not matter that it goes further. What matters to them is that we change what we are doing to suit them and they are not expected to be here for more than one term. That is essentially the crux of their argument. They are saying that MPs do not need pensions. That is their view.

Mr. Benoit: We never said that.

Mr. Boudria: The hon. member should have participated in the debate to a greater extent. There are quotes in many places where members said they did not need these pensions. I have to disagree with members who made those statements.

We have had a rather sorry spectacle. The Reform Party asked the Prime Minister point blank whether he would exempt them from that plan. The Prime Minister said yes. Then we produced the bill that did just that. The first question Reform members asked in the committee on procedure and House affairs was whether it was not unfair that the plan was designed in such a way to permit people to opt out, which is just what they asked for.

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): That is a crock.

Mr. Boudria: Perhaps the hon. member personally disagreed with the member for Beaver River when she asked that question in committee. He has a right to disagree with her. I want him to know that the member for Beaver River made that statement. All members of the committee know it and the statement is recorded in the committee transcript. I am sorry if the member disagrees with that proposition. He will have to take it up with the member for Beaver River but I invite him to be cautious when he does so because she can certainly rough him up.

That being said, I will turn to the principle of the bill. Essentially the bill has three components. First, it establishes a minimum age of 55 for receiving a pension on future contributions from the date of proclamation of this bill.

The second component is to officially end double dipping. Mr. Speaker, you and I know perfectly well that since this government has come into office, rule or no rule, we have ended double dipping for any new appointment where a person had previously been eligible for an MP pension. That was done and I congratulate the Prime Minister for that.

The third component is to reduce the accrual rate, which goes beyond the commitment made in the red book but was a good idea. It was done by the President of the Treasury Board in the bill before us today.

Canadians and members have various views of the role of an MP. I heard one member say in debate a couple of weeks ago that the House of Commons should be for people who "have made it". This statement was made by the member for Peace River when he was participating in debate. In other words, people who have accumulated a certain fame, wealth and otherwise have some sort of right to this place superior to that right which the rest of us hold.

• (1520)

I do not agree. Had that been the case, although the number of women in this House is insufficient, it would be far less than what it is today. Although the number of people who come from a disadvantaged milieu is probably lower than what it should be, it would be even less than what it is today if only people who have made it, to use the words of the hon. member for Peace River which are in the *Hansard* of this House, were the only ones who had a claim to be here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about members who come from a more disadvantaged milieu than others. I think that I am entitled to an opinion, coming from such a background myself, as you, Mr. Speaker, and all my colleagues well know.

I have been in this institution for a long while. I began my working life here, not as the assistant to the prime minister, not as the assistant to a minister or to the Leader of the Opposition or to the Speaker of the House, but as a bus boy in the parliamentary restaurant.

At the time, I had not even finished secondary school, which I went on to do later. I went back to school to earn credits, and although I wish I had more education, I did get four years, after starting here as an employee on the bottom rung.

[*English*]

When I ran for election to this place, I had not made it. I do not apologize for that. Constituents elected everyone in this House for all the good reasons they choose to elect members of Parliament. If this House is to be a microcosm of this great country, then people from all backgrounds and milieus have a right to be candidates, not just those who have made it.

Let us go back a little in the history of parliamentary institutions. Some members across the way denigrate the fact that in their view we are a little too close to the traditions of this great place. I do not apologize for that.

I have become in my own way an amateur historian. Our parliamentary institutions date back prior to the Norman invasion of Britain to the witans in the period prior to that. They have evolved all the way in Britain from the invasion and the Magna Carta, the bill of rights and all those other documents, the declaration of rights and so on and in our own country through our Constitution and the precedents in the British House.

I remind the House that in 1829 Daniel Patrick O'Connell was elected to the British House of Commons. His sin, what was wrong with the man, was that he was a Catholic. It was legal and had been for only a few years prior to that for Catholics to vote in Britain but they did not have the right to sit in Parliament. Notwithstanding that, in 1829 the people of Ireland found someone who could do it, who was rich enough, wealthy enough and a Catholic. There were very few of them. He was able to run as a candidate. He defeated a popular cabinet minister to become an MP.

However he was not allowed to sit. He was made to run again in 1830 in order to be reconfirmed. Daniel Patrick O'Connell then took his seat in the U.K. House of Commons but nobody else could do the same. Why? Because there was no salary for members of Parliament. Only the rich, those who had made it, could become members of Parliament and the Catholics and other disadvantaged people could not.

Salaries of members of Parliament should not be such that we get rich. We do not in this House. We should never go back to an era where only people who have made it have a right to claim

that they can sit in this House. All Canadians have the right to be represented.

• (1525)

If this Parliament is going to be the microcosm of this country, as I claim it should be and has a right to be, then all of us have a right to be candidates. Whether that person is a well known lawyer or a professor of law, as I see colleagues across the way, whether that person comes from a different ethnic background, whether that person is a medical doctor, or whether that person is the busboy in the parliamentary restaurant, it is all the same. We have the right to be represented in the Parliament of this country.

In the next few minutes I want to talk about the salaries, benefits and pensions members get. After the Reform Party speeches, how many Canadians would know that since 1952 there has not been one year where the premiums to the pension plan were less than the payout? Every single year the premiums by MPs and the matching contributions were in excess of the payout from the plan.

People imagine a huge deficit in that plan. They do not know that every single year it has had a surplus, not thanks to the Reform Party or their friend they are in bed with, Mr. David Somerville of the National Citizens Coalition. They do not know that. Why do they not know that? Because that does not sell ads in the newspapers. That does not buy ties with little pigs on them for the member for Beaver River and the others who have made a mockery of this institution by doing some of the things they have been doing.

[*Translation*]

And then these people come to this House complaining about our integrity. They have talked about the new approach to politics. Give me a break. We could comment on the actions of some of these parliamentarians, particularly the Reformers.

[*English*]

Now we hear that MPs are all millionaires when they retire. Hogwash. Since when does someone take pension benefits based on a lifetime, total them up all at once and pretend that everyone is rich? If that were the way, the silly argument could be made by extension that everyone who qualifies for the old age pension is a millionaire. What kind of nonsense is that?

Mrs. Chamberlain: Rubbish.

Mr. Boudria: It is rubbish as the hon. member so eloquently just said.

A study was done by the Library of Parliament on my own pension benefits. I revealed it in committee and I will now do so on the floor of the House of Commons.

I have been a member since 1984 and I have paid premiums every month to the pension plan. Those premiums as of last January, when the study was done by Finn Poschmann of the research branch of the Library of Parliament, were evaluated with accumulated interest at the GIC rate, the rate offered in probably the most, pardon the expression, conservative investment vehicle anyone could use. If we calculated what I have invested in that personally, I have invested $136,988 in all these years.

Imagine what the member for Windsor West has invested after being an MP for 30 years, or the member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce, the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke and other veterans of this place. They will never see even a fraction of the interest on the money they have invested in those plans unless they live to be about 150 years old. How many times is that said to the people of Canada?

In any case I have invested almost $137,000. Based on a matching employer–employee contribution that is used in any kind of plan that would mean that right now I would have $274,000 invested. The interest alone on that right now would bring in about $27,000 a year. What would I get if I retired today as an MP? I would get $30,000 a year. What about these millions of dollars they say I would get? The difference is $3,000 a year based on the most conservative investment vehicle we could possibly find.

• (1530)

Imagine how much better off I would be if I had done rather well at investing. That plan is not to make the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell rich or the member for Windsor West rich or any other members who are already here and have served many terms. That is not the idea.

The idea is the following:

[*Translation*]

In my case, I was able, at a certain point, to leave my job and run for office. Now I have been elected, and nothing is going to change me, because I am here already.

[*English*]

To use the words of the member across, maybe now I have made it. However, that is not the point. The point is that others in all groups in society can run for office. Perhaps a 29–year old sole support mother who has a good job would like to run for office. She can do so and not threaten her family and their future by wanting to serve her country.

None of this is going to change me. I am already here and I have been here for a long time.

An hon. member: You won't be here for long.

Mr. Boudria: I do not know whether I will be re–elected. That is for the good people to decide. At least I had this great opportunity. One of the reasons why I had that opportunity is because that security was there.

What is wrong with other people wanting to run in 1998 or 2002 and the elections after that if they are able to do so? Not everyone when they get here has previously made it. Not everyone was rich before they came here or had this huge business empire to go back to. Yes, there are some of those and there is nothing wrong with that, but there is another reality out there. Parliament is the place where everyone in Canada has a right to expect that one of them, if they are elected, can afford to sit in this great institution.

The former Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, once said—perhaps it is be unusual for me to end my remarks by quoting a Conservative Prime Minister but I will anyway—that there was no greater honour for a Canadian than to represent his or her fellow colleagues in the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that is an honour that was given to me, to you and to all of us. What I want is for all Canadians to at least be able to aspire some day to represent their fellow constituents in the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on his excellent remarks, on sharing his personal experience of parliamentary life, from his early days in a former life to his election to this Parliament, and to the provincial legislature in Queen's Park before that.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell what he would reply to the Reform Party's claim that all the bill before us is designed to do is sweeten even more the members' retirement package.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Bellechasse for his question. While I am at it, perhaps I could take this opportunity to thank him for his work at the procedure and House affairs committee. I think he did a very fine job and I wish to thank him for that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, we all know that this bill will have the effect of reducing members' benefits. It is true that there used to be no minimum pensionable age.

• (1535)

It is true that some former members are receiving benefits although they had not reached pensionable age when they left. It is also true that others, while having contributed to this plan much longer than they would have in a regular plan, are still not receiving any benefits. I gave the example of the hon. member for Windsor West who would probably be eligible for a bonus if he left now. Those are facts, but not the kind of facts that some Reform Party members raise on a regular basis in this House.

Members' benefits are reduced through the institution of a minimum pensionable age and also for members who took a federal position upon retiring from politics. In their case, double dipping would be prohibited; they would not be allowed to receive money from both sources at once. Third, pension accrual rates will also be reduced because of the decrease in contribution rates and ensuing decrease in benefits at retirement.

I realize that the time is up. To conclude, because this is probably the last chance I have to do so before the summer recess, I wish to thank, in my capacity as government whip, the Chair, our staff, the table officers, the pages and especially my two colleagues the opposition whips, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte–Marie and the hon. member for Calgary West.

In spite of our differences, we have worked very closely. I could even say that I look forward to the fall when I can work again with my colleagues, the whips of the other parties, in this House.

[*English*]

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell talk about how he had only given a fair share to the pension plan and he expected to get a fair amount back.

I wonder if he could respond to a question. We had a financial expert come to our caucus to talk about what we should do since we were opting out of the plan. His first piece of advice to the Reform Party as a professional financial adviser was: "Don't opt out of this pension, it is the best pension plan in Canada".

Would that change the member's mind about his comments that this is a very fair pension plan?

Mr. Boudria: I never said it was a very bare pension plan. I used the amount that I have have contributed versus the payout and put before the House the difference between the two. If the hon. member wants to qualify that or anything else as being bare, they are his words and not mine.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few short comments on this bill, since the debate is coming to an end.

All the more so since, as a Bloc Quebecois candidate during the general election leading up to the 35th Parliament, I did not come here with the idea that I would accumulate any pension. Nevertheless, this issue concerns us all.

If Canadians have shown some interest in the matter, it is probably after finding out that some young parliamentarians could, after two terms, start collecting very generous pensions.

Given the longer life expectancy, some of these pensions could total 3 to 3.5 million dollars.

• (1540)

This is what really concerns people. I did not hear my constituents say that the pensions were too generous. What concerns them is the fact that a member of Parliament can start collecting his or her pension as soon as he or she leaves office. During the election campaign, I pledged to fight in this House to ensure that MPs pensions would only be collected at a normal age, that is the age where the majority of Canadians working in the private or public sector, can legitimately retire.

The bill before us deals specifically with this issue, which is an issue on which we pledged to take a stand. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell clearly showed that, for the last 43 years, the MPs retirement plan has not only been self–financing, but has accumulated a profit. It is not a costly plan for the state. Indeed, it is a plan which is self–financing and which even generates profits.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I am quite aware that there are some strongly held views on both sides of this debate, notwithstanding the person who has the floor.

If others want to continue the debate elsewhere, that is fine. However I hope we can conclude this debate in the parliamentary fashion we have conducted business in this Chamber on the vast majority of occasions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing this House to order with your usual blend of firmness and tact. As I was saying, the main concern of the constituents I have the privilege to represent was the pensionable age. That is settled in this bill. What we usually refer to as double dipping has also been abolished, at least in the case of federal institutions, and that is a good thing.

I must say I agree with those who feel that with an annual salary of $64,400, parliamentarians are certainly not overpaid. Although we represent as many as 100,000 to 150,000 people, we meet daily with people in various sectors who earn twice or three times our salary. Not that I expect to be paid that much. Besides, our salaries are now frozen. The last Parliament decided to put a freeze on members' salaries. We have no desire to broach a subject that as we saw in the course of this debate, tends to elicit the most outrageous verbal attacks.

The remuneration of parliamentarians will probably remain a contentious issue. It may be advisable to provide for an independent review mechanism. Of course, parliamentarians who think they are being paid too much for what they do can always send part of their salary back to the crown. But ultimately, it will be up to our constituents to decide whether the members they elected to the 35th Parliament gave value for money. Theirs is the ultimate verdict.

Members who were elected and want to make a career in politics have to go before the voters in every election and prove they did the job they were paid to do as parliamentarians. Voters may also ask: Did I get my money's worth? Did my MP really deserve to be paid $64,400? Their judgment may be negative or positive. So there are several criteria we can refer to. We ourselves might feel guilty about getting a salary of $64,400. Or we might not feel guilty, but our constituents may show us the door.

• (1545)

That said, I think there has been a great song and dance with this debate and with others about certain parliamentary benefits and our having it soft on our arrival in Ottawa. I would not say we have it soft. I would say, rather, that we did not come here for the salary. We came, obviously, to serve our fellow citizens as best we could, and they will evaluate our performance one day or another. We are accountable to them alone.

I take this opportunity to point out, Mr. Speaker, and you are no doubt aware of this yourself, that our work as members of Parliament is made so much easier by the clerks, by the pages and by all those, who, often anonymously, almost invisibly, make our work or our life less difficult, given that we arrive at dawn and leave late in the evening for a few hours' rest.

People are always working to put things back in order for our return, without our even noticing. The journals are printed and Hansard is there when it is ready. If we need something, pages are ready to find the documentation we need, the people at the Parliamentary Library find us what we need to do our job and our legislative advisers prepare our amendments.

Today we have thanked the pages and the clerks. I would like to take the opportunity to thank as well those who, often behind the scene, work so efficiently that our often heavy workload seems a little less so.

That being said, when it comes time to vote shortly, having obtained the guarantees we sought and insisted on in the last general election, I will be pleased to vote in favour of the bill currently before the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it has been a very interesting experience listening to the speeches this afternoon. The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell talked about how he got his education. We got a history lesson from him and we learned a lot about hyperbole. I never realized that by hon. members not receiving their pensions democracy would collapse.

I am amazed by the argument that the Reform Party is objecting to the Liberal plan simply because it does not like it. I would like to back up our comments with a number of letters from our constituents.

For example, let me quote from a letter from Mrs. Marjorie Hernstedt of Williams Lake, who wrote:

> Chrétien promised to reform the outrageous pension plan. I am a pensioner and this past July, the government couldn't afford to give us our two-dollar raise. I live on the pensioners' pension and Canada pension with very careful budgeting. The whole outlook is grossly unfair and I urge you, Mr. Mayfield, to demand Parliament bring MPs' pensions into line with what is available in the private sector.

How can any of us justify a pension like the one in Bill C–85 when there are people like Mrs. Hernstedt who are barely making ends meet on their own pensions?

Is it not ironic while MPs are getting their pensions that Mrs. Hernstedt and others like her are being told that the government cannot afford a $2 raise in pension benefits. The irony is just sickening.

Also Mr. Don Ford of Quesnel feels that politicians have to be willing to make sacrifices and play a part in cutting government expenditures. He said:

> The pensions of members of Parliament should be based on their contributions as a percentage of their salary, to the point of their retirement at age 65, a percentage in line with the average Canadian middle income worker, and that they be eligible to start receiving the earned pension after reaching the age of 65 years, and not when they are defeated in an election.

• (1550)

We are not simply speaking on our own behalf; we are representing our constituents. Mr. Ford touched on a theme heard over and over again in the House: the MP pension plan has to be brought into line with what is seen in the private sector.

I should also like to mention what some of the media people are saying. Barbara Yaffe of the *Vancouver Sun* had the following to say about the MP pension plan:

> British Columbians are not amused. The corpulent cats who remain in the plan in future will get nearly four tax dollars for every one dollar they put in, while the MPs with guts and principles get zip. Those who opt out deserve real credit. The weasels who stay in deserve our enmity.

Those are very strong words: corpulent cats and weasels. These are the kinds of words that come from Canadians when asked what they think of politicians who opt into the pension plan.

An article by Bob Cox of *Canadian Press* stated the following:

> A proposed leaner pension plan for MPs is still four to seven times more generous than what other Canadians can earn, says an expert on politicians' pensions.
>
> Though an improvement on the even richer existing plan, the Liberal proposal would still be worth $60,000 before taxes—close to an MP's $64,000 salary—The Canadian Taxpayers Federation agreed, putting 242 smiling, pink pigs on the vast Parliament Hill lawn to represent MPs who have indicated they would stay in the new pension plan.

Canadians, not just Reform MPs, do not trust their members of Parliament to handle their own compensation. It is conflict of interest. It is like appointing a mouse to guard the cheese. The time has come to really reform the system.

One proposal that has received strong interest in Cariboo–Chilcotin was to appoint a volunteer committee to examine the pension plan of 10 companies at random on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Their pension plans would be averaged and the result would be the basis for the new MP pension plan. The plan would be reviewed occasionally and altered as needed, preferably by some neutral person like the auditor general. Others have put forward similar ideas.

If we as politicians are to regain the trust of Canadian people, we have to start right at the beginning with the MP pension plan. The best way to handle the issue is to have the electorate decide the compensation with the politicians out of the room. Anything less than this is an abuse of power on our part. It is conflict of interest and a betrayal of the trust Canadians place in their members of Parliament.

In conclusion, at a time when the Canadian pension plan is on the verge of bankruptcy, when over one million Canadians are out of work and many more are barely making ends meet, we are being asked to approve a pension that would turn average MPs into the comfortably well off in only six years.

As a member of Parliament I cannot support the package, especially when there are so many Canadians without any pension at all. Therefore I will be voting against Bill C–85 at third reading and I will be opting out of the pension plan if it passes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, 1995, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78 it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Call in the members.

• (1610)

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: Colleagues, we are approaching the end of the year and we have certain traditions and conventions in the House.

Earlier in the session I mentioned a few times the use of props in the House. I call on all hon. members to respect the traditions of the House. If any hon. members are even considering using what I would call props, especially when a vote is being taken, I would ask you please to reconsider so that it will preserve the decorum of the House.

I ask that with all respect, knowing full well that all hon. members have very strong opinions. Once again in the name of the House, I would ask you to refrain from using any props. I make that appeal to all hon. members.

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

(*Division No. 329*)

YEAS

Members

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bethel
Bhaduria
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Calder
Caron
Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Daviault
DeVillers
Discepola
Dubé
Duhamel
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fillion
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway
Gerrard
Godin
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jacob
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélisle
Campbell
Catterall
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dingwall
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
English
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lalonde
Landry
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Reilly
Paradis
Paré
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Proud
Rideout
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Serré
Simmons
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Walker
Wells
Young —181
Langlois
Laurin
Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien
Ouellet
Parrish
Patry
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Reed
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Wappel
Whelan

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Epp
Gouk
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Manning
Mayfield
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Silye
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)
Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Duncan
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoeppner
Johnston
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Solberg
Strahl
Wayne
Williams—42

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Collenette	Collins
Crawford	Dalphond-Guiral
Debien	Gaffney
Lefebvre	MacAulay
Mercier	Picard (Drummond)
Regan	St-Laurent
Tobin	de Savoye

• (1620)

During the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: As I mentioned before the vote, I would appeal to all hon. members to please not wear or use props.

I appeal to the hon. member for Calgary Southwest to consider taking off the prop which is on his lapel before the vote continues.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, if I could ask you, on what basis do you regard this as a prop?

The Speaker: I regard it as a prop and I would respectfully ask the hon. member for Calgary Southwest if he would consider taking it off.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to remove this prop. I would only ask that members showed the same concern for ethics with respect to the issue that is shown—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Calgary Southwest for what I consider to be his very generous action. I ask all hon. members if they would please follow the lead of the hon. member for Calgary Southwest. I would appreciate it very much.

• (1625)

I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find consent that the House now proceed to deal with Bill C–91 at third reading, subject to an amendment which I am about to propose. I believe agreement has been reached between all parties in the House that there would be three five–minute speeches on third reading of this bill, followed by a bell not exceeding five minutes, following which there would be a vote on third reading.

I think if you could seek that consent I would then propose the amendment to the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I am going to proceed to that request and ask for unanimous consent. Before I do that I am going to read a message from the Senate and then we are going to go to orders of the day, and then I will take that under consideration. That is how I will deal with it.

* * *

• (1630)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related acts, without amendment; and Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles, without amendment.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

BILL C–91

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms proposed by the parliamentary secretary.

Is it the pleasure of the House to proceed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the third reading of the bill, I move:

That Bill C–91 be amended:

By deleting line 25 in section 31 and renumbering (b), (c) and (d) as (a), (b) and (c) and by adding as section 32 the following:

The Bank shall not grant a loan, investment or guarantee to a director or officer of the corporation.

By renumbering existing section 32 as section 32.1 and by deleting line 14 in section 32(3) and renumbering (b),(c) and (d) as (a), (b) and (c).

I seek the unanimous consent of the House for that amendment to be made to the bill.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Speaker: Colleagues, before I leave the Chair this may be the last sitting day. I do not say that it is. As usual, your Speaker is hosting a small reception for all parliamentarians and our pages in Room 216. I cordially invite all of you to join me there when the time permits.

* * *

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (for Minister of Industry) moved that Bill C–91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as amended, be read the third time and passed.

• (1635)

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, the industry critic for the Bloc Quebecois, and the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest who is the industry critic for the Reform Party that the government appreciates the co–operation on this bill. If we were not able to get this bill through today, it would have had an adverse impact not just on the bank as we know it but also on meeting the objectives of helping small and medium sized business over the next three or four months as we adjourn this House of Commons.

As we have debated over the last couple of days, the new Business Development Bank of Canada has been given a new mandate. This new mandate allows the capital of the bank to increase substantially to close to $18 billion. It also means that the bank can be a real force in this country in a complementary way in supporting other financial institutions.

We also have to acknowledge that the bank is not just there to help in making loans to small business. It is also there as a counselling assistance bank. Very few Canadians realize that one of the unique features of the Business Development Bank of Canada is that it has one of the most sophisticated counselling assistance programs in any financial institution right across Canada.

We have given an undertaking that by allowing this bill to proceed quickly today with swift passage, that we on this side of the House will not accelerate the activity of the bank in the province of Quebec before the referendum unless the Bloc changes its mind and wants the bank to be much more aggressive in its lending activities and its presence. That option is there for the Bloc to decide whether or not it wants more activity by the bank before the referendum or if it would like us to wait until after. That decision is with the Bloc and we will honour that commitment.

On behalf of all government members and of course all of our members on the industry committee we have worked as a team in designing this bill and putting it through the House of Commons. Without the opposition's co–operation we could not have had such swift passage. This is an example where all of us are working together to get this economy going.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois–Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak about this bill at third reading, in slightly peculiar circumstances. I would like to state right now that it is only in the interest of Quebecers that we are going along with the government today.

What we would have preferred was for the Federal Business Development Bank to continue as it was before, with a mandate to simply stimulate economic development. We do not want to fundamentally change the rules of the game and create a new small business bank in Canada, as this bill proposes.

There is a fallacy in its very title, because the title does not match its contents, the scope of the bill. The first thing, of course, is the name change: from the Federal Business Development Bank to the Business Development Bank of Canada. That is a little pretentious, a little too pretentious, presumptuous. This was not reflected anywhere in the committee's discussions and debates. In addition, changing the name will be a frivolous waste of time and money.

More serious still, it would change the Federal Business Development Bank's mandate which, up to now, was well appreciated by Quebecers. It would go from being the economic development bank that it was, the last resort bank for a specific clientele, for a very specific market, to a bank which offers complementary financing. We are fundamentally changing what defined it, what gave it its character as a last resort bank.

• (1640)

The bank's role will be changed. There will be changes in the culture of a bank whose primary mandate was to promote the creation and expansion of small business, the culture of economic development. The changes will be subtle, as the new Business Development Bank of Canada seeks financing from the private sector and—this is of major concern to the Bloc Quebecois—will have to be profit–oriented, considering the rates of interest it will have to pay private investors, who will now be invited to invest in the bank. This will bring about a thorough change in the philosophy of the Business Development Bank of Canada, a bank that in our opinion is set to become a commercial bank with a culture that will be more concerned about making profits than just breaking even, as was formerly the case.

Furthermore, and this is probably the most negative development from our point of view, this bill ushers in an unprecedented offensive by the federal government in the sector of regional development, a sector where Quebec has excellent resources and a reputation for its expertise. The federal government, without consulting with Quebec or the other provinces, has the gall to indicate in the bill that it will deal directly with provincial agencies, which are creatures of the provinces, including in Quebec, although Quebec has legislation that regulates relations between provincial agencies—creatures of the Government of Quebec—and the federal government. This is supposed to be done through the Government of Quebec, and now the federal

government comes barging in, tracking mud all over the floor as it were. We deplore this attitude and we condemn it.

Well, let us go on to something else. The bill is full of terms that can be interpreted in a number of ways because they are so vague that bank directors, and especially political leaders, can use them any way they like.

When they are referring to programs, when the qualifier entrepreneurship is used, no definition is given of an entrepreneurship program or indeed of entrepreneurship itself, which opens the door to every possible intrusion by the federal government in the area of regional development, which in Quebec, at least, is considered to be the prerogative and responsibility of the Government of Quebec.

Finally, we seem to be looking at one of the centrepieces of post–referendum Canada which is being put together here in Ottawa, in a very low–key way, and which will make Canada a centralized country, a unitary country, something Pierre Elliott Trudeau never quite managed to do, but now it is being done very subtly, without debate, without any speeches and without anyone being brave enough to come out and say so. It is being done little by little, and the concept that prevails throughout is that Quebec is a province like the others and that for these people, Quebec as a nation does not exist.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear at the outset that our party opposes the bill in principle. We feel that it does not make a whole lot of sense for the government to be establishing another crown corporation to compete with the private financial sector at the very time we are desperately trying to get CN, another crown corporation, into the private sector.

To those Canadians watching, I would like to put the magnitude of the new Federal Business Development Bank into context. The lending authority of the bank will go to $18 billion. The combined total of all of the outstanding loans of all of the chartered banks in Canada is less than double that. It is something like $26 billion. We have created one huge entity in the financial marketplace.

This is a government bill and we knew it was going to pass. I want to tell the House that the industry committee worked very hard to make the bill better. That was the purpose of our amendments.

• (1645)

I think we should also recognize the fact that members of the Department of Industry were most co–operative, very helpful, and worked very hard to put this legislation through. As well, Mr. François Beaudoin and members of the bank have worked very hard.

I do not wish to cast any aspersions whatsoever on the role of the Federal Business Development Bank as a complementary lender and as a mentor to incubating entrepreneurship in Canada. That is where the bank should restrict its activities. In our view, there is a necessity of having that kind of mentoring in our country. They do great work through the CASE program.

We feel that we should not be getting ourselves involved in the private sector. We did great work in the Small Businesses Loans Act working with the banks. This summer the industry committee will be working once again with the banks to keep their feet to the fire, to make sure they are lending money to small business. If the banks do their job, the crown does not have to do it. In my view, and in the view of many people on this side of the House, the correct approach would be to keep the bank's feet to the fire, not exposing more taxpayers' money to small business or any business. The business of business is business. We should not as taxpayers be throwing money at businesses.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say through you to the House and to people of the Federal Business Development Bank that they do have the support of the House. It is a democratic institution. It is going to be continued, and we expect them to be a complementary lender, not a competitive lender.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 330)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin–Andrew	Bodnar
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	DeVillers
Dingwall	Discepola
Dromisky	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Irwin
Jackson	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Paradis	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Ringuette–Maltais	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Thalheimer
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Whelan
Young —121	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Asselin
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Bouchard	Brien
Bélisle	Caron
Crête	Cummins
Daviault	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gilmour
Godin	Grey (Beaver River)
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoeppner
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Silye
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)—69	

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Collenette	Collins
Crawford	Dalphond–Guiral
Debien	Gaffney
Lefebvre	MacAulay
Mercier	Picard (Drummond)
Regan	St–Laurent
Tobin	de Savoye

• (1700)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self–induced intoxication), (with amendments) from the committee.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time? Now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rock moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise today to defend Bill C–72, which has widespread support among Canadians and, I believe, the support of all members for quick passage in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, Canadians hold the strong moral view that people who commit violent acts against others while voluntarily drunk should be held criminally responsible for their actions.

As members of this House are aware, last September the Supreme Court of Canada, in a case called Daviault, held that according to the common law, intoxication, even if self–induced, may be a defence to a charge of violence against another if the intoxication is so extreme that the accused was in a condition akin to automatism or insanity. As a result, the Supreme Court of Canada directed a new trial in the Daviault case in order to permit the trial court to canvas questions of fact relating to that potential ground of defence.

In the Daviault judgment the Supreme Court of Canada, in the exercise of its proper function, established the common law principles that apply in such cases. Today the House of Commons has the opportunity, in the exercise of its constitutional function, to establish a legislated rule; in short, to codify the principles that we believe should be paramount, starting with the principle of accountability for one's own conduct. As we consider this issue today, I suggest that we, as parliamentarians, must examine the question not just as an issue involving the common law but as a matter involving common sense.

The principle of accountability in the criminal justice system has been reflected in every measure this government has introduced while implementing its safe homes, safe streets agenda. During the session of Parliament that ends this week, the government has delivered on that agenda.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rock: Bill C–37, which will receive royal assent later today, toughens the response to violent youth crime, doubling the maximum sentence for first degree murder, introducing important changes to the transfer provisions involving the trial of 16 and 17–year–olds in adult court when facing charges involving serious crimes of violence.

Bill C–41, passed by this House last week, codifies the principles and the purposes of sentencing, encouraging uniformity and predictability in criminal sentences, broadening the rights of victims in the criminal justice process and increasing their rights to restitution.

Bill C–42, passed earlier this year and proclaimed in force in mid–February, modernizes the criminal justice system in dozens of ways, simplifying criminal procedure and making protection ordered by the courts more readily accessible to women who are victims of the violence that is caused by the men with whom they live.

• (1710)

Bill C–68 cracks down on the use of guns in crime, providing for the longest mandatory minimum penitentiary terms in the Criminal Code for those who choose to use firearms in the commission of any one of ten serious offences. As passed by the House Commons, Bill C–68 also provides for mandatory minimum jail terms for those prosecuted on indictment for the possession of stolen or smuggled firearms and provides the police with valuable new tools in their continuing efforts to enhance community safety.

Bill C–104, which will be considered by the House later this afternoon, provides by amendment to the Criminal Code for the taking of bodily samples for DNA testing, providing an important tool for police and prosecutors in the investigation and prosecution of serious crime.

The creation of a national crime prevention council puts crime prevention on the national agenda for the first time, uniting community action with government policy so that Canadians, instead of wringing their hands worrying about safety in their communities, can roll up their sleeves and do something positive and constructive to increase the safety of their homes and of their streets.

With Bill C–72, the government has responded quickly and effectively to deal with an issue of grave public concern.

[*Translation*]

The aim of this bill is to amend the Criminal Code so that intoxication may never be used as a defence against general intent violent crimes such as sexual assault and assault. The bill therefore establishes a new standard of care.

A person in a state of self–induced intoxication that renders them unaware of, or incapable of, consciously controlling their behaviour, who causes injury to another person, is criminally accountable. This person departs from the standard of reasonable care generally recognized in Canadian society and cannot claim extreme intoxication as a defence.

[*English*]

The government believes that the approach taken in Bill C–72 is fundamentally fair, both to the victims of violence and to those accused of crime. It is fair to the accused because we will set out in clear language in the Criminal Code the minimum standard of civilized conduct Canadians are entitled to expect from each other in the context of voluntary intoxication. Hence-

forth, let no one suggest that they were unaware of the standards by which their conduct in such cases is to be judged.

The bill is fair to victims of violence because it ensures accountability for the aggressor. It fosters protection for the security of the person. It introduces concepts of deterrence and punishment to cases of violence involving self–induced intoxication.

This bill reflects Parliament's grave concern about intoxicated violence and particularly its disproportionate effect upon women and children in Canada. It is not without significance, I suggest, that the Daviault case involved allegations of violence by a man against a woman. Almost all of the cases that followed the Daviault judgment also involved allegations of violence by men against women.

In both the preamble and the operative sections of Bill C–72 we acknowledge the need to deal with violence by men against women and we provide an important means to meet that need. Bill C–72 is a way in which this government is delivering on its commitment to deal squarely with violence by men against women.

[*Translation*]

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the speaker and the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for taking time to examine in depth the complex issues underlying this bill.

[*English*]

The evidence heard by the committee is valuable not only as an indication of the widespread support for the bill, but it is also an important record of Parliament's reasons for legislating in this area. To guide those who are called upon to apply the bill or to defend or adjudicate upon its constitutional validity, the committee heard from practising and academic lawyers, from women's groups, from experts on the psychiatric, pharmacological, and behavioural effects of intoxication.

• (1715)

Of key interest in my view was the uncontradicted testimony that there is absolutely no scientific evidence that alcohol acting alone can medically produce a state of automatism or a state akin to automatism.

To be sure, there were some witnesses who expressed concern about some elements of the bill in relation to the charter of rights and freedoms, but most witnesses strongly endorsed the legislation as constitutional and as an appropriate response to a serious legal and social problem.

The bill comes before the House today with two amendments, both of which I commend to my colleagues. First, the fourth paragraph of the preamble has been strengthened to reflect the scientific evidence that the committee heard. Instead of referring, as it did at first reading, to scientific evidence that many intoxicants, including alcohol, may not cause a person to act involuntarily, the revised bill refers to scientific evidence that most intoxicants, including alcohol, by themselves will not cause a person to act involuntarily.

The second amendment involves the term "basic intent" as it appeared in clause 1. Section 33.11 has been changed to general intent. The phrase "general intent" is an expression better known to the law and lawyers and makes the scope and intent of the bill crystal clear.

I suggest that Bill C–72 meets the test that Parliament must apply to all proposed legislation in the realm of the criminal law. It reflects our shared values and our notions of accountability while respecting the rights of those who may be charged with criminal offences.

I suggest that the bill is sound, fair and a workable recognition of those important public and constitutional principles of which I have spoken. I ask for the support of every member of the House for its speedy passage.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have passed these past few days two controversial and divisive bills. The most eclectic views were put forward, and the emotional intensity of the debate on bills C–68 and C–41 was reflected by some members' virulent outbursts.

Unlike these bills, Bill C–72 is not intended to cause controversy and debate, but rather to bring them to a close. The Supreme Court decision in the Daviault affair has outraged the general public. Henri Daviault was charged with sexual assault on a hemiplegic woman while intoxicated.

He was acquitted by the trial judge who was not absolutely certain that Daviault was sufficiently aware of what he was doing to form a criminal intent, that is to say the intent to sexually assault.

The Quebec Appeal Court quashed this decision two years ago and convicted Daviault. But on September 30, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that pleading intoxication could be admissible in some specific cases and ordered a retrial.

Reactions to the decision rendered by the highest court of the land were quick to follow. While a plea based on the Daviault decision was expected to be used only very exceptionally, the interpretation given to this decision by lower courts lead to three acquittals within two months.

All these cases involved women who had allegedly been assaulted, sexually or otherwise. In the Blair case, in Alberta, an alcoholic was charged with assaulting his wife. He was acquitted on the basis of the Daviault decision. In the Compton case, in Prince Edward Island, the accused, who only vaguely remembered what happened at a social gathering because he was drinking, was acquitted of charges of sexual assault. The judge said that he could not make a ruling and that he was not

convinced that the Crown had established the criminal intend required to convict the accused.

Closer to home, in the district of Hull, in the Thériault case, a Court of Quebec judge acquitted a man charged with assaulting and threatening his spouse on the grounds that he was too high on cocaine to realize what he was doing.

• (1720)

Three cases of women who were victims of assault and all three resulted in acquittals. This is more then the public could take. Canadians have had enough of the aberrant decisions made by our judicial system. Following the Supreme Court decision, the Minister of Justice decided to take action. In fact, the general outcry provoked by the Daviault case and the subsequent decisions made by lower courts was such that the minister had to respond immediately. This is of course a political decision; it is only a short term solution, before the Criminal Code undergoes a comprehensive review. This is what we call a piecemeal approach.

The problem with this approach is that it inevitably results in a legislative mosaic which lacks cohesion. Although the justice minister has done some pretty good patchwork, it is still incomplete and inadequate. We wonder whatever happened to the judicial and legislative powers. Simple logic tells us that Parliament should legislate and then let the courts interpret the intent of the legislation. However, this is not the case. The courts, and particularly the Supreme Court, seem to be telling Parliament how to legislate. The world has gone crazy.

It is up to the Minister of Justice to initiate reforms. The Supreme Court should not have to lead him by the hand. It is not up to the highest court in the country to take the initiative, the minister should do it. Enough of stopgap measures. Let us get on with it. The Daviault case was not the only opportunity used by the Supreme Court to send a message to the Minister of Justice.

Indeed, in the McIntosh decision, brought down on February 23, the court gave a rather surprising interpretation of the notion of self–defence. The judges concluded that an aggressor responsible for a dispute could avail himself of the principle of self–defence in a murder case. Chief Justice Lamer made a very telling comment when he wrote, and I quote: "It is clear that legislative action is required to clarify the Criminal Code's self–defence regime". He added: "It is, in my opinion, anomalous that an accused who commits the most serious act has the broadest defence. Parliament, after all, has the right to legislate illogically".

The message is rather clear. Yet, it remains unanswered. With all due respect, the judges of the Supreme Court were not elected by the people and it is not their duty to indicate the direction the criminal law should take. Jurisprudence has an important role to play in the development of the law, but it is not a substitute for the decisions we as legislators are supposed to make.

As for the bill before us today, the substantive amendments to the Criminal Code proposed in Bill C–72 are preceded by a preamble setting out the circumstances and considerations justifying this new legislative measure. The preamble will appear in the texts as an integral part of the amending legislation, but it will not be included in the Criminal Code. In fact, the preamble is longer than clause 33.1, which will be added to the Code. It is therefore difficult to ignore.

Generally speaking, the preamble gives the background to the bill. Among other things, mention is made of the serious concern with violence in society, the close association between violence and intoxication and the recognized potential effects of alcohol on human behaviour. In this same vein, reference is made to the moral view that people who, while in a state of self–induced intoxication, violate the physical integrity of others are blameworthy and must therefore be held criminally accountable for their conduct, whence the need to incorporate in the law a standard of care, departure from which would entail criminal fault.

• (1725)

A minor amendment has been suggested by the justice committee concerning paragraph 4 of the preamble, which points out logically enough that the consumption of intoxicants may not necessarily cause a person to act involuntarily.

It is difficult to argue with virtue. On the other hand, the preamble raises a number of questions and comments. What is meant by saying that violence has a particularly disadvantaging impact on the equal participation of women and children in society. Are we afraid to say what we mean? Why does the preamble emphasize violence against women and children? Why are we still and always compared with children? It has really started to bug me that women are being equated with children, when it comes to victimization.

Let me make this clear. I am not saying that children do not deserve special attention. What bothers me is the condescending and paternalistic attitude of the lawmaker. Whenever women need protection of any importance, we protect them as if they were children. It would seem to me that several people still consider us the weaker sex, actually, as weak as a child.

Therefore, society should give us women the same protection, according to the lawmakers, perhaps; that is a male way of thinking. A woman does not need to be taken by the hand. A woman does not need to be told to look twice before crossing the street. A woman is a mature and responsible being. A woman is a mother who raises a child. A woman is not a child.

Stop thinking of us in this way. If, in general, women need special protection, that protection should be different from the protection given to children. And children certainly do not encounter the same obstacles as women do, when they try to take an active role in society. So, why suggest that they are similar? Otherwise, we would have to reclassify all human beings in our society. We would have to start talking about adults, on the one hand, and, on the other, women and children. There was a time

when people used to think this way. It would seem that the lawmaker is now heading back in that direction.

The summary gives an insight into the legislative amendments contained in Bill C–72. However, this litany of excuses has no other purpose than to eventually refer the issue to the Supreme Court, for an opinion on the approach taken in the amendments made in Bill C–72.

The Minister of Justice is consistent as he again considers the option of a referral asking the Supreme Court to examine the amendments to the Criminal Code in Bill C–72, as soon as the legislation is passed by Parliament but before the legislation comes into force.

He would seek a non–binding advisory opinion from the Supreme Court, as if Parliament needed the seal of approval of the courts! And if the Supreme Court felt that the provisions were unconstitutional, we would have to go through the whole process again. We would be back to square one, and the time spent in the House and in committee would have been wasted.

If the Minister of Justice is so sure that his bill would pass the test of a constitutional challenge, why bother seeking the approval of the Supreme Court?

Immediate implementation of these amendments is both necessary and crucial. As long as we keep postponing the coming into force of this legislation, the number of these sad and sordid cases will continue to increase. Courts across the country are waiting for the Minister of Justice to act. This time they are seeking an opinion from the Supreme Court.

Aside from the preamble, the bill is very brief. Just one clause. Bill C–72 proposes to add a new section 33.1 to the Criminal Code, which consists of three subsections. The first one removes the defence of self–induced intoxication, the second subsection defines the standard of fault and the third specifies the type of offence to which the provision applies.

Section 33.1 of the bill will be added to the general part of the Criminal Code under the heading *Self–induced intoxication*. However, the section in question provides no definition of this term and does not list specific circumstances to which the section does not apply. It seems to me that the Minister of Justice, who wants to correct a judicial decision, is still leaving a lot of room for interpretation. The connection between the preamble and subsection three of the article seems somewhat ambiguous.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business. Before we do, however, I would ask the hon. member for Saint–Hubert if she could tell the House how long she will need to conclude her remarks. Perhaps we could then agree to delay Private Members' Business, or perhaps we should ask for unanimous consent.

Could the hon. member for Saint–Hubert help us out with this information?

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I would need 8 or 9 minutes more.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Under the circumstances, I would ask, without wanting the hon. member for Saint–Hubert to be bound by her statement, if there is unanimous consent?

[*English*]

Would there be unanimous consent that I not see the clock so the hon. member for St. Hubert could conclude her remarks? Then at approximately 5.40 p.m. we would go into Private Members' Business. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the parliamentary secretary to the House leader has another issue he would like to bring forward. If he does I would like to have that heard now so that we could proceed. We would agree to the request.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): As we say repeatedly from the Chair, it is your House and I am only here to accede to your wishes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDUSTRY—AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments of the Reform Party whip I would seek the consent of the House for a couple of motions. I move:

> That 15 members and 7 staff of the Standing Committee on Industry be authorized to travel to Toronto, Ontario, during the adjournment of the House between August 1 and August 3, 1995, in order to conduct hearings on major banks and their activities.

I seek unanimous consent for that motion and then I will have another one.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*Translation*]

SUBSITUTIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice:

> That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Standing Orders, the chief whip of any party can, for the purposes of this trip, make substitutions by giving notice to the clerk of the committee. These substitutions will apply for the duration of the trip and will take effect as soon as they are received by the clerk of the committee.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce this motion as well, Mr. Speaker.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to revert to presentation of reports by interparliamentary delegations so that the hon. member for Labrador could present a report to the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the 1995 spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before returning to the previous business before the House, I would like to express my thanks to the House for its co–operation.

The hon. member for St. Hubert will conclude her remarks. Upon completion of the remarks we will proceed to the private members' hour. I particularly appreciate the co–operation and the indulgence of the member in whose name the motion stands, the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self–induced intoxication), be read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Sint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing me to conclude my comments on Bill C–72 right away.

I was speaking about the preamble and the relationship of the preamble to the third paragraph of the new clause. The preamble provides that it is necessary to legislate a basis of criminal fault in relation to general intent offences involving violence.

However, subclause 33.1(3) of the bill provides that the section applies to offences including violence or threat of violence under the Criminal Code or any other act of Parliament. Does this not mean that the section would also apply to specific intent offences with violence? This however is not the case.

In fact, an individual charged will still be able to claim self–induced intoxication as a defence against such serious charges as murder, theft, robbery, extortion, breaking and entering and torture.

As the preamble to the bill indicates, we clearly recognize the close association between violence and intoxication. The urgency of the situation requires immediate intervention. Every day women are battered by their drunken spouse.

The results of a national survey on assaults against female spouses, in which more than 12,300 women participated, were released in March 1994. As I said previously, this survey establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt the relationship between alcohol and violence. It reveals that alcohol is a prime factor in spousal assaults. The aggressor had been drinking in half of all the reported assaults.

More specifically, the rate of assault on woman living with a man who drinks regularly, that is at least four times a week, was three times higher than for abstinent husbands.

Women whose husbands drink often five drinks or more at one time were six times more exposed to assault than women whose spouse did not drink. In 1993, 55 per cent of the men who killed their partners had consumed alcohol.

That being said, Bill C–72 is only part of the solution when dealing with the violence issue. When sexual assault results in the death of the victim, what was common assault becomes culpable homicide. The offender will be able to use the intoxication defence, whereas he could not have presented such a defence if the victim had not died, since in that case he would have been charged with aggravated sexual assault.

Which leads to the following nonsense. If the aggressor hits his victim hard enough to cause her death, he can plead that he was too intoxicated to know what he was doing. On the other hand, if the victim recovers from her injuries, he will no longer be able to use this defence. Such nonsense ought to be remedied at once. The only way this can be done is by consolidating the

Criminal Code and updating our law so that it reflects what society condones and what it will not tolerate.

Every form of violence should be exterminated like vermin. The Minister of Justice should not wait any longer to complete the reform of the general part of the Criminal Code. The rules of criminal law are archaic and many of its fundamental principles are not included in the general part, as they were developed by the courts.

Precedents shape the law. It is high time for roles to be reversed and for lawmakers to act responsibly. The Barreau du Québec quite rightly expressed serious concerns about Bill C–72.

In its brief to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, it suggests a global approach to penal law. Here is what it said in unequivocal terms. "The Barreau du Québec wishes to emphasize that, far from eliminating the confusion which surrounds the concepts applying to criminal law, the proposed legislation creates even greater confusion. The urgency is of a political nature and is the direct result of the treatment, by the media, of the Daviault case. This certainly confirms the need to look at the issue, but we must do so in the appropriate general context".

• (1740)

Other groups showed less tolerance toward Bill C–72. The Criminal Lawyers Association called the legislation "premature". These criminal lawyers feel that the bill violates the charter of rights and freedoms. They deplore the attitude of the Minister of Justice, who is providing a political solution to a legal issue. These criminal lawyers also feel that the premises of the preamble are flawed and are too open to interpretation.

Without necessarily agreeing with these groups, I do see a common denominator, namely the need to reform our criminal law, particularly the Criminal Code. Using a piecemeal approach or merely patching things up only leads to inconsistent legislation and absurd precedents.

We need a comprehensive review, as Superior Court Justice Réjean Paul said:

"It has already been quite a while since the Law Reform Commission of Canada suggested to Parliament that it should undertake major changes regarding substantive law and criminal procedure, so as to be able to deal with contemporary issues. It is necessary to adopt a new Criminal Code, as well as a new Code of procedure. In Canada, we are still using a working tool that dates back to the previous century, was reworked in 1927 and 1952, and patched up several times since to deal with new political, economic or social realities".

The chaotic situation prevailing in our criminal law system could not be better summed up. Therefore, I exhort the Minister of Justice to stop grandstanding and to propose an overhaul in September. Criminal law needs a steady hand at the helm, someone capable of keeping on course, not someone who will be dragged along in the wake of the courts.

In closing, I would like to wish all of my colleagues a pleasant end of session; we all know that the last sprint is difficult. I wish you all a good summer and above all, a happy national holiday, Saint–Jean–Baptiste Day, to all Quebecers. May we proudly celebrate the joy that comes with belonging to a people who will soon, very soon, take charge of their own affairs and create a country of their own.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.43 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

NATIONAL GRANDPARENTS DAY

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.) moved that Bill C–259, an act respecting a national grandparent's day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, in today's times the family seems to be under constant attack and so it is that those of us who are chosen to represent Canadians and make decisions for Canadians must also protect the Canadian way of life.

The family is the basic unit for all society, yet it seems to have its adversaries, those who seem intent on belittling the importance of family in today's world. I am sorry to hear from those who do not respect the family for it is our heritage. It is mankind's heritage and mankind must protect it if the world is to remain strong.

From strong families we have strong communities. From strong communities we have strong provinces or states, and from strong provinces and states we have strong countries. One unit builds upon the other.

Why is it so important to remain respectful of the family unit? When we are born, each of us learns from our parents. We are taught who we are and learn the values of living within a family, of treating each other with love and respect.

Our future behaviour, one of being responsible, carrying one's weight and respecting others and our way of life begins in a family setting. Later, as we continue to grow and get an education, our relationships with others and our treatment of others reflect our early family teachings. We are what we are taught. We are what we experience.

If we are part of the working world and go into business, our business reflects our attitudes. If we take a position in the workforce our treatment of others and our ability to work with

others forms our reputations, that which we become known by or judged by and hopefully loved by.

The most common reference to the life of mankind is a tree. If the roots are strong and well fed, so grows the tree. If families teach strong values, good citizenship, respect for others, children as they grow will carry out this practice in their every day lives. As we know, acorns never fall far from the tree. So it goes that our basic teachers who become grandparents are of great value to our society.

If a country is to remain strong, its people must be strong, for a country reflects the values of its people. In Canada we have many cultures and we are made aware of this when we travel or walk through our large cities, whether we are in a market square or a restaurant or a school. If we look closer when we meet our fellow Canadians I know we will see the attitude within each of these cultures toward their families.

We can learn from each other. Whether we watch our aboriginal peoples or new cultures that come to Canada from other countries, they clearly show respect for their elders in each of our many family groupings in Canada.

It appears to me to be the underlying theme in most cases, the elders in each of our families, the grandparents and the great grandparents, those who are wise in the ways of the world. The best way to be wise is through life experience and through hardships.

Let us look at who our grandparents and our great grandparents are today. First, I want to point out that this group in Canadian society is the very one who gave us many of the plans we have today, such as the basic UIC program, workmen's compensation, old age security and the health care plan. These citizens have paid their way in society. Now we should support the intent of my Bill C–259 and help them by recognizing the second Sunday in September as grandparent's day, the same as we have a father's day and a mother's day.

At this time, in this House, it would be a very special thing to do. At the end of debate in this session on Private Members' Business, we should finish the session by recognizing our grandparents in this way.

Grandparents and all seniors today are very active. Many are still in the workforce. Many are in volunteer organizations. I want to take a moment to point out that right now in Ontario we have grandparents who are in the volunteer organization Many Hands. As a volunteer one does not get paid for one's services. There are many grandparents in this program called "School Volunteers Add Life to Their Years".

These are the types of things this group of grandparents and seniors do in our communities throughout Ontario: volunteer activities and general classroom assistance. These volunteers carry out various tasks such as assisting with learning activities, oral reading, creating displays, helping young children with their clothing. They might also form part of the class grandparents which is the intergenerational program in which a senior becomes a grandparent to one classroom. They might take on remedial education. Volunteers are needed to assist students with reading, language and math skills.

They might also do special education. Volunteers work with developmentally challenged students, either one to one or within an integrated classroom. They might be in mentoring where they are working one on one with a student to provide friendly support, increase motivation, encourage attendance and help prevent dropouts. They might work with languages.

Volunteers with fluency in languages could assist in French immersion programs or in English as a second language, RESL programs. Grandparents might work in the electives. Students benefit from hands on learning when volunteers introduce and demonstrate their skills in art, drama, music, computers and more. They might be resource speakers. How often in my classroom did I have seniors speaking to students about various skills they have. Volunteers speak on topics of interest to the class which include careers, travel, hobbies and special projects. They might be part of school clubs. School clubs and science fairs all benefit from the involvement of volunteers with specialized experience.

• (1750)

Grandparents might coach team sports. Many school teams need help in activities such as coaching, training and managing. Grandparents might be library assistants. A busy library needs volunteers to assist students to locate materials, prepare library cards, repair books, help with circulation tasks and reshelve books or work as an office assistant. The school office frequently needs help in general clerical assistance, filing, copying and telephoning.

I have demonstrated that when it comes to volunteering, our seniors, our grandparents are invaluable. At least in Ontario we already realize what a wonderful resource they are.

I wonder how many of us realize that we have something called seniors games in our provinces. I know Ontario has seniors games because I have in front of me a very beautiful, very large magazine that goes out to 160,000 grandparents throughout the province.

I want to point out that the Ontario senior games have many qualifications within them. One must qualify for various programs to take part in them. Just some of them are: cribbage, contract bridge, carpet bowling, darts, five–pin bowling, golf, horseshoes, lawn bowling, shuffle board, tennis, ten–pin bowling walking, and it goes on.

These activities for grandparents, for seniors are all organized and all paid for by volunteers. I know these seniors have a very good time. I know this because I partake in the seniors program in British Columbia. I competed last year and I will be competing again this fall in the same program.

All of these seniors give their time but they still enjoy life. I want us to remember that our grandparents are not too old to enjoy life, not too old to take responsibility, not too old to work, as many of them still do.

In the seniors programs we see a demonstration of sport and sports abilities that are second to none. Last year I watched an 87–year–old senior in British Columbia win the badminton finals. A very excellent sports athlete.

I also want to point out, as this book does, that seniors are in volunteer programs here in Ontario. It says: "Volunteers make a difference; $93.3 million gift to society". That is what the seniors in Ontario have managed to help raise. In 1994 in metro Toronto seniors donated an average of four hours a week to charities and community work which translates into a whopping $93.3 million. Think about all those volunteer hours that are not paid for, that are given freely.

Seniors have experienced maturity and commitment. They are looking for an opportunity to learn new skills, be challenged, makes friends and have fun. We should take the time to realize that our seniors are very special people.

I would like to point out that in my grandparent's Bill C–232, I stated something very firmly. It was my opinion of the value of grandparents in the home. In this country and in the United States grandparents sometimes raise their grandchildren. In that case they are attending to needs I am going to talk about. In the United States there are over three million grandparents who are raising their grandchildren.

In Canada we have no records on that. The reason we have no record is that we have nothing in legislation yet, even though Bill C–232 did get the unanimous support of the House and I hope it makes it into legislation shortly.

My idea of literacy and crime prevention, which incidentally I have been speaking about for over six months, is something I feel could start with grandparents and with our senior volunteers because literacy begins at birth, it begins in the home. What a wonderful opportunity. Grandparents are there. They drop in. They visit regularly. They look after their grandchildren. It is an opportunity for them to read to them, take time to talk with them, to listen to them, to encourage them in that they are doing.

This literacy program which I have been talking about for six months automatically has a positive result.

• (1755)

I believe that positive result would be crime prevention. I have spoken of this in every every group I have spoken to during the last six months, whether in British Columbia, here or in the maritimes.

I strongly support literacy and crime prevention. I strongly support the program as it is outlined by the government, literacy and crime prevention. However, I have to take issue with one booklet which I am holding in my hand. I know my grandparents would agree with me that the language in this booklet is not acceptable for use. I know the grandparents that are in the gallery and the grandparents that are watching at home would agree that perhaps we could take a second at this booklet. We agree 100 per cent with literacy and crime prevention but we know our children have to read good language in books.

I also have a few talking points which relate to Bill C–259, an act respecting national grandparent's day. I want to stress it is important to recognize even in a symbolic way the contribution of our ancestors. They can be recognized, if the House agrees that the second Sunday in September would be a great day to recognize grandparents on grandparent's day.

It is through grandparents and great grandparents, if one is fortunate enough to know them, that the oral tradition of family history is passed on. How many times did we listen to our grandparents telling us stories about their lives?

These traditions that go back to our roots are necessary in times of great change. It is always encouraging to have a touchstone to mark one's activity against and it is important this touchstone never change.

This is what grandparents do for us: for our children they provide a solid base of support and advice. How many times do we in the House remember asking for our grandparent's help when we were younger?

Recognition of grandparent's day is really a recognition of grandchildren and their relationship to the future of the country. I cannot stress that enough. When we talk about grandparents we are reinforcing the rights of our grandchildren. Lifting up the role of grandparents gives recognition to the interests of our grandchildren, it provides a bridge between the age gaps of young and old. When you see seniors working with young children, you realize there really are no age gaps. They converse very well together and they understand each other very well.

We are all aware of the breakdown in the family unit and in family values in this last decade of the 20th century. This is our opportunity at least as parliamentarians to say that we do not want that to happen. We want to support our grandparents.

This breakdown is attributable to many causes: the stress of modern day living, monetary worries and lack of job opportunities. In many cases these stresses have led to the break up of families. In a family breakdown most children who are involved believe they are at least partially to blame for the divorce of their parents. Only grandparents who are not immediately involved can act to console the children of divorce, to reassure them the divorce is not their fault. Grandparents are there in

good times and in bad to lend a hand. They make the grandchildren whole again.

Those in their later years have contributed greatly to the development of this country. It was they who fought in the last world war, it was they who have attempted to prevent global war since 1945.

We do not as a country spend enough time in reflection on our past. We have been caught up in the struggle to personally succeed, to live our personal success story. Grandparents can contribute a quiet assurance to the development of children that parents because of jobs and other pressures cannot now give.

Bill C–232 dealing with grandparents rights of access to grandchildren during a divorce hearing has been debated on three occasions in the House and sent to the justice committee for study. As I mentioned earlier I would like to see it come back in the House.

It follows from this heightened awareness of the rights of grandparents that one day per year should be set aside to honour them. I hope we can agree with this.

Finally I want to mention an article I happened to run across which contains the words of Pope John Paul. Regardless of our religion or absence of religion, we might all realize this is a world leader to whom we should listen. He is talking of problems of the elderly:

> —as the years pass and their strength fails and illness comes to debilitate them further, they are made to feel increasingly conscious of their physical fragility, and, above all, of the burden of life.
>
> The only way to solve this problem is for our seniors to be taken to heart by everybody and accepted as a matter with which the whole of humanity must concern itself, for all humanity is called upon to support our seniors.
>
> The experiences of our elders are a treasure the young married folk who, in the difficulties of early married life, can find in aged parents agreeable counsellors—and confidants, while the children will find in the example and affectionate care of their grandparents something that will compensate for the absences of their parents, which, for various reasons, are so frequent today.
>
> The fact is that modern cultural patterns in which an unbalanced emphasis is often given to economic productivity, efficiency, physical strength and beauty, personal comfort, can have the effect of making the elderly seem burdensome, superfluous and useless, and of putting them on the margins of family and social life—
>
> The elderly often have the charisma to bridge generation gaps before they are made. How many children have found understanding and love in the eyes, words and caresses of the aging. And how many old people have willingly subscribed to the inspired word that the crown of the aged is their children's children?

• (1800)

It is my hope today that members who are still in the House at the end of the time set aside to debate my private member's bill will join with me in agreeing that the second Sunday in September would be an excellent day to recognize grandparents.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I remind the House that we can expect an interruption very shortly for royal assent on some bills.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of creating a grandparents day for Canada to honour grandparents for their significant contributions to both our individual and collective lives. We have a mother's day, a father's day and a year of the child, yet we have been reluctant to similarly recognize and honour grandparents who have contributed so much to our attitudes and values as citizens.

Grandparents would have been invented if nature had not already seen to create them in the hierarchial structure. Grandparents come in various sizes and shapes, not to mention ages. In fact traditionally one had to be a senior to be a grandparent. Today grandparents may be in their forties or fifties. In fact I have a friend who is a 35–year old grandmother. Even though I am no longer so young, I confess the thought of being a grandparent has begun to enter my fantasy and beckon seductively. Alas my sons have no wish to comply just yet.

My only grandparent who I can remember—all others died before I was born—was my grandmother. She was my mentor and she was my heroine. She taught me early about advocacy, feminism and politics. She had a more profound effect on the path I chose in life than my parents. She taught me to be strong and to be outspoken, to be independent and to tilt at windmills. She taught me more by her example than by dictum. I am the woman I am today mostly because of my grandmother.

Grandparents are not only mentors. They are nurturers. They come to the rescue of their grandchildren. They spoil them. They do things for them they would never have done for their own children, and so it should be. The grandparent is a grandchild's greatest defender and advocate, caretaker, surrogate babysitter, money lender, chauffeur and cookie baker. Grandparents are so important to our society that where nature did not provide them humans have indeed invented them.

In B.C. there is an organization of volunteer grandparents who take the place of grandparents especially in urban settings. This association adopts children the same way as the Big Sister and Big Brother organizations, bringing a new and important relationship into the lives of lonely young children and young people. They become part of the extended family, eventually creating mutually beneficial lifelong bonds.

• (1805)

My own sons, born in a land far away from their own biological grandparents, were deprived of that special relationship with a grandparent, and they recognize that loss even now that they are men.

As late 20th century family trends continue and global travel creates distances between natural families, grandparents will live lonely existences separated from their biological families either by divorce or distance, as too will their grandchildren. For many children, grandparents may be the only stable caregiver they know.

True, the new blended family may create new opportunities for multiple grandparents and that is a plus. But whatever the scenarios, for those of us who remember or still have grandparents, we know that their work is indisputable, their wisdom invaluable, and their experience as story tellers unmatchable. They link the past to the future, bringing a sense of continuity, tradition and belonging to this fragmented world of ours.

Grandparents have built and shaped our world of today and with our gratitude and will as parliamentarians we can make them an integral part of the world of tomorrow. I suggest we honour the immeasurable contribution of grandparents to our lives by creating a grandparent's day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is my second speech in this House about a bill to declare a national grandparent's day throughout Canada. Like my colleague from Mission—Coquitlam, I also wish to salute the seniors, the grandparents sitting in the public gallery upstairs.

Bill C–259 tabled by my colleague says this:

> Whereas it is recognized that grandparents have laid the foundation of our family structure and future well–being;
>
> And Whereas it is desirable to encourage all Canadians, and particularly children and grandchildren, to remember and appreciate their grandparents;
>
> And Whereas the people of Canada wish to honour all grandparents in acknowledgement of their contribution to Canadian society;

The bill proposes that throughout Canada, in each year, the second Sunday in September of each year shall be known as "National Grandparent's Day".

As the official opposition's representative for seniors' organizations, I noticed that my previous comments in support of a very similar bill declaring a national grandparent's day touched many seniors in my riding of Argenteuil—Papineau and across Canada, including the British Columbia seniors' group of which my colleague is a member.

It is essential to recognize the place of grandparents in our society, when we see how many organizations, groups or simply themes are entitled to their own days underlining their existence and importance. Bill C–259 at last gives seniors a prominent place in keeping with the very important role they play in their grandchildren's lives.

However, to help them play this role properly, the government must provide seniors with a minimum level of financial security, thus preserving their autonomy. Our seniors' financial situation shows that we must not reduce the deficit on the backs of the most vulnerable. I refer you once again to the report by the National Advisory Council on Aging, which reveals that seniors do not enjoy high income levels.

As representative for seniors' organizations, I have always sought to ensure that the government does not penalize seniors. Incidentally, I recently participated in the debate on Bill C–54, which specifically affects seniors' pensions either through the Canada pension plan or through old age security. We in the Bloc Quebecois proposed a series of amendments aimed at protecting seniors who would otherwise be penalized by Bill C–54. Unfortunately, the government rejected them.

• (1810)

I suggested, for instance, that Canada Post should not have access to personal information provided to the government by beneficiaries. I also proposed an amendment that would oblige the minister to remit overpayments due to an administrative error.

Furthermore, the Bloc Quebecois presented an amendment that would reinstate the one–year statute of limitation on overpayments by the government on old age security pensions that were not due to fraudulent intent.

The present statute is five years, which means that the government has five years to claim amounts paid in excess. In fact I spoke yesterday in the House on the subject of Bill C–54, to explain the series of amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois. The bill was passed but the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, the official opposition, were defeated.

I support Bill C–259 because it takes into account the contribution made by grandparents to our society. However, the economic situation of seniors is something we should be mindful of every day of the year, so that they can play their role as grandparents.

We should recognize, even symbolically, the contribution of our seniors. Bill C–259 also gives us a chance to recognize their relationship with their grandchildren. We are, of course, all aware of the breakup of the traditional family.

I also spoke in the House not long ago on the subject of Bill C–232, an Act to amend the Divorce Act. The purpose of this bill is to provide that grandparents will not be required to obtain

leave of the court to apply for a temporary, permanent or amending order regarding custody of or access to the children.

Divorce always leave a bitter aftertaste, and I see it as my duty to ensure that seniors continue to enjoy the place that is theirs in our society. Personally, I am very concerned about the old age pension reform announced by the government, which will come into force in 1997.

In 1994, the government announced that a document would be produced and tabled. Production was delayed, however, and the government preferred to wait until after the referendum in Quebec. In fact, seniors in Quebec had an opportunity to discuss their future at hearings held by the Commission des aînés sur l'avenir du Québec. In the course of these consultations, we found that seniors' concerns are similar across the country. They are concerned about their social and economic situation.

Practically everywhere, people argued in favour of letting senior citizens use their experience for the benefit of the society they will pass on to their grandchildren. Bill C–259 gives seniors a decisive role and reflects our recognition of the role of seniors in our society.

In concluding, I want to say that the official opposition supports Bill C–59 standing in the name of the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. I want to thank the hon. member on behalf of all seniors' organizations and also on behalf of all grandparents, the young and not so young, in this country for drawing attention to their role in our society.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to be asked to speak in support of Bill C–259, an act respecting national grandparent's day.

I am sure that my colleague from Mission—Coquitlam asked me to speak on the bill because despite my youthful appearance she knows that I am a grandfather. So today, to my grandson, Marcel I say: "If you are watching the parliamentary channel on TV, Pop says hello". I am a grandparent and I am proud of it. All together my wife and I have four grandchildren. Marcel is five going on 16. We also have Alannah, Carson and Brock who are quite a bit younger.

• (1815)

We have a national mother's day and a national father's day. Grandparents are either mothers or fathers and I can see the logic in setting aside a day to recognize the importance of grandparents.

Parents are often so caught up in the task of earning a living, keeping the house organized and keeping the children on the straight and narrow they do not have the energy or the patience to enjoy their children in the same way grandparents do.

My wife Bernice says she has more fun with our grandchildren than she did with our own children. When she was a young mother getting the house tidy usually took priority over reading to our children and other things. Now she spends time with our grandchildren, in particular our grandson Marcel, and she says he claims he loves his grandmother more than pancakes. I can assure members pancakes are my grandson's favourite food.

Grandparents have a big influence on their grandchildren. They provide their grandchildren with deeper roots and a sense of connection with the past. They can teach them different things because they have a different perspective. They can be more tolerant because discipline is not their responsibility any more. They can enjoy their grandchildren for who they really are.

Our grandson Marcel has already learned a few things from watching me in the role of politician. The other day at the dinner table he told a story which his mother knew was a little white lie. She gave him one of her looks and without even skipping a beat our five–year–old grandson said to his mother: "Mom, I would like to rephrase that". He is watching television and he is smooth for a five–year–old.

In today's society grandparents can be of enormous help to their children. With so many families breaking up and with so many families stressed out from making ends meet, an extra pair of loving hands is always welcome.

If we were to have a national grandparents day it would be set aside to honour the role of grandparents and the role they can play. It would recognize the wisdom which grandparents can bring. It would give grandparents a sense of importance and worth. It would be a powerful reminder to those grandparents who are not as involved with their grandchildren as perhaps they could be that the more time they spend with their grandchildren, the longer the memory of their influence will survive.

The House should give serious consideration to the bill. It will be an important signal to the nation of our ongoing commitment to the family. It will strengthen the resolve of those involved in taking their roles more seriously and, most important, it will not cost a dime.

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think grandparents are wasted on the young because it is not until later in life when we can look back that we really appreciate what our grandparents have given to us.

I had the great pleasure of knowing three of my grandparents very well. One grandmother, who has been gone from us for almost 40 years, is still revered by her family as a strong, principled woman who worked hard to provide a life for her family in the new country.

My grandfather impressed on me the importance of my responsibility as a citizen, as a new Canadian, ensuring his

children took great care in participating in and supporting the democracy of Canada. I am here today because of him.

My other grandmother provided me with another strong role model, a woman with her own special brand of humour, intelligence and tenacity.

While we discuss a grandparent's day for Canada I would like to introduce the idea of reciprocity. The trend from single to dual earner families has restructured the family as we know it. This has required substantial lifestyle changes within households. The trend has produced uncertainties in role expectations for spouses, their children and grandparents.

Family members or friends provide most of the support for seniors needing care. In return, seniors are active contributors to their families. They provide financial assistance, care for their grandchildren, do housework, they bake and they undertake household repairs. More important, they provide emotional support and continuity for the younger members of their families.

Grandparents donate their time as volunteers, they share their experience—

ROYAL ASSENT

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1830)

And being returned:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C–76, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 1995—Chapter 17.

Bill C–67, an act to establish the Veterans Review and Appeal Board, to amend the Pension Act, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal the Vetrans Appeal Board Act—Chapter 18.

Bill C–37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code—Chapter 19.

Bill S–7, an act to accelerate the use of alternative fuels for motor vehicles—Chapter 20.

Bill C–70, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules and related Acts—Chapter 21.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

GRANDPARENTS DAY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–259, an act respecting a national grandparent's day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, grandparents donate their time as volunteers. They share their experiences of life, thereby passing on values to a new generation. Grandparents support a child's development by unconditional love.

Both grandfathers and grandmothers are retiring earlier from the workforce and remaining active and healthy. This affords them the time to emphasize family care and connections. The active participation of grandparents in the lives of their grandchildren helps reduce the stress on their own children who are trying to juggle family and work responsibilities.

We pride ourselves in Canada on being a caring population. We respect and celebrate individual differences. This is our opportunity to honour the role seniors in general and grandparents in particular play in the interdependent relationship enjoyed by different generations. This is the opportunity to do so by declaring a national grandparent's day we can celebrate each year to remind us and Canada's future generations of that interdependence and reciprocity and to honour our elders for their significant contributions.

• (1835)

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address the House on the issue of creating a special day each year known as grandparent's day all across Canada.

From a child's point of view, a grandparent is the person who loves unconditionally. Child development experts will tell you that unconditional love is the kind of love you receive just for being you, and it is critical in the life of a child.

Not too long ago in this House an hon. member referred to his grandson as the most handsome, intelligent, talented, and clever boy in the whole world. The other grandparents in the room may have taken issue with the statement, because we all know that in fact our grandchildren are the best, the finest, the most terrific kids in the whole universe.

Children learn about themselves from many sources. One such source is to see oneself through another's eyes. What they see in a grandparent's eyes is a reflection of their own special uniqueness. From these loving mirrors self–esteem is developed, and from that love come immeasurable benefits for children, young and old.

Grandparents are historians and story tellers. They weave tales of days gone by, providing gentle guidance as children learn about family and social values and morality. Kids learn from the stories about their parents that everyone, even those who seem infallible, can in fact make mistakes. They learn that everyone struggles when growing up and they learn that parents are human.

Children also learn about their heritage from their grandparents. Seniors are the keepers of all the treasures of our culture, our spiritual identities, and our social values. In this country, where we welcome people of all cultures, grandparents are often the custodians of a family's original language and heritage. The retention of these original cultures makes Canada rich with variety. Our children and their children gain from a multicultural society where each culture is appreciated for its uniqueness.

I have been talking mostly about younger children and the incredible benefits they enjoy by being close to their grandparents. From the point of view of older children, the relationship, while different, can be equally invaluable. Many of us can remember how we suffered through adolescence, having to balance our desire for independence from our parents with the need to seek counsel and be protected from the hard knocks life can often fling at us. Those of us who could turn to a grandparent enjoyed receiving adult advice without having to jeopardize that all–important independence we felt so ambivalent about.

Children today who do not have grandparents of their own are lucky to be able to adopt surrogates. Several provinces have programs where older people volunteer to take on a grandparenting role. Both the children and the older people win in these relationships.

Grandparents are a source of constant support to grandchildren of any age. They provide respite to tired parents by taking care of the children. They share their energy lovingly with their grandchildren, providing them with a fresh point of view. Grandparents are the connection between the past and the future. They allow us to learn from past mistakes and to plan for the life to come. They are the conduit between what is known and what is as yet unknown.

In families under stress, grandparents can provide the anchor that allows children to escape even briefly the tension at home. By alleviating the anxiety and being solid pillars of calm in a confused world, grandparents help their grandchildren to cope.

The children may not realize it until later in life, but grandparents can provide a stabilizing and powerful influence. They can help children develop their personal identities and a positive image of aging.

The idea of creating a national grandparent's day was first presented to this House a mere few weeks ago by the hon. member for Don Valley North. I know how hard he worked on that initiative and that he is very pleased that this House has decided to reconsider his initiative through this bill. I urge the government and indeed all members of this House to help celebrate the role of grandparents in Canada by supporting this bill in creating a national grandparents day.

• (1840)

Mrs. Jennings: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everyone who spoke today; I notice they were all in favour of it.

While I recognize this is not deemed a votable bill, I would like to seek the consent of this House to recognize the second Sunday in September as grandparent's day.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C–72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self–induced intoxication), be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C–72 regarding self–induced intoxication.

Like all Canadians, I was shocked when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in the Daviault case. To remind members present, the Daviault case involved an elderly woman who was sexually assaulted by an intoxicated man. In a six to three decision the court ruled that the man was so intoxicated that he was virtually insane at the time of the crime and was declared innocent of all charges because he did not know what he was doing, I presume.

This country was assured at the time and time and time again by the government that this defence was a rare exception to the rule. Yet in the following weeks at least three criminal charges were overturned, all using the Daviault defence.

Many Reform MPs stood in this House and demanded action on the issue. As the justice minister stood by trying to ease concerns over Daviault mania, individual MPs and the Senate were wrestling with the problem and trying to find solutions to it. Is that not a sad testimony when two private members' bills and a Senate proposal can deal with a justice crisis like this faster than the justice minister?

When Bill C–72 finally did make its grand appearance into this House, Reformers were relieved. Finally the minister was dealing head on with this critical issue and stemming the use of the Daviault defence.

Reform promised to work with the minister to get this bill passed as fast as possible. Whatever it would take, we would do it. That was months ago. Now Bill C–72 is just one bill in our list of many to pass and ship off to the other place. Things could have been much different. This bill could have been made a priority, put on a fast track in the process to show Canadians that we as their representatives share their concerns over public safety and justice.

What was the holdup? Why did the Minister of Justice not give this bill the priority it deserved? Why are we only dealing with it now, the last day before the end of this session?

Perhaps a better question is what was more important than closing the Daviault defence? For one, Bill C–41 had a higher priority than ending the drunkenness defence. After all, this was a bill that was being pushed by the special interest groups and had to be passed to prove to these groups that the Liberal Party wants to get tough on crime. As well, the new gun control bill had a higher priority, since it supposedly would prevent crime and according to the justice minister save thousands of lives in the process through the creation of a new gun registry. And let us not forget the changes to the Young Offenders Act.

In other words, before dealing with the drunk defence the Minister of Justice felt he had to clear away Bill C–41, Bill C–68, and the Young Offenders Act changes. The justice minister's actions show just how out of place the Liberals' priorities really are, not only to the members of this House but to the victims of the criminals now off scot free thanks to the Daviault defence.

The Liberals are putting political causes ahead of public concerns in the hope that Canadians will be fooled by this smokescreen.

• (1845)

Bill C–41, one of the minister's priorities, is not really about getting tough on hate crime at all. The bill is filled with measures dealing with the so–called alternative sentences giving criminals an easy way out of hard time. Serious concerns raised over section 718 were brushed off as scaremongering. Concerns about true justice were put aside for the sake of criminal rights and lobby groups.

Then there is Bill C–68. Even by the minister's own admission we know the multimillion dollar gun registry this bill will create will not reduce violent crime. Law–abiding owners of legal guns will be forced to register their weapons. Thousands of firearms have been declared illegal on the minister's whim. Meanwhile gun smugglers will continue to flood the underground economy with American firearms.

Are Canadians going to be any safer under Bill C–68? Will criminals have fewer firearms? Come to think of it, will any criminals be rushing to the nearest police station to meet the registration deadline? The answer on all counts is no.

Of course there are the changes to the Young Offenders Act which still gives young criminals kiddie sentences for adult crimes.

There is a lot of talk but no action. The Minister of Justice is not really interested in justice at all. Time after time he betrays his left wing roots by writing legislation that fails to deter crime and instead treats the criminal like a victim. The bleeding heart socialists would be proud of the minister for his charitable approach to dealing with criminals. However I am not.

Canadians are feeling less safe than ever before. Violent crime surrounds all of us. The tranquillity of our cities is shattered every night by drive–by shootings, senseless beatings, robberies and sexual assaults. Canadians are looking to their political leaders for help and the government is not delivering. The proof of this lies in Bill C–72.

When the Daviault ruling was made, Reform MPs demanded that action be taken to make extreme intoxication a criminal offence. While the minister waffled, Reform put forward not one but two private members' bills putting an end to the defence of drunkenness. Meanwhile one of the senators put forward his own bill on the issue.

With three bills now on the table the justice minister could have picked any one of them, made any necessary amendments and sped it through both Houses. Instead he took his time, wasting precious days and weeks drafting a fourth bill. In all, Canadians have waited five months for the minister to bring forward Bill C–72.

Despite the delays and the indifference on the part of the minister, Reform still promised its co–operation. We would limit debate, cut committee time, even cut the committee process altogether, all to get this bill on the law books.

The minister first put forward his response in February and Canadians have been waiting for action ever since, and waiting, and waiting, and waiting. The delays have not come from Reform. We have promised to do all we can to get this bill passed. The fault lies across the House, specifically with the justice minister. His nearly one–half year delay has put the safety of Canadians at risk while he pursues his personal agenda that have nothing to do with justice.

To close, Canadians have been poorly served by this minister. Canadians are demanding good, effective laws, not laws for special interests, not laws for lobby groups. While pursuing his own agenda this justice minister has left the drunkenness defence issue on the back burner.

Reform supports Bill C–72 and wants it passed. I am relieved this bill will finally undergo third reading and soon at least partially close the drunkenness defence. I only hope that next time the minister will put his own interests aside and work on behalf of the interests of all Canadians instead.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1850)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Hon. Christine Stewart (for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food, Lib.) moved that Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mrs. Stewart (for Mr. Goodale) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri–food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks a number of colleagues have spoken on this bill. I would like to add my words in favour of Bill C–92 again today. It is an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. This bill would change the pooling points for wheat and barley sold through the Canadian Wheat Board to bring greater fairness to that system.

We are living through a time of enormous and almost revolutionary change in western grain transportation. After many long years of debate the federal government has finally moved to put western grain transportation on a commercial footing. The impetus for change came partly from the need to meet international obligations under GATT, partly to ease the federal debt and deficit, but mostly because it was the right thing to do for the economy of western Canada, including the grains and oilseeds sector.

Under the new GATT agreement that was reached in Geneva in December 1993, Canada along with 120 other countries made a commitment to reduce export subsidies. For Canada this meant gradually eliminating export subsidy components of the Western Grain Transportation Act or hampering exports of oilseeds and special crops as early as this year, the 1995–96 crop year.

When the Minister of Finance tabled his budget on February 27, 1995, he announced major changes to modernize the western grain transportation and handling system. This included the cancellation of the WGTA effective August 1, 1995.

Rather than allow the subsidy to wither away as called for under GATT, we decided to take the value of the subsidy over the next seven years, which is $1.6 billion, and funnel that $1.6 billion into the prairie economy. Along with that one time $1.6 billion ex gratia payment the government also announced a $300 million adjustment fund to assist the prairie agriculture sector in adjusting to the new environment including a change in the Canadian Wheat Board freight pooling system.

Changing the pooling system has long been seen as a prerequisite to making the system fair. Under the present system, grain producers in the western part of the prairies subsidize the movement of grain from the eastern prairies through the St. Lawrence seaway.

I will take a few minutes to explain how it works. When farmers deliver grain to their local elevators they receive an initial payment plus the freight costs for moving the grain to export position. These costs are based on two pooling points at the present time, Thunder Bay and Vancouver. It has been generally recognized by the industry that these pooling points, while historically price equivalent, are no longer appropriate points at which to pool sales revenue. This is due to changes in the global grain market and the transportation system.

• (1855)

Very little grain is now exported directly from Thunder Bay. It is usually now transferred from Thunder Bay elevators to terminal elevators in the St. Lawrence. This means the difference between the cost to export grain from eastern Canada and western Canada is greater than it used to be. At the same time, more Canadian grain is exported through the west coast because of the markets that can be reached from there.

Under the current pooling regime, a producer for example in Brandon, Manitoba, being closer to Thunder Bay, would have an estimated $20.34 per tonne in freight deducted starting as of August 1, 1995. A producer in Calgary, Alberta being closer to Vancouver would have a freight deduction of $22.19 per tonne.

There are additional costs of about $20 a tonne for moving grain from Thunder Bay east through the St. Lawrence to an export position somewhere on the St. Lawrence River. These costs are shared equally by all producers through the Canadian Wheat Board's pool accounts. For wheat that is about $7 per tonne. That is paid by every farmer delivering wheat and barley to the Canadian Wheat Board regardless of where they are on the prairies. It is paid out of the pool account for this purpose.

Most Canadian Wheat Board grains produced in the western prairies move to the west coast for export. As a result the current pooling system has meant income has been transferred from the western part of the prairies to the eastern part of the prairies. The proposed amendment recognizes very clearly the locational advantages in the different regions on the prairies that all of those have on the markets for grain produced on the prairies.

This proposal represents a significant improvement over the current pooling system. It reflects the comparative advantage of different regions on the prairies. It reflects it better than the current pooling system. It significantly reduces the income transfer from the western part of the prairies to the eastern part of the prairies starting August 1, 1995. It does that provided that this bill passes before our summer recess which means that it needs to pass this week. We appreciate the co–operation of this House in hopefully seeing that done.

No seaway costs would be pooled after three years or after 1997–98, thus eliminating freight costs related income transfers in the prairies. This will result in grain producers in Manitoba and to a lesser extent in Saskatchewan facing higher transportation costs than before. However, the proposed change to the freight pooling system is being made in response to the requests from the western grains industry itself. Even Manitoba farm groups and the Manitoba government are in agreement with this amendment provided there is compensation. There will be compensation.

Assistance is available to offset a significant portion of the farmers' increased domestic freight costs in the eastern part of the prairies. With the passage of Bill C–92 a fair method of allocating freight costs among prairie producers of wheat and barley that are sold through the Canadian Wheat Board will be in place for the coming crop year and phased in during the next three years.

Again, I would ask all members of the House to support Bill C–92 before this House recesses for the summer for the good of the industry and to follow the directions and the wishes of the grain industry in western Canada.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C–92 and to express Reform's support for the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to change the pooling points on which initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to determine pooling points across the prairies and to establish a deduction from the initial payment that reflects the relative transportation cost across the prairies.

Through this bill, effective August 1, the federal government plans to change how eastward grain transportation costs are paid. This means that eastern prairie farmers who ship through the St. Lawrence seaway will have to pay the full cost of movement, or very close to the full cost of movement.

• (1900)

Originally the government planned to make this change in August 1996 and the minister says he actually had some lobbying on the part of Manitoba groups to make the change a year earlier, in August 1995.

I fully support this move because it will let the market forces take over a lot more substantially, a lot more effectively, in the grain business in western Canada. This change will mean farmers in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan will be paying substantially more of the cost of freight out of their pockets while farmers in western Saskatchewan and Alberta will be paying relatively less out of their pockets. The amount of freight paid will be much closer to the actual cost of the freight and therefore the freight pooling will be pretty much removed with this change.

I feel it is important to recognize for Manitoba farmers and eastern Saskatchewan farmers that it will be difficult for them to deal with this change. It is another change on top of the loss of the Crow benefit, the Western Grain Transportation Act subsidy. It is substantial and the two added together will have an incredible effect on their industry.

To help counter that for the next three years there will probably be $100 million out of the $300 million transition fund made available to help Manitoba and Saskatchewan farmers deal with the change.

Some positives will result from this change, even from the point of view of Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan farmers. This move should encourage an expansion of the livestock industry in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan.

This kind of diversification is desperately needed in that part of the country as well as across western Canada. This will very quickly lead to a building of the cattle, hog, dairy industry in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan that would not have happened otherwise. By less distortion in the marketplace there will be a far better balanced industry in Manitoba and Saskatchewan as the effects of these changes take place. That is a positive and I support the bill. Reform supports the bill.

Our concern is the act amends the Canadian Wheat Board Act but does not nearly go far enough. Reform for some time has been calling for changes to the wheat board, particularly giving control of the wheat board to farmers by allowing farmers to elect a board of directors to replace the presently government appointed commissioners.

That cannot happen too soon. It is very important that it does happen quickly. Farmers are starting to become very active and are expressing a lot more concern that the wheat board exists for the pleasure of the federal government and not to serve farmers.

That is what is stated in the wheat board bill and farmers are starting to recognize maybe the wheat board is not working for them quite the way they would like it to and the way they can make sure the board does work more effectively for them is by electing a board of directors.

When I am asked about the chances of farmers getting an elected board of directors to replace the government appointed commissioners soon, looking at the record of the government in the way it treats democracy and the real lack of respect it has shown for democracy over this session, it is not very likely.

I point out a few of the specifics that make me say that. We can start with the pension bill. We have seen with the pension bill which was debated earlier today there are several procedural perversions put in place by the Liberals which really showed the Liberals do not have the respect for democracy they should have.

• (1905)

The Liberal led and directed committed refused to hear from members of the public on the substance of the pension bill, the Canadian public, the people paying for the pension program. That is not acceptable; it not democracy as it should be.

The lack of notice from the government of its intention to debate the bill clause by clause after a full day of hearings is not the kind of democratic change that would lead me to believe it is likely to go on and allow democracy into the wheat board.

Despite the fact that witnesses pointed out numerous flaws in the bill, it took the Liberals just 12 short minutes to complete their consideration of this porky pension bill.

Their actions on the pension bill really should not surprise me.. It led me to believe it is very unlikely they will allow the democratization of the wheat board. I will go through a list of other specifics that lead me to believe this is very unlikely to happen.

Here is an extended list of the procedural perversions the Liberals have used to show they really do not respect democracy in this place. These are all cases of time allocation or closure invoked in the House: Bill C–18, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, March 24, 1994; June 21, 1994, Bill C–34, the Yukon First Nations self–government act; Bill C–33, the Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act; Bill C–32, the Excise Tax Act; Bill C–35, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act; March 22, 1995, Bill C–77, maintenance of the Railway Operations Act, second reading; Bill C–77 at report stage; April 5, 1995, Bill C–68, the gun control act, second reading and Reform's reasoned amendments to split the bill; April 26, 1995, Bill C–76, the Budget Implementation Act, second reading; June 5, 1995, Bill C–76 at report stage, and the list goes on, a list that really leads me to doubt the government will ever allow the Canadian Wheat Board to be democratized and allow farmers to take control of their organization.

The most recent procedural perversions are Bill C–41, the sentencing bill, hate crimes, report stage; Bill C–41, third reading; Bill C–68, gun control, report stage; C–68, gun control, third reading, and Bill C–85 today on MPs pensions, first at report stage and again time allocation.

This interference in the normal procedure that should take place in the House, which has rules which govern the amount of debate, is unacceptable.

As we add to the list of procedural perversions, I will mention some other anti–democratic things we have seen happen in the House over the past while.

Let us go back to before the last election, the appointment of several Liberal candidates, rather than going through the democratic nomination process. This is unacceptable.

A few days ago the Prime Minister threatened MPs in his party, saying he would not sign their nomination papers if they vote against government bills, twice was what we heard. In an article from the *Globe and Mail* by Doug Fisher: "Support us or else, MPs warned. Liberal MPs who vote against important government legislation may not be allowed to run for the party in the next election, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien warned Saturday".

Here is a quote from Mr. Chrétien—

• (1910)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): According to the rules we recognize one another either by riding name or by portfolio. Notwithstanding reading any quotes, it is to be as if the member were saying the words.

I ask the member's co–operation in recognizing the minister or the Prime Minister by portfolio and not by name.

Mr. Benoit: Mr. Speaker, the quote is: "I sign the nomination papers when there is an election. It is my privilege, and dissident MPs know it". That comes from our Prime Minister in another clear demonstration of the lack of respect for democracy. It is intolerable and the Liberal backbenchers will not stand for this much longer. I hope that is the case.

The Prime Minister kicked three members who had the guts to vote with their constituents against the gun control bill off their committees. The chair of the justice committee, who decided correctly the budget implementation bill went completely against what was stated in the red book, had the guts to vote against it and of course was disciplined.

I felt it was important to demonstrate from what has happened in the House in terms of anti–democratic actions it is very unlikely the government will ever allow—

Mrs. Barnes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to check what bill we are on. I thought we were talking about the wheat board.

I question the relevancy of the comments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): As stated before, the rules of relevancy are very elastic. Members give themselves a fair amount of range but I ask members to be conscious of that.

Mr. Benoit: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. member's wanting to keep this hidden. However, it is directly connected to the point which I am trying to make about the chances of farmers receiving from the government the right to take control of their own organization and to have the wheat board democratized.

I have to talk about the record of the government in that regard when I am evaluating those chances. I can understand members wanting me to keep quiet but I will not keep quiet on this.

Because of this record it is unlikely to happen and I am afraid I cannot give farmers much hope in their taking control of their organization.

This piece of legislation is a move in the right direction. This is the best piece of legislation I have seen from the government in the entire session. It is not a bad piece of legislation. I congratulate the government on it. It will be good for western Canadian farmers in the long run. It will be tough for some farmers now and we recognize that. There is some compensation to help them deal with that.

I congratulate the agriculture minister and the parliamentary secretary for this piece of legislation but we need a lot more and we need to allow farmers to take control of their organization very quickly through an elected board of directors.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I know there is some haste to bring the debate to a conclusion but this is a matter which is very relevant to my riding in west–central Saskatchewan. I will use a few minutes of the House's time to speak to Bill C–92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board. It will begin to alter the grain transportation system subsequent to the elimination of the Crow benefit.

The purpose of the legislation is to change the pooling points on which the initial payments are based from Thunder Bay and Vancouver to other points in Canada designated by the governor in council. The new pooling points will reflect the actual transportation costs for each producer, or at least it will come closer to reflecting the actual transportation costs.

• (1915)

It should be noted that these changes to the pooling points and the abandonment of the Crow have been in the embryonic stage for a long time. Farmers across the prairies have known for some time that the transportation system would be changing and the Crow subsidy no longer would be in place. In fact, some of the politicians were the last ones to realize this, particularly politicians on the other side of the House.

It is hard to believe that it has actually been 10 years since the Canadian Wheat Board 85 proposal. As we have seen in the past two weeks, the government operates at the speed of a turtle until certain legislation needs to be passed and then the bills are rammed through with a sledgehammer with time allocation and closure.

Fortunately, there is enough support for this bill that the government has not felt it needed to move to censure the members and not allow them to speak to the bill.

The Canadian Wheat Board 85 proposal, seeing the general equivalency of the west coast and St. Lawrence ports in terms of sales returns, recommended the eastern pooling point be changed from Thunder Bay to St. Lawrence. However, under today's market conditions, the demand from Pacific rim far outstrips the demand from the Europeans. Therefore, an extra burden is placed on farmers in Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan when it comes to paying the shipping costs in moving their grain.

The National Grain Bureau proposal of 1990 is the basis of Bill C–92. This is not, and I want to emphasize this, an initiative of the minister of agriculture. Under the National Grain Bureau proposal, producers would pay the transportation costs based on their proximity to certain markets. For example, a farmer close to the west coast would pay less freight than a farmer farther away if his grain was shipped to the west coast. This would be dependent on him shipping through the Canadian Wheat Board.

The goal is to end the cross subsidization of eastern farmers by western farmers. Under the Crow subsidy, transportation costs being pooled meant that a farmer in Lethbridge, for instance, would pay the same shipping costs to the west coast as a farmer from Brandon. The National Grains Bureau proposal added two catchment areas, Churchill and the United States, to the west and east coast points.

The changes in this legislation are definitely a step in the right direction. I do not think farmers have too many qualms about ending the cross subsidization of farmers. It would not be fair to ask farmers on the western prairies to continue subsidizing eastern farmers based on their location. Conversely, I really do not think that farmers in the east want to be subsidized.

There is talk that some of the $300 million transition fund that will be spent over the next six years will be going to eastern farmers although that has not exactly been clarified. There are some problems with respect to the allocation of these funds. It has yet to be decided the exact specifics of the allocation, but we have heard that approximately $100 million of the $300 million may be earmarked for farmers. This would allow farmers to develop new marketing strategies for grains and allow for increased diversification, especially crops such as peas, lentils and beans will be common as farmers shy away from planting cereal crops when prices are falling.

Also, one is likely to see the development of value added in the processing industry. Certainly this is the result that we would like to see. We were trying to focus on the positive developments in the industry and we are encouraged to see farmers responding to market conditions and no longer planting crops based on eschewed or artificial returns for their product.

The Reform Party has expressed some concerns over the implementation of these proposed changes. Although the bill does not specifically set out the catchment areas, it is quite probable that they will be the west coast, the east coast, the United States and Churchill.

The use of the port of Churchill as part of the catchment area may be problematic. In 1994 the port posted a loss of $6 million. Traffic grew by 11 per cent with 322,000 tonnes being shipped, but this was only two–thirds of the volume Churchill needed to break even on operating expenses.

We need clarification from the government and the minister of agriculture on what they are going to do to solve the Churchill problem.

As I have already stated, the changes to the pooling system are just the first of many changes that should be made to the Canadian Wheat Board. My colleague from Vegreville indicated our concern that the first step be the democratization of the Canadian Wheat Board. The government has not heeded that suggestion and is dealing with some areas which we can support and others which we cannot.

However, there is no doubt that in talking to farmers we have heard their expression of concern regarding its marketing practices.

As outlined by the member for Vegreville on many occasions, the wheat board has a monopoly on the buy side but certainly not on the sell side. Farmers must sell through the board any wheat or barley being sold for export and what is being used for domestic purposes in Canada. Farmers do not have the option to sell wheat directly to points within the United States without going through the board and farmers who do sell across the border do so illegally and are open to criminal charges unless they go through the offices of the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (1920)

All farmers want is an open system that is free from government over–regulation and restrictions. It is clear it is not the bureaucrats that want to improve the system but it is individuals who have to work directly within the system and have a vested economic interest in improvements.

While the Canadian Wheat Board would argue that its advisory committee, which is made up of 11 farmer elected bodies, serves the purpose of providing a link between farmers and the Canadian Wheat Board, I would suggest that it is nothing more than a token gesture. The advisory committee does not have the clout or the power to implement the changes necessary to bring the board into the 21st century. Farmers have the know how to make the wheat board effective. A farmer elected board, not an advisory committee, is needed to serve the interests of farmers.

It is noteworthy that we are also starting to hear rumblings from the provinces regarding the Canadian Wheat Board. First we heard that Alberta's minister of agriculture is interested in having a plebiscite on the dual marketing of grain. Then last week the minister of agriculture for Manitoba, Mr. Harry Enns, suggested that he would not be opposed to a modification in the role of the Canadian Wheat Board if it would improve opportunities for farmers to sell wheat into the United States.

I really believe that the Canadian Wheat Board is agreeable to investigating reforms to make it more effective in the 1990s. The government has no choice but to respond to these concerns. From the first day Reformers arrived in the House we have suggested serious modifications to the board with respect to its marketing of grain. Bill C–92 is more or less tinkering with the Canadian Wheat Board but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

I want to assure the House that Reformers will support Bill C–92. We have said this before and we will say it again. The globalization of world trade markets and the removal of trade barriers and subsidies make it imperative that Canadian farmers, whether they are in the supply managed sector or in grain farming, be prepared for changing conditions. In a small way Bill C–92 is helping farmers make the transition to the realities of the NAFTA and the globalization of marketing around the world.

The Liberal government is often shortsighted, trying to patch flat tires when they should be buying new tires or maybe even designing a new automobile. The future is bright for grain farmers if the government can be in step and be as progressive as the farmers are.

In closing, I would suggest that the Canadian Wheat Board should provide more options for farmers. It should be in touch with the 1990s. The board wants to be and farmers want to be. The only barrier is the minister of agriculture and the Liberal government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that Bill C–104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis) be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to speak to Bill C–104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, to provide by legislation a system for governing the collection and the use of DNA evidence in Canada's criminal justice system.

May I also at the outset record my gratitude to all members of all parties in the House whose collaboration and agreement will make it possible for us today to consider and approve this bill, allowing quick and effective action on an important measure to improve Canada's system of justice.

DNA evidence is not new to Canadian criminal law. Since 1988 forensic DNA analysis has been successfully introduced in more than 100 trials. In a significant number of other cases, it has also been instrumental in obtaining pleas of guilt. There have been cases, some of them very spectacular, in which DNA forensic analysis has exonerated innocent people. In total, it has been used in more than 1,000 cases in this country alone.

• (1925)

[*Translation*]

Notwithstanding the importance and the use of this kind of evidence, the Criminal Code does not specifically authorize us to take samples of bodily substances from a suspect for the purposes of genetic analysis. Several courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada in the recently issued Borden decision, have pointed out that no law in Canada specifically permits us to take blood samples in order to carry out genetic analyses for medical and legal purposes.

[*English*]

DNA typing is a powerful investigative tool that can help to identify with greater certainty those who have committed serious crimes. The presentation of this bill represents another step forward in the government's safe homes and safe streets agenda.

This initiative is one of a number of measures we have introduced to enhance community safety to preserve the peaceful character of our society.

Allow me to briefly outline what this bill will provide for. Although, as I have mentioned, DNA evidence has been used in Canadian courts for some time, there has been no clear legislative framework to regulate its use. This bill will clarify the circumstances in which the court would be permitted to issue a warrant authorizing the collection of a sample for DNA testing. It will clarify the procedures under which the suspects could be compelled to provide samples of bodily substances for DNA analysis. It will regulate the manner in which those samples can be taken, the uses to which they may be put and the manner in which they should be disposed of after their use.

[*Translation*]

The legislation we tabled today names three bodily substances which can be sampled: first, hair; second, cells from the surface mucus of the mouth; third, a small quantity of blood, extracted by needle.

[*English*]

In examining what the bill will accomplish, it is important to be clear regarding the present state of the law in Canada. What we are proposing is not in any sense revolutionary nor is it an ill–prepared step into unchartered territory.

Section 487.1 of the Criminal Code, a general warrant provision, currently allows for this type of procedure to take place. DNA samples are used in the courtrooms in this country on a regular basis. As I have previously said, they have figured in more than 1,000 cases.

The difficulty has been in the absence of an expressed authority in the criminal law to remove any doubt about the legitimacy of the practice, leaving room for challenge, leaving uncertainty in the law about the circumstances in which samples can be taken and the manner in which they can be put to use as proof.

The changes in Bill C–104 will provide that legislative clarity. They will bring Canada into line with the practice which is in place at present in many other nations. Forensic DNA typing is conducted in countries throughout the world, including the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Australia, New Zealand and Sweden.

The purpose of the bill is to remove doubt as to the procedure in Canada, to institute a mechanism for its even application throughout the country, to enhance the criminal justice system by establishing a greater degree of certainty in the process.

• (1930)

That being said, may I also suggest to the House that we have been careful in drafting the legislation to abide by principles requiring respect for human dignity and privacy. While the government recognizes the importance of DNA typing as an investigative tool, we also acknowledge that privacy concerns and rights guaranteed by the charter require that adequate safeguards be put in place.

As will be seen from a review of Bill C–104, it contains express safeguards to protect privacy and to protect rights. In the first instance, a sample can only be taken for DNA testing pursuant to a warrant.

Second, that warrant can only be issued by a provincial court judge; not a justice of the peace but a judge.

Third, the judge may only grant the warrant if satisfied from evidence on oath that there are reasonable grounds to believe the person to be tested was a party to the offence, and if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that analysis of bodily substances will provide probative evidence confirming or disproving that person's involvement in the commission of the offence.

I point out as well that a warrant can only be obtained to take a sample in the investigation of specific offences that are designated in Bill C–104. Once the warrant has issued, a sample so taken and tested can give rise to results that can only be used in that investigation or prosecution. Furthermore, even after the judge is satisfied that the tests I have described have been met, the judge must also be satisfied that it is in keeping with the interests of justice to give the warrant to take the sample, having regard to the circumstances of the case including the offender and the offence.

The act also provides that the sample is to be destroyed if the person is found innocent. It provides that after the warrant is obtained and before the sample is taken the peace officer executing the warrant must explain to the person the purpose for taking a sample and the uses to which it can be put. There is an express provision that the warrant must be executed in such a fashion that is reasonable in the circumstances to ensure the privacy of the person is respected. Nevertheless the person cannot be detained for a period longer than is reasonable to obtain the bodily substance, and the bill makes that clear.

May I also point out that the bill is introduced only after protracted consultation. In September of last year the Department of Justice issued a consultation paper identifying the issues and seeking comment. We heard from scores of respondents, including the Canadian Bar Association, criminal lawyers' associations, the privacy commissioner and others.

Support for such a measure was almost unanimous. We have taken from the submissions which we gleaned during the consultation many of the suggested safeguards and incorporated them into the bill as I have described.

[*Translation*]

As I said, the bill also provides for the disposal of both the bodily substances taken under warrant and of the genetic testing results in cases where, for example, the results show that the person in question did not leave any substances at the scene of the crime or in cases where the person is acquitted.

[*English*]

I hope it is evident that the government has gone to great lengths to ensure that the procedures provided for are not only constitutional but are in accordance with basic principles of due process and fairness.

[*Translation*]

I agree with those who recommend that the provisions contained in this bill and their repercussions should be studied later to determine if the legislation meets its desired ends.

Therefore, we intend to ask the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to study these changes at the very latest one year after they are implemented. At the same time, we will ask the committee to examine any future amendments which should be made to the overall system of DNA typing.

• (1935)

[*English*]

In closing, let me express my belief that we are taking today an important step in the enhancement of the criminal justice system. I believe we are improving that system by giving the police an important tool that will help them carry out their duties, by providing for greater certainty in the rules that govern the investigation and prosecution of crime, by improving the effectiveness of the criminal justice system, and by ensuring fairness for those who would be involved in such a regime.

I commend the bill to my colleagues in the House and I ask them for their support.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the question of the admissibility as evidence of DNA tests is not new. It has been a subject of legal debate for quite a while. Sometimes it comes up in public affairs, but it has burst forth in a very special way in terms of public concern because of the drama faced by the family of Michael Manning last year in Pointe–Claire.

The fact that this House is today considering with exceptional speed, it must be said, and with unanimity rarely seen in connection with a subject of debate here is due to the seriousness of what happened to Mr. Manning's family. We will remember that, last year in Pointe–Claire, Mr. Manning and his son discovered Tara, their daughter and sister, aged 15, raped and dead in her bed. There followed a criminal investigation and a police investigation, with the father and son under suspicion, because of the question as to how such a crime could have happened in a private home, at night. The only way the father

and son could free themselves of suspicion was to voluntarily undergo DNA testing.

DNA is what gives all of us a unique and lasting print of our identity. It is practically impossible to confuse one print with another. Because Mr. Manning and his son were able to use the test, they established their innocence. However, biological substances were found on the girl's body that were not hers. An investigation in another matter revealed that an individual involved in a similar assault on another victim had left the substances on young Tara. Following a long legal saga—which, it appears, is not over yet—the crown has been unable, or in any case, has found it extremely difficult in its prosecution to use the biological substance to prove the individual in question committed the crime. This person will soon be released in connection with the other crime, unless found guilty in the one involving Tara.

Why are we debating this in the House today? It is not in order to bring Tara Manning back to life. The sacrifice of the family has been made. However, Mr. and Mrs. Manning, the parents, along with the entire family have made a huge effort nationwide. They have toured Canada far and wide with petitions in order to convince the justice system to come up with the means to arrest criminals in the future. While Tara Manning paid for this flaw in the Criminal Code, others will be spared, because we will now be able to equip police investigators and the justice system with the means to provide the vital evidence.

It is, of course, a complex question, one which, yet again, puts the requirements of public safety and the need to preserve individual privacy in the balance. What could be more private than one's genetic inheritance, which is a part of oneself and of one's being? The question is very serious and very important, of course. I think we have to acknowledge the wisdom of the minister, who, in this case, wanted to divide up the bill and the matters involved to enable us to deal as quickly as possible, before the summer, in Bill C–104, simply with the admissibility as evidence of this type of test, leaving for later and more detailed consideration the issue of data banks that would be set up with this type of sample collecting.

• (1940)

We know that some important issues will be raised when this bill comes before the House. We will have to look at this very seriously, because although it is true that it is entirely appropriate, as the House will decide unanimously today, to let the courts use these samples as evidence, and especially to oblige a person suspected of a crime to submit to compulsory testing, the fact remains that this information should not be used to constitute huge data banks whose information could be used indiscriminately.

We know that this information has many uses, that these gene prints contain a tremendous amount of data and can be used in a lot of different ways, some of which are excessive, and we will therefore need a very strict regulatory framework.

We will need more detailed studies when the time comes to consider the issue of data banks which, according to the minister, will be the subject of another bill that will not be rushed through the House as is the case today.

Why should we allow this kind of testing? Because there is a gap, I would even say a disparity between where we are from the technological point of view, especially in the biological sciences, and the resources available to the Crown and the judicial system when evidence must be established.

The gap has become very obvious now that biology has made such tremendous progress. Scientists are now completing the entire genetic chain, an operation that seemed impossible a few years ago, and that now, thanks to computers, is perfectly feasible. We have made giant strides. We are on the verge of new and exciting discoveries.

All the major diseases affecting humankind today, AIDS and the rest, will probably be demystified and the key to these diseases will be determined as biological sciences progress. In this particular instance science has given us some very important techniques that are even more reliable than fingerprints and will help the police avoid judicial errors.

This is not just about convicting people who should be convicted and keeping them from escaping justice when they commit a crime and we cannot prove it, there is also the advantage that with this kind of testing we will be able to avoid judicial errors. It is a fact that major judicial errors have been made but could be reversed after the fact, when it became possible to use this kind of evidence in criminal proceedings.

I think we all felt some initial reluctance. Of course we understand the legitimate concerns of the Manning family, and we try to imagine the horrific situation facing this family as a result of this atrocity. Just think how we would feel if it happened to us.

But beyond that, as legislators, we have a duty to ensure that we do not go too far, that we do not make ill considered decisions and that our good intentions do not lead us to discriminate against other people and, above all, that we do not create an imbalance with respect to the burden of proof and change the dynamics of our criminal law. Therefore, I am convinced that we all hesitated, momentarily.

I discussed this issue frankly with Mr. Manning when I met with him in my office, and I think that he is a reasonable person and that he understood that it was important to put safeguards in the bill to prevent abuses. I think that there are some in the bill now.

I believe that the bill is crafted wisely and carefully and that it imposes criteria, for example, that justices of the peace cannot issue warrants. First, a preliminary warrant has to be issued, and in addition to that, justices of the peace cannot issue warrants, it has to be at least a provincial court judge who issues the warrant. And decisions will have to be made case by case. The judge will have to weigh the pros and the cons in each case. In addition, for a warrant to be issued, the case must pass three tests: one, it must be demonstrated that an offence in particular was committed; two, it must be demonstrated that the person from whom the mandatory samples are to be taken took part in the crime committed, therefore preventing the possibility of someone being framed; and three, it must be demonstrated that the samples can be linked to a substance found at the scene of the crime and is evidence necessary for the investigation and will further the investigation.

• (1945)

All that having been said, I think that all of the major precautions have been taken, that the act is quite simple and that it covers the main points. However, the official opposition felt that it would be prudent to incorporate in the legislation a mandatory review after one year, because we cannot predict exactly what the courts will do and how they will administer it. Is there a risk that it will be abused and that the courts will go too far?

There is no reason to doubt our judicial system, which is one of the world's finest, I must say, compared to what goes on in some other countries. Even in very democratic countries, the justice system often gets quite out of hand. But we are fortunate enough to have a wonderful judicial system and excellent judges in Canada. I think that the appointment system has given good results. The way our investigations are carried out and the almost complete lack of instances of judicial corruption for many years now in our country should make us proud of this system.

I think that we can be fully confident that this legislation will be administered properly. But, the minister was right to adopt one of the Bloc Quebecois' proposals, which was to add the mandatory review to the legislation. In one year, therefore, when Parliament examines the second part of the issue, a bill concerning data banks in particular, it could review how the courts, crown attorneys and police investigators handled this new tool for obtaining evidence.

And I can say that we are going to vote in favour of the bill before us. We are proud to vote for it, to contribute to this judicial and legislative progress. We are confident that the courts will administer this bill and use their new powers in a balanced way which will take equally into consideration the rights of individuals and the need to ensure the public's safety.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset of the debate on Bill C–104 that the Reform Party, as the other opposition party, supports this legislation.

I am sure the justice minister must be extremely pleased to be going out on this kind of note after the vehement objections he has been facing on some of the other legislation he has introduced.

We support this bill. We applaud the government for bringing it in. We believe that this type of legislation should be a priority for this government. In fact, if we have one criticism it would be to ask why it took 18 months to bring in such a sensible piece of legislation to facilitate the proper workings of our justice system and assist in the protection of citizens.

As the House knows, the member for Wild Rose from our caucus has been pressing the justice minister to present this bill as quickly as possible. We are pleased and we thank the justice minister for responding to those requests.

The bill has been described both by the justice minister and by the Leader of the Opposition very well as to its technical details. I do not intend to repeat those. However, one important thing to remember and perhaps the key important thing to remember is that DNA testing is a virtually certain way of establishing not only guilt where proper samples are available at the scene of a crime but also innocence. This is a real protection for our citizens.

There was a recent case in Ontario, as most members will recall, where there was a miscarriage of justice on circumstantial evidence, but when DNA testing was able to be carried out the accused person was exonerated and found to be innocent.

My understanding is that in 25 per cent of cases DNA testing proves innocence. This is a test to make our justice system fairer to protect innocent people who are wrongfully accused of crimes.

The other comment I have is with respect to the proposal of the Bloc that the legislation be reviewed after one year. I think that is a very sensible thing to do; that is, to revisit legislation like this and see what weaknesses may be disclosed once the procedure is operating.

• (1950)

I would raise a question on timing. Given the fact that the bill will have to receive royal assent, be proclaimed, and put into operation across the country, will a year be enough time to allow the bill to operate to disclose the weaknesses? However, we certainly would support a thorough review after the bill has been operating for a reasonable period of time.

The purpose of the bill then is to amend both the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act so that both acts dealing with criminal offences will be dealt with in this legislation. That will allow the courts to authorize the obtaining of proper samples so that DNA testing can be done and to use it in ensuring that proper justice is carried out.

We have examined the legislation the minister has brought before the House. We are satisfied that it is good legislation, that it is well drafted. As the speaker before me pointed out, there are good protections for the rights of citizens in the use of this procedure.

The Reform Party supports this legislation and thanks the justice minister for coming forward quickly with it. We will be supporting it completely. We hope its implementation will in fact help Canadian citizens.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, O.J. Simpson, Guy Paul Morin and the alleged murderer of Tara Manning all have something in common: their fate hangs on a tiny sample of DNA.

In each case, this microscopic amount of organic substance did or will determine whether the accused is guilty or innocent. In one case, Guy Paul Morin was finally acquitted of a crime for which he had already served ten years in prison and been tried twice. In the well–known Simpson case, which is closer to a circus than a criminal trial, the public prosecutors are trying to nab O.J. Simpson by linking several DNA samples.

Closer to us, the fate of Tara Manning's alleged murderer will be determined by the match between a DNA sample taken from the accused's saliva with a cotton swab and a sperm sample collected from the murdered girl.

Deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA for short, is found in the nucleus of every cell in the body—in hair, in blood, and in every other bodily fluid. DNA contains a person's entire genetic code and varies from one human being to another. In fact, it is specific to each individual. It is like fingerprints but much more precise.

Collecting DNA samples can be compared to fingerprinting suspects. They had to submit to it.

The Tara Manning tragedy commanded public attention because of both the aggressor's cruelty and the circumstances surrounding the murder. Since the case is still before the Quebec court responsible for youth, it would be inappropriate to discuss it here, if only to say that the admissibility of the DNA sample as evidence is being questioned, because the warrant to collect this sample was obtained under the current provisions in the Criminal Code. Since the accused did not consent to the collection of the sample, a warrant was required.

There is an urgent need to end this uncertainty by adding a new chapter to the Criminal Code so that the evidence gathered can be used against the authors of these awful crimes. That is why the Bloc Quebecois has demanded these changes.

Already in the U.S., genetic sampling has been used in over 24,000 criminal trials. While DNA testing is already used in Canada, the existing legislation is deficient, and often criminals are set free for lack of sufficient evidence against them.

• (1955)

We have before us today a long–awaited bill designed to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act to allow a provincial court judge to issue a warrant authorizing a police officer to obtain samples of bodily substances for forensic DNA analysis from a person who is reasonably believed to have been a party to a violent crime.

Violent crimes include sexual offences and robbery. Bill C–104 contains provisions regulating the use that can be made of the bodily substances seized and the results of the DNA analysis.

DNA can be destroyed under certain circumstances only. Nowhere in this DNA bill does it say that the substances seized shall be destroyed in the case of a guilty plea or verdict.

Finally, young persons will be treated as adults, although they will be afforded some special protection, such as the right to have the samples taken in the presence of counsel, a parent or another appropriate adult.

Right off the bat, Bill C–104 corrects a major deficiency in criminal law. The police and the Crown are having a hard time obtaining samples of bodily substances from suspects at present.

At present, they have to ask suspects to provide voluntarily the required samples. At present, a peace officer can ask for a warrant under the Criminal Code, but the applicable provision remains vague and was not designed for taking DNA samples. It is all too likely that murderers would be acquitted for lack of provisions dealing specifically with the seizure of samples for DNA testing.

However, it should be pointed out that the bill does not provide for the destruction of seized samples in the event that a guilty verdict is returned. This means that these samples will be kept for some unknown future use.

A procedure that makes obtaining samples for DNA printing is a great thing. But the minister should know that, by supporting Bill C–104 as it stands, we are not giving him a blank cheque to store genetic information and use them for any undisclosed purpose.

The Bloc Quebecois will keep an eye on the justice minister. If it looks like he is going off on a "big brother" tangent, he can kiss his data base goodbye because we will not hesitate to expose him. To conclude, the Minister of Justice tabled Bill C–104 today in response not only to demands from the Bloc

Quebecois, but also and mainly to the representations made by Michael Manning, Tara Manning's father.

We support the principle of this bill, but we cannot help but think that the justice minister is walking a tight rope without a net. He has legislated in dribs and drabs, taking a piecemeal, case–by–case approach. Let us hope that this will not become a habit.

The minister himself said that his department had been working on this case since September 1994. Yet, he waited until today to act. Let us hope that he will be quicker to act next time and will initiate discussions instead of being forced to react after the fact.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this legislation builds a bridge between science and human justice. These two fields are now joined and intertwined to improve life in our modern society.

• (2000)

Bill C–104 seeks to promote justice as we perceive it from an early age. Justice is aimed at punishing those who are guilty of an offence. It also seeks to protect the innocent and the victim.

The use of DNA evidence is relatively new in the criminal justice system. In Canada, it was first introduced in the fall of 1988. As we can see today, DNA evidence is still not regulated in Canada. From a legislative standpoint, Canada lags behind other countries such as England, Australia, the United States and New Zealand.

Today, the government is trying to make up some of that ground. I applaud this initiative, but I regret the way in which we are expediting matters. A few months ago, the Minister of Justice announced that his department was working on a bill to deal with this issue. One wonders why it took so long to table this legislation, considering that it was known as early as last September that there were legal problems regarding the admissibility of DNA test results.

Indeed, in its September 1994 decision in R. v. Borden, the Supreme Court of Canada dealt with the admissibility as evidence of these results. Mr. Justice Iacobucci wrote that there was no legislative provision authorizing the collection of a blood sample in a case of sexual assault, and that the defendant's consent was required to make such a procedure legally valid. This implies that, if an accused refuses to give his consent, the collection of that blood sample is illegal and could therefore be ruled inadmissible as evidence by the court.

This could be the case in the trial for the murder of Tara Manning, a teenager killed in her house, during the night, in May 1994, since the suspect refused to give his consent. Consequently, police officers obtained a search warrant under section 487.01 of the Criminal Code. However, this section specifically prohibits the issuance of a warrant when the physical integrity of a person could be affected. This is a problem, since the courts have made several rulings to the effect that the collection of hair, saliva or blood violates the physical integrity of a person.

We can see why quick action was needed. It resulted in Bill C–104 being tabled in this House today.

There are several reasons justifying this legislation on DNA evidence. The fact that such tests violate one's physical integrity must be weighed against the need to preserve justice. In other words, are we as a community ready to allow the physical integrity of some suspected criminals to be violated to a certain extent, in an attempt to establish the degree of guilt and to eventually impose a sentence? If so, what degree of violation are we willing to tolerate?

At the same time, we can ask how much importance we give the harm suffered by the victim and the accused's right to physical integrity. In addition, in a society subject to the rule of law, we must protect all citizens against unreasonable seizures. This principle is recognized and accepted in both Canada and Quebec. We simply do not want to live in a police state where any officer could demand that anyone undergo tests against his or her will and for no valid reason.

We must also determine in what specific cases these tests may be ordered. We must decide whether or not we should allow bodily substances to be seized in minor criminal cases or if this procedure should be reserved for crimes that are considered serious. Finally, the legislation must spell out all the conditions to be met and all enforcement mechanisms.

It goes without saying that a seizure warrant can only be issued when there are valid reasons to believe that a person has committed a crime. It is also obvious that, to protect individual privacy, tests must not be carried out publicly and the chain of custody must be well established and protected.

Finally, let us keep in mind that, because of the very nature of DNA, these tests can help identify those responsible for certain crimes in which the direct evidence is rather flimsy, thus allowing us to punish the guilty, clear the innocent and avoid subsequent offences against new victims.

Those are some of the reasons why Parliament must look at DNA testing. Let us now examine our reaction to the bill before us.

• (2005)

I would like to start by saying that I support the underlying principle of the bill which provides for a warrant to be issued to obtain samples of bodily substances when there is reason to believe that a person has committed a serious crime.

For more than 18 months now, I have had the honour of being my party's critic for th e status of women. As such, I have had the opportunity to fully understand the importance and impact of violence in our society, and the need to take all necessary steps to stem this phenomenon.

I know that others have said it before me; I am only their spokesperson in this House. Society must pursue a zero tolerance policy on violence. This policy must be implemented through referral to the courts and sanctions. If a bill can make possible the identification and punishment of offenders guilty of serious crimes against persons, if a bill can provide for their confinement, preventing them from reoffending, at least for a while, then it must be passed.

I have one important reservation, however; the minister must undertake to bring forward a complementary bill in the fall to deal with the use of data gathered pursuant to the warrants. Misuse of such data must be avoided at all costs.

Finally, since it is a brand new piece of legislation, at the Bloc's request, I will urge the minister to undertake a review of the bill and its implementation one year after its coming into force. If changes appear to be necessary, the Bloc will have a serious look at them.

Women welcome any measure aimed at protecting them against physical and sexual violence. The same is true of people in general. Ten thousand signatures were collected in favour of this bill. And, as the director of the Montreal Women's Centre, Doris Makhoul, said: "Taking blood samples for DNA testing will not endanger the health of the accused".

Therefore, we support this bill while hoping that the Bloc's reservations will be heard by the minister and dealt with.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.)

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 100, I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(House in committee on Bill C–104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis))

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clause 1 agreed to.)

On clause 2:

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert, BQ): Mr. Chairman, we have just passed clause 1 which, I believe, covers sections 487.03, 487.04 and the rest, did we not?

The Chairman: That is right.

• (2010)

Mrs. Venne: Still, I would like to know on what basis the Minister of Justice made his list at section 487.04, even if clause 1 has already been passed, but so rapidly that you did not hear me ask to be recognized. This is the section in which offences warranting DNA testing are listed.

I would just like to know the basis for this list. You can be assured that we will vote for the bill and that I have no intention of prolonging the debate unduly, especially since the minister acceded to our request and eliminated the need for the amendment we were going to put forward. I just wanted some clarification.

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, what we did literally in assembling the list was review the Criminal Code to examine the offences to determine which of them were of sufficient seriousness either as crimes of personal violence such as murder and sexual assault or other crimes that might on the face look to be property crimes such as break and enter which could be for the purpose of committing a crime of personal violence.

We focused on those crimes in respect of which punishment was provided by the code of roughly five years or longer. We did not limit it to either indictable or summary conviction. Some of the offences here are hybrid. We focused on offences that are of the degree of gravity both in their potential for personal injury and death or in relation to the manner in which they are punished in the code so as to justify this investigative technique.

May I point out as well that in respect of these designated offences it will be necessary that there was a bodily sample left at the scene so that the sample to be taken from the person subject to the warrant can be tested for comparison with the sample at the scene.

Second, the mere fact that it is a designated offence is not sufficient. The applicant for the warrant will also have to satisfy the provincial court judge that it is in the interest of the administration of justice for the warrant to issue, including all the circumstances relating to the offender and the offence.

The fact that the designated offence is involved is not sufficient in itself, although we have selected offences which as I said are in relation to personal injury or death or of such a gravity that such a tool or investigation should be available.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I would like another clarification about section 487.08.

It is stated that DNA analysis will be conducted in the course of an investigation of the designated offence. I thought it would be for identification purposes. I would like to know how much of a distinction the minister makes between identification and investigation. How far will the investigation go?

Mr. Rock: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am not sure I caught the hon. member's question. Is she inquiring about the difference between identification and investigation?

Mrs. Venne: I will rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker.

We are dealing with the restriction concerning the use of the sample to be collected. My question refers to the provision relating to this restriction. It reads:

> 487.08(1) No person shall use a bodily substance that is obtained in execution of a warrant except in the course of an investigation—

The word investigation is the one I have trouble with.

> —of the designated offence—

Instead of referring to an investigation, why did we not use the word "identification", since the ADN test is supposed to be used for identification purposes and not for general investigation purposes?

• (2015)

[*English*]

Mr. Rock: Mr. Chairman, while it may be true to say that ultimately the results of the DNA sample test will be to identify, nonetheless the process—that is to say taking the sample and putting it to use—occurs in the context of an investigation. It is the greater word encompassing the narrower. The choice of word was to delimit the greater activity.

The purpose of the sample is in connection with an investigation generally, although ultimately it may be for the purpose of identifying the culprit.

I would have thought we were safer with the broader word because we want to refer to the entire transaction, not just the ultimate function. While I take the hon. member's point, I think it might unduly limit the purpose to say just identification.

I will read the section with that in mind. If we were to say that no person shall use a bodily substance obtained in execution of a warrant except in the course of identification of the person who might be responsible, for one thing there might be other phases of the investigation or the prosecution where the sample has a purpose that would be excluded unintentionally. Particularly when the act is enhanced by the subsequent amendments creating a data bank we might also have purposes that are not strictly identification of a person in a specific offence; it might be broader than that.

I think we are safer to use the broader word, "investigation". That is certainly what I would recommend.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question for the minister.

There is quite a long list of designated offences. This list may need to be expanded in the future, even by one or two offences. I wonder what the procedure would be if that became necessary.

Mr. Rock: Mr. Chairman, it would be necessary to amend this act.

I might say that in the course of preparing the bill we looked at some of the recommendations from the people who responded in the consultation process. Some of them would have had us provide simply that in any indictable offence the warrant should be available on application.

This bill is an innovation in the criminal law to the extent to which it provides an express recognition of DNA sampling. We are very conscious of the charter and privacy considerations. We chose to go with a specific list of the offences that upon a review of the code struck us as most serious for the reasons I recited earlier. The list can be added to; indeed, it could be replaced with reference to just indictable offences. But any of those changes would require statutory amendment.

I have committed tonight in the House to a review in a year. It may be that after we accumulate experience we might want to look at the question of whether the list should be expanded or whether we should take a different approach. I think for now this is a prudent approach. It captures the crimes that are obviously of gravest concern to the public and to the authorities and will provide a very good place from which we can learn more about how we can better serve the public by improving the justice system.

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clause 2 agreed to.)

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clause 3 agreed to.)

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Title agreed to.)

The Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Shall I adjourn the sitting and report on the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Bill reported.)

• (2020)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Deputy Speaker: When will the bill be read the third time? Now, with leave of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Rock moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

The Deputy Speaker: I am sure, colleagues, that in the name of all of us we thank the Manning family for being with us tonight for this very special occasion.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rock: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of a response that I gave on June 1, 1995 to a question from the hon. member for Kootenay East dealing with agents supported by the government in criminal matters.

In response I said that there had been a significant decrease in government expenditures on agents. I suggested that spending on agents in 1994 was some 25 per cent less than in 1993. I have since been informed the answer was not accurate, that the calculation was based on a partial year and not a full year.

Although a number of savings have been made, they do not amount to the 25 per cent range. In the fiscal year 1994–95 we expect a reduction in the level of expenditures for the cost of standing agents in criminal law matters but the reduction will not be 25 per cent.

We will furnish particulars of what the savings are when they are known.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

Hon. Allan Rock (for the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.): moved that Bill C–65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies be read a third time and passed.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C–65.

The purpose of the bill is to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. I have spoken on the bill several times before. I do not intend to repeat what was said at that point but I would like to point out its historic importance.

The purpose of the bill is to end overlap and duplication of federal agencies, simplify government and reduce costs. Under the leadership of the Minister for Public Service Renewal, 350 boards and agencies were reviewed.

Bill C–65 represents the first legislative step in that overview and the result is 22 agencies and 6 departments have been affected. Seven agencies have been wound up and 15 restructured. In all, no less than 150 order in council positions have been eliminated.

A second stage of the review will take place in the fall and will result in the loss of 314 patronage positions. Fifty–one agencies will be eliminated and the savings in total will amount to approximately $5 million.

All of these factors are important: the elimination of overlap and duplication, simplification of government and the reduction of cost. What is important with this bill is for the first time in 40 years so–called patronage positions have been eliminated within the federal government. We have accomplished this and we will continue to carry out this review in the future.

I am sure all members of the House will join with me in supporting this important bill which makes a historic approach to simplifying and improving government.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have made excellent progress today. I thank the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, the hon. member for Roberval, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte–Marie, the hon. member for Calgary Centre and all my colleagues and ministers who have been here today to assist in seeing the proceedings went smoothly.

We have now completed the work that had been agreed to be completed before adjournment. Therefore I am pleased to move the following motion.

Before I do I would like also to add my thanks to the pages for their contribution, as some others have done, and wish them well in the years ahead.

I therefore move, with unanimous consent:

That the House shall not sit on June 23, 1995, provided that it shall be deemed to have sat and adjourned on that day for the purposes of Standing Order 28.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Deputy Speaker: In the name of everyone, I thank the staff members who will be with us next year and in particular the pages who will not, unfortunately, be with us next year. We wish them all the success in all the years ahead. All members feel you have done a wonderful job this year.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 8.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, September 18, 1995.

(The House adjourned at 8.27 p.m.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 13, 1995

The House met at 12.30 p.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 28, I have recalled the House today for the sole purpose of granting royal assent to certain bills.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall

July 13, 1995

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Peter deC. Cory, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 13th day of July, 1995 at 12.30 p.m. for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony P. Smyth, Deputy Secretary, Policy, Program and Protocol. l e

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills:

Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof; Bill C-86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act; Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the Company to the public; Bill C-87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction; Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act; Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis); Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada; Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies; Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision; Bill C-92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act; Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self-induced intoxication); and Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the representative of His Excellency the Governor General that this honourable House attend him immediately in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1250)

And being returned:

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof—Chapter No. 22.

Bill C-86, an act to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act—Chapter No. 23.

Bill C-89, an act to provide for the continuance of the Canadian National Railway Company under the Canada Business Corporations Act and for the issuance and sale of shares of the company to the public—Chapter No. 24.

Bill C-87, an act to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction—Chapter No. 25.

Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act—Chapter No. 26.

The Royal Assent

Bill C-104, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (forensic DNA analysis)—Chapter No. 27.

Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada—Chapter No. 28.

Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies—Chapter No. 29.

Bill C-85, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to provide for the continuation of a certain provision—Chapter No. 30.

Bill C-92, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act—Chapter No. 31.

Bill C-72, an act to amend the Criminal Code (self-induced intoxication)—Chapter No. 32.

Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act—Chapter No. 33.

It being almost one o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Monday, September 18, 1995 at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 12.55 p.m.)