



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 119

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, November 2, 1994**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 2, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### LONDON INVESTMENT AND EDUCATION COUNCIL

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, learning is a life long process and in a rapidly changing world our vision of learning must be constantly changing and evolving. I am proud to say that the city of London is developing into a learning community.

The London Investment and Education Council is a non-profit community based group committed to bringing together students, business, labour, government, families and social and cultural organizations to plan initiatives and share information related to education.

The federal government recognizes that learning is a life long process and encourages all sectors of our community to become involved in the learning process. London truly is a learning community, thanks to the innovative work of the London Investment and Education Council.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### DEFICIT REDUCTION

**Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, the Minister of Finance said in an interview published in *Le Soleil* that everything to reduce the deficit was on the table. In other words, the minister is simply ignoring the commitment made by the Prime Minister in the last election campaign that he would not raise taxes. On the expenditure side, the minister tries to justify additional cuts in social programs that might total \$7.5 billion, arguing that everyone would have to do his or her share.

Instead of targeting the needy, the unemployed and the middle class, I suggest the minister take a good look at the government's operational expenditures, subsidies to corporations,

Defence spending and duplication, and ensure that taxpayers who live on high incomes are the first in line to pay their fair share of taxes.

\* \* \*

[English]

### ORGANIZED CRIME

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, police sources state the hub of Asian organized crime for the world will be situated in Vancouver and Vancouver Island by the turn of the decade. This statement has been acknowledged in part by the Solicitor General who recently supported the deployment of extra drug enforcement officers to Nanaimo.

The situation requires more than just extra police. The government must get serious about reforming and strengthening legislation in the areas of immigration, customs, justice, fisheries and human resources development.

The Reform Party recognizes the need for these changes. In my riding I have already started bringing together concerned members of the immigrant population with municipal, provincial and federal authorities to look at ways to make the system work for all Canadians. Next week I will continue the process and will report the results of this truly grassroots consultation process back to the House.

\* \* \*

### SOCIAL REFORMS

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite often suggest that the views of Canadians are not taken seriously by the government. I want to tell my hon. friends that they are wrong.

Some of the suggestions made last April by my constituents appear in the discussion paper the Minister of Human Resources Development tabled in the House on October 5.

Oxford recommendations in this paper include: first, programs should be result oriented, with the emphasis on ending dependency.

Second, while everyone should pay into unemployment insurance, it should be structured more like private insurance so that those in higher risk areas of employment pay higher premiums. Third, to help those on welfare become independent the gov-

*S. O. 31*

ernment should subsidize those who choose to take low paying positions rather than remain at home.

I am happy to see that these recommendations were taken seriously by the minister and that they are now being discussed across Canada.

\* \* \*

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, next week on November 11 members of the House will join with thousands of Canadians to pay tribute to those who fought and died so that we might enjoy democracy and freedom: freedom to hold democratic elections and the freedom to voice concern.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the end of the second world war. It is a time to show that Canada remembers. Let us join with all Canadians on November 11 to renew our pledge to the many Canadians who fought and fell in battle.

Let us also remember the sacrifices and efforts made by those at home. It is through the efforts of these people that we have been able to build Canada into a country deemed the best in the world in which to live.

We shall never forget.

\* \* \*

**PHARMACY AWARENESS WEEK**

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all Canadians that November 1 to 7 is Pharmacy Awareness Week.

The theme of the week is: "Talk to me, your pharmacist, your friend". The purpose of the week is to encourage communication between pharmacists and their patients. This week recognizes the important role that pharmacists play in health care, and in particular medication use.

During Pharmacy Awareness Week pharmacists across the country will be demonstrating their commitment to close the information gap on the safe use of medications.

(1405)

I recognize today the work of pharmacists in the field of health. I encourage them to continue their work in ensuring that medications improve the health of all Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL FILM BOARD**

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, by not dismissing out of hand the recommendations of the SECOR

report on the future of cultural industries, the Minister of Canadian Heritage knowingly supports the abolition of the NFB.

NFB productions are well received and win many prizes internationally. The minister does not seem to realize that closing the NFB would mean shutting down the production of documentaries and animated films.

How many artists and technicians have been able to benefit from this institution's training programs? Does the minister really understand the impact that NFB productions have on our cultural life?

The Minister of Canadian Heritage is obviously no longer competent to defend the interests of cultural institutions. The industry can do without friends like these.

\* \* \*

[English]

**GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance realizes he is over budget and will have to make deep cuts. The human resources development minister will also be making some cuts.

Now we find that Canadians are paying some \$24,000 for the commissioner of official languages to drive back and forth between his two residences in a chauffeured limousine because he does not want to relocate from Montreal to Ottawa.

The Minister of Finance likes to give us the impression that he is attacking the deficit but now we find this example of scandalous spending. Canadians are outraged when they learn of this type of spending. How could the government dream of paying \$15,800 for his apartment, \$5,160 for his meals, and \$3,000 for incidental expenses?

I call on the Minister of Finance to stamp out this spending. Let us hope that the commissioner is paying taxes on his benefits as are all other taxpayers.

\* \* \*

**STAY IN SCHOOL INITIATIVE**

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House of the partnership being announced today in Toronto between the National Basketball Association and the stay in school program by my hon. colleagues, the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Secretary of State for Youth and Training.

The stay in school initiative has become a community success story. The program encourages young people who are at risk of dropping out to stay in school longer and complete high school.

Significant gains have been made in expanding knowledge, action, collaboration, and moral obligation among Canadians to find solutions to the disturbing high school dropout problem.

As the Toronto Raptors and the Vancouver Grizzlies become household names to Canadians, they will become synonymous with championing this important issue.

\* \* \*

#### SERVICE KANADA

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge a pilot project for young adults that has commenced for the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority in my riding of Erie.

Service Kanada, an initiative of the Secretary of State for Training and Youth, brings 19 to 24 year olds and non-profit organizations together to provide labour for needed projects while offering the participants training and the opportunity to live in another community while learning another language.

Participants are paid \$2 daily and will receive a \$1,000 grant at the end of their six-month stint. Food and lodging are provided by Service Kanada.

There are four objectives for the participants: performance of valued work for the community, acquiring personal work skills, achieving an awareness of our environment, and learning a second language.

These energetic volunteers, these young adults of today from Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick will be the leaders of a strong and united Canada in the not too distant future. We all benefit from projects such as Service Kanada.

\* \* \*

#### ENTREPRENEUR OF THE YEAR AWARD

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the great honour of visiting Rideau Hall for the presentation of the first ever National Entrepreneur of the Year Award by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada.

In particular I wish to single out one of the nine recipients, Mr. John Bragg, president of Oxford Frozen Foods Ltd., Oxford, Nova Scotia. John Bragg founded his company in rural Nova Scotia processing wild blueberries in a single plant. Today he has four processing plants and has capacity to process 1.9 million pounds of blueberries per day as well as other frozen foods. In peak season John Bragg employs 3,000 people throughout his diversified companies.

I salute John Bragg and the other eight national award recipients whose gross sales total more than \$2 billion annually. The government is very proud of our entrepreneurs, the role models for all Canadians.

(1410)

[Translation]

S. O. 31

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the co-chairman of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy is quoted today in *La Presse* as saying that this department exists solely to show our solidarity with the rest of the planet.

In the report that came out Monday, he defended the idea of acquiring new equipment, the purpose of which would be to enable Canada to defend, at great expense, its territorial sovereignty.

It would certainly take mental gymnastics to be able to see how buying tanks, not to mention submarines, is a way of expressing solidarity with the planet. On the contrary, it merely confirms the militaristic doctrine that pervades the report.

My advice to the co-chairman is that he would do better to strengthen his solidarity with Quebec, which is in great need of support, particularly his, if it is to hang on to what little it receives from the Department of National Defence, the Liberal Party notwithstanding.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### NATIONAL FILM BOARD

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the National Film Board of Canada's mandate is to produce and distribute films for Canadian audiences and foreign markets, to enhance knowledge of Canadian social and cultural realities and in so doing contribute to the development of a flourishing film industry.

The National Film Board receives over \$80 million from taxpayers. I would like to outline for the House where some of those dollars are going. A film board promotion for a video says: "Compelling, often hilarious and always rebellious, the 10 women discuss lesbian sexuality and survival in Canada during the fifties and the sixties. This video brings lesbian history out of the closet and contributes to the viable history of sexuality in Canada". It also states: "Due to the explicit nature of certain scenes, viewer discretion is advised".

This is another example of hard earned tax dollars at work enhancing Canadian social and cultural realities.

By the way the current debt is \$536,656,634,487.41.

\* \* \*

#### PHARMACY AWARENESS WEEK

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Pharmacy Awareness Week serves to draw attention to the very serious problem of over medication and cross-medication. Our senior citizens are at greatest risk.

*Oral Questions*

I urge the members of the House to support Pharmacy Awareness Week and participate in making the issue better known.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MEMBER FOR LAURIER—SAINTE-MARIE**

**Mr. Martin Cauchon (Outremont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, four times a year, the House of Commons meets the cost of publishing a householder prepared by each member of Parliament to keep their constituents informed.

In his latest householder, a Bloc member published a letter under the heading "Changes required at the CECM". In this letter, the member argued the need for a school that meets modern-day needs and one with a resolutely forward-looking curriculum, adding that in the current debate, only MEMO offered such a perspective.

I must admit that, on the surface, the connection between the member's mandate and school board elections is not obvious. However, we are not naive enough to believe that this statement has nothing to do with the fact that the member's spouse is a MEMO candidate in ward No. 9 in Montreal.

Taxpayers strongly object to their taxes being used to indirectly fund the election campaign of the wife of the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

\* \* \*

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, here is something I would like the ministers of agriculture, transport and finance to think about before they discontinue the so-called Crow benefit.

In my region the benefit is worth between \$22 and \$28 per tonne. We grow about one tonne of crop per acre and good land rents between \$20 and \$30 per acre.

If the benefit disappears and freight costs rise by a like amount, the cash rental value of those lands becomes zero. The financial effect on the region is to further deflate farm land values by several hundred dollars per acre. This equity, which will disappear with the decline and demise of the Crow benefit, is what farmers and their communities have been using as collateral to borrow funds for economic diversity.

The proposal to save some \$600 million per year will take billions of dollars worth of value and equity from existing farms and businesses in western Canada and will trigger further bankruptcies and business failures.

How can the government justify that?

\* \* \*

(1415)

**CIDA FUNDING**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to CIDA and our foreign aid program, the inmates are running the asylum.

Since 1991 the Canadian Wilderness Committee has received around \$300,000 from CIDA. The Sierra Club of Western Canada and the Clayoquot Biosphere Project have also received CIDA funding.

To my best recollection, British Columbia is still a part of this great nation. Why then is nearly half a million dollars being misspent to bolster the efforts of anti-logging radicals?

This is blatant interference in British Columbia's jurisdiction over its natural resources. B.C. is battling to maintain the considerable lumber exports in the face of a concerted campaign of disinformation by these very groups.

We are neck deep in debt. What little foreign aid we can afford should go to those most in need. The federal government, which has not shown any great competence in managing natural resources, has no business interfering in provincial concerns.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor, Howard Wilson, said on television this morning that at no time did he receive from the Prime Minister or his colleagues the mandate to investigate the heritage minister's direct interference in the CRTC's business.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does he confirm what his counsellor said?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all the facts relating to this issue were clearly put on the table; these are public documents available to all. The counsellor, Mr. Wilson, is aware of the facts, but he does not need to investigate. All the facts are public knowledge and have been discussed in this House for several days.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the Prime Minister deliberately neglected to ask his ethics counsellor to investigate last week because he did not want to have to justify the decision to overlook this matter which he had made a month earlier when he was informed of his minister's mistake?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we told the House of Commons and the public everything that happened in this affair and, as I said several times, the minister in question realized that his letter was interpreted as support. He immediately took action to correct the situation and we accepted this explanation. Then I personally took the initiative of asking all ministers to search their files to see if there was anything in them concerning the Radio-Television Commission, which itself asks for public opinion before rendering its decisions. Several members have written to this commission and several ministers wrote as they did when they were backbenchers. I asked Mr. Wilson to clarify the directives on this subject. I have had conversations with him and I hope that the new directives will be ready within a few weeks.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister if he thinks that his minister again showed his lack of judgement yesterday when he said that he felt more and more at ease, although four of the largest newspapers in Canada and Quebec are calling for his resignation.

Does the Prime Minister, who has shown the virtue of forgiveness, not consider the penitent to lack firm resolve and to be insufficiently remorseful?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Lord in Heaven decides whether someone has firm resolve, not I.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. We learned that government ethics counsellor, Howard Wilson, was disciplined in 1992 for awarding almost \$1 million worth of contracts without tender. His signing authority was suspended by the Deputy Minister of Industry after the Auditor General intervened.

How can the Prime Minister think that the government's ethics counsellor still has the credibility needed to occupy his position, whose incumbent must be above suspicion?

(1420)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there was an investigation on this matter and Mr. Wilson's signing authority was reinstated. All I know about this man is that he is honest, competent and very open. He readily makes himself available to the media and, under circumstances like these, he gave interviews.

Before appointing him, I asked both the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Reform Party for their opinion on his ability to perform these duties; they both agreed with me that he was an honourable man and that he could do an excellent job.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, need I remind the Prime Minister that Mr. Wilson himself admitted that he had not informed the Prime Minister of his situation before being appointed ethics counsellor in June, thus making it impossible for the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party to find out about the situation which Mr. Wilson was involved in.

How can the Prime Minister continue to trust Mr. Wilson, who hid his suspension when his first duty was to inform the Prime Minister of his background at the time of his appointment?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the man in question was not suspended. He kept his position. It was an administrative matter as to whether he had authority or whether he should keep it. It was found appropriate to give him back the authority he had before.

[English]

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, October 27, the Prime Minister said regarding the heritage minister affair: "I consulted the government's ethics counsellor and confirmed that I had made the right decision in this matter". On Friday in the House he said: "I did not speak to Mr. Wilson myself but I asked that he be consulted". Today we find out that in fact no one, neither the Prime Minister nor his staff, asked the ethics counsellor to rule specifically on the heritage minister's letter to the CRTC.

The ethics counsellor's revelations on national television this morning contradict every version of events that the Prime Minister has given us. I ask the Prime Minister: How does he explain his previous comments to the House?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I explained clearly that I had asked people to call the ethics counsellor and they called him. He gave me an opinion that did not lead me to change my mind.

The leader of the Reform Party should know that whatever advice a minister or a Prime Minister receives, that advice is for him or her. As I said, he is the one who takes full responsibility for the decision. I cannot get up in the House and say to somebody here: "I made that decision because somebody told me to do that". That is not the way it works. The Prime Minister is the one who is fully responsible. I am fully responsible for the decision I have made and I will stand by it.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Prime Minister to accept responsibility for comments that he made to the House.

The Prime Minister clearly declared that the ethics counsellor had been consulted and said nothing that changed the Prime Minister's mind about his decision to retain the heritage minister. In fact, the ethics counsellor was not asked to give a ruling on that matter so how could he have provided advice to the Prime Minister on that subject?

*Oral Questions*

Could the Prime Minister explain this contradiction between his own comments and the comments of the ethics counsellor?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we seek advice. The ruling is the decision of the Prime Minister and this Prime Minister makes decisions. He was not called upon to rule. He has no right to rule. I have the right to rule and I made a decision.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this whole affair from the letter writing to the Prime Minister's comments is either an example of gross stupidity or unethical conduct, or both.

(1425)

**The Speaker:** We are getting very close to language that is not acceptable. I wonder if I could ask the hon. leader of the Reform Party to rephrase his question.

**Mr. Manning:** Mr. Speaker, this whole affair is either an example of a grave error in judgment or unethical conduct, or both.

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

**The Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for changing his wording on the first part. I would invite him to do the same on the second part.

**Mr. Manning:** Mr. Speaker, this whole affair is either an example of a gross error in judgment or in conduct unbecoming to a minister or a Prime Minister, or both. It has also made a mockery of the office of the ethics counsellor.

Will the Prime Minister allow the ethics counsellor to report directly to Parliament on the conduct of the Prime Minister's own office in this affair?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am responsible to the people of Canada.

I appreciate the frustration of the leader of the Reform Party. He and his party are out fishing and catching no fish. That is their problem. However I do not want to get mad.

When the member for Beaver River yesterday made an accusation in relation to me she forgot to tell the nation in the accusation she made in the House today that the judge apologized to me and the *Globe and Mail* apologized to me. Not only that, the *Globe and Mail* paid me money because they had made an error.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CARREFOURJEUNESSE-EMPLOI**

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. On Monday, we were stunned to learn that a young man who is

unemployed was threatened with losing his UI benefits because he intends to participate in the job-search program set up by Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi. This is an agency whose federal contribution was just cut and which has now been taken over by the Quebec government and the city of Gatineau.

How can the minister justify such blackmail on the part of his civil servants when young jobless people want to use the services provided by Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi to improve their lot?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a judgment by employment counsellors as to the advice they give to clients of our employment centres as to the services that can be provided.

In this particular case, the employment counsellor referred the young man in question to the project La Relance. It has an almost 75 per cent success rate in ensuring that employment is gained under these circumstances.

We believe very strongly that we have to ensure there is discussion and decision making at the local level. Therefore that kind of authority is given to local employment counsellors. I am sure when they make a judgment that a reference to the group Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi is appropriate and helpful they will make references to that group as well.

(1430)

It is a little strange that a member of Parliament in this case is second guessing the judgment of an employment counsellor when he was not there. He does not know the case and he does not know the individual. It is up to the employment counsellor who is dealing with the case individually to make the best judgment that can be made.

[Translation]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, does the minister recognize that this deplorable situation demonstrates once again the scope of the current mess in manpower training, with federal and provincial civil servants wrestling with each other, at the expense of the unemployed?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly what question the hon. member has.

I would like to point out to him that in the case of the Carrefour Jeunesse the federal government provides an annual contribution of \$550,000 which compares with the \$100,000 from the province of Quebec. It would seem to me that we are doing our proper job in contributing to help the unemployed in

that area by that contribution at a five to one ratio to the province.

\* \* \*

### ETHICS

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have pages from a document from the Privy Council Office called "Guidance for Ministers", marked confidential.

I will read the Prime Minister a quote from pages 23 and 24 of that document:

Parliament has gone to special lengths to protect the independent mandate and powers of certain other agencies such as granting bodies or tribunals. You are advised to take very special care to avoid intervening, or appearing to intervene in cases under consideration by quasi-judicial bodies.

In light of this, will the Prime Minister do the only honourable thing that is available and ask the heritage minister to resign?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have asked the minister to be careful but there is no accompanying prohibition for ministers. We have tabled in the House some letters by ministers in support of cases from their constituents. We have debated in the House the problem of members of Parliament who become ministers remaining members of Parliament in our system.

I have asked the ethics counsellor to work on some guidelines so that members who are ministers can serve their constituents at the same time as serving the government. The guidelines will be ready in a couple of weeks.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, these guidelines are absolutely clear.

Is the Prime Minister's version of responsibility that he has no responsibility for his own guidelines, no responsibility for his ministers, no responsibility for his own statements? Is it the Mulroney version of responsibility: "to heck with the facts, I will wait until the next election"? Is that his version of responsibility?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the next election anxiously because a lot of you guys will not be there.

We have been in government for a year and Canadians are quite happy with the government. Never has the confidence in the nation been as high as it is today. We have growth in the economy and the mood of the country is very good. I can see why the Reform Party is going fishing when it dropped in the polls from 19 to 11.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Human Resources Development.

### Oral Questions

The federal government's decision, as a result of which unemployment insurance benefits may be cut off to young people who do not use the services of La Relance, a centre subsidized by the federal government, is starting to look like some kind of retaliation or tit for tat, just because the Government of Quebec and the City of Gatineau have decided to support Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi.

Does the minister realize that by supporting La Relance as opposed to Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi, his public servants are contradicting the very essence of the minister's social security reform, which includes substantial flexibility in the way young people will be helped?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have just explained, the federal government funds the Carrefour Jeunesse to the tune of \$550,000.

(1435)

It shows that there is a very clear commitment to that organization to conduct a variety of services. At the same time we made it very clear that the judgment of the employment counsellor as to what is the best reference and the best service should be left to that counsellor and not be second guessed here in the House of Commons.

We are not cutting the UI benefits to the young man. That is a false statement. The hon. member should withdraw that statement. It is simply not a fact. He should recognize that we have many good public servants working in the province of Quebec giving major help to a lot of young people. They should not be second guessed by the hon. member.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we do not deny the competence of the employment counsellors, but we do deny that the federal government has jurisdiction over manpower training.

Does the minister not realize that this is just one more pitiful example of the federal system's failure to function where manpower training is concerned, which merely strengthens the broad consensus that exists in Quebec in this respect?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's statement is really not logical, nor does it make much sense.

The presence of the federal government is through the people we have as our public servants who represent the federal government who are doing an effective job in giving good advice. In this specific case, as I just stated, we provide funding of over half a million dollars to the Carrefour Jeunesse. We have

*Oral Questions*

also provided funding for projet La Relance, but we have made some division of responsibility so that we can get more efficiency and more effectiveness out of it. That was a choice that was made very much within the local region.

I believe that trying to turn this into some kind of great abstract argument of the role of the federal government in Quebec simply makes no sense at all. The federal government, as the member well knows, is highly committed to the employment of people in Quebec because we are doing something about it. That is why we have created close to 100,000 jobs in that province in the past 11 months.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said over and over again in the House that his officials had consulted the ethics counsellor regarding the letter by the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

He said over and over again that the ethics counsellor's advice had affirmed his own decision to not fire this minister. The ethics counsellor has a different story. He says that he was not asked to rule on this incident.

Can the Prime Minister explain why the ethics counsellor was set up to be the fall guy for providing bad advice when his advice was not even sought?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have said everything I have to say. We talked to the ethics counsellor. I said to the House that I have consulted a lot of people in my life. I know one thing. At the end of the day, I am responsible. There is no fall guy in this. We have debated that. We went a long way. I have asked every cabinet minister to look over the files and to say whether they have written letters. It is an open process. These documents were public at any time.

If the Reform Party is so smart, why did it not go to the CRTC? These documents were public. Those members did not do their job. We had to tell them what the facts were. We were not trying to have a set up person.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says they talked to the ethics counsellor.

Did the ethics counsellor talk to the government? The Prime Minister indicated to us that the ethics counsellor had advised him on the minister's letter and the ethics counsellor says that this is simply not the case.

This morning he said no, and that is clear. The question of course is: What part of no does the Prime Minister not understand? Will the Prime Minister accept responsibility for this contradiction in his integrity and apologize for breaching the trust of the Canadian public?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Beaver River for getting up and giving us a lesson.

Yesterday she made an accusation that was completely false. It was on national TV and she does not even get up to apologize. I do not want an apology from her because I do not need an apology from her.

\* \* \*

(1440)

[Translation]

**PROGRAM FOR OLDER WORKER ADJUSTMENT**

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

On Monday, the minister stated that he had included in his discussion paper on social program reform proposals regarding older workers who are laid off. But the paper contains no concrete proposal, and does not even make reference to POWA.

How does the minister, after undertaking to make known his intentions regarding POWA, explain that no reference is made to this program in his reform? How does he explain this?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read chapter 2 of the green book, he would recognize the entire chapter is devoted to the question of how we can take resources of the federal government, provincial governments and the private sector and redirect them toward proper training, job core development, literacy programs and community based employment through a strategy that would help older workers, young people, workers who need adjustment.

The chapter is devoted to how we basically can improve the entire system of employment development services.

It would seem to me that the hon. member should be able to read the entire chapter and come to the conclusion that it is a brand new philosophy and direction by giving a lot more local control, a lot more responsibility to the people to make decisions about how they get re-employed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister rise in this House and tell us how, in concrete terms, and in what sense he intends to reform POWA in order to end the discrimination to which older workers are subject, since 75 per cent of them are excluded from the very program designed to help them?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's facts are simply not true. The fact of the matter is that in the province of Quebec we have approved, in conjunction with the provincial government, because it is a joint federal-provincial program, 65 per cent of the applications we have received. I think the expenditure represents almost 45 per cent of the entire POWA expenditure in that province alone. It has been a very important program.

I do agree with the hon. member in one area. It is an awkward program to run. I am quite prepared to talk with the provinces about how we can improve the program and how we can, as I said in my earlier statement, use many of the existing programs to consolidate into broad based employment services so we can then direct resources to those groups that need it most, and they can help make the choices to put their own signature on their re-employment efforts.

\* \* \*

**CANADA POST**

**Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, rest assured my question is not one of whining and rewhining about a letter. My question is for the minister responsible for Canada Post.

Canadians from coast to coast and I were pleased last winter when the minister stopped the closure of post offices in small communities which are vital for their social and economic development.

Could the minister tell the House what plan he has to modernize those post offices in order to provide decent, modern, written communication abilities for all Canadians?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the excellent question. It is an extraordinary question and has particular significance for rural Canada and small communities across the country.

Canada Post will be working co-operatively with a number of federal agencies and departments to see whether it can utilize existing facilities in small town Canada in order to provide better government services to Canadians, and to partner with the private sector so that we can elaborate and bring into these facilities more services in order to serve rural Canadians who are a very important element of Canadian society.

**ETHICS**

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have clear rules on dealing with quasi-judicial bodies. We have very clear statements in the 1976 Trudeau guidelines. We have the 1984 Starr-Sharp guidelines. We have the government's conflict of interest code. We have the guidance for ministers guidelines. The guidelines from the Privy Council are very clear.

(1445)

I ask the Prime Minister: Since the government has plenty of guidelines, is not the real problem a shortage of confidence and integrity from the front benches?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have a very competent cabinet.

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to see how the government side gets its exercise for the day: up and down, up and down.

The government's pursuit of improved ethical guidelines is just a red herring to divert attention from the failures of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and from the incredible lapses in the Prime Minister's office. Reform MPs will not be diverted.

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

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Despite the shrieking Liberals, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to put my question.

When is the Prime Minister going to live up to all of his talk about integrity and responsibility and ask the Minister of Canadian Heritage to resign?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want the Reform Party to change its policies and divert. It has the right policies to lose the next election so badly that we are supporting Reformers to stick to these policies. This is why we want them to stay on it.

I made the decision about this problem and I have informed the House of Commons many times. The answer is that I have not asked the minister to resign and he is still a minister.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Defence.

In a majority report on Canada's defence policy, Liberal and Reform Party members recommended cosmetic changes instead of a real and thorough reorganization of the Canadian Armed Forces.

*Oral Questions*

Committee members from the Bloc Québécois have dissociated themselves from this report, after the Liberals refused to reconsider Canada's participation in NATO and NORAD and in UN peacekeeping forces.

Considering that only 13 per cent of Canadian defence infrastructure is located in Quebec, while Quebecers meet approximately 25 per cent of Canadian defence expenditures, can the minister undertake to take into account this imbalance that is unfavourable to Quebec before making any cuts whatsoever?

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it sounds to me as if the hon. member is reflecting upon the position taken by his defence critic in response to the committee's report and that is that the Bloc Québécois advocates defence spending be reduced in Canada and Quebec of course as part of Canada by 25 per cent.

I do not think that is widely known. It was said in the election and it has been reiterated. That is very interesting.

With respect to the report of the hon. members, I have read it with interest. I have read the report of the defence committee. All the members of the House and Senate who took part should be congratulated.

The government will certainly consider its recommendations in the development of the new defence policy.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, given that Quebec already receives proportionately less than its fair share in terms of military equipment, can the Minister of Defence dissociate himself from the defence committee today and give this House the assurance that unacceptable decisions such as the closure of the military college in Saint-Jean will not be repeated in the case of Bagotville or Saint-Hubert?

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the only comment I wish to make is that as a result of the budget cuts that we announced in February of this year defence spending in Quebec actually increased by 3 per cent. That was because of the severity of cuts elsewhere in the country.

(1450)

I have said this before in the House. We will look at the committee's report. We will look at the report of the hon. member and his party and we will take all of that into consideration in the formulation of a new policy.

**ETHICS COUNSELLOR**

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not know for sure what it was but the other day he said the buck or the puck or whatever it is stops with him.

I have news for the Prime Minister. The buck stops with the Canadian people and they are fed up with governments that put political survival before integrity. The guidelines are clear. We have four different guidelines. Everyone of them makes it wrong for a minister to telephone or influence a judge or a quasi-judicial body in his control. That is clear. Yet we are not getting an answer.

**The Speaker:** I would ask my hon. colleague to please put the question.

**Mr. Epp:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister promote public trust by giving the ethics counsellor full independence and have him report directly to the House of Commons?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor has the mandate to report to the House of Commons once a year. He is invited to give advice to all sorts of people. Members of Parliament, ministers, everybody can consult him before doing something. These are private conversations, for example, with any member of Parliament who has a problem with conflict of interest. He is there to give advice but he does not have to report on every case. He gives advice to people. He gave advice to me.

At the end of the day I am responsible. Yes, I said the buck or the puck stops with me and I do not run away when it is coming.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Prime Minister that he made a red book promise to give the Canadian people an independent ethics counsellor. I do not know why he is now so afraid of that independence.

Will the Prime Minister cut the political strings between his office and the office of the ethics counsellor? If not, why not? Also, how does he balance his response with his own needs and the expectations of Canadians?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for the first time we have an ethics counsellor who will report to the House of Commons once a year. He is there to advise everybody, including myself.

He gave me advice and he gave advice to other people. It is up to the person who received the advice to keep it or not, but at the end of the day the decision is made by the minister or by the Prime Minister. In this case it is me and I am not afraid to take my responsibility.

*Oral Questions***THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

The minister is aware of the situation in the harbour adjacent to Massena, New York. Many seaway residents are worried about the environmental damage which could be caused if the safety measures taken do not control the PCB laden silt which will be stirred up as a result of the proposed dredging.

I realize that the minister has stopped the dredging for now. What guarantee can the minister give that she will not allow resumption of any more dredging in the St. Lawrence near Massena until it is proven absolutely safe for the people and the environment in that area?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we did announce jointly yesterday with the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States that there will be no dredging at Massena this year. I can further assure the House that there will be no dredging unless and until the Department of the Environment and myself as minister are satisfied that there is absolutely no risk to the health of Canadians.

There is no dredging this year. If there is any operation next spring, and I want to thank the EPA and General Motors for their co-operation and their assurances, no dredging will take place where there is any risk of any PCB contamination.

\* \* \*

(1455)

**RAIL WORKERS**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. Early last October as speaker at a dinner sponsored by the western transportation advisory committee, the Minister of Transport made the following comment: "Railway labour with grade eight or nine education cannot be blamed for negotiating excessive collective agreements".

Does the minister realize that his remarks were an insult to the 62,000 rail workers in Canada and is he prepared to make a public apology for his unacceptable and scornful comments?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that question because it provides me with an opportunity to explain to him and to the House exactly what was said.

I am from northern New Brunswick. From the time I was a kid I have dealt with railroad workers. I know who negotiated the contracts. I have listened to the stories of the people who returned from the war and had to negotiate contracts with the railway barons in the country.

What I said that night in Winnipeg was that never, no matter how much pressure is exerted on the Minister of Transport, will I ever point a finger at those men who worked very hard with very limited educations to find a way to negotiate collective agreements to protect their rights and to protect the rights of others who worked on railroads in the country.

I said that government had to take its responsibilities and management had to take its responsibilities. I did say, Mr. Speaker, because it was the truth—I remember Bill Dunn telling me exactly this in Tracadie in 1950—that it was very difficult for people with grade eight and grade nine educations to sit with people who were educated and who were in the pay of the railroads of the country and try to negotiate collective agreements to protect their rights.

I said then I would never attack the men who achieved that and I will not now because they did what they had to do to protect their rights.

\* \* \*

**GUIDELINES**

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, day after day we receive more copies of ethical guidelines for cabinet ministers. None of them appear to be unclear. None of them are contradictory. In fact, the current guidelines from the PCO insist there be no intervening by ministers with quasi-judicial bodies under their jurisdiction. The letter tabled said intervention on it.

Now that the truth about guidelines has become obvious will the Prime Minister admit that he has offended Canadians by stripping his government of its integrity?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I made a speech on Monday and I explained the guidelines, the distinction between the two. I have asked everybody to table the letters and so on.

I think the people of Canada think the members of the Reform Party are just trying to score some political points because they cannot attack the government on its economic policy. They cannot attack the government on the performance of the economy. They cannot attack the government because unemployment is down. They cannot attack the government because the mood of the country is much better than it was a year ago.

\* \* \*

**RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. On October 20, 1993, five days before the last federal election, the Prime Minister, then leader of the official opposition, wrote a letter to one of his caucus members.

*Points of Order*

In this letter the Prime Minister stated that Canada requires a first rate transportation system that is able to serve every region. He also stated that the PC government's continued tolerance to rail line abandonment had done nothing to improve the situation. He stated that the Liberal Party, if elected, would clean up this mess.

(1500)

The Minister of Transport has stated that he cannot answer my call because he has 175 Liberal calls to answer first. In view of that fact, could the Prime Minister intercede and make sure that after December 15 the people in Saint John have a dayliner to Moncton instead of a bus as promised by the Minister of Transport?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. member for Saint John, I have been into her beautiful city on at least four or five occasions to meet with people who have concerns about the transportation system there.

I want to say to the hon. member that we are going to do everything we can to continue to provide services to Saint John and all other parts of the country. However, what we need to hear are some solutions and proposals that make a lot more sense than what was done over the last nine years by the party that she represents.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Jorma Huuhtanen, Minister of Social Affairs and Health from Helsinki, Finland.

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

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## COMMENTS IN QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Yesterday in this Chamber the Deputy Prime Minister quoted from a letter I wrote to the Minister of Canadian Heritage regarding the concern of one of my constituents without my prior knowledge or permission or the prior knowledge or permission of my constituent.

Mr. Speaker, in your deliberations as to whether what I raise today constitutes a prima facie question of privilege, I ask that you consider the following. Beauchesne's 6th edition, citation 115 reads:

A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity.

Because breaching the right of a member of Parliament is a serious matter, before taking it any further I undertook to obtain the transcript record of what transpired yesterday. I also undertook to consult the legal counsel of the House regarding what had occurred.

The Deputy Prime Minister and by making the aforesaid letter available to her the Minister of Canadian Heritage breached confidentiality and in so doing interfered with my ability to function as a member of Parliament.

By breaching confidentiality the minister has called into question whether or not issues on which my constituents ask my assistance will be made public.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to find this to be a prima facie question of privilege. If you do so find, as is the usual practice of this House as described in Beauchesne's 6th edition, citation 118, I will move that this question of privilege be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all the letters were part of the public record of the CRTC.

**The Speaker:** I also will avail myself of the transcript of what was said yesterday and I will seek advice. I will do research on it and if necessary I will come back to the House with my decision at the earliest time.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have been rising in my place for the last two days trying to get the floor.

**An hon. member:** It is good exercise.

**Mr. Blaikie:** I have been getting the kind of exercise somebody else was referring to earlier only I have been getting more of it than I want.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall an argument I made to you earlier in this session. I argued that the NDP caucus should be entitled according to the mathematics of the opposition to at least a question and a supplementary and a statement each day. We have not come anywhere near that.

(1505)

This week we have only had two statements. I have to say that I think the treatment of the NDP caucus in this Parliament by you is abominable.

**The Speaker:** Every day in Question Period I attempt to see that according to the approximate proportion each party has that they get a chance to put questions. It is not always possible in

every Question Period to recognize everyone who stands in this House, although I must say in fairness that I have no difficulty seeing the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

I would respectfully request that if the hon. member wishes to pursue this case I invite him of course to see me at any time at his convenience in my chambers. I would hope that the hon. member would be a little judicious in his comments toward the Chair.

I will do the best I can to see to it that all members get fair treatment in this House as has been my want since I took this Chair. I will see if I can make improvements on my performance. I would surely urge all hon. members to seek to do the same thing in theirs.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1994-95

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting to the House of Commons supplementary estimates (b) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1995, was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Deputy Speaker to the House.

\* \* \*

### 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, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), the government's response to two petitions.

\* \* \*

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1994-95

#### REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 81(6) I move:

That supplementary estimates (b) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1995, laid upon the table on this day, November 2, 1994, be referred to the several standing committees of the House as follows:

(1510)

This list being rather long and there being a detailed allocation of the supplementary estimates (b) to the committees, if it is agreeable to the House, I ask that the list be printed in *Hansard* as if it had been read. I will file a copy at this time.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Editor's Note: List referred to above is as follows:]

#### Routine Proceedings

**To the Standing Committee on Natural Resources**  
Natural Resources, Vote 10b, 20b, 30b, 35b and 40b

**To the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs**  
National Defence, Votes 5b, 10b and 20b

**To the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs**  
Justice, Votes 1b, 10b and 30b

**To the Standing Committee on Finance**  
Finance, Votes 2b, L25b and 35b

**To the Standing Committee on Public Accounts**  
Finance, Vote 30b

**To the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development**  
Environment, Vote 10b

**To the Standing Committee on Industry**  
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Votes 1b, and 10b  
Industry, Votes 1b, 2b, 10b, 70b, 75b, 80b and 90b  
Western Economic Diversification, Vote 5b

**To the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development**  
Human Resources Development, Votes 5b, 10b, 30b, 35b and 42b

**To the Standing Committee on Health**  
Health, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b and 25b

**To the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade**  
Foreign Affairs, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b and 25b

**To the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage**  
Canadian Heritage, Votes 10b, 70b, 75b, 125b and 140b

**To the Standing Committee on Government Operations**  
Privy Council, Vote 1b  
Parliament, Vote 1b  
Public Works and Government Services, Votes 20b, 31b and 41b  
(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

### PETITIONS

#### GUN CONTROL

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present five petitions I have recently received from my constituents in the Ontario riding of Victoria—Haliburton.

The first petition was sent to me by Dr. Jules Sobrien. It calls upon Parliament among other things to refrain from any further gun control legislation in the name of controlling crime which would be of no value and would constitute unjust harassment of lawful gun owners.

#### SERIAL KILLER CARDS

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** The second petition asks that Parliament amend the laws of Canada to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of

*Routine Proceedings*

killer cards in law and to advise producers of killer cards that their product if destined for Canada will be seized and destroyed.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** The third petition asks that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** The fourth petition 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.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** The fifth petition 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 which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition from many hundreds of residents of my riding of Thunder Bay—Nipigon.

The petitioners plead that the crimes committed on society by young offenders are on a serious uprise throughout all of Canada and that there are certain elements in the young people of our communities who have little or no respect for law and order and the protection of life of their fellow citizens. The petitioners abhor the lack of remorse or shame shown by many of the young offenders within our communities.

The petitioners implore Parliament to review and revise our laws with respect to the Young Offenders Act by at least releasing the names and lowering the age to allow prosecution of the young offenders in this country to meet the severity of the crime.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present three petitions from constituents in Williams Lake, British Columbia.

The first petition calls upon Parliament to ensure that the Criminal Code prohibiting assisted suicide be vigorously enforced.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** The second petition calls upon Parliament not to amend the 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

Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** The third petition calls upon Parliament 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.

I concur with all of these petitions.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present this afternoon, pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The first petition is signed by a number of constituents of The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, all members of the Ukrainian Catholic Women's Organization in The Battlefords.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the following: Decriminalizing assisted suicide or legalizing euthanasia could lead to a reduction of patient-physician trust and respect, the degrading of the value of human life and the erosion of moral and ethical values. 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.

(1515)

Therefore the petitioners pray that Parliament continue to reject euthanasia and physician assisted suicide in Canada and that the present provisions of section 241 of the Criminal Code of Canada which prohibits the counselling, procuring, aiding or abetting of a person to commit suicide be enforced rigorously, and that Parliament consider expanding palliative care that would be accessible to all dying persons in Canada.

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by a number of residents of various parts of Canada. The petition presented to me states that Canadians for several decades have been provided home delivery of their mail not by privatized post offices but by Canada Post post offices.

Further, the recent introduction of supermailboxes has further reduced and eroded post office services that all Canadians have come to expect as a normal federal government service.

Therefore the undersigned petitioners pray and call on Parliament to end privatized postal outlets and reinstate full postal services and products normally provided by Canada Post through sub post offices.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting two different petitions today.

One is signed by 387 of my constituents regarding the issue of abortion. Now that an abortion clinic is opening across the street from the Parliament Buildings the issue is receiving new life and I hope higher priority on the political agenda.

My constituents are concerned that unborn human beings do not receive the same protection as those who are allowed to be born and they request that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child.

I too am concerned that there is currently no law in Canada protecting unborn children.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I also have the privilege of presenting two additional petitions today signed by 124 of my constituents.

Their concern has led them to sign a statement which says that a majority of Canadians believe that same sex couples should not receive the same privileges as heterosexual couples. They also say that the Canadian human rights code should not be amended to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

I share their concerns and I want them to know that I concur with their sentiments.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present three petitions to the House.

In the first one the petitioners pray that Parliament ensures 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 which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia. I concur with this petition.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition has to do with the issue of sexual orientation.

The petitioners pray that Parliament not amend 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 Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited

*Routine Proceedings*

grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation. I concur with this petition.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my third petition has to do with the rights of unborn human beings.

The petitioners of Mississauga South and the surrounding area pray 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. I concur with this petition.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions.

The first petition is signed primarily by constituents of Scarborough West but also surrounding areas. They pray and request that Parliament not amend 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 Act to include the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed primarily by residents of the town of Frankford, Ontario who have requested me to bring this petition to the attention of the House.

They have asked 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.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition is signed primarily by residents of Smiths Falls, Perth and Lanark in Ontario. They have asked me to present this petition for them.

(1520)

The petitioners ask 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 which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

I concur with all three of these petitions.

## LEONARD PELTIER

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions on the matter of Leonard Peltier. One has 175 or so

*Routine Proceedings*

signatures, the other has 75. They are signed largely by people from Peterborough riding but also from elsewhere in Ontario.

These people petition Parliament stating that at the time of the Lakota-Chippewa native American Leonard Peltier's extradition from Canada to the U.S., the information provided surrounding Mr. Peltier's case was fabricated by U.S. authorities. Since that time new information has emerged that indicates that Leonard Peltier was not guilty of the crimes for which he has spent the last 18 years in prison.

Therefore these petitioners request that Parliament hold an external review of the 1976 extradition hearing and that he be brought back to Canada for asylum.

I would like to say the last time I presented one of these petitions I made the point that an internal review is already under way but I would stress that these petitioners want an external review.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am presenting three petitions for my constituents in the Collingwood—Stayner area.

The first petition contains 67 signatures and calls on the government to amend the Criminal Code to extend to unborn children the same protection enjoyed by born human beings.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition contains 63 signatures and calls on the government not to amend the human rights code in relation to the recognition of same sex relations.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition contains 60 signatures and calls on the government to ensure that the present provisions in the Criminal Code with regard to assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and to make no changes to the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to stand this afternoon to present two petitions.

The first petition is signed by residents of my constituency of Regina—Lumsden, as well as the communities of Copper Sands and Pilot Butte in Saskatchewan. Pursuant to Standing Order 36, this petition is duly certified and states that whereas under section 745 of the Criminal Code of Canada convicted murderers sentenced to life imprisonment without chance of parole for 25 years are able to apply for review after 15 years and that the murder of a Canadian citizen is the most reprehensible crime,

these petitioners request that Parliament repeal section 745 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

## THE SENATE

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition I have to present today pertains to the Senate.

The petitioners are from the constituency of Regina—Lumsden primarily. They believe that the Senate, being unelected and unaccountable, has become a home of recipients of Tory and Liberal patronage, and has been a discarded notion of a working body in the best interests of Canadian taxpayers over the past number of years. Because the Senate costs \$54 million to \$55 million per year to Canadian taxpayers, and that travel costs for senators alone are nearly \$3 million, these petitioners request, pray and beg the House of Commons, the Parliament of Canada and the Government of Canada to abolish the Senate.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present two petitions to the House today.

In the first, petitioners pray and request 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 law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian 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 sexual orientation.

It is my pleasure to present these to the House.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 71 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 71—**Mr. Caccia:**

With respect to the World Cup Soccer games and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), (a) did CBC submit any bid for TV broadcasting in Canada for the 1994 games, (i) if yes, how much did it bid, (ii) if no, why not and (b) will CBC commit itself to compete for broadcasting rights in Canada for the 1998 World Cup soccer games?

*Government Orders*

## MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

**Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage):** (a) no; (ii) the CBC did not bid for any of the 1994 World Cup soccer games because its summer schedule was already very heavily committed to sports, particularly the 100 hours of coverage from the Victoria Commonwealth Games; (b) at this point it is too early for such a decision.

[*English*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary has been answered.

**Mr. Milliken:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

(1525)

**MOTION FOR PAPERS**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the notice of motion for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The parliamentary secretary requests that the notice of motion be allowed to stand. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*Translation*]

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-50, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from a committee.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Deputy Speaker:** Here is the Speaker's ruling on Bill C-50. Five motions in amendment are listed in the Notice Paper at the report stage of Bill C-50, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 4 and 5 will be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 2 and 3 will be debated and voted on separately.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1, 4 and 5 to the House.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 10, on page 2, the following:

“(1.1) The Board shall recommend to the Governor in Council a rate to be fixed for deductions pursuant to subsection (1) after consultation with persons or organizations that in the opinion of the Board represent the holders of certificates and the Governor in Council shall take into consideration the recommendation of the Board in fixing a rate for deductions pursuant to subsection (1).”

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 43 to 46, on page 3, with the following:

“by giving notice in the application for a permit book for the period that no deduction should be made for the period.”

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 14 to 19, on page 4, with the following:

“33.5 A deduction fixed by the Governor in Council shall apply at the same rate to all holders of certificates in the designated area.”

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the two amendments that we propose regarding Bill C-50, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, are cautionary measures. Indeed, some protection must be provided to agricultural producers.

The purpose of the bill is to allow the Canadian Wheat Board to make deductions from wheat and barley producers' final payment cheques. The purpose of these deductions, or check offs, is to finance plant breeding research. Contributions will be made on a voluntary basis.

Since the bill meets the expectations of western producers, we can only applaud this initiative which imparts a responsibility to agricultural producers. However, some provisions deserve a closer look and we should even be prepared to amend those if need be. This is the case with the provision concerning check offs for research.

(1530)

The initial provision provides that the Canadian Wheat Board shall, with the approval of the Governor in Council and at such rate as is fixed by him, make the deduction. The danger with this provision is that the Governor in Council may unnecessarily increase the deduction and reduce the federal government's own research budget, thus forcing producers to shoulder a heavier burden. In that case, agricultural producers would have to make a greater contribution to research funding.

Based on the original rate, that is 40 cents on each tonne of barley sold and 20 cents on each ton of wheat sold, and based on the assumption that 90 per cent of farmers will voluntarily participate in this funding scheme to promote research and development, contributions should total \$4.5 million.

*Government Orders*

The Canadian government currently provides between \$17.4 and \$17.5 million. Consequently, a total amount of about \$22 million could be allocated to research on wheat and barley in the four western provinces. Again, my fear is that cabinet might decide to increase farmers' payments and lower the federal government's contribution. Should that happen, farmers would have to fund a greater proportion of the research and development budget. I may recall that in a speech made here in the House, Eugene Whelan, a former Liberal Minister of Agriculture, who has made quite a name for himself throughout the world, said that there is a return of seven dollars on every dollar invested in research and development in the agricultural industry.

The government should invest now in research and development, because no bank in Canada will give us a better return on our investment. The government could, of course, take advantage of this opportunity to cut its research budget as a deficit reduction measure, in the knowledge that it can tap the incomes of grain producers for the funding it needs.

To preclude this possibility, we in the Bloc Québécois suggest that the CWB conduct consultations with individuals and organizations that represent certificate holders so that the board itself can make recommendations on the rate of deduction to the Governor in Council, who would then consider such recommendations when the time comes to fix the rate as provided in subsection (1) of the Act. In addition to providing safeguards for producers, this would also benefit consumers who, in the end, have to pay, because if the producers have to spend more on research, consumer prices may very well be affected.

This amendment will require genuine consultations with the principal parties, people in the industry who are in the best position to know what a reasonable deduction would be and what our research and development needs are. In any case, I may remind the House that farm producers in the four Western provinces are entirely free to say yes or no to this voluntary deduction, which will be used to collect \$4.5 million for research and development. Should the Governor in Council start throwing his weight around, I assume farm producers will simply decide not to participate.

(1535)

The amendment also gives producers some say in determining the amount of the deduction, and since this bill is a response to their initiative, it is entirely fair that this should be the case.

We are aware that the Canadian Wheat Board, an agency established to defend the interests of producers, consults producers on decisions as important as setting the deduction rate. But this is only to make it automatic and include it in Bill C-50.

I would go as far as saying that our amendment proposal will give the Canadian Wheat Board enhanced legitimacy vis-à-vis the Governor in Council, as it should be the case on the issue before us today.

My proposal is clear: to allow those who are the most qualified to set the rate of deduction do so. These are my arguments in favour of Motion No. 1 and I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Lotbinière, who sits with me on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, for seconding Motions Nos. 1 and 2.

Now, turning to the famous Motion No. 4 put forward by the hon. member for Vegreville, it is important to note that this motion introduces two significant changes to Bill C-50. First, we eliminate the red tape and make life easier for producers.

I imagine that the situation is no different in Western Canada than in Quebec. In my riding, indeed everywhere in Quebec, producers and voters ask us ten times a week: "Why make things so complicated?" This is one such case. When it comes to withdrawing from the deductions plan, why make life difficult for our farm producers? What my colleague from the Reform Party, the hon. member for Vegreville, is proposing here makes a lot of sense. It will cut the red tape.

Motion No. 4 deals with the procedure for opting out of the voluntary deductions plan to support research. The bill provides for filing a separate notice to withdraw from the program, whereas it is suggested here that this notice be given in the permit book that producers have to fill in when they sell their crop to the board. There should be space provided at the bottom; you check off one or two boxes and there you have it.

This makes life easier for producers who do not wish to contribute to research, and spares doing unnecessary paperwork. But there should be a space provided specifically for this purpose inside the book, in order not to make life unduly difficult for the board.

I would like to conclude by saying that, with this amendment, producers will have to decide whether or not to continue contributing to the research fund at the wrong time of the year. That is to say, when they see their income for the year. But since this is the risk you take with a voluntary contribution plan, I will vote for this amendment.

(1540)

*[English]*

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the three amendments in the first package today, amendments 1, 4 and 5.

I will start with amendment No. 1 which puts in this bill a requirement for consultation with the people who would be affected by research done with the money collected through this fund established by the Canadian Wheat Board.

*Government Orders*

There is need for consultation. Certainly my concern with that amendment is that by putting it in the act it may lead to more consultation than is necessary. I say that because in this case the check off is refundable. Because of its refundable nature I suggest that when the research foundation is setting the level of funding it should be careful to make sure that the level is reasonable.

Because of the refundable nature I think this amendment is not needed and may cause a lot of extra bureaucracy beyond what is necessary. For this reason I do not think I can support this amendment, although I do recognize the need for consultation.

Another concern is that it still leaves the power to make the decision in terms of the level of the check off in the hands of the governor in council. The power should be left strictly in the hands of the Western Grains Research Foundation, the organization that will allocate the funding for research. For that reason I cannot support that amendment.

Amendment No. 4 is the Reform amendment which, as the Bloc member has stated very clearly and very well, would simplify the process that farmers would have to go through in order to get a refund for their research funding.

This amendment would put on the permit book application form, which every grain farmer receives every year, another box and require the farmer to check off the box if they want to get a refund on their check off for this particular year.

Some argue that it is really not a problem for a farmer to write a letter for a check off. As a grain farmer I know that farmers are inundated with stacks of letters and requests, a tremendous amount of book work they do not ask for. This would just be another piece of paper, another duty, another responsibility, another process they would have to go through to do business. I think there is far too much government interference right now. Certainly farmers would appreciate this simplification of the process. I believe simplifying the process of refund would be very worthwhile in this bill.

Amendment No. 5 put forth by the NDP is really asking for the wheat board to have complete control to interfere with check offs that are presently in place. For example, right now the western barley growers have a refundable check off through the Alberta Barley Commission. Barley farmers selling barley in Alberta already have a check off in place. This amendment would require that the people selling barley would have a check off by the wheat board as well as by the Alberta Barley Commission. For that reason it would cause a double check off or would cause the barley growers to give up their check off.

(1545)

It is a general Reform principle that the closer to the people one can put decision making, the better the decision will be. In this case I believe it would be better to leave it in the hands of the barley producers in Alberta, just as an example, instead of requiring that all the check offs are done through the Canadian Wheat Board.

I cannot and will not support this amendment because it is just another move to put the power in the hands of this huge bureaucratic monopoly. I can in no way endorse that. Leave it in the hands of the Alberta Barley Commission for example.

I will leave my comments at that. I certainly look forward to speaking on this bill again at third reading.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this grouping of amendments.

One is from the member for Frontenac. He proposes to set up a group with whom the wheat board would consult before setting the rate of the deductions that are provided for under this act. I commend the hon. member for his concern about consultation. However I remind him and the House that there is a group that provides consultation and advice to the board now. It is the advisory committee and the board would be asking for that group's advice.

The board will also be asking for advice and recommendations from the Western Grain Research Fund. It makes certain there is no duplication in the research efforts that go into plant breeding and the research programs that gravitate around plant breeding, whether it is to establish what methods and levels of fertilization should be utilized or what genetic changes should be searched for in order to avoid disease and to get better productivity and yields and to come to fruition in a shorter growing period.

Therefore there is in place already the kind of organization the hon. member for Frontenac envisions. I am sure it will be put to that purpose.

With regard to Motion No. 4, essentially the member for Vegreville is proposing to make it fairly simple for people to opt out of paying into this program. I have no personal problems with that. I would remind the hon. member that if he is going to support the idea of raising money for research through check offs that asking people if they want to save some money when they are applying for their permit book will almost always get the response: "Of course I want to save some money. I will not bother allowing the check off to occur". It will depend on how that part of the application form is drawn to the farmers' attention as to whether they do or do not decide to participate in the check off.

*Government Orders*

My motion proposes that a deduction fixed by the governor in council shall apply at the same rate to all holders of certificates in the designated area. First there should be a little bit of translation as to what that means.

Holders of certificates are people who are eligible for a final payment under the wheat board for the four pools that exist for various types of barley and wheat. These are people who will have a final payment accrue to them at the end of the crop year when there is a surplus that has accrued from the sales and marketing activities of the wheat board. That surplus is distributed on the basis of how many tonnes of each grade and variety the farmer delivered.

(1550)

This act is proposing to take a certain amount from each of those pools which would go into specific research which would be designated and allocated by the Western Grain Research Fund. This works in conjunction with the other granting agencies which set out the programs that will receive public funding for research, whether it is for plant research as in this case, or for engineering or other disciplines throughout the country.

I am proposing this motion because the act as written now permits some parts of the wheat board designated area, which for those who do not know what that is, it is essentially the prairie region plus the mountain valleys and the valleys running into Thunder Bay in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. It is essentially the northern end of the great plains region. The climate and the soil and the farming technique there is such that most of the varietal research that will be done will be only applicable to that region. Therefore the plant varieties we develop for that region are usually of no application to regions in the rest of Canada. It is a nice, clear cut area whose economic interest in the area of plant breeding is basically the same.

The province of Alberta has decided to take a check off for barley and some types of wheat. That exists and is possible under provincial legislation. It is Alberta's constitutional right to do so. If we are going to take an action as a federal Parliament with a federal program, it should apply to all of the area the program is designed to cover. There should not be written into the law the ability for some regions to opt out. If some regions want to use their powers under the Constitution to do a similar thing, so be it.

We have plenty of examples of how that has been applied. For instance, when the GST was applied it was applied at the same rate right across the country, even though it was a tax on consumer goods and some of the provinces already had consumer taxes on consumer goods. However there was no recognition that because for example Newfoundland had a 9 per cent provincial sales tax that we would not bother to collect it in

Newfoundland because those taxpayers were already contributing to the tax system in Newfoundland.

I think it is inappropriate for us to put forward federal legislation that will apply to all of the wheat board designated region that covers as I said basically the northern plains of North America. That is a very concise and well-defined region that has very clearly defined needs because of climate, geography and agrology for basically the same services. It makes no sense to have a separate rule for growers of some crops in some of the provinces.

Therefore, I would expect that there would be considerable interest in the House to try to apply the rules equitably and fairly across all the regions. I presume I would get support for this very logical motion.

Alberta growers may wish to continue with the activities they have been carrying out under their check off system which is different in many respects from the check off for research that this program is collecting for. As an example, the Alberta program only contributes less than half of their collected moneys to actual research and the the rest is either held in trust or used for administrative costs. With this program however we have been assured by the promoters at the department of agriculture that virtually all of the funds will be allocated for research through the Western Grain Research Fund.

(1555)

If my amendment does not pass, I do not think it is fair for the contributors in Alberta under the proposal to contribute a lesser amount to the research needs of the area and still benefit from the activities of the surrounding areas. Barley growers in Alberta will benefit just as much as barley growers in British Columbia or Saskatchewan from the research that is done on barley varieties. Yet if we go along with the way the bill is currently drafted without my amendment they will be paying less toward research for the same benefit as everyone else gets.

I have no objection to Alberta growers taxing themselves by means of a check off to perform their political, administrative, and other activities the fund is now engaged in. However they should not expect the rest of us in the other provinces to finance the research and to give them the benefits from barley research they will get by opting out.

I urge members of the House to support this motion because it makes sense, because it is fair, because it is the cheapest way to get the most bucks for research. This will work if Alberta farmers pay the same rate as Saskatchewan farmers, as Manitoba farmers, as farmers in the rest of the wheat board designated area. I urge support for this because I think the only way the federal government and the federal jurisdiction can continue to receive the kind of respect this country ought to receive is if we treat them all in an equitable manner.

*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Colleagues, it is now the turn of the government to speak. I do not see anybody standing on the government side. I take it there is nobody wishing to speak. Is the minister of agriculture intending to speak? It would be his turn to speak now.

**Mr. Goodale:** Mr. Speaker, I do intend to speak with respect to both groupings of amendments. However, with the permission of the House I would prefer to wait until all relevant comments have been made so that I could respond to them all together, once I have heard all members of the opposition on the points they wish to raise.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois wishes to express its concerns about Bill C-50, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, which provides for deductions from the board's wheat sales in the four Western provinces and from barley sales in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia.

We certainly agree with the principle that this sector should contribute to research and development and with an initiative that could generate close to \$5 million for plant breeding research on wheat and barley. Especially since this initiative was put in place by the producers themselves, who will thus remain competitive with their counterparts in countries where plant breeding research is strongly encouraged. I am thinking in particular of American, European and Australian producers, who played a leading role in reviving government plant breeding programs. That is why a deduction program is vital to Western producers.

However, we are entitled to ask a few questions. While the government really meets this sector's needs by promising to contribute to the research fund, it should not withdraw later because it is a producers' initiative. We must see to it that our interests are truly protected.

(1600)

That is why the Bloc Québécois proposed amendments to this bill which, as you will see, my colleagues from other parties will readily approve. Again, they are aimed at protecting producers' interests.

The first amendment provides that it should be clearly stated in the act that the board must consult with producers before changing rates, for example. If it seems obvious to you, then the government should have no objection to putting this in writing in the act. This would provide extra protection for producers. We must ensure that the Canadian Wheat Board always consults producers' associations before recommending changes in deduction rates. The democratic right of any association of producers to be consulted should be respected.

The second amendment is necessary to prevent the department's research projects from duplicating or overlapping the industry's. We are told that those concerned in the farming community will discuss the research plans in order to avoid duplication and overlap and ensure that the funded projects are complementary. The bill says nothing about this and that is why this amendment is essential. We in Quebec have seen too much wishful thinking to believe that the government will always act logically. The Minister of Finance has told us often enough that the government's financial resources are limited. A good way to avoid wasting public funds is to make duplicate research impossible.

We all want to reduce the deficit. When an opportunity to avoid waste presents itself, we should seize it! If you refuse to adopt this amendment, the people will judge you and you will be accused of lax handling of the funds provided by the producers. What we are asking for is a simple effort so that the government does not subsidize the same research activity twice. Show some resolve to end waste—that is what the people expect of us in general and the government in particular.

The Reform Party presented two motions with which we agree. Having the minister table a report will show that the producers and the government actually co-operate. However, we consider the fifth amendment unacceptable. Alberta set up its own program and, considering that we keep asking the government to put an end to duplication and overlapping, we would be ill-advised to let that government impose its program on a province which already funds research through contributions from its producers.

It would be useless to compete with the provincial initiative in Alberta. Quebec's example should be eloquent enough to understand the absurdity of such overlapping. In our province, the federal government never stopped trying to control agriculture. It has been told time and again that the Quebec government already supports farmers. Yet, the federal government is involved in market development as well as in research activities, even though the Quebec government is already looking after these aspects. The same is true for activities related to the inspection of agricultural products. Let us reject this amendment so that Alberta can avoid such problems with overlapping.

As for the other amendments, the bill would become a lot more acceptable if they were supported. As we say back home, you cannot be against virtue.

[English]

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words on these amendments as they have been grouped today.

I am particularly pleased that the minister of agriculture has indicated that he wishes to listen to all the presentations before responding. I certainly respect that position. I am quite appreciative of the fact that the minister is present today and that he is

*Government Orders*

taking note of what is being said in response to these amendments.

(1605)

I would like to take advantage of that circumstance to indicate that the majority of farmers I have talked to throughout my constituency have asked me on as many occasions as I can to speak strongly in favour of a strengthened Canadian Wheat Board and to convey to the minister their concerns that the current debate about the future of the Canadian Wheat Board is one that they have expressed opinions upon for numerous years by their continual support for the board and its activities.

In fact they would prefer a bill in front of the House today that did not deal with check off but dealt with expanded powers for the Canadian Wheat Board, powers that included marketing jurisdiction for oats as in the past and perhaps for canola and other products as well.

On behalf of many hundreds of producers in my constituency who have discussed this matter with me, I would certainly urge the minister to consider bringing forward another bill in the near future to take into account those very issues of expanding and enhancing the jurisdiction and role of the Canadian Wheat Board.

In particular, I want to add a few words to what my colleague from Mackenzie said in direct response to the amendment, Motion No. 5, that he has put in front of the House for consideration and debate today. That concerns the application of the check off to all holders of certificates within the designated area.

The member for Mackenzie spoke very well. I support his arguments about the need for the act to have a blanket application to producers supplying the Canadian Wheat Board with product for sale and therefore not dealing with the exemption for certain Alberta producers who as the member for Vegreville indicated already have a check off in place.

Perhaps when the minister makes his remarks he could address this issue and give the House some information about why the check off for Alberta producers exists in the first place.

I wonder if we know specifically what the Alberta check off is for. We know that the federal check off proposed in the legislation is for breeding research, that the funds that are collected will go specifically for research into plant breeding. Is the Alberta check off for the same specific purpose? If not, why are the Alberta producers not participating in this breeding research program?

Will Alberta producers not benefit from the research that will be commissioned by the WGRF? We do not know if Alberta has plans to continue in perpetuity the check off within that province for its producers.

Under this legislation, if for any reason the Alberta check off were discontinued, would Alberta producers continue to enjoy the exemption allowed by the current legislation or do they automatically get picked up by this legislation?

I believe that we need the blanket provisions. Alberta producers should recognize that the benefits that they would receive under this program are the same as if they were living anywhere else in Canada.

I want to reiterate the point that my colleague from Mackenzie made because it is a most appropriate one. When we look at the way other federal legislation has applied, the Goods and Services Tax Implementation Act is a very good example.

If we applied the same principle to agricultural check off programs as we applied in the introduction of the GST, we would find that the GST would apply only in the province of Alberta, the only province that did not have a pre-existing tax in place as a result of other legislation.

(1610)

All the provinces, with the exception of Alberta, have a sales tax. If the federal government was applying tax appropriately across the country then obviously the GST could not have applied in other provinces, only in Alberta. It is an interesting point and I think the minister of agriculture might want to give some indication whether or not he would agree with or support that premise.

It is obvious that I am anxious to support the amendment put forward by my colleague from Mackenzie. I look forward to additional legislation that may come forward from the minister of agriculture concerning a stronger and enhanced Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on Bill C-50 and the amendments. In particular, I would like to address my comments to amendments Nos. 4 and 5. First I would like to go back a little bit and share with the House my history of involvement with a check off program in the riding I am pleased to represent.

One position I held prior to being elected to this exalted place was with an organization called the B.C. Grain Producers Association. I was a founding member of the organization. I was the first vice-president when it was first formed and subsequently became president of that organization. Over the years, as any struggling organization does, we had to try and sell memberships and raise money to keep the organization running. We had a number of ongoing projects.

One we always wanted to get involved in was in the area of varietal trials and research at local levels. There were always problems with the government operated research farms in areas that did not necessarily conduct research applicable to the Peace River region of British Columbia. We wanted to carry that

*Government Orders*

research one step further by conducting trials in our area on a field scale.

Over a number of years we came up with a plan to lobby the provincial government to allow the B.C. Grain Producers Association to enact a check off that would automatically come off producers' cheques at the time their product was delivered to the elevators. This check off is now in place and has been for a number of years. It is working quite well, I might add.

I would like to address some concerns that have been raised by my colleague from Vegreville and other members. One real strength of the operation of the check off in the B.C. Peace has been that it is local and is administered at a local level. In other words, the farmers have the option of electing councillors to a regional council that oversees how the money is spent. The problem my colleague from Vegreville mentioned was that once you go beyond that and have a bureaucracy in some distant place administering the money, there is concern with the local producers that they lose control of how that money is spent and whether they get the best bang for the buck, so to speak.

Local producers supported the check off because they could visibly see how their money was being spent. As we moved forward and were able to purchase specialized equipment for plots to expand different varieties of wheat, barley, canola and other grains, we could readily drive by the fields in our area and see how different varieties were producing in comparison to one another. That was a real benefit to the producers.

(1615)

Subsequently we found that there were very few people who opted out at the end of the year because the check off was and is fully refundable. However, what we found, because it was a local organization, was that at our annual meetings we could certainly do a good selling job to the local producers of what they were getting for their investment. Subsequently we found that very few wanted their money back out of the check off pooling fund.

I am certainly in support of the fact that this check off is totally refundable, as is the one in B.C. However, I am very concerned about the process. I think that is addressed in amendment No. 4 put forward by my colleague and the amount of the extra paperwork. In other words, make it as easy as possible for farmers to opt out of it because after all if it is not easy for them to get their money out they will view this as just another form of taxation, just another expense for them. They have to be convinced to see it as an investment in their future.

All of us in the agricultural industry certainly understand that we have to have and have to find the funds in these days of increasing problems with the government funds being available for research and development. We have to find them elsewhere. Producers are willing to do that as long as they can see the results. To do that we certainly want to pass amendment No. 4

which would allow that there would be as little paperwork as possible to allow the producers to opt out should they decide they are not getting the best investment for their dollar.

The other thing I would like to briefly touch on is the amendment as put forward by the hon. member for Mackenzie in allowing certain groups that already have a check off in place an exemption from it. We had concerns when we were holding meetings in our area of the B.C. Peace region trying to convince producers to come on board and support this thing. We actually had to pass a referendum of the producers before the B.C. government would pass the legislation to allow that check off. They insisted, and rightly so, that the producers supported the concept. To do that the B.C. Grain Producers Association had to go out and hold meetings and actually convince the farmers of the necessity of this and that it would certainly be worthwhile over the long haul.

We did that but one of the real concerns that was expressed to us time and time again was if we vote in favour of this what is to prevent next time another check off by the Canadian Wheat Board or the prairie wheat growers and the list could go on and on. That was the major concern that they voted for with the understanding that there would be no further check offs.

I am quite insistent that we should oppose amendment No. 5 put forward by the member for Mackenzie because it does allow those areas that already have an existing check off the option of trying to get the exemption and not having a double check off put in place.

With that bit of history with my involvement with the check off I thank you very much for the time, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to listen to the remarks that have been delivered by all members with respect to three of the motions that are before us, Motion No. 1, Motion No. 4 and Motion No. 5.

I will confine my remarks at this point in the debate to those three specific motions. I understand we will have a chance later this afternoon to talk about motions 2 and 3.

First, with respect to motion No. 1 proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, this motion would in effect impose a duty for the Canadian Wheat Board, not the Western Grains Research Foundation, to consult with respect to the amount of levies and to make certain recommendations.

(1620)

The motion would effectively make the Canadian Wheat Board more than simply an administrator of the check off program. In the development of this program proposal and in the lengthy consultations with farm organizations, it was recognized that the Canadian Wheat Board is a marketing institution and not a research agency. Therefore the role of the board in this particular research initiative should be purely administrative.

*Government Orders*

This has been explicitly discussed and agreed to by all of the farm organizations involved in this initiative.

The Western Grains Research Foundation as a matter of practice consults with its membership on all significant business matters. In turn, the member organizations that are a part of the WGRF consult with their producer membership to gauge support for all of the foundation's activities.

It was that kind of consultation that resulted in the accumulation of a very broad base of farmer support for the check off proposal presently contained in Bill C-50. Should there be any discussion in the future about altering the levy rates from where they will originally be established, there is an obvious and ready mechanism to consult with producers and with producer organizations. That mechanism is the Western Grains Research Foundation, its board, its member organizations and their broad based farm membership at the grassroots level.

This amendment in effect would contradict the agreement and the consensus that exist for implementation of this particular research initiative. Therefore it is not possible for the government to support the amendment because it would contradict that consensus and that agreement.

In addition, we view the amendment as unnecessary in any event because that ready consultative process is already in place through the apparatus and the means of the WGRF.

Motion No. 4 proposed by the Reform Party has to do with the method by which a producer could effectively opt out of the check off procedure.

The resolution that is proposed in motion No. 4 really deals with an operational matter, the method of operation for the check off program. It seems to me that is something which producer groups should decide upon for themselves.

It is my understanding that the Western Grains Research Foundation board of directors has reviewed the motion that is before us at this moment in Motion No. 4. It has considered very seriously the arguments and the rationale put forward by the Reform Party and by others who support the motion. The board of directors of the Western Grains Research Foundation has decided that it would by far prefer to retain the opt out mechanism which is envisaged in the bill and envisaged in its business plan.

The rationale for taking this position on the part of the WGRF is really three fold. First of all, when a person merely has to put a check mark in a box, opting out may be done without a lot of serious consideration going into that decision. Support for agricultural research is in the view of the government and in the view of the WGRF a serious matter and it is important that a conscious decision be made by producers whether to participate

in the program. Merely ticking off a box in the wheat board permit book application form may not provide the opportunity for that serious consideration.

Second, writing a letter by a prescribed date is not a very onerous obligation. It does show that the individual has given some thought to the matter and has made a conscious decision to opt out and that evidence of that conscious decision is in the form of the letter.

(1625 )

Third, the opting out mechanism that is envisaged in the bill and in the business plan for the WGRF is consistent with virtually all other existing check off mechanisms and procedures. It is obviously consistent with the wishes of the WGRF and the 12 farm organizations that make up the WGRF.

This is my final point with respect to motion No. 4. It is also important to recognize this amendment would effectively restrict the producer's ability to opt out, to make that judgement call to one specific moment in time. That moment in time would be when the permit book application form is actually being filled out.

The other procedure as we have envisioned it under the terms of the bill and under the business plan of the WGRF would allow the producer more time and more flexibility with respect to making this decision. If the producer had to just tick off the box on the permit book application form, that decision would have to be taken effectively 18 months before the check off would become effective.

The check off becomes effective when the final payment is made, which is basically in January after the end of the crop year. The permit book application form must be filled in before the crop year begins, about 18 months prior to the date upon which the check off would occur. It seems to me that is a time gap that is unreasonable and limits the producer's flexibility and the timeliness of the producer's decision.

Accordingly, for those reasons we are not in a position to support Motion No. 4.

Finally, with respect to Motion No. 5, I certainly would agree with the general comment that the check off systems presently available in the province of Alberta are somewhat less focused in their objectives and more costly in terms of their administration than the check off system being proposed in Bill C-50.

However, the scope of Bill C-50 effectively embodies an agreement that has been reached among 12 producer organizations in western Canada. Part of this agreement, this consensus among producers, is that the activities of the WGRF check off system will not impinge on other established check off schemes.

In developing the consensus necessary to implement this program, the WGRF directors were in unanimous agreement that the program should not overlap upon the activities of other existing check off programs. This means that where existing check offs are in place with respect to Alberta barley and Alberta soft wheat, the WGRF will not make a check off.

The WGRF and existing agencies that are funded by other check offs have agreed among themselves that they will co-operate with each other. They will co-ordinate their research activities to make sure that research dollars from producers, whether collected under one check off or the other check off, are used in the most cost effective and efficient manner to the advantage of grain producers.

This is essentially a producer decision about a producer program. It is not appropriate in my opinion to alter the program in a manner that explicitly contradicts the consensus upon which the program was developed. Part of that consensus at the outset was that there should be no overlap.

I appreciate the comments that have been made by hon. members on Motions Nos. 1, 4 and 5. I regret for the reasons I have already stated the government is not in a position to support these motions. I acknowledge that in putting forward these motions to amend Bill C-50, hon. members have done so in a conscientious and sincere manner. Their close attention to the subject matter is much appreciated.

(1630)

**Mr. Althouse:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since we will have to make a decision on how to vote on the basis of the minister's wonderful remarks, I wonder if he would tell us what method he is going to be using to assure that producers of barley, for instance, in Alberta will pay exactly the same amount into—

**The Deputy Speaker:** That is not a point of order.

Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

### Government Orders

**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 the motion stands deferred.

[English]

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 the motion 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 the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

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 Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing—Social programs reform; the hon. member for Beaver River—Ethics; the hon. member for Mackenzie—Child care; and the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona—Railway workers.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ)** moved:

*Government Orders*

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by adding after line 47, on page 2, the following:

“(5.1) The research funding agency shall not distribute moneys received by it pursuant to subsection (3) to persons or plant breeding centres for a research purpose unless the research funding agency, after reasonable inquiries, has determined that the information to be sought by the research is not and is not likely, as a result of other research, to become available to holders of certificates.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, the second amendment we wish to present in the House this afternoon, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière, is aimed mainly at preventing duplication by the various organizations that are awarded research contracts and also any duplication of research carried out by the Research Branch of the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

(1635)

Under Bill C-50, the Canadian Wheat Board will be responsible for distributing monies received as a result of deductions from producer income. The Board will distribute such monies among the various centres engaged in developing new and improved wheat varieties.

The purpose of our amendment is to make it clear that the agency must, after reasonable inquiries, have determined that the information to be sought by the research is not, and is not likely, as a result of other research, to become available to the producers. In other words, we must make sure we are not paying twice for the same research. To do so, we need consultation between the research funding agencies.

Take the example of Agriculture Canada conducting research on possible alternate processing of red wheat. If the Canadian Wheat Board does not make the necessary inquiries, it might provide funds to an agency in order for it to carry out similar research, and producers would end up paying twice for research seeking the same information.

This measure would also oblige Agriculture Canada to carry out its research mandate on behalf of producers. If private agencies wish to receive research funds from the CWB, they will clearly have to align their research activities with the interests of producers, who ultimately are the ones making the recommendations. Thus, if Agriculture Canada does not carry out its mandate well, independent research agencies will step in to meet producers' needs.

The Canadian Wheat Board will be obliged to increase the amounts given to independent agencies and to increase the contribution from producers, who will again pay for a duplication of services. If producers see their contributions increasing unduly, that would be a good sign that Agriculture Canada was not meeting the needs of the clients it serves, because private agencies would have to take over the department's work.

As set out initially in the bill, however, the measure allows Agriculture Canada to diversify its areas of research. If, for example, grain production picked up substantially and for this reason more research than earmarked for the sector was necessary, another sector might suffer. This could happen to dairy producers, for instance.

This bill give producers a chance to have research conducted on demand. With the element of information we are adding, it would be very interesting to see that organizations eligible for CWB grants do not need such grants because the Minister of Agriculture satisfies any requirement this farm production sector may have. It could mean that other sectors are probably being neglected.

(1640)

Our proposal is designed to prevent Agriculture Canada from focusing on one single aspect of grain production in terms of research. One potential risk that should be kept in mind and could be countered with our amendment proposal is that larger producers end up running the show at the expense of smaller ones. Insofar as the voluntary contribution is based on the number of tonnes of wheat sold, larger producers will inevitably make larger contributions to this fund because they produce more than the others.

If research is not adequately suited to the needs of smaller producers, the Canadian Wheat Board will be able to react to this threat. Since it will be monitoring the research activities, it will know exactly what is the fruit of the research it is supporting.

In closing, I would like to point out that initiatives such as those put forth with respect to Bill C-50, which show a commitment on the part of producers to assume responsibility for themselves, are encouraging. To sit idly by and wait for the department to resolve our problems is not a very effective approach, in my view.

The cautionary measure we want to include in this bill is simply aimed at greater protection. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food must not see this measure as an excuse to neglect his duty to Western grain producers to promote research.

In closing, may I remind you that producers will contribute to this research fund on a strictly voluntary basis. If the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food ever abuses the good faith of grain producers, he will live to regret it. There will be a protest movement, producers will withdraw, and he will end up financing research and development by himself.

Partnership is another key to success in research and development. When producers are directly involved in research, development, or co-operation, they co-operate wholeheartedly. Farmers, as is well known, are the workers who show the most solidarity in Canada, or at least in Quebec. I personally can tell you that if the Minister of Agriculture still thinks that he has a monopoly on truth, he is sorely mistaken.

*Government Orders*

The amendments proposed in this House by the Bloc Québécois, the Reform Party and my colleague from Mackenzie—some of which I think are relevant—are not meant to thwart the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. On the contrary! It is to help him and at the same time to help farmers in the four western provinces. Of course, the Bloc Québécois has nothing to gain politically in this matter, but we are doing it as members of the Official Opposition and we are also acting in accordance with the old principle that if your neighbours are prosperous, you will also benefit and live well.

(1645)

With that, I call on my colleagues in the Reform Party and the NDP and the Minister of Agriculture to read this amendment carefully. I ask the minister for once not to say no just because it comes from the opposition. I ask him for once to try to assess it for what it is worth and to support this motion.

*[English]*

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac would, I believe, require that the funding which is gained from the check off on wheat and barley which passes through the Canadian Wheat Board is spent on research.

If this motion did put in the hands of the Western Grain Research Foundation the responsibility to ensure that there is no duplication in research, then I would support the motion. However, this motion puts this responsibility in the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board through the Canadian Wheat Board Act. A responsibility that should be in the hands of the foundation will now be in the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board.

A brand new level of bureaucracy will be added to the process. The Canadian Wheat Board certainly is not the one you would want to add to as far as bureaucracy is concerned because it is a very large bureaucracy. It would be counter productive to have the Canadian Wheat Board as it is set up now deciding whether there was duplication in funding.

I believe it would be a big mistake to give the Canadian Wheat Board control and get it involved in the process of allocating funds. For that reason I cannot support this motion.

The Canadian Wheat Board is a monopoly that is not accountable to anyone it seems. I said the other day that it is not even accountable to God because it thinks it is God. Certainly it is an organization that has power beyond what the farmers who pay for the operation want.

The Canadian Wheat Board ought to be run by an elected board of directors and farmers across western Canada, as proposed by the Reform Party. That type of organization could be involved in making a decision such as this but certainly not the board as it is.

I strongly oppose this motion because it adds another level to the decision making. That level is the Canadian Wheat Board which is a large bureaucracy and one which would make this bill, which I support, not as good.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I was not going to intervene on this motion until I heard the member for Vegreville. I wonder if he was speaking to motion No. 2 because he does not seem to have read it the way the hon. member for Frontenac wrote it.

We should remind ourselves that the research funding agency that is mentioned in the motion by the hon. member for Frontenac is to be the Western Grains Research Foundation. If members look at the section of the act where this all starts, the deductions for research portion on page 2 explains that the board collects the funds and then turns it over to this research funding agency.

(1650)

The motion we have before us from the member for Frontenac directs that the research funding agency, which will be the western grains research fund, shall distribute funds to persons who will make the results of their research available to the people who contributed to it, namely the producers. I do not see anything wrong with that. This is something that should pass as a matter of course. However I realize the way some bureaucracies work and some funding works it does not always happen.

I do not know if the people who contribute to the check off for research in Alberta necessarily know what varieties of plants their deduction money has gone into. Neither do I know if the designation of research is the same in each case. In the bill it is quite clear that the funding will be for plant breeding research. It is not clear what the deductions are in some of the other provinces.

I hope the research granting agency, which is the western grain research fund, will make certain that it collects the same amount per tonne from producers in Alberta as is collected from producers in Saskatchewan, British Columbia or Manitoba. Whether it comes from a different collecting group should be irrelevant, but I hope that the same amount of moneys for a tonne of grain goes into the research granting agency from Alberta producers as is coming from Saskatchewan or Manitoba producers.

If that does not happen a lot of screaming and yelling will be going on by producers in Saskatchewan if this duality that the minister appears to be willing to support and which apparently the Reform Party is willing to support results.

If we cannot have fairness in the funding of research and openness to the point of allowing the people who pay for it know what the results are, then we are on a long, slippery slope into another form of taxation and another way for government to opt out of providing the kind of research dollars that it ought to have supplied in the first place.

*Government Orders*

I have one other thought as I look at motion No. 2. Since this money is being collected directly from farmers to finance this plant research I would hope that when a variety is developed that those same farmers will not be asked to pay fees under plant breeders' rights for the privilege of growing the variety they paid to produce.

I believe that is what the member for Frontenac is trying to avoid. If we know what varieties our money has produced as a result of the deductions from our grain sales then we should not have to pay plant breeders' rights on those varieties because we have already paid for them once, thank you very much.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I will take just a few moments to comment on the amendments in front of us this afternoon, motions No. 2 and 3, before we conclude the debate.

I could not help but notice a few moments ago, when the minister of agriculture rose to speak on motions No. 1, 4 and 5 and the following interventions by a number of members on this side of the House, including myself, that many of the issues we raised were not addressed in his responses in reply.

In particular, I was expressing the support of my constituents in northwest Saskatchewan for the strengthened and enhanced Canadian Wheat Board.

(1655)

I hope the minister takes an opportunity before the end of the day to express to the House, to producers in Saskatchewan and the prairies his support and his party's support for a strengthened Canadian Wheat Board, a marketer of Canadian grain.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, coming from the west you realize that the Canadian Wheat Board has long benefited the producers in western Canada. It has always found premium markets for Canadian grain. Those premium markets occasionally come close to the Canadian border as they do today.

Those people, including the Reform Party, who support dual marketing of grains forget that the premium market is not always across the Canada-U.S. border. The premium market is sometimes in Japan or Saudi Arabia. With the agricultural situation in China today it is quite possible that the premium market may exist there in the near future. Under no circumstance could any of the dual marketers survive without the Canadian Wheat Board in a marketplace that is dominated by a nation outside of North America. In any case I hope the minister of agriculture would take a moment to discuss that.

More to the point of the amendments, I could not help but add my voice to that of the member for Mackenzie who just talked about plant breeders' rights. Members of my constituency a few years ago were opposed to the introduction and passage of the

plant breeders' rights legislation. They said at that time the legislation would lead to a greater concentration of agricultural breeding in the hands of multinational corporations and other corporations that would push up the cost of producing agricultural products, grains in particular. When the costs of producing the product increase and the results of plant breeding are tied in with fertilizer and chemical production of any kind, then the input costs rise as well.

My constituents are now seeing a possible tie between legislation that perhaps turns some of their contributions to plant breeding over to those individuals or corporations which may financially benefit from their breeding programs at the expense of the producer. This is a situation to which the government should pay very close attention because we cannot jeopardize public supported research in grain varieties to benefit the corporations to the detriment of the producers and the industry.

I have spent a great deal of time as the New Democratic Party's environmental critic working on issues of population and the environment. These issues have helped me to understand that the need for agricultural product must be increasing with the increasing populations. Whether we are feeding grains to people or whether we are feeding grains to cattle, fish or other sources of protein or food for human consumption, the growing of grain will become very important to the future of the world as populations increase.

Yields must increase. Therefore the transfer of support and resources to the producers of the grains must also exist to ensure that we have a steady supply from this part of the world where grains grow so well and to ensure the transfer of the benefits of that growing to the areas of the world where populations are also growing.

(1700)

For that reason alone, even though it is not fully intended in Motion No. 2, I would look favourably upon Motion No. 2 as it appears before us. Obviously, from my remarks I hope the minister of agriculture will have some additional matters to think about as he looks to additional legislation and perhaps even additional amendments to this legislation in the future.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** During the course of the debate this afternoon on the various motions that we have had before us members opposite have invited me in my responses to go quite a distance beyond the precise subject matter that is the focus of the debate today.

While I am indeed tempted to respond at length and in a wide ranging way to some of the remarks that have been made by all of the speakers this afternoon on Motions Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5, I will continue my practice of restricting myself to the precise

subject matter that forms the point of the debate and save the wider ranging commentary for another time.

The fact that I do not happen to mention some of those other things should not be taken as any kind of disinterest in the subject matter. I am simply holding my fire.

Motion No. 2, the further proposed amendment by the member for Frontenac, is directed to the point that research efforts funded by the proposal in Bill C-50 should not be duplicative or overlapping. I take that as a valid point. Unfortunately, the proposed amendment would really not offer any assurance of no duplication and no overlap other than just comfort language. Quite frankly, I do not think that is realistic. The avoidance of research duplication in reality is a primary objective of the Western Grains Research Foundation. To this end, the foundation has already established a very close working relationship with both public and private research establishments, including a very close working relationship with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada researchers.

Further to this the foundation has consulted with and it intends to work with existing producer-funded research programs—for example, Alberta barley—to ensure that there are not turf wars started and that research efforts are co-ordinated.

Since this type of co-operation and co-ordination of research is already an established practice, it would not be useful in my view to proceed with the motion contained in Motion No. 2. Incidentally, I would add that in its present form I believe the amendment is unenforceable in any event.

I conclude by saying that I fully understand the spirit of what the hon. member is trying to achieve. I think it is achieved otherwise through the WGRF and I cannot recommend this particular amendment to the House.

**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 said motion?

**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.

*Government Orders*

**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 the motion is deferred.

[*English*]

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.)** moved:

That Bill C-50 in clause 2 be amended by replacing line 39 on page 3 with the following:

period ending on December 31, and the Minister shall lay the report before the House of Commons on any of the first fifteen days on which the House sits following the day the Minister receives the report.

(1705)

He said: Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 3 is about accountability. The Western Grains Research Foundation is required under this legislation to report to the minister once a year. All we are asking for in this amendment is to require that any report to the minister is made public through the House of Commons. That is the intent of the motion.

I cannot possibly see how this government would be against this accountability. I do not know why a report from a body such as the Western Grains Research Foundation should be kept under cover. I do not know why it should not be a public document.

The Western Grains Research Foundation, I just want to acknowledge, has an annual report that is made public every year but that does not necessarily mean that the report that it sends to the minister is the same report.

That is why I want this report which is sent to the minister every year made public through this House. That is what the intention of this motion is and I believe that is what it would do if it was passed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on Motion No. 3, moved by the hon. member for Vegreville. First, I would like to say that we support that proposal to the effect that a report must quickly be tabled in the House of Commons.

For reasons of transparency, annual reports submitted to every minister must be tabled in the House, so that all parliamentarians can quickly have access to them. If our good friend the Minister of Agriculture receives a report, he should not keep it to himself for months. We, members of the opposition, have a right to see that report as quickly as possible. As you all know, if a report is made public after a six-month delay, it has lost a great deal of its timeliness. It no longer generates the same interest.

The proposal made by the hon. member for Vegreville makes a lot of sense. As regards agriculture we, members of the

*Government Orders*

opposition, work primarily for the agricultural community and, in doing so, we also work for the 28 million Canadian and Quebec consumers. Indeed, we do not work exclusively for the agricultural community. We work for everyone, and that includes producers and consumers.

If the minister believes in transparency for his party, he should support the motion tabled by the member for Vegreville. In its original bill, the government merely proposes that a report be tabled to the minister as soon as possible. If there is still some fortitude left in this House, if transparency is really a concern, as the Prime Minister mentioned again today, why not accept that it be done within two weeks of the minister receiving the said report?

Right now, the government's transparency somewhat resembles the St. Lawrence River, you cannot see anything a few centimetres below the surface. The proposed amendment is very interesting because it does not put pressure on the agency, but on the minister. Indeed, it suggests that the minister shall lay the report before the House within fifteen sitting days of the day the minister receives the report.

(1710)

All of us elected representatives from Quebec and Canada have the right to have access to the report within fifteen days.

Since such a wish can be easily granted, I wonder how anyone could oppose an amendment making a minister accountable to the House of Commons.

Therefore, it will be for the sake of transparency and efficiency that we, in the Bloc Québécois, will support the motion presented by my colleague for Vegreville.

To conclude, I will use the few minutes I have left to comment on Motion No. 5. I must say that I am rather puzzled by the amendment proposed by the member for Mackenzie. Considering that section 33.1 recognizes the principle of distinct wheat classes, the amendment he proposes would only allow the Governor in Council to exclude the province or the area where a given class of wheat is produced.

In Alberta, since farmers can already contribute to a similar program for barley, offered by the Alberta Barley Commission, the proposed amendment would eliminate the monopoly and encourage competition between that organisation and the board.

The argument is justifiable, since the results of the subsidized research funded by the board would also benefit Alberta and also because farmers who support the board might prefer that it manage their deductions.

However, if the Governor in Council no longer has the authority to exclude a province, provincial initiatives will immediately be cast aside.

This is why, as you can imagine, I have a great deal of difficulty supporting motion No. 5. When a province, like Alberta, is ahead of the federal government, it is essential that its initiatives be respected.

This is why members of the Bloc Québécois cannot support the motion of our colleague from the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Mackenzie.

[English]

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few words on this motion. I will take up where the minister of agriculture left off in his remarks. The minister of agriculture indicated this was not the time to talk about the future of the Canadian Wheat Board. In fact he said, and I think I quote him correctly: "Now is the time to hold my fire".

I could not help but think that on this side when one holds one's fire and when one is fed up, it leads only to indigestion. We do not want this issue to be lapped without the proper debate in this place that it deserves.

(1715)

I remind the minister of agriculture that members of his party campaigned in my province and others one year ago, some of whom were elected on a campaign of supporting the Canadian Wheat Board and enhancing its powers.

The red book has a commitment toward marketing boards and the support of the Canadian Wheat Board. There were numerous news releases issued a year ago from Liberal candidates and now sitting members indicating support for the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not believe that at this time when the future of the Canadian Wheat Board is under so much pressure that the government, especially members who campaigned the way they did, and particularly the minister can hold their fire on this very important issue.

As it stands, my constituents are firmly behind the Canadian Wheat Board and I will speak for them as often as I can to ensure that the Canadian Wheat Board supports the farmers, the producers of western Canada and all the communities those farmers and producers support throughout my constituency in western Canada.

I want to indicate that on this motion the member for Vegreville has made an interesting intervention and with a couple of clarifications I believe I will now be able to support the amendment he has brought forward and I urge the government to do the same.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to address precisely to the subject matter of Motion No. 3.

Once again the member who has just spoken and others have tempted me to broaden the discussion this afternoon. I will not do that. There will be ample opportunities for that. I will

*Government Orders*

welcome those opportunities and if hon. members want a sneak preview of some of my views and opinions on the subject they seem to be amply reported almost on a continuous basis in the media so they can whet their appetites on those observations and we will get to the main subject matter in due course.

There do seem to be some animal noises coming across the way from the opposition members. Sometimes it is difficult to determine the distinction between their heckling and their speeches. I trust the speeches will have more substance than the animal imitations that seem to be emerging from the opposition members at the present time.

That type of conduct does tend to trivialize the subject matter that is under consideration. I prefer to remain serious about it.

With respect to Motion No. 3 the proposal is essentially for a tabling of the annual report of an arms length, not for profit private organization. That is a rather unusual proposition because the Western Grains Research Foundation is an arms length, not for profit private organization. It represents 12 farm organizations in western Canada. It may represent in due course more organizations than that because as I understand it other organizations are expressing very sincere interest in joining the WGRF because of the good work that it does. It does represent those private sector producer based organizations.

It will operate with producer and not taxpayer funds. That is essentially what the check off procedure is all about.

Bearing in mind that the agency we are talking about in terms of the WGRF is a private, not for profit, arm's length organization. Bearing in mind that organization will operate with producer funds, not taxpayer dollars, it seems to me that a different type of accountability is appropriate.

(1720)

Accountability obviously is important but it must be of a different kind than one would think of if we were speaking of a purely government institution. The foundation is operated by producers and is accountable to producers. The program that is proposed in Bill C-50, it seems to me, does not require excessive control by the House of Commons or by any government agency. It should have that kind of accountability which the WGRF in the proper exercise of its responsibilities considers to be appropriate.

In these circumstances the avenue that should be pursued is simply this. Every year when the report from the WGRF becomes available there should be a notice published in the *Canada Gazette* indicating that annual report has now been produced and it obviously is available for inspection. That is a more economical and appropriate way to deal with this requirement of accountability in the case of the WGRF.

At the same time I would again point out the nature of the WGRF. It is an organization involving 12 western farm organizations. They have a board of directors and they are accountable to their membership. They have developed this whole program in very close consultation with farmers. There is a very real discipline and a very real form of accountability built right into that structure because it is producer based and producer driven through those farm organizations that make up the WGRF. The board of directors of the WGRF is representative of those farm organizations.

In addition to that kind of accountability which will certainly ensure the publication of the kind of annual report that is appropriate and necessary in the circumstances, I think it would be sufficient for us to simply publish a notice in the *Canada Gazette* every year noting that the annual report is available for inspection if needed. In addition, it would seem to be logical that a summary of that annual report could be provided in the ordinary course through the publication known as "Grain Matters" which is broadly distributed to all Canadian Wheat Board permit book holders across western Canada.

The annual report will include statements concerning revenues and expenses as audited and other statements as may be necessary to provide and to ensure full transparency.

I would also note in conclusion that when Bill C-50 was in committee it was strengthened by allowing for agreements between the minister and the research funding agency. That agreement is now provided for in a prior amendment to Bill C-50, section 33(1)(6). That particular agreement will provide for another form of accountability. All of those factors taken together sufficiently address the point and make the amendment proposed in Motion No. 3 unnecessary.

[*Translation*]

**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 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:*

*Private Members' Business*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(1)(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

(1725)

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.

[English]

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), I have been requested by the chief government whip to defer the division until a later time.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the division on the motion before the House is deferred to tomorrow at 10 a.m. at which time the bells will ring for 15 minutes.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would probably find unanimous consent to proceed immediately to private member's hour or we could suspend for four minutes. My colleague seems to be ready to proceed now so the House would probably consent to proceed immediately.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it is important while we are on this subject of deferring the votes until tomorrow morning that the House realize that the minister of agriculture is before the standing committee on agriculture at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. The deferral of the vote until ten o'clock tomorrow morning simply cuts short the amount of time that the minister would have in front of the committee. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to call it 5.30 p.m.?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** 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

[Translation]

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

The House resumed, from September 20, 1994, consideration of the motion that Bill C-218, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act (excepted employment), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on Bill C-218, an Act to amend the Unemployment

Insurance Act. I wish to indicate my approval of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert.

The bill seeks to correct an injustice made against almost a million Canadians and Quebecers, of whom two-thirds are women.

Yes, one million Canadians, most of them women, that the government does not trust and considers as UI abusers because they are not dealing at arm's length with their employer, who is either a brother, a son, a daughter or a spouse. This is unacceptable in a country where citizens are presumed to be honest.

I remind the House that until 1989, any woman employed by her spouse could not draw unemployment insurance benefits. That in itself is shocking and appalling. Indeed, who would accept such a discriminatory clause nowadays? Yet, women had to unite in a long and vigilant fight to bring that discrimination to an end.

After a challenge under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the section of the act excluding from entitlement to benefits any woman working for her spouse was ruled invalid and discriminatory by the Supreme Court of Canada in March 1989. This ruling finally gave fair treatment to these women who work in family businesses and granted them the well-deserved right to unemployment insurance benefits.

However, this victory was short-lived. In October 1990, the then government found a way to get around the 1989 ruling, by including, in the definition of excepted employment, employment where the employer and employee are not dealing with each other at arm's length. By excluding from benefits not only women, but everyone not dealing at arm's length with their employer, legally, the law no longer seemed discriminatory.

It is possible that some employees working for their spouses defraud unemployment insurance just as it is possible for an employer and an employee who are perfect strangers to cheat the system. The penalties in the law are explicit and severe enough to cover all fraudulent claims.

Losing a job is in itself a stressful event that can weaken one's self-esteem. We, on this side of the House, do not think that most people choose unemployment as a way of life. Nor do we believe that the unemployed in Canada are lazy people drinking beer in front of the television, as the prime minister unfortunately said. But that such a suspicion be covered in the act is unacceptable to the 1 million Canadians who are unemployed, including 650,000 women.

What is shocking here, and that I want to denounce, is the burden of proof which lies with the unemployed individuals from the very first stage of their benefits claim. These individuals must prove to Revenue Canada, Taxation that their work contract was meeting all the requirements of a position that anyone else could have held. No other category of claimants is required to produce such proof.

*Private Members' Business*

But what is more shocking and adds to my determination to support the deletion of section 3(2)(c) is the fact that the amendment adopted October 22, 1990, only slightly softened the blatant discrimination present in the former Unemployment Insurance Act. The existing legislation is targeting an easily identifiable group and results mainly in the systematic exclusion of women employed by their spouse.

Are these women entitled to UI? Yes, said the Tax Court of Canada in 1989. Since then, these women have been contributing to the system. But by a clever trick, the 1990 UI reform managed to include anyone not at arm's length with the employer.

When these women lose their job, it is often because their spouse's business is going down the drain. It is then that these women need UI benefits. Instead they have to prove to officials of Revenue Canada, Taxation that their job is justified, therefore insurable.

Then begins a long inquiry process that can last several months, even a year, during which the slightest doubt leads to an exclusion because the process does not tend to confirm eligibility but rather to prove abuse.

Once more, the Canadian government shows that it does not focus on the real problems and that the services most needed by people are still subject to a cumbersome bureaucracy.

I believe it would be improper to assume that a woman taking an active part in the operations of her husband's business would try to abuse the unemployment insurance system. Yet, if she worked for a competitor, she would not be subject to such misconceptions. Bill C-218 precisely aims to put an end to such an unfair situation.

This discriminatory clause of the act is detrimental to all women from a human and social point of view because it denies them the right to their fair share and a fair treatment.

Therefore I ask the government to repeal paragraph 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act. I urge the government to get rid of the vicious and discriminatory measure by which the previous government deprived one million Canadians and Quebecers, mostly women, of their right to unemployment insurance at a time when they need it most.

[English]

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to address the concerns expressed in Bill C-218 by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert.

The hon. member's bill purports to correct an injustice she perceives in section 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act. I know the hon. member has brought this matter forward with the very best of intentions.

(1735)

The government appreciates the hon. member's concern. After all, we are striving to make sure its rules and regulations are fair and equitable for everyone. It pleases me to say that this particular provision is an example of the equality we are trying to achieve.

The section of the act that the hon. member is concerned about addresses the situation whereby relatives work for one another. Some hon. members have argued that this section of the act discriminates against relatives of employers. This is simply not so. The provisions simply act to make sure that those individuals who work for a spouse or for a mom or dad have the same access to this important government program as any other worker. Perhaps I can alleviate the hon. member's concern by pointing out the intent of this arm's length employer-employee relationship.

The government recognizes that more so today than ever before individuals are starting their own businesses working out of their homes and providing services that may involve family members. What we can call non-standard employment is on the increase. Last year more than 60 per cent of all new jobs were part time. Therefore I think the hon. member will agree with the necessity of having UI regulations that allow a relative or common law spouse to be an employee.

This section of the act entitles these individuals to pay premiums and collect benefits if their contracts are similar to those of workers not related to their employer. As well the employee of a corporation in which he or she has shares may also be eligible to pay UI premiums and collect benefits.

All the unemployment insurance program is asking in this regard is that relatives employed by relatives ensure that this is a legitimate employer-employee relationship. This is not discriminatory because all employees related or not must also do the required paperwork to satisfy the commission that they are legitimate employees. I say to the hon. member for Saint-Hubert that the only real distinction is a few additional forms to fill out. This is but a minor inconvenience. It is a reasonable measure because it protects the integrity of the UI program for everyone.

The hon. member has quite rightly pointed out that the majority of individuals affected by this section of the act are women but that is why the section was amended in the first place. It used to be that spouses, the great majority of whom are women, were not eligible for UI benefits. This is no longer the case. Women are not discriminated against in this regard. They

*Private Members' Business*

are however required as any other employee to show there is a legal employer–employee relationship if they wish to pay UI premiums and to be eligible to collect benefits.

In a related matter this government recognized that many women are entering the workforce. We know that many women are the main providers for their families. To address this evolving situation, the government introduced the dependency benefit rate of 60 per cent. This rate is for claimants with low incomes supporting a dependant or who have a spouse supporting a dependant. Without this, people in this situation would receive a 55 per cent benefit rate.

I believe that if the hon. member for Saint–Hubert considers the matter, she will see that this government is totally committed to fairness and compassion in applying its programs.

The thinking behind any adjustment to unemployment insurance is to guarantee that all potential UI recipients are treated fairly. That is one of the reasons we are looking at UI as part of the social security reform. Our surveys have shown that the great majority of Canadians support the concept of unemployment insurance, but the key word is insurance.

Canadians want this program to be used for the purpose for which it was originally intended, the purpose being temporary financial support between jobs and not as a supplement to a regular income. People understand that UI is a major component of social security and they want to see that it works fairly and equitably.

During previous debate on this bill one hon. member referred to the government's initiative to use UI development funds for training and upgrading skills. He suggested that by supporting the hon. member's bill we will enable workers employed by relatives to take advantage of training programs.

Individuals who qualify under this section of the act are as eligible for training programs as any other recipient. They are not being denied training because they have to fulfil an obligation, an obligation that guarantees that the business arrangement with their spouse is a true employer–employee relationship.

(1740)

I say to all hon. members that a review of our social security system will give them ample opportunity to present their ideas on reforming our unemployment insurance program. The government's proposals are detailed in the discussion paper and we more than welcome constructive input. Social security reform is a partnership. It is a partnership that needs helpful suggestions if we are to develop new social security programs that will be fair and beneficial to all Canadians.

In summing up I thank the hon. member for Saint–Hubert for raising concerns over what she perceives to be discrimination.

The government appreciates her attention in this regard. However in studying the matter I see no grounds to assume there is discrimination under this section of the UI Act. Therefore, regretfully I cannot support the hon. member's bill.

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity today to speak on Bill C–218 which seeks to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. The member for Saint–Hubert proposes to eliminate the exemption that prevents family members from collecting UI if they work in the family business.

I suppose the intent of unemployment insurance at the time it became law in 1940 was to provide financial assistance to industrial and commercial workers during periods of unemployment. Since that time the program has expanded to encompass everything from grants to organizations under section 25 to maternity leave and sickness benefits. Today 97 per cent of paid workers are covered by the unemployment insurance program. The originators of the program would not recognize it in its present form today.

For some time now Canadians have been expressing concern over the abuse of the unemployment insurance program. Even the Minister of Human Resources Development realizes there is a need to tighten up the system and close the loopholes.

When the hon. member for Saint–Hubert outlined her reasons for introducing this bill, she said that the primary effect of section 3(2)(c) is the systematic exclusion of women who work for their spouse. She finds it objectionable that such employees must prove to Revenue Canada adjudicators that the labour contract has all the features of a job that the employer would have given to someone else who was completely unrelated to him or her.

We believe that if a wife works for a husband or vice versa, they should be prepared to prove that a bona fide employer–employee relationship exists. At this point many people on farms would qualify under those regulations.

It should be incumbent upon them to show they are not taking advantage of the system and trying to add to the family income. I do not believe this is an unreasonable safeguard in a system that is all too often abused. Members from the official opposition often talk about abuse in the system.

Revenue Canada adjudicators would adjudicate arm's length relationships. Statistics show that each year some 3,750 UI claimants are denied benefits because they do not work in true employer–employee relationships. This actually amounts to one-quarter of the claims that are reviewed each year. This means there are some 11,000 arm's length relationship claimants who do receive UI benefits. If this amendment were passed those 3,750 claims that are rejected each year possibly would be approved. Taking the average benefit from 1992 which is

*Private Members' Business*

\$6,600, the minimum annual increase in UI payments would be \$25 million.

I am sure my colleague for Saint-Hubert believes that her amendment would be a great benefit to women and to the small business community. The truth is that she is ultimately bringing more harm to those people she is trying to protect.

(1745)

The changes and add ons brought in since the inception of the program have been costly to the workers and their employers. Together the contributions by employees and their employers average 7.3 per cent of contributors' income.

As it stands now the UI program will take \$19.8 billion from the people who are trying to keep their businesses solvent and from workers who are trying to make ends meet and pay their taxes. That \$19.8 billion amounts to approximately \$1,500 from every Canadian worker covered by the unemployment insurance program. It is the second highest source of revenue for the federal government, second only to personal income tax.

If the hon. member really wanted to help women and small businesses she would support the proposal of the Reform Party for a private insurance plan, one which is operated on basic, actuarially sound insurance principles. She would be proposing an amendment to make UI contributions voluntary so that those who are not eligible to collect benefits would not have to contribute to the plan. She would be calling on the government to lower the tax rate so that money could be left in the hands of the entrepreneur, the farmer, the small business person who relies on family members to help out on the farm or in the store.

We feel most Canadians would agree with our party's belief that a dollar left in the hands of an entrepreneur, a small business person is far more likely to stimulate economic growth than a dollar left in the hands of mother government or bureaucrats.

Reform Party members oppose this bill for many reasons. It opens up the Unemployment Insurance Act to yet another avenue of abuse and waste of taxpayers' dollars at a time when we should be tightening the loopholes and saving employer and employee UI premiums to cover UI claims by workers and their families hardest hit by today's high unemployment. This bill would increase payouts of the UI benefits by millions of dollars per year. It directly contravenes Reform Party principles which support elimination of fraud and abuse and returning UI to true insurance principles.

Most important, spouses employed by their partners already have an advantage over other Canadians because they can split their income and reduce their taxation in that way. While Reformers support income splitting for married couples, we would like all Canadians to have equal opportunity to do so.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** As you know, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to repeal section 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, which stipulates that employment where the employer and employee are not dealing with each other at arm's length is not insurable. The law is clear: Where the employer is related to the employee, he or she must prove that the job would have been given to an unrelated person in similar circumstances.

The vast majority of workers affected by this section of the Unemployment Insurance Act are women who work in a family business. For these women, the law is also unequivocal. Women who work for their spouses must pay unemployment insurance premiums. This is also true for employees who are not dealing at arm's length with their employer and who hold 40 per cent or less of the family business shares.

Since the act was brought into force in October 1990, the Department of Human Resources Development, which is responsible for the administration and the application of the Unemployment Insurance Act, increasingly refuses to pay unemployment insurance benefits to these people.

The Bloc Quebecois denounces such an attitude stemming from the retrograde section 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this section is retrograde and even discriminatory, since its main effect is to systematically exclude from the unemployment insurance program women who work for their spouses.

(1750)

The argument most often put forward to prove that the employment is not insurable in the case of women working for their spouses is this: The employer and employee are not dealing with each other at arm's length, hence there is no employer-employee relation. When examining the claims of these women, Revenue Canada may carry out all inquiries it deems appropriate at the workplace, including financial statements audit, analysis of bank statements, and study of the work organization in the plant or the office.

In fact, the department is not seeking to establish eligibility but to prove fraud. I support Bill C-218 put forward by my colleague from Saint-Hubert to repeal this antiquated provision of the Unemployment Insurance Act that is so unfair to a certain category of women. There are 650,000 women in this situation. If they lost their job, these employees who work in a business controlled by their spouse, these workers described as wife associates, would not be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because of their status.

*Private Members' Business*

Again, wife associates represent the vast majority of exclusions under section 3(2)(c) of the existing legislation, which deprives women of their right to equality in matters related to unemployment insurance. In general, these women perform administrative duties in a family business, whether it is a farm or any other type of small business.

They perform duties such as billing and accounting and respond to requests from suppliers and clients. A family business, like any other type of business, can experience serious financial difficulties. The wife associate can be laid off and stop receiving a salary. We think that, since she contributed to the unemployment insurance program, it would be quite normal that she be eligible for benefits.

This injustice toward women is particularly obvious in agriculture. In 1988, 6,066 Quebec women had titles of ownership in a farming enterprise. In 1993 their number had almost doubled. For their work on the farm, 43 per cent of respondents to a survey say that they are paid, either through a salary or through profit sharing or through investments made in their name.

The survey also shows that 33 per cent of those women earn off-farm revenues. Obviously, women with such earnings make a large contribution to the operation of the family farm. What, then is the difference between women who earn their living in the family business and those who do so elsewhere?

Both groups of women are equally dependent on the farm and pay UI premiums, but their status is different when they become unemployed. Again, that is blatantly unfair to a group of working women.

It is not a matter of whether a wife is dependent on her husband. In any normal couple, the wife is no more dependent on her husband than he is on her. It is a matter of being fair to a group of working women. That is why we support Bill C-218, which proposes that section 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act be repealed. The Bloc Québécois refuses to wait, as was suggested at first reading, for the Liberal comprehensive reform of social programs, a reform that will never achieve national consensus in any case. I urge all the women in the House, including those in the Liberal government, to support this bill.

[English]

**Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Saint-Hubert has presented the House with a matter which I am sure concerns us all and that is the fairness of our rules and regulations. This government most certainly does not wish to discriminate against anyone.

The question in the circumstances raised by the hon. member is whether or not discrimination is occurring. Her bill argues

that because the majority of people affected by section 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act are women the section discriminates against women.

(1755)

I admire the hon. member's concern but this section does not discriminate against women nor does it discriminate against any relative involved in an employer-employee relationship. The intent of the section is to ensure that genuine legal employer-employee relationships exist in businesses that involve relatives. That is hardly an unreasonable requirement.

The House has heard some interesting arguments on this matter but if my hon. colleagues consider what could happen if the act did not have safeguards I think they would agree we would be in a real quandary.

Section 3(2)(c) of the act requires only that those affected by it satisfy the Unemployment Insurance Commission that they qualify for UI coverage just as any other employee. It is merely one of the regulations set out to protect the program's integrity. I do not hear hon. members arguing that employees not related to their boss should be exempt from proving a legal employer-employee relationship, so why should employees who are related be exempt? That would be the effect of passing Bill C-218.

Family employees should certainly have the same rights as any other employee. However I trust the hon. member will agree that family employees should also have to meet the same requirements to be eligible for UI benefits. That is all section 3(2)(c) requires. To have it otherwise would then discriminate against employees not related to their employer. The regulation treats everyone in the same manner, which is the way it should be.

One word we have heard frequently in the remarks of my colleagues is fairness. I would like to expound briefly on how the government has used fairness, not as a political slogan but as a philosophy. Fairness or equality or whatever synonym you wish to use is a cornerstone on which this country's social security system was built. Indeed it may be argued that it is the cornerstone on which the entire country was founded.

I do not for a moment claim that every program is perfect or that these programs do not have loopholes that unjustly deny people their due. I will state however that fairness has been and will continue to be the watchword for this government. We will strive to close loopholes wherever and whenever we find them.

A case in point is a recent series of changes to the UI program which took effect in July. We realize that reducing the benefit rate to 55 per cent would represent an undue hardship to people with lower incomes who have dependants. That is why we

*Private Members' Business*

introduced the dependency benefit rate which gives a 60 per cent benefit rate to people in these circumstances.

A decision to reduce the benefit rate was indeed a tough one. However we tried to be as fair as we could by minimizing the impact of this change on those who could least afford it. It is this spirit of fairness that embodies the provision which so concerns the hon. member.

As my colleague has pointed out this provision allows family members to collect UI. In the past they simply were not eligible. Yes it is true there is a little bit more paperwork involved in these cases. I hasten to point out that among the tens of thousands of UI claims filed by family businesses in the 1992-93 fiscal year only 15,000 were reviewed by Revenue Canada. The great majority of individuals employed by a relative simply filled out the forms necessary to qualify for UI and they received their benefits.

Therefore I can say with great sincerity and with all due respect to the hon. member that her concerns are exaggerated. No one is questioning the intentions of the hon. member for Saint-Hubert regarding this matter. She is undoubtedly addressing what she perceives to be an injustice but I would say to her and to all hon. members that during the review of our social security system there will be plenty of opportunity to present constructive recommendations for reform of the UI program.

In our discussion paper the government has proposed a number of possible approaches to adjust and strengthen unemployment insurance so that it serves all Canadians. That is the context in which we should be looking at the UI Act. Everyone most certainly recognizes that UI is very much a key element of social security.

I am sure that when hon. members hear from their constituents they are finding more and more people are working in what we refer to as non-standard employment. There is a considerable increase in the number of part time, self-employed and multiple job holders. And yes, there is also a significant increase in family run businesses.

We need to look at the whole picture. We need to consider whether we should develop an entirely new unemployment insurance program that will address the needs of workers in the changing economic structure, or whether we can adequately adjust our present UI program to serve the needs of a rapidly diversifying workforce. Whichever approach, the government has stressed that social security reform is a partnership. We want input from anyone who has constructive ideas.

(1800)

The hon. member for Saint-Hubert will have an opportunity to present her ideas and the government will be pleased to give her submissions every consideration.

At this time, while I appreciate the intent of her bill, I regret that I cannot support it.

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to debate the bill presented by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert.

Like my colleagues, I recognize the hon. member's intent in presenting this bill which is to correct a perceived injustice. I would ask her and all hon. colleagues to remember that the bill received first reading prior to the government's discussion paper on social security reform. Perhaps if the hon. member had known the extent of the proposed revisions to the unemployment insurance program she would have seen fit to wait and put forward her ideas in that context.

As the old saying goes, I do not want to keep flogging a dead horse, but I honestly believe that Canadians want their elected representatives to consider revisions to the UI program in the context of social security reform. I am sure the hon. member sees the logic of evaluating her suggestion in that context.

The hon. member for Saint-Hubert talks about injustice but there is no injustice in doing everything possible to maintain the integrity of our unemployment insurance program. I can state unequivocally that the majority of UI claimants are honest, law-abiding citizens and we need not fear that they will try to take advantage of the unemployment insurance system.

However that does not preclude us from being diligent in ensuring that UI benefits go only to those who meet the necessary conditions. We must be accountable. Canadians expect their elected representatives to do everything in their power to ensure the viability of our social security system.

I would ask the hon. member to look at it another way for a moment. Just last week the Minister of Finance made it abundantly clear that the government will fulfil its commitment and meet its deficit reduction target, that is 3 per cent of the gross domestic product at the end of the third term in office. It has been made very clear that this goal will be met. There is no doubt about that. We can help by keeping costs as low as possible in our social security programs.

We have already tried to do what we can to save UI funds through other measures. I am thinking of such things as lowering the premium rate which we estimate will create or preserve about 40,000 additional jobs. These jobs mean that people will pay into the fund rather than take money out of it. Besides that, we have to do everything possible to ensure that the system is used for the purpose for which it was intended.

Now that we have heard hon. members argue that arm's length provisions discriminate against women since they are often the ones employed by their husbands in a family business, as the kids say today: "Let's get real". When it comes to making

*Private Members' Business*

revisions to UI, we have been mindful of the particular needs of Canadian working women.

One measure we have taken, as hon. members have mentioned, is to bring the dependency benefit rate of 60 per cent for low income earners who are supporting a dependant or whose spouse is supporting a dependant. We estimate that approximately 240,000 claimants are helped by the dependency benefit rate. I can assure my hon. colleague that the majority are working women. If hon. members want to do more for women then I encourage them to study the proposals for social security reform and to come up with positive, constructive ideas on how we can make improvements.

(1805)

It is easy to criticize but it gets us nowhere. It is just the easy thing to do. The hon. member whose bill we are debating today is down on the government because the government is being responsible and protecting the integrity of the unemployment insurance system, a system that has served Canadians well for more than half a century.

Just what are we asking under this provision of the Unemployment Insurance Act? Are we asking workers to do anything more than ensure the UI branch that they are genuinely in an employer-employee relationship? No, we are not. We are simply requesting that workers fill out the required forms and let us know the precise nature of their working relationship with a family member. This is not too much to ask if it helps reduce the UI deficit and maintain the fund's integrity.

It would not surprise me at all if the majority of individuals in this situation would support this requirement because it will guarantee that working for their relative fulfils their obligations under the act of employer-employee relationship.

I implore the hon. member not to use the scattered shotgun approach to fixing problems to UI and other social problems. Let us look carefully at the whole package, as we are presently doing. During our review of the system the hon. member for Saint-Hubert and all hon. colleagues will have every opportunity to present constructive ideas on changes to UI. I encourage them to do so in that context.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Standing Order 44(2) in part states:

(2) a reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion—

(3) In all cases the Speaker shall inform the House that the reply of the mover of the original motion closes the debate.

Since no other members are rising, I will recognize the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, who will close the debate.

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking hon. members for their interest throughout this debate on Bill C-218. I particularly want to

express my thanks to members who have solidly supported a cause that is just and democratic, a cause that is reflected in Bill C-218.

However, we cannot close this debate without responding to certain claims that repealing paragraph 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act would inevitably increase the likelihood of abuse and fraud and lead to a sharp increase in UI claims.

I refer more specifically to what was said by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville who, on April 21, expressed his apprehensions about Bill C-218. The hon. member's fears are clearly ill-founded. The hon. member seems to think that paragraph 3(2)(c) of the Unemployment Insurance Act is a punitive provision. The sole purpose of this section is to discriminate against a substantial part of the population that contributes to the fund and pays premiums but is treated unfairly and inequitably when the time comes to claim benefits. These individuals, who may have paid unemployment insurance premiums throughout their working lives, are denied the benefits to which they are entitled because a public servant at the Department of National Revenue has decided that their employment is not insurable and that as a result, they cannot receive these benefits.

I referred earlier to concerns that were expressed by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. I think he can take some comfort from sections 73 and 74 of the act and from the powers of investigation conferred under sections 92 to 106 of the same act. The purpose of such provisions is to deter potential offenders. The Unemployment Insurance Act already incorporates procedures to curb abuse and prevent fraud. Stiff penalties are already provided for with respect to anyone who would dare to contravene the act. This means that, as it stands and regardless of paragraph 3(2)(c), the act already has teeth and can bite.

Opponents of this bill also quoted some interesting statistics, showing that, on average, 85 per cent of benefit claims are found to be admissible after review. Opponents of Bill C-218, and the Minister of Human Resources Development in particular, maintain these are very satisfactory results. The parliamentary secretary is glad that the vast majority of benefit claims are not fraudulent.

(1810)

How can he allege that the very existence of paragraph 3(2)(c) is justified? How can we claim that the act as it now stands is fair and equitable to 85 per cent of those who must wait months and even years before a decision is made as to whether or not their jobs are covered by UI?

These people, the majority of which are women who help run the family business, are honest people with no intention of committing fraud. Yet, they are treated like cheats until they can prove otherwise.

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 99)*

The member for Calgary North added insult to injury when she said in the House on September 20:

If a woman works for her husband in a small business, then she must be prepared to convince Revenue Canada that she is in fact in a true employee-employer relationship [—]

It is very wrong that in 1994 women in family businesses must still have to prove that they are really working, as though their work were not real and these women were only foils for their husbands. It is this kind of archaic thinking that underlies the philosophy of the present law and denies working wives and dependants the same protection and benefits as the rest of the population.

This is an opportunity to say loudly and clearly in this House that we cannot close our eyes and give our tacit consent to such an unfair and unjust law. I therefore ask hon. members to vote for Bill C-218 and above all to think of all those who are still waiting for a decision from a revenue department official.

**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 said motion?

**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.

(1830)

[*English*]

*And the division bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The division will be taken row by row starting with the mover and then proceeding with those in favour of the motion seated on the same side as the mover. The votes of those who are in favour of the motion on the other side of the House will be recorded.

(1835)

Those opposed to the motion will be called in the same order.

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

## YEAS

## Members

Althouse	Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Bouchard	Bélair
Bélisle	Caccia
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	Debien
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Fry
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Guay
Ianno	Jacob
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Shefford)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Marchand
Mercier	Minna
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Solomon
St-Laurent	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—53	

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Anderson
Assadourian	Augustine
Benoit	Bernier (Beauce)
Bertrand	Bethel
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Bridgman	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Catterall
Chan	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
DeVillers	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
English	Epp
Finlay	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Gaffney	Gagliano
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Guarnieri
Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (MacLeod)
Hopkins	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lincoln	Loney
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	Malhi
Maloney	Marleau
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick

*Adjournment Debate*

McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Milliken
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Peters
Phinney	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Ringma
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Solberg
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—126

## PAIRED MEMBERS

	Members
Anawak	Asselin
Bernier (Gaspé)	Brien
Crête	Deshaies
Discepola	Fewchuk
Flis	Guimond
Hubbard	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lefebvre	Loubier
MacAulay	Manley
Patry	Peterson
Pillitteri	St. Denis
Whelan	de Savoye

(1840)

*[Translation]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

(1845)

*[English]*

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

## SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the week before last I raised a question in the House with the Deputy Prime Minister about the proposals in the green paper for post-secondary education funding.

We all know that there is much in the green paper which talks about the importance of education, skills upgrading and training to Canadians and to Canada in terms of our ability to compete in the new world economy.

I am glad to see those comments in the green paper but the proposals which the Minister of Human Resources Development goes on to suggest for post-secondary education belie this rhetoric.

The minister is proposing that the \$2.6 billion which each year goes to the provinces for post-secondary education instead go to students in the form of loans. We remember that federal government transfers to the provinces were first cut by the Liberal government prior to 1984. Those cuts were continued by the Mulroney government through the 1980s and into the 1990s and of course, as we all remember, were vigorously criticized by the Liberal Party while in opposition. Now the Liberals are back in government and those cuts continue.

The government rationale here appears to be that the cash portion of post-secondary education funding coming from the federal government to the provinces is going to disappear anyway because of this trend begun first by the Liberals and continued by the Conservatives. As it is going to disappear why worry about tuition fees going up, they are going up already. Let us just let them go up even further.

What the government is planning to do in spite of arguing, quite rightly, for the importance of post-secondary education, is planning to slash \$2.6 billion from post-secondary education and make that available as loans to students and have an income contingency loan repayment system.

The contradiction is quite clear. It is time the government recognized that it cannot say good things about post-secondary education and then cut funding to post-secondary education and expect Canada to compete in the world economy.

The imposing of a heavy burden of loans on students will of course lead to less accessibility of education as more and more potential students decide that they simply cannot afford to incur such heavy loans.

A study in Australia which has a similar program to that being proposed by the government has found that the average man repays 50 per cent of his loan by the age of 28 years but it takes an average woman until she is 38 years old in order to pay 50 per cent of that loan because of the difference in earning capacity for women. We know that Canadian women earn significantly less than Canadian men and thus they will be the most heavily burdened by this process.

Perhaps the most cynical and disturbing part of this proposal is what this government is doing is saying to Canadians and to Canada that the agreement that we have always regarded as important, that post-secondary education is an important contribution both to the student and to Canada as a society, is no longer the case.

What this government is saying is that the burden of paying for post-secondary education and thereby the benefits will all fall to the student and Canada will not benefit in the slightest.

*Adjournment Debate*

This completely contradicts every study done in Canada since the Massey commission in 1951. It is stupid and the government should change its strategy and position on this.

It has done a good job of politicizing students in 1994. I am glad to see the students have seen through this government's action on this. I urge the government to change its policy and make post-secondary education an investment in Canada and Canadians and stop imposing the burden on Canadian students.

(1850)

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond.

Under the present system Canada spends a lot, about \$16 billion, on post-secondary education. The federal government alone spends \$8 billion annually. The cash portion of the EPF transfers to the provinces is slowly ratcheting down. As the cash portion decreases the invisible portion which is given to the provinces through tax points is increasing. This is an invisible endowment to the provinces which will grow from about \$4 billion in 1996-97 to \$6 billion within 10 years.

The provinces will make the decision whether or not to pass on some or all of this cash reduction to students. Nobody yet knows how much will actually be passed on. That remains to be seen. Many factors will influence their decisions.

At the same time we face different pressing realities. Government resources are shrinking but more people need more education to get and to keep a job. Full time college and university enrolments are up 36 per cent since 1981 and 3 million workers, 25 per cent of the workforce, want to upgrade their skills and cannot afford it.

The discussion paper asks whether the federal government's role should remain as is or whether we should develop a more strategic approach. One option proposed in the green paper is to use the cash to invest in a new permanent program to provide more loans and grants to individual students.

Each \$1 we spend could mean \$4 in loans, \$500 million could mean \$2 billion in loans. Instead of declining cash loans would remain constant. Along with tax transfers this would mean the total resources available to the post-secondary education system would continue to grow in order to meet increasing demands for more learning opportunities for more Canadians.

ETHICS

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this adjournment debate to ask more questions and try to get some clarification about this ongoing saga that has continued in the front benches.

I would like to make the Chair aware again of the remarks I made on Friday where I asked the Prime Minister about his particular quote in which he said and I quote from *Hansard*:

I consulted the government's ethics counsellor and the one I appointed for myself—

We asked questions about that and did not seem to get wonderful answers. The Prime Minister replied to me on Friday morning, October 28 and I quote from *Hansard* at page 7367:

The ethics counsellor was consulted yesterday and gave his advice. The advice he gave was given to me and it did not force me to change my mind about the decision I took a few days ago.

It is pretty straightforward. It would seem to me that would make perfect sense if we took the Prime Minister at his word.

However this morning the ethics counsellor appeared on national television, CBC Newsworld. I quote from the transcript that we were provided where the interviewer said: "You're saying then that the Prime Minister at no point asked you to rule on the ethics of this letter". Mr. Howard Wilson replied: "No. That is quite clear. The Prime Minister indicated that he had handled it and came to the conclusion and he stated it".

This seems perfectly clear to me that the ethics counsellor in fact was not consulted, was not asked for his advice. There is a huge discrepancy here and we want to get to the bottom of it.

There are any number of guidelines for cabinet ministers, the most recent of which I quote from, when we look at quasi-judicial bodies versus the judiciary. It would seem to me pretty straightforward again where these guidelines from the Privy Council Office in a confidential document say to ministers: "You are advised to take very special care to avoid intervening, or appearing to intervene in cases under consideration by quasi-judicial bodies". It is again fairly straightforward to me. It would seem like the minister certainly knew what his bounds were and he stepped outside of them.

I would just like to finish before asking the parliamentary secretary to respond to this by pointing out that the Prime Minister has made it clear over and over again that you should not phone a judge no matter what. I refer to a situation that went on in the House yesterday and of course in the newspapers recently where the Prime Minister said that I was being dreadful for bringing up an incident in which he phoned a judge in 1971. Of course he said that he was just asking when the particular court case on this bankruptcy would be. That is fine. The *Globe and Mail* accused him further of saying that he had tried to intervene in that case.

(1855)

Regardless the instance, regardless the circumstance, this Prime Minister stood in his place a number of times in the last week and said that no cabinet minister should phone a judge ever, for any reason, period. That seems fairly straightforward to me.

*Adjournment Debate*

We are trying to get to the bottom of this. I hope that we get further answers and further clarification from the parliamentary secretary right now.

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the question of October 28.

In our parliamentary system it is the Prime Minister who is ultimately accountable for the actions of his government and who must answer to Parliament and to the public. There can be no substitute for responsibility at the top. It is the Prime Minister who sets the moral tone for the government and who makes the ultimate decisions when issues of trust and integrity are raised. That is what leadership is all about. As the Prime Minister said yesterday during question period, the buck stops here.

The ethics counsellor plays a very important role in advising the Prime Minister in conflict of interest issues, but at the end of the day it is the Prime Minister who must make the decisions. He must make the decision about membership in the cabinet. Creating an ethics counsellor with a reporting relationship to Parliament will not change this fact.

The ethics counsellor envisioned in the red book had a focus on lobbying. This government extended that to a much broader range of ethical issues, including administering and enforcing the revised conflict of interest code which replaced the old conflict of interest guidelines.

The ethics counsellor's responsibilities in the two domains of conflict of interest and lobbying put him in a unique position to make a significant contribution to restoring public confidence in government.

The ethics counsellor is available to the Prime Minister to investigate allegations of impropriety by public officeholders and to advise the Prime Minister accordingly, but he is only an adviser. At the end of the day the Prime Minister is ultimately responsible for ministers and senior officials.

Under Bill C-43, the lobbyists registration bill, the ethics counsellor has independent powers with respect to the lobbying industry. If there are grounds to believe there has been a breach—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Mackenzie.

## CHILD CARE

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday I raised a question with the Minister of Human Resources Development to whom I had given notice. Eleven ministers of agriculture for Canada had agreed to an initiative to help with community development, particularly concerning child care. The Department of Human Resources Development had allo-

cated some \$720 million for 150,000 child care spaces in this budget year. I was asking how much of that would be dedicated to rural child care.

I raised this question because we have just come through a harvest season which is a very busy time on farms. As always there have been reports of some injuries to children because of the exigencies of harvest.

The modern farm is not the idyllic place that we read or think of in mythology. There are huge machines around. There is noise. There are chemicals. There are factory type buildings. There are sinkholes that children can get caught in. There are grain augers. There are all sorts of hazards for children. It is not a place particularly for very small children to be involved. However, both parents of necessity are required to contribute to the work, especially in busy times and it is unsafe and quite impractical for those children to be among the machinery and animals on the farms.

There has always been difficulty in setting up child care facilities for rural areas because of the low population and great distances and the need for very flexible hours. Families will sometimes need child care for short periods of time during harvest and seeding that would run from eight o'clock in the morning until 10 or 11 at night. The rules that have been set out for urban child care just are not adequate and do not fit.

(1900)

For the decade and a half that I have been in this Chamber, I know of groups that have been trying to find a model for rural child care that is flexible, that will work, and that provides all of the requirements for children and still provides the basic necessities available for urban child care but can be adapted to rural communities.

We have watched a model of child care develop at Langruth, Manitoba. That very small community of some 500 souls has developed a child care facility that meets all of those requirements. It has been in operation for about two and a half years and provides child care for some 40 children. It is considered to have overcome most of the organizational problems, the service delivery models and particularly provides the required flexibility.

There is an old saying that it takes an entire village to raise a child. All communities whether they are strung out rural communities or local neighbourhoods in cities understand that. Particularly in an era of the global village we understand that the whole of society must contribute to the raising of a child. Therefore it is only fair that the money which has been allocated for child care should also be equally available to rural families.

I would hope that the government would state how much, what proportion and what its plans—

*Adjournment Debate*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order please. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the member for Mackenzie.

This government is committed to improving child care in Canada. In its red book the government committed itself to investing \$720 million toward that end. The intent is to expand existing child care in Canada by 150,000 new quality child care spaces, 50,000 to be phased in over the next three year period.

The implementation of the federal initiative will be done in co-operation with the provinces since child care is a provincial responsibility. Initial discussions with provincial authorities have shown that rural child care is a priority for any new spending. However no decisions have been taken yet on the allocation of spaces. The provinces will decide on the distribution of funds and services to their rural communities. During these discussions most provinces indicated a preference for rural population in new cost sharing arrangements with the federal government.

In his question, the member referred to Langruth, Manitoba as a model for delivering rural child care. This centre is an excellent example of federal-provincial co-operation. The centre became operational through provincial support and federal funding under the child care initiatives fund program. The centre's program is designed to meet the specific child care needs identified by families living in that rural community.

I would remind the member for Mackenzie that the federal government currently contributes significantly to the cost of child care services in Canada. The federal government is contributing in excess of \$400 million annually to support child care services mainly through the Canada assistance plan. Clearly that is not enough and more needs to be done. The human resources minister tabled a discussion paper on social security reform which addressed the whole issue of child care. Page 53 is the reference.

In closing, I would like to invite the member for Mackenzie to submit any proposals on how we could develop child care in rural parts of Canada to the Minister of Human Resources Development. I am sure he would be very interested.

## RAILWAY WORKERS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am here today to pursue a question that I asked of the Deputy Prime Minister. The Minister of Transport was not in the House at the time but I asked the Deputy Prime Minister whether or not letters that were being sent to the Prime Minister with respect to something the Minister of Transport had said would be answered.

These letters are from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the United Transportation Union and others. They were calling on the Prime Minister to ask the Minister of Transport to apologize for remarks that he had made and to which railroaders had taken offence.

(1905)

Subsequent to my question and to putting in for this adjournment debate the Minister of Transport had an opportunity to explain what he had to say in the House during question period earlier today.

I listened carefully to what he said. I think he could probably bring the matter to a close if he had added, and perhaps that is what he wants to do now, that if people took offence at what he said that he would apologize. He explained himself earlier today but did not actually apologize. Clearly some very sincere offence was taken at what the minister said. I look forward to what he has to say.

While I have him here and because I have so much difficulty in communicating with the minister on the floor of the House, perhaps he might also want to comment on a couple of other matters.

Recently a colleague of his, the member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon said that we would be better off without Churchill in the Canadian port system. This runs directly contrary to promises made by the Liberals in Manitoba during the last election.

Another matter has to do with Manitoba and Liberal promises during the last election has to do with the Liberals making a lot of promises in Winnipeg with respect to stopping the flow of jobs from Winnipeg to Edmonton on the part of CN. Subsequent to the election of the new government, CN has announced that it will be moving its rail traffic control centre and its crew calling offices from Winnipeg to Edmonton in 1995.

Here we have two Liberal promises to Manitoba, that Churchill would be revived and that the bleeding of jobs from Winnipeg to Edmonton on the part of CN would be stopped. What do we have? We have the rail traffic control and the crew calling jobs being transferred from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and we have a Liberal chair of a committee looking into ports and the seaway, et cetera, saying that we would be better off without Churchill.

I hope the minister can deal with these matters, repudiate the member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon and say that Churchill is still part of the plan for the Liberal government. Could he also say that pursuant to the promises made by his colleague, the member for Winnipeg South and the minister of human resources, that the Ministry of Transport and the government will be instructing CN to stop this constant diminution of Winnipeg as a rail centre by transferring jobs to Edmonton.

*Adjournment Debate*

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for recognizing that I had tried to explain the context in which the remarks were made in Winnipeg.

I do not know the rules on this, but let me explain with respect to Churchill. There is a marine review going on and Churchill will be addressed as well as the comments made by my hon. friend whom he mentioned in his speech.

With respect to jobs in Winnipeg, CN has just announced hundreds of jobs in Winnipeg. I was there a couple of weeks ago and that was confirmed, so there has been an effort to retain some jobs there.

I want to address specifically the question that was raised a couple of weeks ago. In the 1950s and 1960s, thousands of CN employees worked in my province and many times I heard about the challenges that employees faced when representing their union brothers in trying to improve salaries, working conditions and safety conditions.

Many of these men to whom I spoke and listened to were veterans of World War I and II, like Luc Roussel and Bill Dunn who I mentioned this afternoon. They were very proud of what they had achieved in their military service but they understood they had very limited educations which was through no fault of their own. They had fought for their country and then they fought for their rights as workers, faced by highly skilled lawyers, negotiators for powerful railroad interests.

I said in Winnipeg that all parties today have to recognize their responsibilities with respect to where railroads are and what is happening, whether it is government or management. I also said that under no circumstances would I point a finger at those achievements arrived at by men who in many instances had only grades 7, 8 or 9 education who worked very hard at protecting their rights and the interests of those who have succeeded them.

Everybody in that room in Winnipeg, with the exception of the three people who walked out, knew exactly what I meant. It was a compliment to people who had made an enormous effort in the face of very difficult odds to achieve rights that were theirs.

I want to take up my friend's suggestion and apologize to anyone who has been misled by the way those remarks were interpreted. I apologize if anyone felt slighted by them because those achievements were remarkable in those days. Now I think it is time for us to move on and make sure that the railroaders of today have a future by making sure the conditions they work in and the railroads they work for can be viable.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Colleagues, pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), 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 7.11 p.m.)

# CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 2, 1994

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### **London Investment and Education Council**

Mr. O'Brien ..... 7551

### **Deficit Reduction**

Mr. Laurin ..... 7551

### **Organized Crime**

Mr. Ringma ..... 7551

### **Social Reforms**

Mr. Finlay ..... 7551

### **Remembrance Day**

Mr. Culbert ..... 7552

### **Pharmacy Awareness Week**

Mr. Szabo ..... 7552

### **National Film Board**

Mr. Plamondon ..... 7552

### **Government Expenditures**

Mr. Williams ..... 7552

### **Stay in School Initiative**

Mr. Bevilacqua ..... 7552

### **Service Kanada**

Mr. Maloney ..... 7553

**Entrepreneur of the Year Award**

Mrs. Brushett ..... 7553

**National Defence**

Mr. Jacob ..... 7553

**National Film Board**

Mr. Thompson ..... 7553

**Pharmacy Awareness Week**

Mr. Malhi ..... 7553

**Member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie**

Mr. Cauchon ..... 7554

**Agriculture**

Mr. Althouse ..... 7554

**CIDA Funding**

Mr. Hart ..... 7554

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Ethics**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7554

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 7554

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7554

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 7555

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7555

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 7555

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) ..... 7555

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 7555

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) ..... 7555

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 7555

Mr. Manning ..... 7555

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7555
Mr. Manning .....	7555
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7556
Mr. Manning .....	7556
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7556

### **Carrefour Jeunesse–Emploi**

Mr. Dubé .....	7556
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7556
Mr. Dubé .....	7556
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7556

### **Ethics**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7557
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7557
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7557
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7557
Mr. Crête .....	7557
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7557
Mr. Crête .....	7557
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7557

### **Ethics**

Miss Grey .....	7558
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7558
Miss Grey .....	7558
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	7558

### **Program for Older Worker Adjustment**

Mr. Ménard .....	7558
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7558
Mr. Ménard .....	7558
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	7559

### **Canada Post**

Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais .....	7559
------------------------------	------

Mr. Dingwall ..... 7559

**Ethics**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 7559

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 7559

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 7559

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 7559

**National Defence**

Mr. Fillion ..... 7559

Mr. Collenette ..... 7560

Mr. Fillion ..... 7560

Mr. Collenette ..... 7560

**Ethics Counsellor**

Mr. Epp ..... 7560

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 7560

Mr. Epp ..... 7560

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 7560

**The Environment**

Mr. Jordan ..... 7561

Ms. Copps ..... 7561

**Rail Workers**

Mr. Guimond ..... 7561

Mr. Young ..... 7561

**Guidelines**

Mr. Hermanson ..... 7561

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 7561

**Rail Line Abandonment**

Mrs. Wayne ..... 7561

Mr. Young ..... 7562

## **Presence in the Gallery**

The Speaker .....	7562
-------------------	------

## **Privilege**

### **Comments in Question Period**

Mr. Hart .....	7562
Ms. Copps .....	7562
The Speaker .....	7562

## **Points of Order**

### **New Democratic Party**

Mr. Blaikie .....	7562
The Speaker .....	7562

## **ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

<b>Supplementary Estimates (B), 1994–9</b> .....	7563
--	------

## **Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken .....	7563
--------------------	------

## **Supplementary Estimates (B), 1994–95**

### **Reference to Standing Committees**

Mr. Eggleton .....	7563
Motion moved and agreed to .....	7563

## **Petitions**

### **Gun control**

Mr. O'Reilly .....	7563
--------------------	------

### **Serial killer cards**

Mr. O'Reilly .....	7563
--------------------	------

<b>Human rights</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	7564
<b>Rights of the unborn</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	7564
<b>Assisted suicide</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	7564
<b>Young Offenders Act</b>	
Mr. Comuzzi .....	7564
<b>Assisted suicide</b>	
Mr. Mayfield .....	7564
<b>Human rights</b>	
Mr. Mayfield .....	7564
<b>Rights of the unborn</b>	
Mr. Mayfield .....	7564
<b>Assisted suicide</b>	
Mr. Taylor .....	7564
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mr. Taylor .....	7564
<b>Rights of the Unborn</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	7565
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	7565
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	7565
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	7565
<b>Rights of the Unborn</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	7565

<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	7565
<b>Rights of the Unborn</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	7565
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Wappel .....	7565
<b>Leonard Peltier</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	7565
<b>Rights of the Unborn</b>	
Mr. Calder .....	7566
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Calder .....	7566
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Calder .....	7566
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Solomon .....	7566
<b>The Senate</b>	
Mr. Solomon .....	7566
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	7566
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	7566
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	7566
<b>Motion for Papers</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	7567

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## Canadian Wheat Board Act

Bill C-50. Report stage ..... 7567

### Speaker's ruling

The Deputy Speaker ..... 7567

### Motions in amendment

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 7567

Motion No. 1 ..... 7567

Mr. Benoit ..... 7567

Motion No. 4 ..... 7567

Mr. Althouse ..... 7567

Motion No. 5 ..... 7567

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 7567

Mr. Benoit ..... 7568

Mr. Althouse ..... 7569

Mr. Landry ..... 7571

Mr. Taylor ..... 7571

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) ..... 7572

Mr. Goodale ..... 7573

Division on motion deferred ..... 7575

Division on Motion No. 4 deferred. .... 7575

Division on Motion No. 5 deferred. .... 7575

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 7575

Motion No. 2 ..... 7576

Mr. Benoit ..... 7577

Mr. Althouse ..... 7577

Mr. Taylor ..... 7578

Division on motion deferred ..... 7579

Motion No. 3 ..... 7579

Mr. Benoit ..... 7579

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 7579

Mr. Taylor ..... 7580

Mr. Goodale ..... 7580

Division on motion deferred ..... 7582

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Unemployment Insurance Act

Bill C-218. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	7582
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	7582
Mrs. Ur .....	7583
Mr. Johnston .....	7584
Mrs. Picard .....	7585
Mr. Murray .....	7586
Mr. Kirkby .....	7587
Mrs. Venne .....	7588
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 53; Nays, 126 .....	7589

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### Social Program Reform

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) .....	7590
Ms. Augustine .....	7591

### Ethics

Miss Grey .....	7591
Ms. Augustine .....	7592

### Child Care

Mr. Althouse .....	7592
Ms. Augustine .....	7593

### Railway Workers

Mr. Blaikie .....	7593
Mr. Young .....	7594

### Appendix