



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 120

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday November 3, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday November 3, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

The House resumed from November 2 consideration of Bill C-50, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on the motions at the report stage of Bill C-50, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

The first division is on Motion No. 1.

Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 100)

### YEAS

#### Members

Bachand  
Bouchard  
Canuel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
Dubé  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Guay  
Lalonde  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Marchand  
Ménard  
Paré  
Pomerleau  
Sauvageau  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Bellehumeur  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Crête  
Daviault  
de Savoye  
Dumas  
Godin  
Jacob  
Landry  
Laurin  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Mercier  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Rocheleau  
St-Laurent  
Venne—36

Adams  
Allmand  
Anderson  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Bellemare  
Berger  
Bethel  
Blaikie  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Brushett  
Belair  
Calder  
Chan  
Clancy  
Collenette  
Copps  
Culbert  
Dingwall  
Duhamel  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Epp  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Galloway  
Gilmour  
Goodale  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Hanger  
Harb  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Kirky  
Kraft Sloan  
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)  
Loney  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Mayfield  
McCormick  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
Meredith  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Morrison  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Ouellet  
Parrish  
Peric  
Phinney  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Riis  
Ringuette—Maltais  
Rompkey  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Silye  
Solberg  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Szabo  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer

### NAYS

#### Members

Alcock  
Althouse  
Arseneault  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Barnes  
Benoit  
Bertrand  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Bridgman  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Catterall  
Chatters  
Cohen  
Collins  
Cowling  
DeVillers  
Dromisky  
Duncan  
Easter  
English  
Finlay  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gerrard  
Godfrey  
Gouk  
Guarnieri  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harvard  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hopkins  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Johnston  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lincoln  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Malhi  
Marchi  
Massé  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
McKinnon  
McTeague  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Pagtakhan  
Patri  
Peters  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Ringma  
Robichaud  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Sheridan  
Simmons  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Strahl  
Taylor  
Terrana  
Thompson

*Government Orders*Wood  
Zed—159

Young

## NAYS

## PAIRED—MEMBERS

## Members

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien	Deshaies
Discepola	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	Manley
McWhinney	Peterson
Plamondon	Serré
St. Denis	Walker

(1035)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 negatived.*[English]*

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

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

*(Division No. 101)*

## YEAS

## Members

Bachand	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bouchard
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour	Godin
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Jacob
Jennings	Johnston
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Mercier
Meredith	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne	White (North Vancouver)

Williams—73

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Culbert	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Marchi	Massé
McCormick	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Phinney	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Riis
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Solomon
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Ur
Valeri	Verran
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Young
Zed—127	

## PAIRED—MEMBERS

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien	Deshaies
Discepola	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	Manley
McWhinney	Peterson
Plamondon	Serré
St. Denis	Walker

*Government Orders*

(1045)

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

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

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

*(Division No. 102)***YEAS**

## Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie	Riis
Solomon	Taylor—6

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Chan
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Copps	Cowling
Crête	Culbert
Cummins	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Duncan	Dupuy
East	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fillion	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gerrard	Gilmour
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Guarnieri
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harb

Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Harvard
Hayes	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Leroux (Shefford)	Lincoln
Loney	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchand
Marchi	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Mercier
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Peric
Peters	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Ringma
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Solberg	Speller
St-Laurent	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur	Valeri
Venne	Verran
Wappel	Wells
White (North Vancouver)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—195	

**PAIRED—MEMBERS**

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien	Deshaies
Discepola	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	Manley
McWhinney	Peterson
Plamondon	Serré
St. Denis	Walker

*Government Orders*

(1050)

*[Translation]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 5 negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

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

*(Division No. 103)***YEAS**

## Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Blaikie	Bouchard
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Davault de Savoye	Debien
Duceppe	Dubé
Fillion	Dumas
Godin	Gagnon (Québec)
Jacob	Guay
Landry	Lalonde
Laurin	Langlois
Lebel	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Marchand	Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard	Mercier
Paré	Nunez
Pomerleau	Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau	Riis
Solomon	Sauvageau
Taylor	St-Laurent
Venne—45	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Chan
Chatters	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	De Villers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Epp	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)

Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Phinney	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringma	Ringette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Simmons	Solberg
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Ur
Valeri	Verran
Wappel	Wells
White (North Vancouver)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—157	

**PAIRED—MEMBERS**

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien	Deshaiés
Discepola	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	Manley
McWhinney	Peterson
Plamondon	Serré
St. Denis	Walker

(1100)

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

*[English]*

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find the House would give its consent to apply the vote taken on Motion No. 4 to Motion No. 3, save and except that

I think a member of the New Democratic Party may make a small alteration to that for the purposes of his colleagues.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr, Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, I concur that we would accept the application of the vote taken on Motion No. 4 to Motion No. 3 that is before us.

We would like yes votes to apply to the members for Kamloops, Winnipeg Transcona, Mackenzie, The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, and Regina—Lumsden.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

*(Division No. 104)*

**YEAS**

Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Blaikie
Bouchard	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond—Guirail
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Gagnon (Québec)	Gilmour
Godin	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Guay
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
St-Laurent	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—79	

*Government Orders*

**NAYS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bellemare	Berger
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Calder	Catterall
Chan	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
DeVillers	Dingwall
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hopkins	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Massé	McCormick
McKinnon	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peters	Phinney
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Ur
Valeri	Verran
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Young
Zed—121	

**PAIRED—MEMBERS**

Asselin	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien	Dashaies
Discepola	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gray (Windsor West)	Guimond
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	Manley
McWhinney	Peterson
Plamondon	Serré
St. Denis	Walker

*Government Orders*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the House would agree to take the vote on Motion No. 5 and apply it in reverse to this motion. I think you would find the result is identical.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

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

*(Division No. 105)*

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Allimand	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Chan
Chatters	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Dingwall	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Epp	Finlay
Fontana	Fry

Gaffney	Gagliano
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Meredith	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Phinney	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringma	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Simmons	Solberg
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Ur
Valeri	Verran
Wappel	Wells
White (North Vancouver)	Williams
Wood	Young
Zed—157	

## NAYS

## Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellehumeur
Bouchard
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond—Guiral
Debien
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Guay
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Riis

Rocheleau  
Solomon  
Taylor  
Venne—45

Sauvageau  
St-Laurent  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

#### PAIRED—MEMBERS

Asselin  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Brien  
Discepola  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Lefebvre  
Loubier  
MacDonald  
McWhinney  
Plamondon  
St. Denis

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Deshaies  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Guimond  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
MacAulay  
Manley  
Peterson  
Serré  
Walker

(1110)

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

When shall the bill be read a third time? At the next sitting of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I could not hear your question; I wonder if you could go back to it. Did you ask when shall the bill be read a third time, and what was the answer?

I ask that with consent it be later this day. I did not hear you ask the question because of the noise. I think you would find consent of the House to have the third reading of the bill later this day.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to have the bill read a third time later today?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is objection to the third reading of the bill today.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

**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, a number of order in council appointments which were made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

### Routine Proceedings

#### SOUTH AFRICA

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, six months after historic elections in South Africa, I am taking this moment to speak about the government's interim and new program which Canada is beginning to implement in South Africa.

As members know, Canada has a long and honourable tradition of support to the people of South Africa. What a joy it was for those of us Canadians who were privileged to participate in the election process of April and May.

[Translation]

However, South Africa needs constant support if it is to successfully emerge as a democratic society, prosper economically, and develop the potential of its population as a whole.

The transition from apartheid and conflicts to reconciliation and rebuilding will bring new challenges.

[English]

I am presenting to the House today an outline of Canada's new three-year bilateral program with an allocation of up to \$20 million for the next fiscal year.

In the past resources from the Canadian International Development Agency as well as from Canadian NGOs, churches, academia, businesses, professional groups and unions have been critical in facilitating the heroic strides of the South African people toward a more democratic society.

For a number of years we have worked with South African groups disadvantaged by apartheid to lay the basis for their involvement in their country's affairs.

(1115)

CIDA has extended its special South Africa fund. This fund will next year make available \$2.5 million to Canadian organizations which have already established strong linkages with partners in South Africa.

With the end of apartheid and the inauguration of Nelson Mandela as president, the Canadian government has acted promptly to re-establish bilateral relations in a number of areas. We have extended the general preferential tariff to South Africa. A Canadian trade office was opened in Johannesburg in February 1994 during a visit by the Minister for International Trade.

Subsequently Canadian exports to South Africa for the first six months of the year were about 75 per cent higher than they were for the same period last year. A significant portion of these exports is in the form of manufactured and high technology Canadian products.

*Routine Proceedings*

Throughout the transition period there has been a strong level of interest in Canadian models of government and experiences. This interest continues.

In July of this year the South African minister of constitutional development led a high level delegation of ministers, MPs and academics to study our system. This week another group of South African public servants is visiting Canada to acquaint themselves with how we develop our foreign policy.

[Translation]

Moreover, South Africa asked for and was given advice on various issues, especially on the refugee status claims processing system it is setting up. Canada offered to help South Africa become an active member of several multilateral organizations.

[English]

For our efforts and our expertise Canada has been singled out. On September 1 South Africa's minister of arts, culture, science and technology, Dr. B.S. Ngubane, speaking in his country's Parliament acknowledged the contribution through Canada's International Development Research Centre to the creation of a science and technology initiative.

The government has made a commitment to open the process of foreign policy making to all Canadians. In May of this year we held a major consultation in Ottawa and invited representatives of academia, the business community, church groups, unions and developmental non-government organizations to discuss priorities for the new South Africa. Their input has been vital in establishing the four key priorities for the next three years in South Africa.

The first priority is governance. We will continue with our \$10 million public service policy project funded by CIDA and managed by the International Development Research Centre. In addition we will begin more intensive training of senior civil servants and government officials from among groups previously excluded from top government positions.

[Translation]

The second priority is human resource training to improve the education sector and correct the past injustices of apartheid. As we all know, it is critical to raise the general skill level of the population. To work efficiently, a society needs a more open and tolerant political culture.

[English]

Third, we will have strengthened civil society. With the transition to a new government many of the old organizations which were organized around resistance now need to transform themselves into bodies which can represent their constituents in a more peaceful but effective manner. We will support them in making this transition.

The fourth priority will emphasize economic growth in South Africa with a particular focus on the participation of black business people in various sectors of the economy as well as the consolidation of Canadian linkages.

We believe that linking our four priorities with the help of all our Canadian partners is the only way Canada can ensure coherent, broad based development which will promote enduring peace and security in South Africa. We need to protect and nourish the South African beacon of hope on the African continent for the sake of all on that continent.

I thank all Canadians for their collaboration in this process.

[Translation]

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the Bloc members, I am pleased to speak on the issue of South Africa. The Secretary of State is giving us this opportunity, this morning, with her outline of the new interim program Canada is beginning to implement in that country. We must welcome this new Canadian commitment very favourably. Indeed, South Africa needs the constant support of the international community to be able to pursue successfully its democratization process.

(1120)

As I mentioned in this House on April 26, while for the first time, Blacks in all the villages, towns and cities of South Africa were starting to vote in order to elect representatives, as parliamentarians, we cannot remain indifferent to the testimony of an elderly citizen who told us: "Now that I have voted for the first time in my life, I can die".

As indicated by the Secretary of State, governance, human resources training, strengthening the civil society, and economic growth in South Africa seem to be well-targeted priorities. We are confident that they will make it possible to sustain coherent development, which will bolster lasting peace and social justice.

This three-year \$20 million program is very timely. We believe that Canada, in addition to its foreign aid action and its remarkable involvement in UN peacekeeping, must make the promotion of human rights and democracy one of the key areas, if not the cornerstone of its foreign policy.

Canada's recent turnaround on this fundamental issue does not augur well. If the Secretary of State is as concerned about promoting democracy as she would have us believe this morning, can she tell us what she really thinks of her government's drastic change of direction on this issue, a change which is far from identifying democracy and human rights as one of the main elements shaping Canada's foreign policy?

*Routine Proceedings*

I want to take the opportunity given to us this morning to call upon the Secretary of State to intervene. Her government's lack of leadership on the issue of human rights is an outright shame. I urge her to ask her Prime Minister not to renege on Canada's international commitments such as those made at the 1989 Dakar Francophone Summit, where the 42 French-speaking countries passed a Canadian resolution to give basic objective status to the protection of human rights in the international community.

Indeed, respect of individual rights was confirmed as a determining factor in the granting of international assistance at the 1991 Commonwealth Summit in Zimbabwe. So, on behalf of the thousands of Chinese people who have been left to rot in prison unjustly, I call upon her, I urge her to ask her Prime Minister to raise publicly the issue of human rights violation during his visit to China. It is her duty to do so, unless she too is afraid that Canada will be laughed at.

But the example of South Africa speaks for itself. This shift the government is making will unfortunately cause the issue of human rights to be discussed behind the scenes, to humour certain nations, particularly potential commercial channels for Canada. We suggest that Canadian action should be consistent. Canada should have the courage of its convictions if it hopes to be respected and to maintain its credibility around the world.

[English]

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Secretary of State for African and Central American Affairs for recognizing the need of South Africa and continuing the longstanding relationship that our countries have had.

Having spent time working and travelling in the country, I am always struck by the enormous amount of potential that the country has both in terms of human and material resources. It can be the powerhouse that drives the whole southern half of a continent, a continent tragically that is littered with the carcasses of countries in various states of economic and political ruin.

The end of apartheid done so admirably by the country and with such extraordinary restraint is a resolution to only one-half of their problem. The other half, perhaps the more difficult one, still faces them. This is where our country can have an extraordinary effect.

We must do this given the constraints of the economic woes that we have within our own country.

(1125)

The trick of course will be for the South African government to guide its country through the mine field of economic and societal problems that face it toward a productive, vibrant

economy that is safe and peaceful, a society where everybody has equal rights under the law, a society where everybody has the opportunity to achieve their greatest potential.

We must do this to ensure that South Africa does not wind up on the tragic heap of African countries that have fallen to such a state of disrepair and I am optimistic that South Africa will not be one of them.

I have some questions for the hon. member. I see no amount as to the total amount of the aid package which will be given. This must be known. I would like to know exactly what projects are going to be funded and on behalf of the taxpayer request that accountability be set into the system.

I would also like to know exactly where these dollars are going in order to ensure that they are going to go to the people intended. I would encourage the member to involve a review process of the project so that we can assess and determine whether the moneys that we are spending are going to help the people who truly need them.

However, if I can synthesize the major problem that affects South Africa in its near natal stage, in its new South Africa, it will be the income disparity that exists between whites and blacks. This disparity and the extraordinary high expectations that have come post-election and how the government deals with this will be an incredibly important determining factor in the success or failure of the new South Africa.

Under the yoke of apartheid and through the sanctions, there have been bred at least two generations of people without money, without jobs and without hope which in turn has bred an extraordinarily high level of violence and many areas of siege mentality.

These expectations are asking for immediate gratification, expectations that unfortunately cannot be met in the short term. The cure for this lies in real sustainable jobs for the future which will provide the people with the funds to produce the necessities for life, education, good health and food and provide the tax structure and tax base that the government can utilize to provide for the infrastructure required.

It will also provide for a vibrant middle class, especially among the poor black populace. This is exceptionally important and cannot be underestimated. It will help to make the transition from the era of apartheid to a new South Africa one that is coherent and one that will be moving in the future for safety and prosperity for all.

I would however encourage our government and the Government of South Africa to listen to the following. Income distribution does not involve soaking the rich. It will be ineffective and counterproductive and will only drive out the skilled business sector and be counterproductive to those people who are meant to help.

*Routine Proceedings*

It is only by retaining these skills and the goodwill of the business sector that help will be provided for the larger, broader poor and essentially the black population and enable them to improve their living standard.

It is important also for South Africa to encourage foreign investment and foreign investment from lending institutions. We must avoid quick social fixes because they do not work.

Social reform is imperative with education and primary health care and widely accessible birth control and public housing being at the top of the list. This cannot come at the expense of a free market economy but must occur in tandem.

In 1993 the government developed a \$12 billion deficit. It must learn from our mistakes and not continue to spend in a deficit fashion. What it does is this. We know from our own sorry experience that it only seeks to compromise the very social programs and services that we hope to provide as governments.

It must also avoid greater government intervention. It is as we know a country that has an extraordinary amount of government intervention in its private sector. We must help it as a country to move away from that. We must therefore encourage its people to move toward privatization. We must also encourage the drop in tariff barriers and decrease the tariffs according to GATT.

Canada can indeed help this and I applaud the government in extension of the general preferential tariff. I would encourage it to remove as soon as possible the double taxation system that exists for companies that wish to invest in South Africa. This will go a long way toward helping our companies as well as their country toward a more productive, economic discourse between our two countries.

South Africa in essence needs trade, not aid, and the liberalization of trade between our two countries is of greatest importance.

(1130)

I will conclude by saying that what has happened in that country has been truly extraordinary, the move by themselves away from apartheid with extraordinary divisions among the people and doing it in a peaceful fashion to move toward an era of hope and prosperity for all. I hope our country will enable them to do this within the constraints of our country's economic woes. I hope the hon. member will provide the information I asked for on the aid package that has been given.

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speak-

er, I have the honour to present the 46th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the associate membership of the Standing Committee on Health.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is unanimous consent of the House to dispense with the reading of the 46th report of the standing committee. I move that the 46th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the name of the following member be deleted from the list of associate members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs: Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing); and that the name of the following member be added to the list of associate members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs: Mr. Solomon.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many Canadians asking Parliament to ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

This petition is signed by Ontario residents from Cobden, Kitchener, Hales Station, Pembroke, Eganville, and CFB Borden, Mississauga, Chalk River, Calabogie, Bancroft and also from Low, Quebec.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by over 5,000 people from the riding of York North and throughout the greater Toronto area in response to the murder of Brian Baylen, an employee in the town of Richmond Hill.

The petition calls for amendments to the Young Offenders Act. The petition urges the government to allow more realistic maximum penalties for violent crimes, to redefine the term young persons and reform sentencing in the Young Offenders Act.

I thank the residents of York North and in particular Susan Chase, a constituent of York North who made such great efforts to bring these concerns to the attention of Parliament. I personally will undertake to bring this petition to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of Jo Congdon and 50 others in which the petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase of sexual orientation.

(1135)

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my responsibility today to present two petitions. The first petition is signed by 416 people from the riding of Calgary West and mainly other parts of the city of Calgary.

It asks that Parliament not amend the human rights code, 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 human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes from 135 electors also mainly in Calgary West and other parts of the city of Calgary.

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

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to present two petitions on behalf of 185 constituents.

In the first petition I would like to draw the attention of the House to the inadequacies of the Young Offenders Act. The petitioners are requesting that a complete and thorough review of existing legislation take place particularly aimed at changes to sentencing length on repeat offenders.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition would like to draw the attention of the House to the issue of sexual orientation.

*Government Orders*

My constituents are requesting that Parliament not amend the human rights code or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Scott (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the House that Question No. 47 on the Order Paper has been there now for some 200 days. I would like to ask the government when we might expect an answer to that question.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I regret that there has been some delay in replying to some of the questions on the Order Paper.

The particular question to which the hon. member refers is one to which I have received a partial answer. Because the answer was incomplete I sent it back to the various departments requesting that a complete and full answer be furnished for the hon. member.

I do not know whether that request will be answered fully or not. However, when I receive further replies from the departments I will bring the answer I have to the House and make it available to the hon. member by depositing it in the House. If there is a further question of course he may want to ask it at that time.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I wish to inform the House that, because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 15 minutes, pursuant to Standing Order 33(2)(b).

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## MARINE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-38, an act to provide for the security of marine transportation, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (for the Minister of Transport)** moved that the bill, amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Robichaud (for the Minister of Transport)** moved that the bill be read the second time.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.)

(1140)

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is a new procedure, colleagues, which is why we have confusion up here.

**Mr. Fontana:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. You alluded to the fact that it was a new procedure with respect to Bill C-38. I do want to thank all members of the House who worked on this bill at the standing committee for their co-operation. That is why this bill is moving so positively through the House. I convey that message of thanks to all members of all parties.

**Mr. Milliken:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you would find unanimous consent to proceed with third reading of Bill C-50 at this time. If that could be the next item of business called, I think it would be appropriate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to proceed with third reading of Bill C-50 at this time?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans), Lib.)** moved that Bill C-50, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, grain production in Canada has never been a static industry. From the time wheat was first introduced to Western Canada in 1812 by the Selkirk Settlers in Manitoba's Red River Valley, the crop has been in a state of change. It has been adapted and improved to meet the needs of producers and consumers. Producers are always looking for improvements in qualities such as plant vigour, early maturity, resistance to shatter and resistance to rust. Consumers, in turn, look for the qualities they need to use the product in a variety of ways.

Here in Canada, we have been successful in breeding new crop varieties to meet these changing needs. Since the early 1930s, over 600 new crop varieties have been introduced. Canada has set international standards for quality with the wheat and barley we have developed. Still, as the needs of consumers and producers have become more finely focused, more sophisticated plant-breeding techniques have become necessary. While our research scientists may find varieties which fill our current needs, we cannot afford to rest on our past successes. Our grain crops must be able to adapt to the requirements of an ever-changing world.

For producers, it is important that the crops grow efficiently with excellent field performance.

(1145)

From an environmental standpoint, this means high-yielding crops so we can free land resources for other uses. It also means crops which require reduced amounts of pesticides, fertilizers and other chemicals to reach their maximum potential.

The results of continued research allow prairie farmers to effectively produce the grain crops our customers demand. The need for this research comes from our industry and from producers. Grain growers across the prairies have told the minister that they want to play an important role in research since the results of research directly affect their operations and their livelihood.

This is why the Minister of Agriculture recommends amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act to allow voluntary levies to be deducted for the express purpose of supporting plant breeding research. An amendment is necessary since such deductions are not possible under the existing Canadian Wheat Board Act.

This check-off program has been developed in close consultation with the 12 prairie farm organizations that make up the Western Grains Research Foundation. These supporters include the United Grain Growers, Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association, Manitoba Pool Elevators, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Alberta Wheat Pool, Prairie Canola Growers Council, Flax Growers Western Canada, Keystone Agricultural Producers, Western Barley Growers Association, Oat Producers Association of Alberta, Canadian Seed Growers Association and Unifarm. Scientists from universities and from the department have also participated in planning this program.

With the passage of Bill C-50, research funds would be generated through voluntary levies on wheat and barley sales.

The proposed check-off program would apply a voluntary levy of 20 cents a tonne on wheat and 40 cents a tonne on barley. It is anticipated that this would generate about \$4.7 million annually in funds to be applied directly to wheat and barley plant breeding research. This would be in addition to the over \$21.5 million on wheat research in the 1993-94 crop year and a further \$8 million on barley research which this government is already committed to.

Levies would be applied to producers' final payment cheques from the Canadian Wheat Board and placed in a special account. Funds from this account would be transferred to the Western Grains Research Foundation (WGRF), which will administer the research funding program. It is important to note that in maintaining our fiscal responsibility to all Canadians, this new program will create no new agency, institution or bureaucracy. This means that more producer dollars will go to research.

*Government Orders*

(1150)

The administrative structure already in place at the Canadian Wheat Board would be used to collect the levy and a proven producer-driven research funding agency would distribute the funds. Total incremental administrative costs associated with this program are estimated to be in the range of 2 per cent of total levies collected.

By using structures already in place, we would be able to maximize producers' investments in research. The Foundation will report to all CWB permit book-holders so that they can see whether it is using their funds wisely. In a sense, the ultimate accountability of this program is that it is voluntary.

If a CWB permit book-holder does not agree with what the Western Grains Research Foundation is doing, he can withdraw from the program. The Foundation needs to demonstrate to producers that it is using their funds wisely, in order to maintain their support. At this point, I should add that the WGRF, a federally chartered public organization, has a proven track record in supporting effective pure research.

The importance of the investments made by our grain producers in research cannot be overestimated. This research has the potential to increase yields by 15 per cent, which could translate into additional gross earnings of \$400 million a year for western grain farmers. This \$400 million is not hyperbole, especially when you consider that a one-bushel-per-acre increase in wheat yields in Western Canada at today's prices would increase revenues by \$100 million.

This program will help Canada remain competitive in the international market and help us maintain our position with other exporters. Just as important, research like this will help further the development of value-added products in the grains sectors. I mentioned earlier the increased income of potential international customers. It is these value-added products which will give us a distinct advantage when we are dealing with these customers, and it is research which will give Canada an advantage in developing new products.

This initiative is an excellent example of industry taking the lead in research funding. It also illustrates this government's willingness to address needs Canadians themselves have identified and to form strong partnerships for the good of all Canadians. With producers and government working together, all Canadians will share in the benefits of this program. I therefore recommend that the House approve Bill C-50, amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act to allow voluntary levies to be deducted in support of this important research program.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to thank and congratulate my colleague

from Beauséjour, the Secretary of State for Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans, for his great history lesson on the development of Western Canada.

He traced its evolution from 1812 through the dark years of the economic crisis in the 1930s to the subsequent development of 600 new wheat varieties.

(1155)

We are participating in this afternoon's third reading of Bill C-50 in the light of the discussions held and the amendments debated a little earlier this week. I doubt we will learn anything new today. We covered all the bases and I am still convinced that this bill could be improved.

This bill amending the Canadian Wheat Board Act did not in the end give rise to a great debate. There was a good exchange of ideas but nothing revolutionary, although it is unusual to see the producers themselves propose that deductions be made from their earnings in order to finance wheat and barley research. This initiative of Western farmers deserves to be encouraged and commended.

I remember that former Liberal Minister of Agriculture Eugene Whelan—who left his mark, as all parliamentarians will agree—once told us that every dollar invested in agricultural research and development brings in \$7. This is an investment that even you would not hesitate to make, if you could lend your money to a bank in return for a 700 per cent profit.

At the very beginning of the process involving this bill, we had an informal meeting with senior officials from Agriculture Canada. They explained to us that this bill was based on an initiative of Western grain producers. Of course, my colleague from Beauséjour insisted several times that the amendment to the Canadian Wheat Board Act was a voluntary initiative of these farmers who, by filling out a form specifically designed for this purpose, could opt out of contributing to the private research fund.

Officials from the Department of Agriculture estimate the participation rate at 90 per cent. I was, I admit, very surprised to hear that 90 per cent of them would agree to pay 40 cents a ton on barley and 20 cents a ton on wheat to set up a private research fund.

However, I would advise my colleague from Beauséjour, the Secretary of State, as well as the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to be very vigilant because, although 90 per cent is a lot, 10 per cent of farmers will benefit from research and development but without paying for it. If participating farmers are pushed around, they will opt out. And if the participation rate drops to somewhere around 50 per cent, it will no longer make any sense for these farmers to contribute voluntarily.

*Government Orders*

At first glance, it would seem very inappropriate for the Bloc Québécois to go against the will of producers, who wish to take control of their future. What they want is simple. They are prepared to take a part of their profits and invest it in wheat and barley breeding research.

(1200)

This bill is necessary because it will allow the Canadian Wheat Board to make deductions from wheat and barley producers' final payment cheques for the explicit purpose of plant breeding research. The Minister of Agriculture tabled Bill C-50, an Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, because the Board does not currently have the right to make such deductions.

The check-off will be made on the payment at the time of delivery. The rate is currently set at 40 cents for one ton of barley and at 20 cents for one ton of wheat. These rates were arrived at by estimating research costs, in millions of dollars, and dividing the total by the number of tons bought. I was surprised to see that, although the bill only refers to wheat, the amendments will affect wheat and also automatically barley, because of the regulations. It seems that two distinct funds will be set up, one for wheat and one for barley.

The rates which I just mentioned will be fixed by the Governor in Council; they will not be specified in the act. That provision will allow certain classes of grain or certain provinces to be excluded. For example, Alberta will not participate in the check-off program for barley, since the Alberta Barley Commission already makes such deductions.

If necessary, the amount of the deduction will simply be changed by order in council. Again, I tell the minister and his parliamentary secretary that if they are too greedy and if they lower the government's contribution in order to force greater direct funding from agricultural producers, they might see a number of these farmers withdraw from the program.

Since the issue was raised when the member for Mackenzie tabled his amendment, I will state my position again. If the CWB starts competing with a province and jeopardizes its efforts, it would be preferable for that province to be able to opt out of this voluntary contribution program.

Based on the 90 per cent participation rate anticipated by the minister, the Board expects to collect \$4.7 million, that is \$3.8 million for wheat and \$900,000 for barley. That money will be used to finance research on four basic aspects: wheat and barley breeding, as well as ways to improve acre yield. I may point out that finding a way to increase the yield per acre of wheat or barley by only one bushel would mean an additional \$100 million earned.

As anyone in business will tell you, your profit is not on the first hot dog but on the last one you sell that day. Farmers know perfectly well that when they start taking the crop off a field, the first bushel does not pay but the last bushel is pure profit. The same applies to milk. The last cow you milked pays for that meal at a restaurant or a show on the weekend.

(1205)

The third component would be to enhance the resistance of varieties to disease and parasites and the fourth, to find new varieties that are better able to meet new market demands.

There is still one question: Why is Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's research budget unable to meet the needs of grain producers? Why? The government tells us that the budget for research is \$18.7 million. In that case, why should producers pay for parallel research? Please do not misunderstand me. I think it is an excellent idea to encourage producers to take the initiative and go ahead with solutions which they know will be to their advantage.

However, the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food should not use the private sector as a way to get out of its commitments or, even worse, let it run the show.

A few weeks ago, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tabled a bill that clarified his department's role, including its involvement in research and development. Despite this restructuring, Western grain producers will conclude that they have to pay twice to get the kind of research they need. We moved an amendment in order to solve that problem, and to avoid duplication between research made in centres which will get contracts and research being done by the Department of Agriculture.

Under this bill, the Canadian Wheat Board would distribute money received through deductions to research centres breeding new strains of wheat and improving existing ones.

Under our amendment, the agency would have had to make enquiries and determine that the information being sought by the research would not become available as a result of other similar research. We are just trying to avoid paying twice for the same research.

As taxpayers, producers already pour \$18.7 million into research and development projects on wheat and barley. However, they will have to invest an additional \$4.7 million to direct the research according to their own priorities.

The Department of Agriculture maintains that, with the research and development budget being eroded, it is important that the private sector takes over. Unfortunately, I am always afraid that, over the years, we will see the emergence of a certain mindset, and that the federal contribution to research and development activities will diminish while that of the producers will increase. This a real threat, and only time will tell if the Bloc Québécois was right to be so concerned.

*Government Orders*

Research and development are key elements to our staying competitive on foreign markets, and it is no secret that in order to increase our exports, we will need to produce more at a lower cost.

(1210)

It is important to encourage such initiatives. The private sector, that is the producers as well as the industrial entrepreneurs, must play a more active role if research and development activities are to increase. However, it is crucial that the government fulfil its mandate, by continuing to finance research and development on a fair basis. In this case, we are talking about subsidizing a private research organization.

This research agency is the Western Grains Research Foundation and it has already studied the issue. In the grain industry, there are some benefits to private funding for research projects which I would like to list. It meets specific needs identified by those who finance the research activities.

However, we must be careful so that the bigger producers do not get to control the research at the expense of smaller producers. Since voluntary contribution is based on the number of tons of wheat sold, the main producers will, of course, invest more. With the amendment we proposed, the Canadian Wheat Board would have had to check the research being done before awarding the contracts.

Then, if the research being conducted did not sufficiently meet the needs of small producers, the Canadian Wheat Board would have been able to do something about it, since it would have known what research it wanted to further. Also, the information remains confidential.

But whatever we say about it, the fact is that two elements can influence the choice made by grain producers. First, the budget allocated by the department for this purpose is not enough. Even though the department advocates new market opportunities, it does not provide the tools needed to access new markets. Second, the research and development projects on wheat and barley that the department is financing do not reflect the priorities of the industry. This goes to show that the needs of the industry are somewhat misunderstood.

Before I conclude, I want to say a few words about the amendments that were before the House yesterday afternoon. You see, a political party cannot pretend to know everything. Acting in a very fair manner, the Bloc Québécois came up with two amendments to Bill C-50 in order to help farmers. My colleague for Vegreville also presented, on behalf of the Reform Party, two amendments that make a lot of sense and are very fair, and my colleague for Mackenzie also put forward an amendment to Bill C-50.

This morning, I watched very closely the results of the vote and, to my surprise, the government party, led by the minister, defeated all five amendments thanks to its majority. I admit that

the opposition may sometimes move conflicting amendments that do not agree but, in this case at least, it seems to me that we found a very positive way to lend a hand to the government party, not to criticize but to improve its bill. It refused. It said no.

(1215)

For example, we asked the minister to submit the report of the Canadian Wheat Board to us, the elected representatives, within 15 days following the day he receives it. This was a suggestion from my colleague for Vegreville. It seems to me that elected representatives like the hon. member for Frontenac, the hon. member for Vaudreuil and the hon. member for Vegreville should not have to wait six months before seeing this report. A fifteen days delay would have been reasonable. No. The government does not want restrictions or limits. Could it be that it has something to hide? Why did it refuse? The fact is it refused.

I will conclude by stressing how important it is to avoid duplication and overlap of research projects conducted by the department and by the private sector even if it is stated that research plans will be discussed between concerned stakeholders to avoid such a thing. It would seem that the projects funded will be complementary but, unfortunately, there is nothing to that effect in the law.

Again, I urge the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to better protect the interests of the farmers across the country and especially in Quebec. You see, Bill C-50 will not be costly for the public purse. Bill C-49 neither, but it will not do a lot of good. All it did was to change the name of the department from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

I dream of the day when the Department of Agriculture will take concrete steps to make our farmers whose living depends on supply-managed products feel secure. Quebec farmers are a bit worried about the implementation of the GATT agreements on January 1, 1995, less than two months from now.

I was reading this morning a press release from the Department of Agriculture announcing the elimination of the surtax on beef imports from New Zealand and Australia. This 25 per cent surtax was abolished on October 7. In May, the minister had increased import quotas to 85,000 tons of beef carcasses from New Zealand and Australia.

And I was interested this fall in the sale of our young steers. I kept track of what was going on in Quebec, particularly in Sawyerville, Victoriaville, Princeville, Sainte-Marie de Beauce and Saint-Hyacinthe, and our producers were proud because, for once, we could sell our cull cows, that is our dairy cows that are no longer productive. These cull cows are sold for beef. The price was 60 to 62 cents a pound and up to 65 cents in some cases. Immediately after the minister announced the elimination of the 25 per cent surtax, the price dropped.

*Government Orders*

(1220)

In the case of slaughter calves, they sold for \$1.25, \$1.30 and up to \$1.35 at the beginning of September, but as soon as meat processors were informed of the elimination of the 25 per cent surtax, the price started to drop to a point where, today, Quebec producers sell their steers for about the same price as in 1980. Fourteen years later, the price per pound is the same while production costs continue to increase.

I was visiting a farm last week and the producer showed me a small plastic container that is used to milk cows. He told me that, on average, he breaks about two of these a year and that he has to be very careful. That small plastic container looks like a plain drinking glass. He showed it to me and asked: "How much do you think this plastic container costs, Jean-Guy?" Obviously, I gave a higher figure than what seemed a fair price: "Seven or eight dollars". That was not it. The salesman from Laval was there. The farmer said: "It is not \$7 or \$8. You know, farmers are used to that. Spare parts are always very expensive". The real cost, as indicated on the bill, was \$45.

I told him: "The day you break that small plastic container, Laurent, you would be better not to get out of bed, because with that mishap, your profit for the day is gone". He agreed. The same thing is true for tractors and farm machinery. It is always amazing. Input and operating costs keep going up, but there has been no increase in beef prices over the last 14 years.

The Minister of Agriculture is trying to justify the reduction and elimination of the 25 per cent tariff on beef imports from New Zealand and Australia. In conclusion, I fear that, once the GATT agreement is in force and tariffication applies, as is the case with negotiations with our neighbours— Tariffs have been set at a very high level, I agree, and they will deter imports, but let us take cheese, for example.

Right now the tariff on cheese is 287 per cent under the GATT agreement that should normally come into force on January 1. If we prove to the Minister of Agriculture there is not enough cheddar cheese in Canada, he will order a lowering of the tariff from 287 to 100 or even 40 per cent or he will simply do as he did for the New Zealand beef and will abolish it altogether.

That is a real concern. I said earlier I was looking forward to the day when the Minister of Agriculture will rise in this House and change the legislation in order to give a feeling of security to farmers. Nearly 85 per cent of all farmers in Canada have to work outside their farms to make ends meet. Only 15 per cent of the agricultural community can earn a living with farming.

We cannot say agriculture is sick, but we can certainly say it is not healthy. There is discontent, serious discontent, and it is undoubtedly one of the reasons why it is so difficult for farmers at retirement age to find someone, whether one of their children

or someone else, to buy the farm at a fair price and to take over the business.

(1225)

There are no new farmers to take over the business, and when you look at the way things are, when you look at the future with open eyes, you realize that maybe young people are right to wonder whether there is still a future on the farm.

I am one of those who believe there might be a future in farming, but our governments would have to take a stance and stick to it.

Just think about what happened as recently as last winter, when we negotiated with the United States for the export of durum wheat. We had a flush in our hands, we had everything we needed to win on that issue, but we lost. We just lost. Will it always be like this? In the course of negotiations, we give some, but we also win some.

In the case of the durum wheat, it was a perfect case. We lost it. In Quebec, our farming industry is based almost entirely on supply management. Quotas will disappear, after tariffs have been set at a rather high level. We hope that it will not be dramatically reduced year after year, because our Quebec farmers would be thrown on welfare or unemployment or onto the streets. We do not know exactly what will happen to quotas, but for many farmers they were their pension funds. I do not know what will happen six years down the road, when the value of quotas will be virtually down to zero.

All this to tell you that the Bloc Québécois, despite the flaws in Bill C-50, will vote for it, because that is what farmers want. They are the ones who demanded it. Of course, the bill is not perfect. But, between asking for perfection and voting against it, the Bloc Québécois has chosen to support it, even if it means amending it next year, because with time, we will see what goes wrong with Bill C-50.

*[English]*

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be speaking on Bill C-50, a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. In my presentation today I will talk about the bill itself, what is in the bill. I will talk a bit about the improvements that should have been made to the bill, some of the amendments that were put forward but unfortunately were not made. I will talk about the missed opportunity at a time when the Canadian Wheat Board Act has been opened up to change and the real missed opportunity because there were not more substantial changes made to the bill.

I will start today by talking about the bill itself, Bill C-50, the bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Canadian Wheat Board by allowing refundable check offs on wheat and barley on sales of wheat and barley to the board.

*Government Orders*

This refundable check off is to be used for plant breeding research. I will summarize some of the provisions of the bill. The bill would allow for deductions from the farmer's final payment checks for each pool period, unless the farmer filed each year to the Canadian Wheat Board to be exempted from the refundable check off, from the deduction. The bill places this revenue in a fund with the Canadian Wheat Board which will be distributed to the Western Grains Research Foundation.

The Canadian Wheat Board must estimate how much money it will take from farmers per tonne for the grain to provide the \$4.7 million it wants to raise from this bill for research, again funding that will be directed to the Western Grains Research Foundation.

(1230)

The research funding agency would distribute the money to people or organizations for research based on what the board of directors for the foundation determined.

There will be an additional reserve account set up which will put money into a special fund, a contingency fund intended to cover shortfalls from any particular year, shortfalls in funding, in case of a higher opt out rate or poor production on the prairies or just lower shipment levels through the Canadian Wheat Board.

There is to be an annual report provided to the minister from the Western Grains Research Foundation each year and under the present provisions of the bill, the bill that we are going to vote on, this report must be presented by the minister within six months. One of the amendments I will talk about later states this report should be made public more quickly and the report should be made public as soon as it is presented to the minister from the foundation.

In terms of the rationale behind the bill, the purpose for the bill, it is assumed that the benefits will be accrued to farmers for the following reasons. It will give farmers a role in supporting and directing research into new varieties of wheat and barley. It will link more closely the wishes of the agriculture industry, in particular farmers but others as well. It will give them more responsibility in directing where the research funding goes. I think this is an important part of this bill.

It will provide \$4.7 million of additional research for development of new varieties of wheat and barley, varieties which will be grown in western Canada.

It may improve the development of new marketing alternatives, new marketing opportunities through the development of better varieties that are more readily marketable. Hopefully it will improve farm income through increased returns to farmers and a higher profit margin to farmers.

That is the intent of the bill. Reform does support this bill. I support this bill and the Reform Party supports this bill for the following reasons. We believe that research does benefit farmers and we believe that research money collected through the Canadian Wheat Board presented to the Western Grains Research Foundation will benefit farmers. Not only do we believe that but many farm groups believe that and have supported this bill.

In talking to individual farmers in my constituency it seems that most individual farmers also support this refundable check off that will go to research.

There are some conditions put on this and really some hesitation on the part of farmers, I have found. They hesitate because the number of check offs on the sales of their commodities is increasing all the time and they are concerned that there are too many.

Farmers do recognize very well the importance of research. Farmers are willing to do their part in directly funding research. Farmers are also becoming concerned about the number of check offs, and this is another one.

I believe the support is there but it is becoming hesitant and I think with new check offs there will be strong resistance at some point.

This bill would have been improved substantially through amendments that were presented. I would like to speak briefly first about the second Bloc amendment, Motion No. 2. I believe the intent of that amendment was good. Reform did not support that amendment because the interpretation which we got from the legislation was unclear. Because of that we just found that we could not support the amendment.

I think the intent would have been to ensure that the Western Grains Research Foundation funding is not duplicated, is not already done somewhere in Canada or somewhere else. Overlap and duplication would have been prevented.

(1235)

I think the intention of that motion was good but again, because of the way it fit into the legislation, we found that it was unclear. We were afraid that the Canadian Wheat Board would have been given the responsibility of making sure that money spent by the Western Grains Research Foundation was not on research already being done.

We were afraid—I was certainly concerned—that the Canadian Wheat Board would be given that responsibility. We do not want the wheat board to be involved in any way other than providing a convenient collecting mechanism.

*Government Orders*

Reform put forward two amendments to the bill, both of which I believe would have strengthened the bill. The first one was accountability. What we proposed is that the minister's report which he receives from Western Grains Research Foundation would be made public in a very short time through this House. I believe that accountability is needed. The hon. member for Malpeque on previous bills has pushed for a very similar type of accountability.

Our second motion was to simplify the process that farmers would go through to opt out of making their contributions to the wheat board and ultimately to the research foundation through this check off. What we proposed was adding one small box to the Canadian Wheat Board's permit application form which a farmer could check off if they wanted to opt out of the program for that year.

Some in the industry and some other members in this House opposed that method of opting out because they said that it is too easy to do. I am very concerned when government supports action whereby a bureaucracy interferes unnecessarily with decision making.

In other words, in this case the people who opposed our amendment to make this easy said let us make it more difficult for farmers to opt out through added bureaucracy. I believe that is morally wrong.

In too many places in our lives and especially in the lives of business people we have government interfering through the bureaucracy to make business more difficult to do. I am really quite upset that this motion was not supported, especially considering the reasons that were given for not supporting this motion.

I believe these two motions and the intent of the second motion would have substantially improved this bill but they did not pass.

What I would like to talk about now is the missed opportunity. The Canadian Wheat Board Act was opened. Why did we not make substantial changes to the act?

My colleague, the member for Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, and I went to a Canadian Wheat Board rally in Regina about two weeks ago. What did we see at this rally? Did we see a bunch of radical farmers out to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board, this body which has been a very important body in western Canada for marketing grains? No, that is not what we saw.

We saw very reasonable people speaking on changing the Canadian Wheat Board to improve it, to make it better for farmers. After all, this organization exists for farmers and it is funded by farmers. It is their organization. They wanted improvement.

I want to just talk about what a couple of speakers said at this rally in this regard. One gentleman talking about needed changes talked about how the Canadian Wheat Board was established in the first place. It was established originally in the 1930s. It disappeared and came back during the war under the War Measures Act as a monopoly.

That is when the wheat board first gained its monopoly power. It was in 1942 under the War Measures Act. It gained monopoly power so that Britain in particular could buy cheap food from Canadian farmers. Like so many pieces of legislation, instead of having a grandfather clause which would have the legislation end after a certain period of time it just continued.

(1240)

Again I want to say that the Canadian Wheat Board has served a useful purpose. When the Canadian Wheat Board was set up we had a situation in the world first of all in western Canada in which farmers had a very poor communication system, very poor transportation and the grain buying companies were taking advantage of farmers because of the world they lived in, with poor information, poor transportation.

The Canadian Wheat Board, as did the wheat pool, served a very useful purpose in dealing with this problem. Back then we were dealing in a world where we had central desk buyers and central desk sellers. It worked well having a central desk seller selling to a central desk buyer. What wheat really was at that time was basically one commodity with a few different grades. This wheat board was marketing a fairly uniform commodity to a world that was not all that concerned with getting exactly a certain quality or a certain type of wheat. Under those conditions the wheat board worked well.

What has happened is that the marketplace has changed. The world has changed. Now we have farmers who have extremely good communication systems. We have wheat which is no longer just wheat but is dozens and dozens of different commodities.

Buyers buying wheat want a very specific product and we are looking at dozens of different products. Are we selling to central desk buyers any more? No, we are not. There are very few central desk buyers in the world so what we have now are mini-sellers because farmers want to become more active in selling. Grain companies servicing farmers want to become more active in selling outside of Canada as well. We have these mini-buyers and mini-sellers funnelling through the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Wheat Board not selling to few buyers but selling to many buyers.

We have the wheat board now which has become a funnel which takes a product from mini-sellers and sells to mini-buyers and again it is not just wheat or barley. There are many different, very specific products that these buyers want. We live in a different world.

*Government Orders*

I believe that the Canadian Wheat Board still can serve a useful purpose and so did these farmers at the rally. They said they were not out to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board, they were out to improve it. They talked about a voluntary wheat board and I thought they presented their case for a voluntary wheat board as they called it very well.

There was one other farmer who really explained very well some of the problems we have with the board as it is. This story is going to sound really silly to anyone familiar with the grain industry but it is true. This farmer talked about his own situation. He had built a flour mill on his farm. He was processing flour, wheat, strictly from his farm. He was selling flour all across western Canada but he was selling specialty flour so he had to mill this flour from a very select type of wheat, his own wheat.

The problem is that to operate within the law he has to market his wheat through the Canadian Wheat Board to sell to his mill. It is absurd but it is true. Not only that, he would only be allowed to sell as much wheat as the quota levels would allow. In spite of the fact he is milling his own wheat in his own mill he would be restricted by a quota level. It is absurd but that is what has happened.

This story I believe demonstrates very well why we need to open the Canadian Wheat Board to change, to positive change, to changes that farmers support.

This rally in Regina would have been an excellent meeting for the minister to have attended as it was in the minister's riding in Regina. It was really unfortunate I think and the farmers felt really cheated that the minister was not there. They were very pleased to see us there. They saw MPs who do understand there is a need for change to the Canadian Wheat Board.

I want to ask a question of farmers and other small business people, managers, owners. Would a farmer or another small business person allow a government agency to come in and manage their farm? They own the farm and they fund it. How many small business people would allow a government agency to come in and manage their operations? I say very few.

(1245)

The Canadian Wheat Board is owned by farmers, funded by farmers and is supposedly for farmers. Then why on earth is it managed by government appointed commissioners? That is exactly what is happening and it does not make any sense.

With regard to the Canadian Wheat Board, farmers want to be able to elect a board of directors. Recent polls have shown that over 90 per cent of western Canadian farmers want an elected board of directors to replace the government appointed commissioners. Does that sound so unreasonable?

The minister must act very quickly to allow for a farmer elected board of directors. After the farmers have elected the board of directors, the farmers should be allowed through referendum to determine what type of wheat board they want to serve them. They could choose to keep the board as is, which they certainly will not do from everything I have heard. They could choose to eliminate the board completely, which they certainly would not do from everything I have heard.

There is a new movement to completely eliminate the board. I do not believe it is a strong movement. I do not believe a majority of farmers support it. I believe the options that would be chosen are somewhere in between. The first option would be to open the wheat board to competition on a continental basis. A continental market in barley and wheat is the first realistic option.

The second realistic option would be to open the Canadian Wheat Board to competition anywhere in the world. More and more farmers are supporting this all the time.

Another possible option would be to open the board to competition but allow the Canadian Wheat Board only to buy in export positions. It would eliminate the interference that the Canadian Wheat Board has in our transportation system, car allocation system and grain marketing system. It would let it stay in place to do its job in the export market. I believe it could serve a useful role in that regard.

Let farmers decide that. It is not for me to decide. If they have another option that suits them, let them put the option forward to be voted on in a referendum. Let them choose the option they want.

I would like to ask a rhetorical question: Why is the minister so opposed to making the changes that farmers want? I am not going to try to say what his motives are for refusing this change.

I would like to end today with a story. It is a story about a farmer I know who is the anxious type. Some say he has an attitude problem. To relieve his anxiety, on Sunday mornings he goes out to his road. He calls it his road because he was the one who pushed to have it built and the one who pushed to have it paved. He likes to go to the end of his driveway and on to his road on his five-speed. On Sunday mornings the road is his. There is a curve down the road. He likes to get the car going about 100 before he gets to the curve and by the time he hits the curve have it up to 140. It makes him feel good; it relieves his anxiety.

One Sunday morning he went out on his road, started to accelerate, and what does he see around the bend? A car was coming down his road on Sunday morning. He was upset. He was more anxious than ever. He started down his road and the approaching car swerved. He said: "My God, a drunk on my road on Sunday morning". As the car got closer he saw that it was a lady driver. He said: "Oh my, a lady driver on my road on a

*Government Orders*

Sunday morning". As the car got closer, the lady stopped the car and opened her window. He slowed down but did not stop. As he went by he heard the lady shout "pig". He was really anxious then and said: "sow" and he went on. He was more anxious than ever and hit the curve at 120 and as he started to accelerate into the curve he hit the pig.

(1250)

When that story was told to me it was to demonstrate how an attitude problem can interfere with the ability to change, but I am not so sure that is the only way to interpret the story.

I believe that pig in the way of that farmer is in fact government. The biggest interference farmers have with doing business is government. Certainly, if that pig is not government, that pig and other pigs are being dropped in front of farmers by government and are interfering with them doing business. I believe government must stop dropping these pigs in front of farmers and other business people.

In closing, we support Bill C-50, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board. We would have liked the bill amended, but I believe it is supported widely by farmers and I am looking forward to the legislation being enacted.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak at third reading of Bill C-50. I note several of the previous speakers have wandered considerably off the topic of the bill.

I want to make a quick allusion to the story we just heard concerning the man who presumed it was his road and all the problems he got into as a result of that false assumption. That is one of the basic problems of many people who are opposed to the wheat board and want what they call change. They too fall into the trap of making false assumptions about reality.

The man presumed that it was his road and that no one else should be on it on a Sunday morning. What they presume is that the wheat board is just another buyer, just another grain company in the market, when in fact it is marketing the grain for all growers in western Canada. Once they get their heads around that space it will begin to make a lot more sense. That is one of the difficulties of my friend from Vegreville and his colleagues.

The bill deals with how to finance plant breeding. It is a further proposal by government, following some proposals of the last government and some that were put forward in the Trudeau administration, to extract itself from publicly financed plant breeding. Publicly financed plant breeding has a long history in Canada, going back well over a hundred years. When John Wise was the minister of agriculture we celebrated a hundred years of plant breeding under the Department of Agriculture in Canada.

In my region of western Canada it was an extremely exciting initiative that was taken more than 100 years ago. Without the publicly sponsored plant breeding effort that occurred at the central research station in Ottawa and the varieties that were developed for early maturing hard spring wheat, my region would not have had a reason to exist in the world of agriculture.

The varieties that existed prior to that time were not suitable for my region with its relatively short growing season. The development of Marquis wheat attracted the population there and made it possible for it to be economically viable. It made agriculture on the prairies the bread basket of the world, according to publicity at the turn of the century. Of course we were never that big.

(1255)

Many countries grow more wheat and more grain than does Canada, but few countries export as much of their production as we do. We export about 80 per cent of our production. None of the other countries are forced to do that because they have larger populations and consume it at home.

Because of this we developed the marketing institutions to which some of my friends in the House have been referring. Essentially we built on that success by continuing the publicly financed breeding program to get around diseases that came up, rust that developed and insects that developed over time. As the region continues to grow grains, some of these pests and hazards insert themselves into the land and into the environment. It is a constant struggle to change varieties so they will be resistant to insects, pests, rusts, fungi and so on.

I noticed the minister made reference to the fact that it was possible to get as much as a 15 per cent increase in yield due to plant breeding. It is on paper and it is in the test plot. However when we go on to the farms and start dealing with the exigencies of the overall environment and the climactic changes that occur over time, it requires a lot of other attendant improvements in agriculture to keep yields up. Some older varieties will still yield almost as well as the newer varieties by using the techniques available now.

The advantages have been better but have not been terribly dramatic. They have been incremental to the point of producing huge benefits when compared to the pittance invested in them. Any economic research on the cost and benefit of plant breeding shows that for every \$1 put in there is as a conservative estimate a minimum of \$7 to other estimates that run as high as \$15 or \$20. The payback is extremely high. In spite of that, previous governments, administrations and popular wisdom have it that government has to get out of plant breeding and there has been a constant cutting back of share of the department's investment in that area.

We have not kept up publicly financed plant breeding and because we have not done so government has come up with various ways of assuaging its conscience about it. During the late seventies and early eighties they talked about plant

breeders' rights. The last government finally implemented plant breeders' rights. That has paid the developers of new varieties for their cost and trouble by virtue of giving them what amounts to a patent to extract a fee from anyone who uses their varieties of seed during the next 15 years.

On top of that we have the bill before us proposing to extract what some people call a voluntary payment and what others call a refundable payment from each tonne of grain sold in the wheat board region through the wheat board. The act does not say so, but the government indicates its intention is to extract \$20 per tonne on all wheats and \$40 per tonne on all barleys from the final payment paid out in January, following the closing of the previous crop year's pool. Producers would have the option before the end of February to inform the board that they wanted their deductions sent to them rather than to the research foundation if they disapproved of the activities of the research foundation.

It is difficult to oppose a proposal that permits individuals to make up their own minds on whether they want to submit payments to such a scheme.

(1300)

I want to make it quite clear to the House that what we are doing here as governments, as politicians, as ministries of agriculture, is layering one more cost on to farmers that was not there 20 years ago. Farmers are now financing plant breeders, first as taxpayers through public financing albeit not quite as adequate as it could be because of government cutbacks. We are asked to finance plant breeding through the payments under plant breeders' rights for the use of the newly developed seeds. Now we are being asked to finance plant breeding a third way by a check off on our sales of wheat and barley through the Canadian Wheat Board.

I think that we have a right to ask how many more times we have to keep up this financing. The clear beneficiaries of this increased productivity are the consumers of the product. My friend from Frontenac indicated that it is the last bushels that create the profit, and that is true, but it is those last bushels that are used to depress the price. As we increase our production the supply is increased and the price for all of the production begins to fall.

The beneficiary of this increased production is always the consumers. They have been getting cheaper and cheaper food. The cost of groceries and basic foods that go into the groceries has been falling all through this century.

That has not been the case for a whole lot of other commodities and things that we use. Even housing has gone up in that

### *Government Orders*

period of time. With regard to transport, I hark back to just 15 or 20 years ago in making comparisons since today at the agriculture committee we were talking about cattle prices. In 1977 I remember buying a new car. It cost me I think seven 800-pound steers to buy a brand new car. It was a full size car, had everything going for it. Today that car would take something in the order of 25 or 30 800-pound steers.

We were being told in the committee that cattle prices had held up pretty well. They certainly have, have they not?

The technology for cars has changed somewhat. I saw an article in the press recently which said that because of demands from government for environmental improvements to the emission controls and other requirements by government, the cost of a car is now about \$4,500 more than in 1977. This was for all the technical improvements. If everything else were equal the car would be about half the price that it is now.

When I look at what labour received out of that car between 1977 and today, it gets about the same amount of money. The input in hours has dropped dramatically but labour gets about the same amount of money. Somewhere there has been a doubling of the real price of that car and the beef has dropped in what it will really buy to about a third. It has dropped two-thirds. Eight would buy a car and now it takes 25.

I just present that to show that consumers have taken real advantage of the productivity of agriculture. I do not see the rationale for farmers to continue to have to pay a bigger and bigger chunk of the research to make productivity gains that consumers are going to benefit from.

I think there will be a great deal of angst among farmers when they see the amount of deduction that there will be on their final payment cheques after January 1996.

(1305)

A lot of them will have to think long and hard whether they want to have their research deduction returned to them or go into the research group. One of the things that will be a factor for farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba at least will be the fairness of the extraction process.

Members will know from the debate yesterday that there has been a special dispensation granted to Alberta and some B.C. producers because they have a different form of deduction already in place. Their deduction is for research in general. It is not for plant breeding research specifically.

All the funds from this deduction will go into developing new plant varieties. We are told that perhaps 2 per cent will be used for administration purposes. The rest will be transferred directly for scientific work on developing new plant varieties.

*Government Orders*

We know from the public annual statement on the Alberta check off for instance that much less than 50 per cent of the funds collected are even allocated to research and there is no distinction made as to whether the research is economic research, marketing research or actual plant development research.

We have one set of oranges and one set of apples coming in for these deductions. Yet the government refused to make a change yesterday and so did the established parties in the House. They did not see any problem with this. They seem to be quite happy that Manitoba and Saskatchewan producers will pay 20 cents a tonne for plant breeding research. Alberta producers will pay an unspecified amount for research. They will pay the 20 cents for wheat but not for barley research.

We will be paying 40 cents. What will they be paying? Nobody seems to know. As long as that stays very fuzzy, there will be a lot of people saying: "Why should I contribute? If Alberta farmers are going to be getting the same benefits from those new plants as I am, why can they not pay the same amount?" We were trying to have that dichotomy straightened out in the act. Yet the government refused to take any action on it.

One of the problems that this federal government always has is a problem of treating people in each region the same within the region. I would argue that it failed this test miserably yesterday when it proposed to continue with this bill.

I find it very difficult to see why we should be pushing for support for this bill. I find it very difficult to go out and tell my producers that this is a good bill for them when I see that we are simply taking step three as a way of continuing to back off public responsibility for plant breeding and put it on to the hands of producers.

It is really a form of government offloading on to producers. It becomes a form of additional directed taxation that is a bad precedent to begin with. I have great difficulty supporting the whole concept that has been put forward in this bill.

It is laying out a system that is inequitable. It is treating some farmers different than other farmers who live in the same region and who will all benefit the same from the research. It is putting what amounts to a third tax on producers who have some interest in upgrading the genetic material that they work with.

It is also true that the final consumer is the one who reaps all the benefit from that new research. I find it very difficult to justify making an additional charge to the producer in those instances.

(1310)

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on third reading of Bill C-50, legislation that will produce a voluntary producer levy or check off program for plant breeding research.

I have a number of comments to make today, some of which are based on the bill before us, some of which are based on the debate that we had yesterday in this Chamber specific to report stage of the bill and as well some comments about the Canadian Wheat Board which I believe is central to this debate and is crucial to the future of agriculture in this country.

First I would like to address the specifics of the bill which are before us for third reading today. Essentially, as we have heard in this Chamber already, the federal government has launched an agriculture initiative, depending on how we want to look at it, either as a tax grab from farmers or an opportunity for farmers to participate financially in the development of new grains research.

The new legislation proposed here sets out what is called a voluntary producer levy or check off program to support plant breeding research programs for wheat and barley.

As the minister of agriculture indicated in the Chamber during his comments at second reading, if passed the legislation would call for the first collection of this levy to take place in January 1995.

The idea of the check off is not a new one. It is already in practise for beef and hog producers and as a concept has been endorsed by many of western Canada's grain organizations. This is however the first time that a check off has been applied across the board for wheat and barley production.

According to the minister of agriculture there is general agreement for this idea among producers. The agreement is on principle more than it is on practice. While this bill sets out a particular practice we as members of Parliament are called upon to examine how that practice will be implemented and what it means rather than on the general principle.

Here is how the bill is supposed to work. Western producers of wheat and barley will pay levies of 20 cents per tonne of wheat and 40 cents per tonne of barley delivered during the crop year. The first levies will be deducted from the Canadian Wheat Board final payments beginning with those for the 1993-94 crop year. Those final payments in the ordinary course of events for 1993-94 would be made in January 1995.

Based on projected deliveries the check off is expected to bring in, according to the minister of agriculture, an estimated \$4.7 million for additional research. That research would be co-ordinated by the Western Grains Research Foundation, a

*Government Orders*

federally chartered public organization that has been co-ordinating research in this field for the past 10 years.

Under the terms of the new legislation the foundation would be accountable to producers by having to report annually to all prairie permit book holders, by giving an accounting of the money received and how it has been used to accomplish its research goals.

The new program is not intended to duplicate or replace current check off programs already in place in some provinces and, as has been mentioned numerous times in the Chamber over the last two days, certain Alberta grain producers will be exempt from the levy.

I think it is worth repeating what was said yesterday. The check off in Alberta is somewhat different than the check off being proposed nationally. If one were to compare the reasons for bringing in the legislation as it is today and apply it to the implementation of the goods and services tax from a few years ago, the implication would be that any province with a pre-existing tax would be exempt from the GST and those that had no pre-existing tax would be levied the GST.

(1315)

In that case if the same principle were applied in 1990 as the one that is being applied here on the check off in 1994 only the province of Alberta would be subjected to this federal levy and the other provinces would be provided with an exemption. It is an interesting scenario to say the least.

The program as proposed in Bill C-50 is also voluntary so that producers who choose not to participate may opt out if that is their preference. Any producer wanting to opt out may do so on an annual basis simply by putting that request in writing.

In introducing the legislation the agriculture minister says he expects 90 per cent of western grain farmers to participate in the program but he gives us no indication at all on how he has calculated that figure.

There has been a fair amount of criticism in the House over the last couple of days about the program. For those who have reviewed its components and have not liked what they have seen in the specifics of the bill, the arguments focus somewhat on the fact that plant breeding research in Canada has always been publicly funded. The new legislation simply gives the federal government an opportunity to withdraw from providing adequate funding, perhaps some time in the future, because they will say the producers themselves are being taxed through the levy for the necessary funding.

Of course the minister of agriculture in his opening remarks denied that this would happen but there is certainly no protection in the existing funding in the legislation to guarantee the federal government's commitment to publicly funded research. Therefore, without that type of legislative guarantee it is difficult to accept the word of the minister.

At the same time if farmers opt out in numbers greater than the 10 per cent the minister has already calculated the financing pool will be diminished. Actually it will be uncertain from year to year because the financing pool will have to be calculated only on the amount of money that is collected and if farmers can opt out on an annual basis it will be difficult to calculate the entire financing pool on an ongoing basis.

Therefore the research institutions commissioned to do the research will not know from year to year what level of funding they will be able to receive. There is also the unfairness that some producers will pay for the support of research and want to contribute to it but all producers will benefit from that research whether or not they paid into it in the first place.

This alludes to the exemption provided to certain Alberta producers who will get the benefit from the research even though they do not pay into it.

The other argument is on the accountability of the process. It is acknowledged that the foundation must report on how it is spending the money for research but if producers disagree for any reason there is no mechanism in place for them to appeal those spending decisions and it is always after the horse has left the barn, after the door has been closed. You can only comment, perhaps publicly, and not direct or influence the way those decisions will be made. Therefore true accountability does not exist.

As the member for Mackenzie mentioned a few moments ago there is an important concept here that every member of the House and all producers in Canada must keep in mind and that is the principle of research into grains production is an important public policy matter and as such we should do whatever we can to ensure that there is as much public funding and public accountability in the process as possible.

Yesterday I indicated during report stage debate in what became in a sense a conversation with the minister of agriculture that the importance of the Canadian Wheat Board has never been more in question among Canadians. We are hearing in the news a considerable amount of discussion about the future of agriculture and the future of the Canadian Wheat Board because a number of producers in Canada, particularly producers near the American border, have been expressing discontent with the marketing practices of the Canadian Wheat Board.

(1320)

I think it is important during this debate about amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act that we do keep in mind how important the Canadian Wheat Board is and the role that this Chamber and the minister of agriculture must play in providing some support for the Canadian Wheat Board, the organization that we as producers and as members of Parliament have created in order to assist in the sale of all Canadian wheat and barley. Perhaps, as I suggested yesterday, we should as well be

*Government Orders*

considering changes that would allow for marketing of oats and canola and perhaps even some other grains in Canada.

Yesterday the minister of agriculture responded to one of my concerns by saying that he did not want to engage in a broader debate about the Canadian Wheat Board. Then he qualified his statement by saying, and I quote from *Hansard* of yesterday at page 7579, pertaining to a broader discussion about the wheat board:

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.

He is simply holding his fire. I wonder how long he intends to do that. How long does the minister intend to remain silent about his personal commitment and the commitment of this government to the Canadian Wheat Board?

I say that because just the other day the Canadian Wheat Board in an unusual statement came forward to defend itself in the face of some of the attacks. I quote the information officer of the Canadian Wheat Board, Miss Deanna Allen: "The board is under personal attack. If others are rallying farmers to rethink what they have, then let them think on accurate information".

The Canadian Wheat Board is arguing that those who are calling for dual marketing in Canada are doing so not with accurate information. If the minister of agriculture has information like the Canadian Wheat Board has which can add to the debate, I think it is very important that the minister not hold his fire in this regard but rather engage in the debate and bring forward not only the information but the opinions that are needed to support the strong Canadian Wheat Board in its work.

I will quote from the Canadian Wheat Board's defence of its activities in its releases from last week. Mr. Richard Klassen is the board commissioner with the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Klassen says in response to the U.S. market:

"The U.S. is a premium market. It is one of the few premium priced markets left in the world. It offers a high return because it is unaffected by the price discounting subsidies imposed by the U.S. and the European Union. U.S. customers are also usually willing to pay a premium for Canadian wheat because of its high quality".

The down side is that market is not large enough to accept all of the 24 million tonnes of wheat and barley that western Canadian farmers want to export. The board as a result must sell into other markets that do not offer as high a return. The prices from these sales are what lower the overall return to farmers.

"The question is really who should receive the commercial premium often available in the U.S. Should these premiums go to individual farmers or grain companies who access the U.S. directly, or should those premiums be shared among all grain growers in western Canada?".

The answer is through the Canadian Wheat Board all western Canadian farmers benefit from the premium market, whether it

is in the United States this year and next year or whether it is in Japan or China or Europe or Saudi Arabia in the future.

(1325)

I also want to indicate that I found the comments of the minister of agriculture the other day quoted in the *Regina Leader-Post* of October 27. The headline on the newspaper article was "Goodale is determined". The agriculture minister said "Canada has a historic right to duty free access into Europe for a million tonnes of high quality wheat and almost a million tonnes of barley".

The minister of agriculture is wanting to have a stronger Canadian presence in Europe and is willing to fight for it. That market in Europe will not be accessible without a strong Canadian Wheat Board. If the minister of agriculture is anxious to fight for Canadian markets in Europe, he should be willing to fight for the Canadian marketing arm that gives us that access here in Canada.

Those concerns of mine are shared by numerous constituents of mine, all of my constituents who have phoned me recently. One of my constituents was fortunate enough to be at a meeting organized by the National Farmers' Union in the United States just a couple of weeks ago, Mr. John Clair from Radisson, Saskatchewan, also a member of the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee; a committee that I would strongly advise the government take a look at and see if it cannot turn that into more of a board of directors than an advisory committee so that the elected wishes of the producers are more influential in the decision making of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. John Clair was at a meeting in the United States, a meeting that involved a number of farmers in Glendive, Montana. Mr. Clair says that he is more convinced than ever after that meeting that the Canadian Wheat Board should be left intact and keep its export monopoly.

Quoting Mr. John Clair recently in an issue of the *Western Producer* from October 20, Mr. Clair says: "They"—meaning the Americans—"said if there was a dual marketing situation in Canada, they would push to have the border closed immediately".

In other words, if Canadian farmers are given the opportunity by the Canadian government to just cross the border unimpeded with every truck load of grain that they can, the Americans as they have on so many other trade issues would immediately retaliate and close the border to all Canadian grain.

That means any premium market that was accessible by the Canadian Wheat Board or any farmer immediately closed and

*Government Orders*

there would be no access to those premium dollars to any Canadian farmer whether we can sell into that market or not.

Mr. Clair also mentioned that the people he talked to looked at the dual marketing supporters in Canada as quite naive about their circumstances and even our own. Again I quote Mr. Clair: "They seem to assume it is just a great big pit we can drop wheat into". In other words, the American market is just there for all the wheat that we can put into it.

Mr. Clair says in a tremendous year, we can sell maybe 10 per cent of our crop to the United States. That means 90 per cent has to go some place else. There is nothing more true than that statement.

I remind the minister of agriculture and the government that in the agriculture supplement to the red book they made a very strong commitment to the financial security of Canadian farm families, a commitment that extends to the value of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Basically the comment from the red book is that Canada's agri-food industry needs policies and programs such as supply management, the Canadian Wheat Board and stabilization to minimize the impact of market price fluctuations.

On this day I call on the minister of agriculture and the government to, as they have with everything else in this place, stick to the commitment of the red book and maintain policies such as the Canadian Wheat Board to minimize the impact of marketplace price fluctuations on Canadian farmers.

(1330)

[*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 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 yeas have it.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

\* \* \*

### DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT

The House resumed from November 1, consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be now read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, these past few weeks, the government has been repeating that it is acting in good faith, claiming it wants to negotiate with the provinces and maintain a partnership relationship with them instead of a paternalistic and dominating one. It never fails however to attack insidiously the government of Quebec for its alleged bad faith.

Today, the Liberals give yet more proof of the fact that bad faith does not lie where they would have us believe it does and that this government, like the ones before it, never had any real intention of considering Quebec as a full-fledged partner.

In introducing Bill C-53 to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Liberal government has reached new heights in denying the existence of provincial jurisdictions and, what is worse, in denying the very existence of the Quebec people. Not content with infringing repeatedly upon provincial jurisdictions—culture, education and language in particular—the federal government has managed to violate the most fundamental element of Quebec's specificity as a society, namely its culture.

As described in 1993 in an administrative document, the mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage is quite explicit: to create a deep sense of identity and feeling of belonging based on bilingualism and multiculturalism.

In order to achieve this, the department will rely only on programs that, according to the aforementioned document, contribute to a very strong sense of identity among Canadians. By emphasizing the Canadian identity and disregarding Quebec's identity and its distinct character, the Department of Canadian Heritage becomes, as far as Quebecers are concerned, a vehicle for promoting Canadian unity.

In this connection, furthermore, we know that the minister will not hesitate to use all the tools at his disposal, at the risk of shamelessly using the public press.

As proof, we have the words of his leader, spoken last June 16, and I quote: "—there is a law governing the operation of the CBC, and I will ask that the CBC respect that law. The law says, in defining the mandate of the CBC, that it must inform people on the advantages Canada presents".

*Government Orders*

I would like to take this opportunity to look at just how little regard the government has for Quebec's special character and its historic claims.

The economic, cultural and social contribution made by immigrants to the development of society in Quebec and in Canada is undeniable. But an indiscriminate policy on the part of the Canadian government could do serious harm to Quebec society. It is essential that a policy of integration does not end up diluting Quebec's identity beyond recognition. In Quebec, any diversification of the social fabric must take into account the French character of our community.

For these reasons, Quebec and interested provinces must be allowed to participate in the development of a multiculturalism policy.

Besides, the Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage makes the minister responsible for "the advancement of the equality of status and use of English and French and the enhancement and development of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada". Since the bilingualism policy is seen as a failure by the majority of Canadians, and a simple review of press reports across Canada is enough to convince us that the situation of francophones outside Quebec is far from getting better—which is not saying much when we know that the future of some French-speaking communities is actually threatened—, we can once again question the Canadian government's good will and ability to act.

(1335)

The unfortunate matter of the closure of the military college in Saint-Jean and the procrastination surrounding the French school in Kingston, combined with the fact that the influence of the minister now in charge of bilingualism with his Cabinet colleagues is very questionable, do nothing to reassure minority rights organizations and those who have been waiting so many years for the Canadian government to honour the commitment to a just society made during the Trudeau era.

From another perspective, we would have thought that, by giving the Minister of Canadian Heritage various responsibilities formerly within the purview of several departments, the government tried to save money. But it is clearly not the case.

The federal government's tactic is well known. First, it consolidates its presence by using its spending power in an area of jurisdiction of special importance to Quebec; then it denies the distinctiveness of Quebec culture; finally, it promotes a hypothetical cultural identity across Canada.

Furthermore, like every time the federal government gets involved in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, duplication increases and becomes institutionalized. The Conseil des

arts et des lettres and the Canada Council, the Grand Théâtre, the Place des Arts and the National Arts Centre, the national libraries of Quebec and Canada are cases in point. Yet, even under the Liberals, Quebec has always demanded full control of its cultural resources and an end to the federal government's repeated interference.

In that regard, former Quebec Minister of Culture Liza Frulla, who can certainly not be accused of having sovereigntist motives, said: "Real dialogue is almost non-existent and when it does occur, it is more often than not at Quebec's request. Since Quebec is often presented with a fait accompli, it has to react after the fact to make its real needs known".

Culture comes from people, artists and creators. It does not come from the government. The role of a government is to accept culture for what it is and to help promote and develop that culture. The government which should play a role to that end must necessarily be the one closest to the realities of people, the one which best understand their needs, priorities and values.

The federal government, which is bent on creating and promoting a Canadian culture, is certainly the one in the best position to fulfill that role. Sure, it does have important, albeit artificial, financial means, but more often than not its priorities conflict with those of the artists and the Quebec government, which is in the best position to understand the needs of these artists.

Quebec's Union des artistes could not have been clearer on that issue: "—when Ottawa comes to Quebec with its own priorities, its objectives do not always agree with those of the Quebec government. That situation not only creates overlapping: It also creates a shock. This is what paralyzes everything".

We must also look at the issue of copyright and the unacceptable sharing of responsibilities between the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

In recent months, I have received dozens of letters from various organizations representing producers and creators and denouncing the uncertainty with which these people have to put up daily. They are not only concerned by the government's slowness regarding the copyright issue, but also by the rightist approach being perpetuated by the current Liberal government, at the structural level, in giving the Department of Industry, through Bill C-46, judicial and administrative responsibility over the Copyright Act.

Composers, authors, artists, performers and producers worked hard to obtain a right allowing them to get something out of their work. The copyright system advocated by major industries, and also by the Minister of Industry, would jeopardize the chances of creative artists to see their economic conditions improve for good. Moreover, Quebec authors, who deal first

*Government Orders*

with Europe and not the United States, would certainly not find satisfaction in a system patterned on the American model.

The basic issue remains the fact that we are faced with an informally shared responsibility between two departments, which unduly delays the tabling of the act on the second phase of the copyright reform.

(1340)

We are witnessing a sterile confrontation, opposing the view of the Minister of Industry, who would rather conform to the line of American trade policies, and that of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who favours the copyright and neighbouring rights system. Meanwhile, our creative artists and performers are stuck between a Department of Canadian Heritage with no real authority, but is theoretically supposed to be looking out for them, and a Department of Industry with little concern for their problems.

The situation has been particularly bad these past few days, since the Minister of Canadian Heritage has been suffering from a chronic lack of credibility with the people as well as his colleagues, after making several unforgivable errors of judgement that were recently brought to the attention of this House.

It is therefore imperative that Bill C-53 be amended so as to make explicit the responsibility of the heritage minister regarding copyright and, in this respect, that the bill be introduced by the Minister of Canadian Heritage himself. Not only is Bill C-53 visibly flawed, but it is further evidence of this government's insensitivity to or even contempt for the distinctiveness and specificity of Quebec, which accounts for at least 25 per cent of the total population of Canada.

That is why I support the motion put forth by my hon. colleague from Rimouski-Témiscouata. I therefore ask that the bill be withdrawn and the subject matter referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

[English]

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to share with you today my views on Bill C-53, the bill to create the Department of Canadian Heritage. The proposed legislation is a technical measure that gives official recognition to the departmental structure and division of responsibilities that was adopted when the government took office.

As most members know the department has been functioning well now for more than a year and a half. The passage of this bill is a necessary legal step and will substantiate the areas of jurisdiction within which the Minister of Canadian Heritage will exercise his powers and carry out his duties and functions.

The Department of Canadian Heritage brings together components from five former or existing federal departments, namely environment, communications, secretary of state, national

health and welfare, and multiculturalism and citizenship. This fact alone allows you to imagine the abundant variety of programs that can be found within this department.

The legislation reflects the breadth of the department's mandate which includes responsibilities in areas such as cultural development, multiculturalism, official languages, heritage conservation, national parks, national historic sites, and amateur sports.

Moreover, the policies and programs of the Department of Canadian Heritage are designated to promote increased understanding of our diversity, the involvement of all citizens in Canadian society and awareness of our cultural and natural wealth. In other words, the department is active in those areas that are linked to our identity as Canadians.

One of the most visible programs administered by Canadian heritage is Parks Canada which is also one of the department's three principal sectors. Many Canadians and for that matter many tourists who visit Canada have taken advantage of the opportunity to experience the magnificence and unique natural beauty of the country's system of natural parks, natural historic sites and historic canals. As steward of these unrivalled examples of our natural and cultural heritage it is Parks Canada's duty to ensure their protection and interpretation on behalf of all Canadians.

Parks Canada has a strong and respected presence in every region of the country. It contributes in a significant way both directly and indirectly to the local economies of communities all across Canada through expenditures on its own operations and through the tourism and economic benefits generated as a result of those activities.

(1345)

The second major sector of the department that I would like to mention encompasses those programs aimed at the promotion of Canadian identity and civic participation. As one would expect with such a broadly based mandate this sector includes an impressive variety of program areas.

Some of the government's most important initiatives are being implemented in this sector. These include the promotion of official languages, the pursuit of excellence in amateur sports, the promotion of our cultural diversity and encouragement of the full and open participation of every Canadian in society, the promotion of greater understanding of human rights, fundamental freedoms and related values, as well as multiculturalism.

All Canadians must feel a sense of belonging to this country. Multiculturalism seeks to bridge the gap between cultural communities with diverse interests and backgrounds. Within this sector are the programs that speak to us regarding what it means to be Canadian, that set us apart from the rest of the world

*Government Orders*

and that have helped Canada earn its top ranking by the United Nations for overall quality of life.

Last but not least, the other key sector that will occupy the time of the minister is concerned with the growth and development of Canada's cultural sector. This area has never been more important than it is now, given the significance of its contribution to the Canadian economy.

Some maintain that culture is first and foremost a way of looking at the world and a symbol of our civilization. It is through this unique perspective of the world that we are able to distinguish ourselves from others. Culture therefore with the traditions and values it encompasses is what gives us our identity.

Most members will agree that the federal government responsibility in cultural matters extends to those areas that are pan-Canadian, interprovincial and international in scope. Federal activities in this area remain complementary to those of the other levels of government. It is vital that there be many agents of cultural development and for governments to play an active role.

The federal government's key objective in this area is to ensure that Canada's artists, creators and cultural industries are provided with the support they need to create and distribute cultural products and that Canadians have access to these important examples of cultural expression.

Culture is the very essence of the national identity, the foundation of national sovereignty and national pride. In a world where globalization and the information and communications revolution are bypassing national borders, Canada needs to commit itself more than ever to cultural development.

To summarize it is clear that the programs and policies of the Department of Canadian Heritage span Canada's past, present and future. The department can be regarded as the flagship of Canadian identity, bringing together a mosaic of federal programs that will help to confront and surmount the challenges that lie ahead.

I fully support the passage of this legislation and look forward to the official recognition of the Department of Canadian Heritage, so help us God.

(1350)

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this debate to address the amendment by my colleagues from the Bloc. Of course this debate deals with the department of culture, the Department of Canadian Heritage. Certainly some questions have been asked of the accountability and responsibility of that whole department very recently.

Those are the types of things we need to discuss because if the credibility is not there, if there is no sense of total ministerial accountability and responsibility, then what does the legislation really matter? What does the name of the department really

matter? As you well know, Mr. Speaker, probably very little. If someone stands as the Prime Minister has for days and days and says: "I am totally responsible", then we want to see that responsibility. We do not want them just to say it, we want to see it.

As I address this amendment and the whole issue of this entire department I would like to call into question, sad to say but necessary to do, the need to look at some of the things that have happened in this department. Then we must ask: Can it even go on as such?

Should there be a department of multiculturalism in this country? When people come to Canada do they feel they should really be part of Canada, or should they be hunkered off in their own areas, getting government money to continue the way of life they so freely left to come to Canada? One certainly wonders about that. When there is a minister who we certainly need to ask questions about, it is important that we look at the whole scope of the entire matter.

Let us look at the chronology of incidents that have happened over the last several months. On March 15, 1994 this whole department was called into question when the minister wrote to Keith Spicer, the chairman of the CRTC, asking that it give "due consideration" to the application submitted by Konstantinos Daniilidis for a Greek language radio program licence. CRTC itself stamped the letter "intervention". The CRTC knows what an intervention is; perhaps this government does not but the CRTC does. Keith Spicer knows very clearly what an intervention is, or an interference if you will, by a minister.

Two weeks later on March 29, 1994, the secretary general of the CRTC, Allan Darling, responded to the minister by thanking him "for his letter of support". He knows what a letter of support is. That confirmed the CRTC considered it an intervention. The minister did not respond to this letter.

On September 20, months and months down the road, Mr. Mike Pattichis writes to the minister expressing concern about support for the Daniilidis application. He knew about it. The letter was never made public.

Ten days later on September 30 the Canadian heritage minister writes to Mr. Pattichis to clarify that his March 15 letter was not in fact intended to convey support, certainly not. It was just carbon copied to the CRTC. It was a six month delay in responding to clarify the issue. The letter arrived too late to be considered by the CRTC. The file regarding Daniilidis had already been closed. In other words: "Thank you. Appreciate that but you are out of time, you are out of luck". Therefore, the CRTC was clearly under the impression that there was ministerial support for this the entire way through.

On October 1, one month ago, the Prime Minister is made aware of the letter of support and exonerates the minister. How can anyone be exonerated for breaking guidelines so clearly, where this whole ministerial department is called into question?

*Government Orders*

The Prime Minister takes no action. Funny. This was confirmed on October 28 by the Prime Minister when he stated in the House in reference to his exchange with the "ethics counsellor": "The answer that came from him did not lead me to change my mind about the decision that I had made earlier in the month". I think it was October 1. We were still in the month of October. As if this was perfectly excusable.

On October 26 ethics counsellor Howard Wilson is contacted not by the Prime Minister nor his officials, but by a Southam News reporter. He is made aware of the March 15 letter. The ethics counsellor does not launch an investigation into that. CBC breaks the story on Prime Time News later that evening.

Sometime on the morning of October 27 the ethics counsellor Mr. Wilson is contacted by PMO staff regarding the minister. Does this smell like damage control, Mr. Speaker? You have seen damage control in your many, many years here. You saw it from within in fact and now you are seeing it perhaps from within again. The contents of that conversation remain confidential, but Mr. Wilson said that he was not asked to start an investigation. The details continue. Later on the morning of October 27 the minister stood up in this House claiming to have never seen the March 30 letter.

(1355)

All of us get a lot of correspondence in our offices, but if we do not see it and if we do not have competent staff to bring very important letters like that to our attention, then as the minister and the Prime Minister have said so clearly, we bear the responsibility for that.

This minister should bear the responsibility for it. He has not. The Prime Minister has not and this is not the end of the story. He says of course that he "took immediate corrective action". From what we have heard in this House it would seem he was just acting as an MP, not as a minister, so he did not really need to take corrective action. However he took corrective action anyway because of what the Prime Minister said was a mistake. It was an error, so hey, go figure, as the high school students would say.

In question period on October 27 at 2.24 p.m., the leader of my party said: "There is a simple guideline that applies in these cases and it is a most elementary one". Surely we could all understand elementary guidelines in this House. It is understood in most jurisdictions. That is that ministers do not communicate with quasi-judicial, regulatory bodies except in three ways: through statute; through orders in council; or through public formal submissions to that body. They do not communicate through telephone calls or casual conversations or casual letters.

This is not proper. Mr. Speaker, you know it and I know it. I suspect all of us in this House know it. Perhaps it is time we admitted it.

At 2.29 p.m. that day the Prime Minister stated in question period: "I consulted the government's ethics counsellor and one I appointed for myself, and both confirmed that I had made the right decision in this matter". At 2.49 p.m. the Prime Minister said: "Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor has informed me that he is satisfied with the conclusion I have come to at this time". The ethics counsellor knew nothing about this. I have spoken often about the phantom of the Ottawa. It seems to me he has been speaking to the Prime Minister during overtime.

In question period on October 28, at 11.15 a.m. the Prime Minister said: "I did not speak to Mr. Wilson myself, but I asked that he be consulted yesterday". This contradicts the statement the Prime Minister said the day before. At 11.52 a.m. on October 28 the Prime Minister said: "In the case of quasi-judicial bodies that relate to the affairs of the government, the affairs of the members of Parliament and so on, the guidelines were not clear to my satisfaction. I have asked the Privy Council Office to prepare new guidelines in consultation with Mr. Wilson".

Sometime later on October 28 Mr. Wilson was approached by the PMO to look at existing guidelines for ministers. This was the first time Mr. Wilson received the confidential guidelines for ministers. Prior to this he had no knowledge of them whatsoever. It was October 28, getting very close to Halloween, the time of spooks and hobgoblins and all kinds of stories.

On October 31, the very day of Halloween, in his statement to the House the Prime Minister stood up and attempted to clarify the role of ministers in regard to quasi-judicial bodies. Interestingly, while he revealed other ministers' letters to the CRTC, he did not account for his own action nor the minister's actions over the last seven months.

During question period on Halloween, in full mask in response to the contradictory statements by the Prime Minister about the ethics counsellor, the member for Medicine Hat asked that the Prime Minister make the current ethics counsellor office independent and accountable to Parliament and not just the Prime Minister. Still during question period on Halloween at 2.45 p.m. in response to the contradictory statements by the Prime Minister, he asked again that this be accountable to Parliament.

Yesterday, November 2, in an interview with CBC News-world, Mr. Wilson admitted that he never undertook an investigation of the heritage minister affair. Can we look at a department that acts responsibly, that acts with integrity? Absolutely not.

Let me close my remarks by saying this entire ministry, this entire department, this cabinet minister and all his officials, the Prime Minister and this entire government has been tainted by more than tuna fish. This department has been called into disrepute and we are disgusted by it.

*S. O. 31*

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, it being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31. The hon. member for Saint-Denis.

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### GREECE

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, Canadians of Greek origin commemorated a very important national holiday of their country of origin.

On October 28, 1940 the Greeks said no, oxi, to the forces that sought to divide and conquer Europe. They chose to fight the forces of the axis and remained united with the allies.

[*Translation*]

Canadians of Greek origin in Quebec are now ready to say no to the separatist forces, no to the Bloc Québécois, no to the Parti Québécois, and yes to a united Canada.

\* \* \*

### LITERACY

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to tell this House about the national family literacy conference now being held in Ottawa, which is organized by the Movement for Canadian Literacy.

Family literacy is a new approach which seeks to provide basic training and development services for adults who have to stay home with pre-school children. Besides meeting the specific literacy needs of adults, this new form of learning creates an environment that encourages children in the family to read and write.

Members of the Bloc Québécois are happy to support such initiatives and hope to see other projects to improve the basic training of a growing number of Canadians and Quebecers.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### ROSE CHARLIE

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce to the House that a woman from my constituency has been accorded a signal honour as one of only five distinguished Canadian women to receive the Governor General's Award in commemoration of the Persons Case.

Ms. Rose Charlie is a member of the Sto:lo and Chehalis bands. She has a record of 25 years of unstinting community service and advocacy.

As a founding member of Indian Rights for Indian Women and the Indian Homemakers Association, Ms. Charlie was at the forefront in challenging the Indian Act that deprived First Nations women of their status when they married non-Indians.

As a result, a federal legislative change was enacted in 1985 that has enabled thousands of women and their children to regain their status as First Nations people.

Rose Charlie never wavered in the pursuit of her cause. Not only is she an example of service and dedication to her people; she is testimony to the success that follows perseverance.

Along with the Government of Canada and on behalf of all my constituents, it is my pleasure to salute her today.

\* \* \*

### ROYAL CANADIAN LEGIONS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Legion was founded in 1925 to look after the veterans of World War I. The first ladies auxiliary was formed a year later. The first Remembrance Day was in 1931 when 50,000 attended in Ottawa. This resulted in parliamentary recognition of Armistice Day. Today the legion has 600,000 members in 1,800 communities.

In Peterborough riding, legions in Havelock, Keene, Lakefield, Norwood, Peterborough and Warsaw, in addition to taking care of veterans affairs, donated tens of thousands of dollars to local charities this year alone. They supported disadvantaged children, minor hockey, Meals on Wheels, Civic and St. Joseph's hospitals, Easter Seals, the United Way, local churches, animals in distress, Terry Fox, homes for the aged, high school students, the lung association, Telecare and many other fine causes.

Canadian veterans who are no longer with us would be proud of their legion today.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### BLOC QUEBÉCOIS

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, 800 committed separatists spent \$125 each to have a drink with the leader of the Bloc Québécois and celebrate their first anniversary in opposition in the House of Commons.

On Monday morning, *Le Devoir* reported that very few PQ members of the National Assembly and cabinet ministers answered the invitation to raise a glass with the Bloc leader.

Clearly, the falling popularity of separatism bothers him a lot. That is why he said it was time for separatists to wake up. [English]

Are we to conclude, then, that despite what the leader of the Bloc said in front of Mr. Parizeau and the other guests, they preferred to continue dozing off for the rest of the celebrations?

\* \* \*

[English]

### CAREER WEEK

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, the Secretary of State for Training and Youth and the Minister of Human Resources Development, I am pleased to inform the House that this week more than 1,500 junior and high schools, colleges and Canada Employment Centres will participate in the 1994 edition of Canada Career Week.

(1405)

Canada Career Week is designed to focus the attention of students and all Canadians on what prospects the job market is likely to hold for them and which skills they will need to succeed in an ever evolving economy.

Education is the key to sound career planning because knowledge opens doors. Young people have to start planning their future very early. Canada Career Week activities like job sharing and career and job fairs will have them face the challenge of making the right career choice.

I convey my best wishes for success to all Canada Career Week organizers and participants.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, filled with pride but also with sorrow, we wish to draw the attention of the House today to the tremendous contribution made by women to the war effort during World War I and, more significantly, between 1939 and 1945.

We take pride in the fact that women participated on all fronts and that their contribution was useful, effective and necessary. We feel sorrow for all the suffering, for the loved ones they and their children mourned, for lives that were disrupted and cut short. We also want to voice our hopes.

Like the World Health Organization that supports the elimination of nuclear arms, Canadian and Quebec women want a world free of all wars and hostility and hope other ways will be found to resolve conflicts. They want peace.

### YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak once again, along with the large crowd in front of the Parliament Buildings today, to demand real change in the Young Offenders Act legislation.

This past Monday in my riding of Port Coquitlam, Derek Rosenberg was attacked by a group of young people upon leaving a 7-Eleven Store and pushed through a glass door face first. Mr. Rosenberg, age 26, has a heart condition and requires medication as well as continued good operation of the pacemaker which was installed this past January and on which his health depends. This was of no concern to those who left him lying in the broken glass with serious injuries.

How many more victims must fall before the government enacts real change to make the streets safe for those who live on them and judgment certain for those who threaten that safety?

\* \* \*

### FROBISHER BAY

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our two members of Parliament from the Northwest Territories, I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to the families and friends of the eight hunters who drowned in Frobisher Bay earlier this week.

Our thoughts are with the two survivors and the whole community of Iqaluit whose lives have all been drastically affected by this tragedy. Although no thoughts or words can ease the pain being shared, some comfort can be taken in the contribution that these two men have given to the continuation of traditional life in the eastern Arctic.

Death is a part of life in the Inuit culture and because of individuals like these hunters the Inuit way of life lives on.

Along with these members from the Arctic I would like to encourage the people of Iqaluit to continue the struggle which these men worked so hard for in sustaining the Inuit culture.

\* \* \*

### LITERACY

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support the MCL's National Family Literacy Conference and welcome participants to Ottawa.

*S. O. 31*

Given my own work promoting literacy in my riding through the community academic services program, I recognize the importance of reaching out to those who are unable to enjoy the printed media.

Children in non-reading families are more likely than other children to be non-readers as adults. Unless this cycle is broken it can continue for generations.

Schools alone cannot be responsible for establishing citizens as full and comprehensive language users. Literacy development demands participation from the family and the community if citizens are to be strong, effective communicators.

In family literacy programs like those championed by the National Family Literacy Conference, parents and other adult family members learn the importance of reading and writing.

I applaud efforts to meet the literacy needs of parents and their children and I pledge my continued support in eradicating illiteracy in our communities.

\* \* \*

**CHINA**

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the largest foreign delegation ever assembled will be leaving Canada for China tonight, led by the Prime Minister; most premiers, with the exception of one; and businessmen and women from throughout the country, some of our most talented people. They will be going to sell our services and our products in that large country.

(1410)

As part of this Team Canada they are going to show the Chinese people that we are willing to sit down and do business with them.

*[Translation]*

We promised that in our red book. It is a part of our program. It is important to develop foreign trade and trade relations. We promised we would, and we are delivering the goods.

I know everyone will want to join me in congratulating the Prime Minister of Canada and wishing him and his team good luck.

\* \* \*

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, next week, at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, we will commemorate a major event of this century.

In 1918, the Great War officially ended with the signing of an armistice. Since 1921, Canada has commemorated this fact, in tribute to all those who made the supreme sacrifice of their lives to bring peace to the free world. Every day, the international news reminds us of the price of peace and the cost of war.

We must remember, for the benefit of our collective memory. It is not just for our veterans, for whom this day symbolizes the entire meaning of their lives. It is not just for all those who died. It is just as important for future generations.

We must remember the lessons of history. Our tribute to the past is as important as our responsibility for the future.

\* \* \*

*[English]***LITERACY**

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House in my capacity as literacy critic for the Reform Party. This is a position which I do not like to have because as long as it exists it signifies there is a literacy problem in Canada.

What is being done about this problem and what should be done about it? For those youngsters in the school system today, which is within provincial jurisdiction, let us hope all education reviews stress the necessity to teach the basics.

For those who have slipped through the cracks in the education system, it is important that they have access to literacy programs which will help them to learn to read and write. I believe it is my job to ensure that whatever literacy programs be established they be effective in this attempt to address literacy.

This is where the national ad hoc literacy group comes in. It stresses helping the whole family to ensure there is an appreciation of books and reading in the home.

In this international year of the family groups such as this which stress the strengthening of the family unit through an appreciation of education deserve our praise.

I wish all participants in the National Family Literacy Conference well in their deliberations and I look forward to joining them for some of their sessions.

\* \* \*

**RAILWAYS**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals made many promises in Manitoba during the last federal election. A lot of them had to do with railways.

They promised they would stop the flow of jobs from Winnipeg to Edmonton through the CNR. They have not done that. Instead the crew calling office and rail traffic control are being transferred from Winnipeg to Edmonton just the way they were under the Tories.

They promised that Churchill would be revived. What do we have instead? We have the member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon saying that Churchill should not be part of the Canadian port system, and the Minister of Transport and the member for Winnipeg South Centre refuse to repudiate him.

All these promises have been broken. The one thing they did not promise was setting up a Liberal only committee to examine ways to commercialize, which is another word for privatize, the CNR.

They broke all their promises with respect to rail in Manitoba.

\* \* \*

#### LEADER OF THE REFORM PARTY

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I note with interest that the leader of the Reform Party is planning to reconsider the advisability of his taking a 10 per cent pay cut. The rationale for his change of heart is that because he is not getting enough credit for the great sacrifice he may start taking his full pay.

It has always been my view that you took an action because you believed it was the right thing to do and not simply to get credit.

The leader of the Reform Party said he decided on a month by month basis whether to take his pay cut. The hon. member made such a big deal over his frugality I would urge him to stick to his guns, take the cut and not decide his pay on the basis of how many fancy suits he wants to buy or get dry cleaned in a given month.

Many hon. members from each and every party in the House make sacrifices for what we do but do not get credit for. We do it because we believe in it. We do it because we want to do our part. We do it because it is the right thing to do. I urge the hon. leader of the Reform Party to do the same.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### BLOC QUEBECOIS LEADER

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition has completely reversed his position this week by voting against Bill C-56 on Environmental Assessment.

(1415)

He was the one who said in October that this was his baby, that he had fought very hard for it in Cabinet. According to him, he never spoke against the bill.

The Leader of the Opposition has a very short memory. On October 21, 1993, when Mr. Lépine asked him during a broadcast of *Le Point* whether he would not find himself opposing Jacques Parizeau if the latter won the upcoming election, the hon. member replied that Mr. Parizeau would also respect the legislation, that the Parti Quebecois had agreed to that position.

#### Oral Questions

By voting against Bill C-56, the Leader of the Opposition shows clearly that he no longer has any credibility when he purports to speak for Quebecers.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### LITERACY

**Mr. Paul Zed (Fundy—Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House the first national family literacy conference which is being held here in Ottawa this week, sponsored by the Movement for Canadian Literacy which brings together groups and individuals from across the country working in family literacy.

The family is the single most important social unit and that is where the serious problem of illiteracy can best be tackled.

I wish to commend the conference organizers, especially Marion Zaichkowski, the co-chair of the New Brunswick Committee on Literacy, who is participating in the work of this conference.

Today I met with the government's literacy minister, the hon. Joyce Fairburn, to discuss literacy initiatives. Senator Fairburn has been an outstanding advocate for Canadian literacy and a strong supporter of the conference and will be addressing the delegates today at the National Press Club reception at three o'clock.

I urge all members of Parliament to attend and renew their support for the government's—

**The Speaker:** Oral questions.

---

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, the Minister of Finance sounded the alarm. "We are in hock up to our eyeballs. This cannot go on. The situation is not sustainable", he said, and he promised once more that he would cut spending.

Yesterday, his colleague at Treasury Board announced \$2 billion in additional spending, including \$26 million for Hibernia, \$4 million for the Privy Council, \$3 million for Canadian unity and \$2 million more for the other place.

How can the government expect taxpayers to take its promises to cut government spending seriously, when today, it announces an additional \$2 billion in spending?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a normal process that is carried out a couple of times a year whereby in the reserves money is allocated for certain projects that have not yet been finalized and details have not yet been provided in the main estimates. They are then put into the estimates through a supplementary procedure which we went through yesterday and tabled in the House.

There is absolutely nothing in terms of removing one iota our commitment to getting our spending down, to getting the deficit down to 3 per cent of GDP in three years. We are on target and we intend to meet that goal.

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister says this is quite normal. I agree. It is normal for this government to keep doing the opposite of what it says it will do.

How can the minister reconcile the mandate the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs received to downsize government and government spending with the decision to give him \$6 million more for operating expenditures?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1993, the previous government implemented changes that abolished the Federal-Provincial Relations Office.

When the new government came back, it obviously concluded that, considering the profile of the opposition, in particular, this was a problem that should be given all necessary attention, and that is what we did.

Of the \$5.9 million in the Supplementary Estimates, several hundred thousand dollars will be used to reduce overlap, which is exactly what the Government of Quebec and the opposition are asking us to do. This will cover the cost of rebuilding a group of officers to take care of federal-provincial relations and of eliminating overlap and duplication.

(1420)

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether she realizes that the government is doing the exact opposite of what everyone expects it to do. It lets its administration spend more and comes down on the needy in our society by cutting social programs.

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well we have always had Supple-

mentary Estimates. That was already the case when he was a minister in Mr. Mulroney's government.

What we said today, what the Minister of Finance said last week and what the Prime Minister has emphasized, is that we intend to meet our commitment to a target of 3 per cent of GDP. And we will succeed.

*[English]*

We are going to meet our targets. We intend to meet our targets. We are going to meet our 3 per cent and the Prime Minister is committed to that. Every member of the cabinet and the government is committed to that deficit reduction exercise.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. The intentions of the federal government remain unclear regarding former Bill C-91. In their attempt to have the supporting regulations changed, a group of government members are challenging openly and publicly the validity of the act designed to protect pharmaceutical companies manufacturing brand name drugs, companies that invest substantial amounts in the design and development of such drugs.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister agree with this open attack on Bill C-91 by several of her fellow government members, with the support of former Liberal minister Bob Kaplan, who now lobbies for generic drug manufacturers?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Nothing is being attacked, Mr. Speaker. Our committees are their own masters. A proposal was tabled in committee and defeated.

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, considering that all the Liberal members in attendance at the committee meeting this morning voted against the regulations pertaining to Bill C-91, does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to take these members to task, in order to prevent a recurrence—

**The Speaker:** Order! I would ask the hon. member to rephrase his question, as it deals with two matters. First, it deals with committees and then with what sounds like a problem within a political party. So, if you could just rephrase the question, it would be acceptable.

**Mr. Rocheleau:** Mr. Speaker, does the Deputy Prime Minister intend to take to task these Liberal members, to prevent major investments by pharmaceutical companies from again being jeopardized by their persistence?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we respect the committee's capacity to act independently. I hope that the hon. members opposite also respect the right of individual par-

liamentary committees to do their job properly, acting independently, as they should, under the reforms we have proposed.

\* \* \*

[English]

### ETHICS

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week. What has become crystal clear to Canadians is that this government has sacrificed its integrity on the altar of political expediency.

Not only did the Minister of Canadian Heritage violate existing guidelines for ministers, albeit a watered down version of Tory guidelines, the Prime Minister failed Canadians by not firing the minister. He compounded his failure with a story a day.

How can the Deputy Prime Minister claim with a straight face that this government will restore integrity to any of our political institutions?

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, in the questioning in the last few days we have been skirting that very fine line where we impute motives to members of Parliament.

I believe the questions, as much as possible, should be directed to the administrative responsibility of the government rather than using this type of wording. I would appeal to all hon. members to please back up a little from the impugning of motives in any of our questions or answers. I will permit the Deputy Prime Minister to answer this question if she so chooses.

(1425)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Speaking of straight faces, Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised to hear the member yesterday saying that Jean Chrétien looked like Brian Mulroney.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. The Prime Minister knew of the heritage minister's letter fully a month ago and he did not contact the ethics counsellor, who only found out about it from the media last week.

The Prime Minister had made up his mind before he contacted the ethics counsellor, who was not even asked for a ruling. These are the facts, not fiction.

If this government wants to restore public confidence and maintain the ethics counsellor as a watchdog of this place as he should, not a lapdog, why will she not have him report to the House on this affair immediately after the recess next week? What are they afraid of?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to reflect on integrity but when the member across the way speaks about

### Oral Questions

integrity I find it passing strange that two days ago she made certain false allegations in the House which she knew subsequently to be false but which she did not have the integrity to withdraw.

I hope today she takes the opportunity to—

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, once again I would appeal to you to try to deal with the facts as opposed to personal attacks. It would make things a lot easier for the House.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as you and I clearly know, calling and intervening with a quasi-judicial body is wrong. Calling a judge for any reason is also wrong. This Prime Minister never denied that he actually called a judge. There was discrepancy about why he called. He admitted he had called a judge.

This entire affair has been unbelievable and continues to be unbelievable. There is no denial of that.

This government has placed politics before principle and its damage control spin doctors have spun out of control. This Prime Minister has set a precedent of claiming to be responsible and accountable but he is neither. Frankly, I wonder would any further supplementaries be totally wasted on this government?

**The Speaker:** Order.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Tonight, the Prime Minister will begin a long trip at the head of a Canadian delegation that will take him to China, in particular. We know how important respect for human rights is and the leadership role which Canada has always assumed in this regard. Last week, the Prime Minister admitted in Vancouver that he did not intend to raise the issue publicly.

How can the Prime Minister believe that timid action behind closed doors can significantly improve the human rights situation in China?

[English]

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this trip to China will be the biggest delegation ever assembled from Canada. We are going to strengthen and advance the ties between Canada and China.

On this front we will advance on the four pillar policies that we have stated so clearly in this House. The first is the economic and trade ties between us. The second is the role China plays in the security of the world. The third is sustainable development and issues about the environment. The fourth is about human rights, good government and the rule of law development in China.

*Oral Questions*

This government would not sacrifice any one of those for the other.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is not exactly what we heard.

Are we to understand from the reservations expressed by the Prime Minister that Canada has now given up its leading role in defending human rights around the world?

(1430)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, last week, I observed with interest the meeting between the Premier of Quebec and the governor of a Chinese province and I noted that the Premier of Quebec made no public comment about human rights in China.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister in his 1995 immigration plan told this House and the Canadian people that the levels of family class immigrants would not increase but would remain stable at a level of 51 per cent of all immigrants. Does the minister still maintain that this is an accurate representation of the facts?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we have said and confirmed in this plan is that the family class is very much a cornerstone within the immigration program. Not only in the family class category itself but the principle of family is protected in every other category. When we bring in an independent or a business class immigrant or a refugee they also have the legitimate right to bring in their families.

We have also tried to seek a balance because there are four different categories in the immigration program. We want each category to have an appropriate market share of the overall program. It has been well received in the east, the west and central Canada.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a plan and the numbers as the minister has released them to the Canadian people are somewhat deceptive.

This minister has in effect created two separate and new classes of immigrants that did not exist last year. These classes were included in last year's family totals but have been conveniently shuffled off into another column. In fact the percentage of family class immigrants in 1995 is expected to be significantly higher than last year.

Why did the minister obscure and fudge the numbers?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to disappoint the hon. member but there is no fudging of the figures. The figures are very clear.

We tabled four documents as part of the immigration plan, a 10 year strategic framework, a document called "Facts and Figures" and a report of the entire consultation process of what Canadians said. In response to this the Reform Party of Canada put out a three paragraph position on immigration. On Monday the critic said he was in support of the general direction, but on Tuesday he was completely opposed. Why do they not get their act together?

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**GOVERNMENT SPENDING**

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

While the Minister of Finance is saying that the country is practically on the verge of bankruptcy and that the time has come to cut government spending, the government tables supplementary estimates confirming over \$2 billion in additional expenditures. At the same time, we learn that senior officials asked federal auditors in charge of the internal audit process to remember that their reports can be made public and to keep a low profile.

Are we to understand that the new approach favoured by the Liberal government is to try to muzzle government auditors to keep them from denouncing gross abuses and waste in the federal administration?

[*English*]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again that I answered this earlier to the Leader of the Opposition who of course at one time was in government and knows how supplementary estimates work.

There are not additional expenditure items. They were provided for in the reserves. There was not sufficient detail in accordance with the required procedures to place them into the main estimates at that point so it is fully understood they come under supplementary estimates.

It has not changed at all our determination to meet our expenditure cut goals and to get the deficit down to 3 per cent of GDP in three years.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the minister really understood my question. Are we to understand that the new approach favoured by the Liberal government is to try to muzzle government auditors to keep

*Oral Questions*

them from denouncing gross abuses and waste in the federal administration?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is exactly the same approach that was used by the Leader of the Opposition during his three years as a minister in Mr. Mulroney's government.

\* \* \*

(1435)

[English]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, recently *Saturday Night* reported on grave problems within the Immigration and Refugee Board. One of the issues raised in the article was the conduct of the vice-chair of the board. *Saturday Night* reported that the vice-chair had ordered the raising of refugee acceptance rates and threatened the career of those who do not meet an acceptance quota.

I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration: Is it not true that he was aware of the manipulations by the vice-chair long ago? Why did he not do anything about it before?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is no.

I confirm that the chair of the Immigration and Refugee Board wrote to me yesterday suggesting that there would be reasons for conducting a fuller review. Yesterday I instructed our department's legal counsel out of the Department of Justice to write to the deputy vice-chair requesting his written comments within seven days. Once I have all the facts before me I will make the appropriate decision. This government will always do the right thing.

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** That is very reassuring, Mr. Speaker.

Recently another high ranking member of the board, Greg Fyffe, was released from the board under suspicious circumstances. Some reports tell of frustration because of interference by this minister. Another distinguished member of the board resigned his post in frustration, accusing the IRB of pandering to the immigration industry costing Canadians millions of dollars and not helping true refugees.

Will the minister admit that he has long known about the troubles in the Immigration and Refugee Board and that he refused to address them?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member's flight of exag-

eration serves no public interest except to further the political exploitation of an issue that this party has never accepted. I do not believe it is dignified for a minister of the crown or a member of Parliament to discuss personnel matters on the floor of the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MARINE TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. The Sub-Committee on the St. Lawrence Seaway is proposing that the Pilotage Act of 1972 be repealed, that the four pilotage authorities be disbanded, and that a Canada—United States agency be responsible for pilotage on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes.

In order to maintain the safety of navigation on the St. Lawrence River, will the Minister of Transport pledge to reject the sub-committee's recommendation to repeal the Pilotage Act?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we understand the great importance of safe navigation on the St. Lawrence River and elsewhere, and the report submitted by the sub-committee will be thoroughly examined. I want to reassure the hon. member and tell him that we will not take any measure that would jeopardize the safety of those who navigate on the St. Lawrence River or elsewhere.

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, considering that the safety of navigation on the St. Lawrence River is not the responsibility of Americans, who have a real interest in cutting the costs of navigating in Canadian waters, how can the minister expect a binational agency to apply the same safety standards as the current pilotage authorities?

[English]

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the introduction of new technology or the changes in any system having to do with maintaining safety and security whether it is in the air, on the sea or on land will always have as its very first priority the safety and security of Canadians and anyone who travels in Canadian controlled environment.

I want to reassure my colleague that whatever changes are made, and this report is one of many that will have to be considered, the first priority will always be to make sure that we are respecting safety and security. Any arrangements whether they are with the United States or any other international arrangement we enter into will always focus on safety and security because that is the fiduciary responsibility of the Department of Transport.

*Oral Questions***LAW OF THE SEA**

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the distinguished Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The law of the sea is designed to protect the world's fisheries and to stop pollution in the oceans. Canada signed that law 12 years ago but has yet to ratify it.

(1440)

Given the fact that the law of the sea will come into force in two weeks and it is not ratified by Canada, would the parliamentary secretary tell this House the precise date when the Government of Canada will ratify this important international law?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to answer this question of my colleague on an issue of importance to Canada.

Canada did sign the law of the sea convention in 1982 but we did have some concerns about some provisions in that convention with regard to the exploitation of the deep seabed. After long negotiations we were able to sign the agreement in the United Nations this year on July 29. Because of that we are now looking through all of our laws to make sure they are consistent with the convention.

The convention will come into force in November of this year and we hope to be able to ratify it ourselves soon thereafter.

\* \* \*

**YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the justice minister.

It is time this government ended the pain. Too many mothers live with tombstones in their eyes. They see the names of their children on gravestones because of the failure of this government to address the problems with the Young Offenders Act.

When will this government quit reviewing, consulting and debating changes to the Young Offenders Act and realize that some young offenders cannot be rehabilitated?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that granted some young offenders cannot be rehabilitated, but most can. It is a very worthwhile exercise to seek the rehabilitation of young offenders because they are not going to serve their sentences forever. They are going to be back in society and it is in the interests of society that they be rehabilitated.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have looked into the eyes of a mother whose four year old child is gone forever. I have seen the tears created by the calling of her child's name. I saw this mother refuse to let go of her child's teddy bear as if the touch might keep her child alive.

Canadians stand on these grounds to protest this government's refusal to admit mothers and fathers cry every day because the current young offenders legislation is no deterrent to violent youth.

When will the minister admit some violent young offenders deserve closed custody for periods that are longer than the time it takes for the tears to stop flowing?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no punishment or sanction in the world that is going to compensate for the loss of a child.

The Reform Party is asking for justice and that is what it is getting from this government. Bill C-37, with amendments to the Young Offenders Act, is in committee at the present time. We have stated that we will be proceeding with a 10-year review of the Young Offenders Act.

We need consultation and dialogue to get the right law. If we were not dialoguing and consulting, there would be another complaint from the Reform Party.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MARINE TRANSPORTATION**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Even though double hulls are not required for navigation on the St. Lawrence and giant oil tankers have very little clearance when carrying a full cargo, the transport sub-committee recommends that the Pilotage Act be repealed and the pilotage associations disbanded.

In order to avoid an ecological disaster on the St. Lawrence, does the Minister of the Environment intend to continue to require shipowners to use certified pilots?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is no doubt that my hon. colleague attaches a great deal of importance to a report prepared by the transport sub-committee, but let us not exaggerate that importance. Before changes, if in fact there are any, can take place, all the implications will have to be examined.

And as far as security on the St. Lawrence River is concerned, we are obviously going to take great pains to ensure that any proposed changes will not result in greater risk than that already existing.

*Oral Questions*

(1445)

When I listen to the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Bloc speaking about budgetary restraint and the need to examine all possible avenues to cut costs, I wish to make it quite clear that we will examine all the possibilities, but we will also maintain our responsibility for security on the St. Lawrence River and elsewhere in Canada.

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Transport continues to threaten to eliminate the St. Lawrence pilotage system, does the Minister of the Environment recognize that this system constitutes the best means of ensuring the protection of the environment with respect to navigation on the St. Lawrence?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is completely false to claim that the Minister of Transport is threatening to abolish the pilotage system on the St. Lawrence or anywhere else in Canada.

A parliamentary sub-committee tabled a report and we will take its recommendations into consideration. But we will evaluate all changes in the context I have described previously, that of ensuring the security of people travelling on the St. Lawrence, or on the east or west coast.

As far as pilotage is concerned, no decision has been taken. I would like to assure my hon. colleague, through you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the time to start rumours that we are going to do anything today or tomorrow that could endanger those who need to have their safety ensured on land, at sea and in the air.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision confirming the defence of extreme drunkenness was only a milestone in developing trends of defensive intoxication.

This year in British Columbia there has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of murder trials that resulted in convictions on lesser charges. The majority of these cases are due to the defence of intoxication.

Why is this government prepared to wait while the intoxication defence is allowing criminals to literally get away with murder?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I think to the hon. member for Beaver

River, this is a great concern to the Minister of Justice and there is going to be something done about this.

The whole question of extreme and excessive drunkenness is being included in the recodification of the Criminal Code. The report on that recodification is now before the Minister of Justice and he will be expressing his position on the contents of this recodification very shortly.

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this House is great at reports and in studies and I think what the Canadian people are asking for is action.

The Liberal red book states that as a government it will introduce measures to protect women and children. Yet in the majority of the above noted cases the victims are females. Over half the cases of manslaughter, over half the convictions for manslaughter have resulted in sentences of less than five years.

Will the minister advise the House when this government will live up to its red book commitment to protect the women of this country?

**An hon. member:** No rush.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a member of the Reform Party says no rush. I want to disagree with him. There is a rush.

The Minister of Justice has asked for the recodification to include the area to which the hon. member refers. She mentioned dialogue and studies. What Canadians do want are good laws. They want good laws that are going to serve the needs of Canadian society and that is what this government is going to bring forward.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS LOANS**

**Mr. Tony Ianno (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

When the Prime Minister appeared on CBC's Prime Time News town hall meeting he said that some banks are doing a good job of supplying small and medium sized enterprises with financing, while others were not doing as well.

He also said there should be a ratio between lending money to big business and lending money to small business.

What is the minister doing to encourage the banks to meet a lending target whereby one-third of all business loans by the banks are allocated to small and medium sized businesses?

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all acknowledge the work of the member for Trinity—Spadina on the industry committee, the study on access to capital for small business.

*Oral Questions*

(1450)

The member has proposed a very important idea. I believe that most members would recognize the fact that thanks to large businesses, lending to small businesses is not satisfactory. The member has proposed an idea that this should be increased to close to a two-thirds, one-third basis.

It is an interesting idea because it would be an injection of close to \$15 billion into the small and medium sized business community pool. It is an idea we are going to look at closely and we will be back to him in due course.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF KINGSTON**

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Defence.

The Minister of Defence has stated on many occasions that the Military College of Kingston would be a model of bilingualism. Last week, he set up a special committee, over which he chairs personally, to make the college bilingual.

How can the minister explain the college authorities' refusal to grant the request of Canadian Military College teachers who are asking that francophone teachers have equal access and access in their own language to cultural, professional, financial and material resources useful for their career progression?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to take issue with the hon. member.

The Royal Military College in Kingston is a bilingual institution. It offers courses in both languages and there are professors and students there of both linguistic groups.

With the consolidation of the three colleges we want to ensure that this bilingualization is total and complete and satisfies people like the hon. member who were obviously upset with the Collège Militaire Royal in Saint-Jean.

I announced the committee last week which I will chair. The former commandant there, General Emond who is now the commandant at RMC, will be on the committee as will the former principal, Mr. Carrier, and other prominent members of the francophone community.

I think that this committee, once it gets going, will oversee the consolidation and bilingualization of all of these colleges into one to the satisfaction of the hon. member.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Defence explain the fact that the dean of the college in Kingston, Mr. John Plant, is sitting on this bilingualization committee, when he is the very person who refused francophone teachers access to services in their primary language?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is an allegation and I have no evidence that the assertion made by the hon. member, the allegation, is actually true.

If he has facts that will substantiate his assertion perhaps he could let me know and I will look into them and try to resolve the matter.

\* \* \*

**ESPRIT DE CORPS**

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry will know that a free and independent press is a cornerstone of democracy. The press must be free to criticize government without fear of retribution.

*Esprit de Corps* has in its writings been critical of certain aspects of sourcing of military equipment. Following this criticism a high ranking bureaucrat from industry, seconded to the Department of National Defence, is alleged to have suggested to advertisers that they should boycott advertising in the magazine *Esprit de Corps*.

Will the minister launch an investigation to determine the scope of the involvement of personnel from the Department of Industry in attempting to destroy this Canadian publication?

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there have been allegations of this nature made not only toward employees of the Department of Industry but also of the Department of National Defence.

I have no evidence whatsoever that anyone in national defence or in the Department of Industry has made these kinds of threats. If the hon. member has names of individuals he could please give them to me or to the Minister of Industry because we cannot every day in the House of Commons have these innuendoes floating around and hurting institutions and government departments that carry on their job on a daily basis beyond reproach.

(1455)

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Industry investigate in the

department to find out whether these allegations are true? That was my question.

General Motors recently pulled its advertising from the magazine *Esprit de Corps*. The reason given for this decision is that its representative was getting bad vibes from the Department of National Defence. Would the minister of defence in concert with the Minister of Industry issue a directive that all personnel are to cease and that this kind of action would not be tolerated in any department of the Government of Canada?

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. member an assurance. If there are people doing this it will not be tolerated no matter what government department. Please come forward and give us the evidence before he makes the charges on the floor of the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. Today the Prime Minister leads Team Canada to China as an important strategy in our government's jobs and growth agenda.

I would like to ask the minister how he expects this mission to improve our international trade position and to improve the prospects for unemployed Canadians?

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the House would join the hon. member for Oakville—Milton in wishing the Prime Minister well as he departs with his nine provincial colleagues and some 375 business people on the largest trade mission Canada has ever mounted.

That mission in its scope and participation by all regions in Canada and by large and small corporations represents the culmination of the commitment this government has made, through the missions led by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Secretary of State for—

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

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Kamloops.

\* \* \*

#### ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister, who will appreciate that in an effort to manage the deficit and the debt, the government has been calling upon Canadians, UI recipients, students, farmers, fishers and many others to pay their fair share.

She will also be aware that last week we heard the Royal Bank of Canada is expecting to see its profit margin in excess of \$1 billion this year. If she looks at the financial record she will find

#### Oral Questions

that in 1992 in spite of \$63 million in profits the Royal Bank paid no income tax at all.

Last year in spite of \$324 million in profits, the Royal Bank paid no income tax and also got a tax credit to apply for this year. Will the Deputy Prime Minister not admit that when a teller at the Royal Bank is actually paying more income tax than the entire Royal Bank of Canada there is something wrong with this picture?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government has made serious efforts to increase fairness. We will make continued efforts to increase fairness.

I would remind the hon. member that the large corporation tax in Canada applies to the banks. The corporate income tax applies to them. They pay a capital tax in addition to that, which is not part of the income tax but is separate from the income tax.

(1500)

I might add that banks and all other financial institutions are expected, when they make profits the size they are this year, to pay their fair share of taxes which will go toward decreasing our fiscal deficit. That will be an important part of it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, could the secretary of state responsible for parliamentary affairs tell us what is on the legislative agenda for tomorrow and the days to come, after next week's adjournment.

[English]

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the order of business for the remainder of today will be Bill C-53 respecting the Department of Canadian Heritage, followed by Bill C-55 concerning Yukon surface rights, and followed by Bill C-54, the technical amendments regarding the Old Age Security Act and the Canada pension plan.

Tomorrow we will begin third reading of Bill C-38 respecting marine safety. We will then return to the unfinished business of today at the place where we left off. I understand there may be a disposition to finish the day earlier than usual tomorrow. We will discuss it as the day proceeds through informal consultations.

Next week the House is adjourned for Remembrance Day observances. I wish to inform the House that Tuesday, November 15, shall be an opposition day. The government will advise members of the business for the remainder of that week before the end of next week's adjournment.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the heritage of our country traces its roots to our First Nations peoples and thereafter to the French and English people who came as the earliest settlers and, even later thereafter, to peoples from all over the world who chose to immigrate and make Canada their home.

I am therefore pleased to stand in the House today to speak about Bill C-53, the Department of Canadian Heritage Act. The objective of the bill is designed to give legal status to the amalgamation of five predecessor organizations, namely the Secretary of State, the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship, the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport, the Parks Canada component of Environment Canada, and the cultural broadcasting and heritage components of the Department of Communications.

This extensive reorganization reflects the government's commitment to more efficient and effective government. Under the new structure, one department with one minister and one deputy minister is given responsibility for delivering an important mandate. The Department of Canadian Heritage is a blend of the various elements that define us as a diverse and vibrant nation with a rich and abundant cultural and natural heritage.

The department's activities are the product of its broad range of responsibilities in the fields of cultural development, arts, broadcasting, national parks, historic sites, amateur sport and multiculturalism. The department also administers official languages, Canadian studies, and state ceremonial and native programs, all of which contribute in a very significant way to our sense of Canadian identity and pride.

As international barriers disappear and evolving technology stretches the world's boundaries, the development of our identity as a nation becomes increasingly vital to our country's prosperity and élan vital. It is only natural that the federal government would have an instrument such as the Department of Canadian Heritage to enable it to continue promoting development and a sense of Canadian identity.

(1505)

The department has three principal areas of responsibility. Through Parks Canada, the department is the chief custodian of the natural and physical heritage found in our national parks,

national historic sites and historic canals. Parks Canada commemorates, protects and presents both directly and indirectly places of significance to Canada's cultural and natural heritage in ways that encourage public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment.

The economic activity and tourism generated by the department's operations are of significance to many local economies not only in Canada but throughout the world. The parks service has been at the forefront of efforts for innovative partnership arrangements with private and not for profit enterprises in carrying out its mandated responsibilities.

Another principal area of the department's activities involves the enhancement of cultural development through policies and programs to support our cultural industries and our national cultural and heritage institutions such as the Canada Council, the National Gallery, the National Arts Centre and the National Archives, to name but a few.

In the area of arts and broadcasting, the Department of Canadian Heritage recognizes the importance of new technologies and is working to ensure that the impact of the information highway on Canadian artists will be a positive one.

Through the citizenship and Canadian identity sector of the Department of Canadian Heritage the government devotes many of its efforts to promoting a greater understanding of our diversity, to increasing the involvement of all citizens in Canadian society and to promoting our two official languages.

Canada's linguistic duality is deeply rooted in our country's very nature. Official language policies introduced by the federal government in the early 1970s reflect a generous and creative vision. The Department of Canadian Heritage has the unique responsibility of ensuring that English speaking and French speaking Canadians, irrespective of ethnocultural origins, feel at home wherever they choose to live in Canada.

This department places a key role in the enhancement and development of English and French linguistic minority communities; respect for Canada's two official languages, together with respect for the traditions and contributions of our First Nations people; respect for our cultural diversity; and respect for basic human rights, making Canada a unique country and one of the most highly regarded and respected in the world.

The Department of Canadian Heritage greatly affects all Canadians economically, socially and culturally. The economic activity and tourism generated by the department's operations are of great importance to many local economies.

The policies and programs of the department are aimed at fostering greater awareness of our cultural and natural riches. These are heavy responsibilities but the department is up to the task. It is apparent to me that the mission of Canadian Heritage is closely linked to the major issues facing our nation today. The

department has a full agenda and its mission extends into many sectors of Canadian society.

Clearly the Department of Canadian Heritage has a key role to play and, with the legislation in place, will be able to forge ahead to meet the challenges of the 21st century and the future beyond.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is out of great concern for the promotion and preservation of Quebec culture that I participate today in this debate on Bill C-53 to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

It is unthinkable, in my view, that a department be established to promote, as indicated in clause 4, Canadian culture and heritage. Once again, the federal government is proving to the people of Quebec that it does not understand the first thing about Quebec culture. How indeed can one seriously claim that there is such a thing as a Canadian culture? Perhaps government members should be reminded that the French language is alive and commonly used in Quebec and in many regions of Canada in spite of sustained efforts on the part of the federal government to trivialize the spoilsports it views francophones as.

(1510)

Not only is Quebec culture alive and well in Quebec but it also radiates worldwide. Just think of the success of Quebec talent abroad. French Canadians are also successful abroad. Such a vibrant cultural environment can legitimately claim and gain complete independence at the cultural level. On that subject, the former Liberal culture minister in Quebec rightly indicated that she intended to reaffirm the need for Quebec to assume control over cultural matters on its territory. Culture is of paramount importance to Quebec; therefore, it is important that the government of Quebec be recognized the exclusive powers required to discharge its responsibilities.

As you can see, there is nothing new or partisan about us, Quebecers, wanting to manage our cultural matters ourselves. History and the evolution of Quebec over the years show this deep-seated will of dealing with Quebec culture, and to do so from Quebec. Let us look for example at the demands made by Premiers Johnson and Bertrand in the 1960s, Bourassa and Lévesque in the 1970s and 1980s, who despite their many differences of opinion all demanded that Quebec's cultural affairs be administered by Quebec.

In addition to promoting Canadian culture, Bill C-53 shows an intention of managing this so-called culture. I think that this bill amounts to an outright refusal to recognize Quebec's distinctiveness.

### *Government Orders*

Let us now look at constitutional responsibilities in cultural matters. Section 92(16) of the 1867 Constitution Act recognizes provincial jurisdiction over all matters of a merely local or private nature. Is Quebec culture not a local or private matter?

Furthermore, the 1867 act gives the provinces jurisdiction over the administration of justice in civil matters, which is, as my colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata so eloquently said, a fundamental characteristic of our distinct society.

Since provincial jurisdiction over education is closely linked to culture, it would be ridiculous and even totally inconsistent to deal with them separately. This demonstration clearly shows that the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction over the whole area of culture.

Quebec is fed up with the federal government's meddling in provincial matters! Justifying cultural interference by invoking the existence of a single Canadian culture is taking comedy, which is turning into drama, a little too far. It also ignores the history of the two founding nations, need I remind you.

Let us look for a few moments at your definition of nation. Since when is Canada a single nation? We live in a country that was created from scratch. Are you denying the existence of one of the founding nations of this country you are supposedly so proud of? Have you forgotten that there is a large francophone community in your great country and that they are in the majority in Quebec?

True, your daily actions show how little interest you have in issues affecting francophones. We only have to think about Kingston, Long Lac, the military college in Saint-Jean. But is flatly denying the very existence of a francophone culture in Canada not going a little too far?

It would be extremely dangerous to leave the administration of Quebec culture in the hands of a federal minister like the one now in place, working with a law which does not even recognize the existence of Quebec's distinct culture. Especially since the federal government was never too keen on investing as much money in francophone culture as in anglophone culture.

(1515)

Take the example of the French and English networks of the CBC. The difference in the funding of these two is growing all the time; in April, the difference in the programming budget was \$76.4 million. At the same time, we learned that the two networks had about the same size of audience.

We cannot fail to mention the many instances of duplication and overlap in the cultural field. Almost every federal cultural institution has a counterpart in Quebec. For example, there are Radio-Canada and Radio-Québec, the Canada Council and the Conseil des arts et lettres du Québec, the National Archives of Canada and the Quebec archives, to name only these.

*Government Orders*

Many hundreds of thousands of dollars are wasted every year with such unnecessary duplication and overlap. Can we afford it? Everyone knows that we cannot. Is it really asking too much to want to administer one's own culture? For too long, the federal government has shown its intention to assimilate and wipe out Quebec culture. The people of Quebec have enough of being laughed at for wanting to have all they need to develop and preserve their cultural identity.

Fortunately, Quebecers have understood that negotiations with the federal government lead nowhere and they will show that by expressing their desire to become a sovereign people. That is the only way to ensure our survival in America. Until that day, as the representatives here in Ottawa of most Quebec voters, we will strive to have the existence of this francophone culture recognized, for it shall never cease to exist.

Francophones pay taxes like all other citizens and as such they are entitled to all the benefits that anglophones have in this country and to the historical recognition that is their due. Finally, as Malraux said, culture is not inherited—it is won.

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on the bill to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage. French-speaking communities outside Quebec have long relied on the federal government to protect their rights and promote their development.

And the federal government has always responded with concrete and helpful measures for minority groups. In the early seventies, it set up programs to support French-speaking communities outside Quebec. These programs reflect an open and creative vision which allows French-speaking minority groups to thrive and fully contribute to the economic, social, cultural and scientific life of our country.

Since then, these programs have evolved according to the needs of communities and they have played an important role in their development. One of these initiatives is the Official Languages Act, which was originally passed 25 years ago and improved in 1988. There is also section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which guarantees French linguistic minorities the right to receive school instruction in their first language as well as the right to manage their schools, where the numbers warrant it.

So, the government of Canada, which happened to be a Liberal government, first created a legal framework to promote the development of French and English linguistic minority groups, and to promote the official languages in our country. It also created a constitutional framework which guarantees to the two linguistic communities the right to delivery of services in the official language of their choice. Whether it is delivery of

services in both official languages or the right to education in the minority language, these initiatives helped make tremendous progress.

As regards the management of schools by French-speaking communities, the federal government supported every cause related to clarifying that right. The Court Challenges Program set up by the federal government was an invaluable tool for French-speaking minorities in the fight for the recognition of their rights. By the way, that program will soon be reinstated.

(1520)

After the 1990 Supreme Court decision on the Mahé case, the federal government lent its support to every province to ensure a quick implementation of that judgment everywhere in Canada. In May 1993, the federal government announced measures to fund part of the implementation costs of a school management system in every province where such a system had not yet been set up.

Today, thanks to federal government support, French-speaking minorities can manage their schools almost everywhere in the country. I am convinced it is only a matter of time before all francophones in this country will be able to manage their own schools. I may add that this is already the case in my own riding.

The federal government is also present in other areas that are of primary importance to these communities, including the economy, human resources development and culture, to name only a few. The Department of Canadian Heritage is not the only federal institution that can play a decisive role in priority areas but is responsible for co-ordinating the implementation by departments and federal agencies of the federal government's commitment to the growth and development of official language minority communities.

These provisions of the Official Languages Act were not acted upon by the previous government. Last summer, cabinet members agreed to consider the specific needs of official language communities when implementing the policies and programs of their respective departments.

A number of specific projects have now been finalized: The La Picasse Community Centre Project in Petit-de-Grat, Nova Scotia; the new school of electrical engineering at the University of Moncton; a human resources adjustment committee for Canadian francophones; an economic development plan for bilingual municipalities in Manitoba; and the construction of a francophone community centre in Edmonton.

That is how this government supports the growth and development of Canada's anglophone and francophone minority communities. The departments each have their own mandate but all work together towards a common goal: ensuring that official language communities can reach their full potential in all areas.

*Government Orders*

The communities themselves agree this is a remarkable achievement that will have a clear impact on the development of minority official language communities.

The Canadian government and the communities had established a good working relationship over the years, but since the seventies, the world has changed dramatically. Economic imperatives and new cultural, social and linguistic priorities that are developing today have made it necessary to restructure the federal government's approach, in order to make its support programs for these communities more effective.

Thanks to the current exercise in repositioning at the Department of Canadian Heritage, communities will be able to take an active part in setting priorities and thus target the main areas where action is needed.

Official language communities are a vital force in Canadian society, not only because of their numbers but also and above all because of their extraordinary vitality and energy.

The Government of Canada has always greatly contributed to their cultural development through cultural co-operation agreements with the provincial governments, direct assistance to cultural institutions, through the federal Cultural Initiatives Program and various other support measures and instruments which I mentioned in my speech.

Some people claim that the federal government does not do enough for francophone minorities outside Quebec. We should realize that despite the current financial squeeze, the federal government has maintained the special budgets that enable francophones to manage their own schools and have better access to post-secondary education.

(1525)

Furthermore, pursuant to the inter-departmental initiative announced last summer, all federal institutions will from now on be involved in the development of francophone and anglophone minority communities, in the spirit of the Official Languages Act.

It is important to see where the real needs are and where real progress can be achieved in developing Canada's francophone communities. The federal government is committed to meeting the specific needs of these communities because it wants to develop this country's full potential. We are firmly committed to pursuing that goal.

[*English*]

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am both proud and sad to address this bill at this time. What has happened within the last 10 days or so has given me concern about what is happening to the heritage of Canadians.

I am a proud Canadian. My parents are proud Canadians. My parents came to this country as children. My father met my mother when they were teenagers in southern Alberta. They were married and raised a family during the depression. They have told me many, many stories about what happened in this country. My grandparents told me of some things that happened in other countries. They talked about heritage and culture. They told us about our culture, about our parents and our background. I am proud of both of those heritages, but the one I really understand and the one I am a part of is the Canadian heritage.

One thing I want Canadians to be known for is their integrity, their honesty and their fairness and treatment of each other with justice. I am not that young any more, but my children are young. It seems to me that we as seniors in this country of ours need to present an example to the upcoming generation.

The real heritage we have as Canadians is our children for whom we are building this country. I ask myself and I ask this House, what kind of legacy are we leaving to our children when they see the kinds of things that have happened in this House over the last 10 days?

There have been allegations and almost accusations and statements made against and about the leader of our country and one of his key ministers. We have to ask ourselves: Is this the kind of thing we want our children to emulate? Do we want our children to think that the Prime Minister would defend a minister of the crown who would intercede or take action that could be interpreted as interceding on behalf of someone so that unfair or special advantage is given to one person over another? We do not want that.

The Prime Minister has said: "The buck stops here". I admire him for saying that. It is responsible of him to say: "I am accountable. I am responsible for the things that happen in my government", which includes every minister on the front bench and all the parliamentarians he leads.

But he is a leader beyond that. He is our Prime Minister. He is my Prime Minister. Even though I am not a member of his party he is still my Prime Minister. I want to be able to respect him. I want to look to him for leadership, as an example of the kinds of things that ought to be happening not only in this House but in this whole country. That is what we are looking for.

Generally the position has been clear. The Prime Minister has indicated that he is a man of the people. He listens and he tries to do what is best. But there is now a question. Did he do what was best in this particular instance? The record is clear. I am not going to review the record now. But I ask the Prime Minister, the minister and every parliamentarian here, including myself: Is this the kind of behaviour we want our children to emulate when they become this country's parliamentarians?

*Government Orders*

(1530)

I am not proud. I do not think I could say yes to that question. I think I would have to answer no. I want my children and those who will follow us to have another example, a standard which says we will not interfere in the administration of justice. We will not interfere in a quasi-judicial body to get it to make a decision that is different from the one that is apparently independent and considers all the facts before a decision is made. That is what I want.

I think there is a position here that can be salvaged but let us make clear that what ought to be said is said and that where a mistake has been made let the appropriate action be taken.

At this time the Prime Minister must take action. He has decided not to. That is a decision. It is his opportunity to do that but I would encourage him to take at least some action. We are in a crisis situation and if we ever needed integrity in leadership it is today.

Next year in 1995 this country will be faced with a major refinancing. A major amount of money is going to have to be borrowed in the world market. The question I want to ask is this: Will the lenders that loaned us money before continue to lend us money if they have any question as to whether we will do what we said we would do? We need confidence in the financial management of this country. We need to know that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister are serious about getting this budget under control and balancing the budget.

Beyond that, we need something else and that is justice. This morning, in fact I am wearing the button which says "Justice for Joshua", right beside me was a group of high school students that said "No, not just for Joshua, for all of us". That is exactly what we want. We want justice for every person, young persons, middle aged persons, seniors, every person in Canada. We want justice for them, we want fairness for them and we want them to live in a way that they are treated equally as individuals and as provinces.

That is the heritage we want. That is the heritage we can have. It is we together as a group, and as individuals, as the opposition, who will fight for that. We will build a country that we can be indeed proud of and we can then say to our children: "Follow our example. It is a good one".

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this opportunity that I have to address the House today is particularly important for me because of the nature of the debate. When we talk about culture, we are really talking about the very heart and soul of a nation. Therefore, allow me to speak with strong emotion.

The purpose of Bill C-53 is to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to unite under one authority all the policy instruments Ottawa has in the cultural area: the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada, museums and national parks and the National Archives of Canada.

The annual budget of this department would be approximately \$2.8 billion.

The main objective of this new super-department is to support and promote the Canadian cultural policy. This is enough to get all the citizens of Quebec and the one million francophones outside Quebec seriously worried.

Even if in the past the cultural development policy was not so well orchestrated, we could yet see clearly that it was in Ottawa's interest rather than that of the francophones all over the country.

On the strength of the British North America Act and, hence, of the residual powers entrusted to him, and encroaching upon some provincial jurisdictions, education for example, the federal government is about to control more closely than ever what we call Canadian culture.

The desire to take over one of the more essential aspects of our lives is not new. This is nothing but the logical and perfect continuation of actions taken since the first Communications Act of 1932 by which the federal government gave itself exclusive jurisdiction in the area of communications. The events that followed confirmed its exclusive jurisdiction in other areas. This is why the CRTC can declare unilaterally what is good for the provinces, including the only francophone province in this country.

(1535)

Using its powers to expand its responsibilities and possibly create a new area of activity, Ottawa developed over the years a policy, the bilingualism and multiculturalism policy, based on a central theme.

We can understand that some of our English-speaking fellow citizens had a hard time finding their own identity, but common sense should never have allowed the creation of such a two-headed monster. For humane considerations, my grandfather used to kill two-headed calves at birth. In Ottawa, they are considered as precious as the Golden calf.

Between you and me, Mr. Speaker, where is the cultural difference between Canada and the United States, except for Quebec, of course? Compared to our southern neighbour, Canada is nothing more than a society without any significant distinctive traits. Is there really a Canadian culture or is it merely the creation of a political administration with an over-productive mind? Have we been the victims of too wide or too narrow designs? The future will soon tell us, since Quebec will shortly be an external observer.

However, for the time being, six million francophones have to adapt to this federal creature that many find disturbing. Beyond worn-out official statements and pious wishes, what did Canada's cultural policy give the French-speaking minority of this country?

Our culture distinguishes us from other Canadians; how has this policy contributed to reinforce our own identity? The question begs the answer. This policy did not contribute a thing to our cultural development. What is worse, it actually had a destabilizing effect, limiting the growth and creative potential of its most distinctive and dynamic aspect. Even then it would have to be recognized as such—this is what happens when you have a policy the rationale of which has no bearing on Canadian reality.

Praise it as you may, claim all you want that it is likely to meet the legitimate aspirations of Quebecers and other francophones coast to coast, it does not even manage to impose respect for the most basic element of our identity: the French language. Reports unanimously show hatred for the use of French, coast to coast. Is it two languages on equal footing or one language stomped on with both feet? In what way did passage of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms benefit francophone communities?

One of its main achievements is the following: Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island have yet to approve a single bill to give effect to plans for French language school management. They examine, they ponder, they hem and haw, as we would say. But so far, no concrete steps have been taken to support these communities who wish to manage their own schools.

Does it come as a surprise that 127 years after the birth of Confederation and 25 years after the passage of the Official Languages Act, the commissioner responsible for ensuring that the linguistic rights of minorities are respected, Mr. Victor Goldbloom, cannot get over the ignorance of the anglophone majority, that goes about completely oblivious of the existence of the francophone minority?

Mr. Goldbloom talks about ignorance when he should be talking about hostility in the case of the 65 Ontario municipalities which declared themselves officially unilingual English, although no law forces them to provide services in French. The Prime Minister of Canada said that his Canada included the 1 million francophones living outside Quebec. He must live in a great country full of respect and dignity. He should try living like little Jean Bilodeau or Jean Leblanc.

In your opinion, Mr. Speaker, should we trust these people who are unable to face up to reality? Do you think that our culture is safe in their hands? Who are these people who, through the Department of Canadian Heritage, want to define our culture and therefore a large part of our lives? Who would

### *Government Orders*

benefit from having a say on the way we live, think and entertain ourselves? What would they like to see in our culture?

(1540)

What about those who recently refused to recognize us as a distinct society? Those who, under the pretext of efficient budget management, merrily slash the amounts allocated to Radio-Canada, which is already unfairly treated compared with the CBC.

There are also those who make it a point of honour, if not a duty, to duplicate the cultural institutions of the Quebec government. We will face those who are against any dialogue, any sharing of responsibilities, any co-operation despite Quebec's repeated calls for joint action.

We should blindly leave essential elements of our collective future in the hands of these people, when all their actions seem designed to neutralize the efforts of another level of government.

Thanks, but no thanks. I, for one, do not trust the supporters of this power, who are now striving to formalize a policy that never was and never will be consistent with our interests and aspirations.

Even Liza Frulla, the former Quebec Liberal minister—who is not a sovereignist—admitted that Ottawa is creating overlap and duplication by interfering in Quebec's cultural affairs.

This government, with its centralizing federalism, knows full well that whoever controls the means of expression of a culture also controls its vitality, energy and creative power. Let us not give Ottawa the privilege of imposing its ideal cultural order.

It has long been proven that no one is in a better position than the Government of Quebec to develop a cultural policy based on the real needs of its people.

Until Quebec has acquired its full political sovereignty, others will decide what should go into our creative endeavours. The Bloc Québécois, which is waging a continual struggle for the integrity of Quebec culture, cannot support Bill C-53, which is contrary to the legitimate intentions of the Quebec government in this field.

By creating this Department of Canadian Heritage, Ottawa is proving that it clearly intends to keep and even increase its ability to act in this sector which is crucial for the development of Quebec's cultural identity.

In this country, where francophones start to be assimilated from infancy, I feel nothing positive about creating a Department of Canadian Heritage. It is simply an expression of the federal government's harmful centralizing designs on Quebec.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you will understand that I wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by the Bloc Québécois member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

*Government Orders**[English]*

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have just a couple of minutes this afternoon to discuss the bill in front of us dealing with the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I am the critic for aboriginal affairs for the New Democratic Party. In that capacity I have had a number of dealings with the Department of Canadian Heritage. The department inherited a number of the programs from the former secretary of state which dealt with aboriginal people, their programs and activities.

One of the programs that the department has inherited that has bothered me in its response for some time has been a program dealing with aboriginal education. I wanted to take the opportunity here, with the minister in the Chamber and the debate on this bill, to bring to members of this House and to the minister's attention some correspondence which I received in recent months concerning the treatment of aboriginal people by the department. When government asks members of Parliament for approval to do anything with relation to the department I think it is important that we understand some of the ways in which the department has responded to us in the past.

I have in front of me a two paragraph letter, in fact the paragraphs are reasonably lengthy, addressed to me from the president of the Saskatchewan Indian Cultural College.

(1545)

I would like to read the two paragraphs. The president of the Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre is Linda Pelly-Landrie. She writes:

The Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations and its affiliate institutions, Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College and Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technology have been actively seeking the financial resources required to develop curriculum for our First Nations. While various government departments have acknowledged that First Nations instructional and resource materials are essential to the retention and achievement of First Nations students, all contend that they are not adequately resourced and cannot finance our projects. Yet, the Department of Canadian Heritage has offered \$500,000 to Mondia Editeurs and an affiliate, Micro Intel, two non-aboriginal firms out of Montreal, a contract to develop CD-ROM curriculum materials pertaining to the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

Enclosed please find correspondence relating to the project proposed by the Department of Canadian Heritage. We ask that you review this material carefully and intervene on our behalf. Not only is offering a contract of this nature to non-aboriginal firms contrary to the government's commitment to the First Nation's inherent right to self-government, it is an insult. Adding to the insult is the demeaning and paternalistic manner in which the Department of Canadian Heritage has dealt with First Nations representatives on the project. We are the experts in

determining First Nations curriculum content and the most capable of managing and controlling a project of this nature. Furthermore, we have demonstrated expertise in developing and producing quality instructional materials. Therefore, it is our contention that this project should be contracted and controlled by a First Nations institution organization.

I want to quote from a couple of paragraphs of a letter that Ms. Pelly-Landrie wrote to the hon. Minister of Canadian Heritage earlier this year on the same project. In the letter she indicates that the cultural centre had met earlier in the year with the minister of Indian affairs with a proposal for resources to develop curriculum programs for First Nations people. They were informed that the financial resources were extremely limited and that their project request could not be met.

She goes on in her letter to the minister to indicate that the awarding of the contract for half a million dollars to the non-aboriginal group in Montreal is most objectionable:

Projects of this nature should be awarded to aboriginal people to promote the principles of Indian self-government and to encourage true partnerships between the federal government and First Nations governments.

We believe that First Nations have contributed significant changes to education. Indian control of Indian education is a principle to which all First Nations continue to strive for, as the ultimate goal of educational change, and improvement. The federal government must also be respectful of our commitment to develop and implement education for our people.

I trust that you will take immediate action to review this proposed project, and that measures will be taken in the future for the full involvement of aboriginal people to determine the development and implementation of such projects.

These letters seem to have been ignored by the minister and the department. The project was awarded to the non-aboriginal firms.

At the same time as Ms. Pelly-Landrie's letters were being circulated, another letter in support of the Saskatchewan centre has been drafted and sent to the minister from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, the Indian governments of Saskatchewan, signed by vice chief E. Dutch Lerat of Saskatchewan.

(1550)

The letter deals with this particular CD-ROM project and the treatment received by the aboriginal community on its request:

The First Nations of Canada have political and institutional structures which represent them on all matters of intergovernmental nature.

The First Nations are nationally represented in all such matters as languages, curriculum and cultural heritage by the First Nations Cultural Centres Executive Council (FNCCEC) of the Assembly of First Nations.

Your Department, over the strenuous objections of the First Nations of Canada, has recently awarded a contract for Aboriginal Curriculum Development to a non-Indian Business—Mondia Editeurs of Montreal.

*Government Orders*

The project involves a computerized Aboriginal Curriculum Project referred to as CD-ROM.

The First Nations have been invited to participate on a sub-contractual basis for a minuscule portion of the contract, although this is not the real issue I wish to raise.

In the pre-election Liberal Party Aboriginal Platform announced by the Prime Minister on October 8, 1993, your Government made a number of important commitments.

Two of those commitments are directly applicable to this issue:

“A Liberal Government, with the participation of Aboriginal Peoples, will establish an Aboriginal Educational Institute and networking facility that will co-ordinate and build upon initiatives in Aboriginal Curriculum Development for Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal Schools, Standards, Development, Distance Education, Aboriginal Languages, Teacher Orientation and the Special Needs of Many Communities such as Literacy, Adult Basic Education and Special Education”.

“The Liberal Platform on Aboriginal Economic Development includes measures such as procurement policies that stimulate the growth of Aboriginal Businesses”.

An example given with respect to this policy goes on to state:

“A fixed percentage of Federal contracts be allocated to competent Aboriginal Government and Businesses”.

I must seriously challenge your commitment to the Red Book Policies in light of the way in which your Department has handled this matter. The entire integrity of your Aboriginal platform is seriously called into question.

A key point of contention surrounding this contract is that your officials have ignored the competency of existing First Nations Institutions and Businesses—for example, the Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre, an accredited member of the Saskatchewan Book Publishing Association and, in fact, the current Chairman of the Association is a staff member from our Cultural Centre.

First Nations must be given first consideration in all matters related to Aboriginal Curriculum and Cultural Projects including the application of Technology such as that represented by the CD-ROM project.

In conclusion, I read from the the concluding paragraphs of the letter sent to the minister earlier this year:

The question now that arises, then is, how can there be money for a non-First Nations organization to develop First Nation's curriculum when there is none for our First Nations?

I think it is very important in our consideration of the Department of Canadian Heritage that we examine carefully the ways in which the department and the ministry are treating the people of aboriginal descent in our country and respect the wishes of the aboriginal community in developing a strong aboriginal curriculum that meets its needs as brought to the minister by the community.

I believe this is an important matter that requires the attention of all members and I thank the House for its time this afternoon.

(1555)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the chief government whip has asked me to defer the division until later.

Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the recorded division on the question now before the House is deferred until Monday, November 14 at 6.30 p.m., when the division bells will be rung for not more than 15 minutes.

The hon. chief government whip has the floor on a point of order.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think that you would obtain unanimous consent from the House to defer the vote that was to take place at 6.30 p.m. Monday until Tuesday, November 15 at 5.30 p.m.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is there unanimous consent for the chief government whip's proposal to defer the vote?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The vote will be deferred until Tuesday, November 15 at 5.30 p.m. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders***YUKON SURFACE RIGHTS BOARD ACT**

The House resumed from November 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-55, an act to establish a board having jurisdiction concerning disputes respecting surface rights in respect of land in the Yukon Territory and to amend other acts in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C-55, the Yukon Surface Rights Board Act. This bill is essentially a matter of legislative housekeeping and as such contains little of substance to either support or oppose.

However, I would like to take some time to address some of the bill's shortcomings and even its positive attributes.

As everyone in the House well knows, this bill is the companion legislation to Bills C-33 and C-34, two bills which the Reform Party strongly opposed. Our detailed reasons for the opposition to those bills are well documented from debates at the committee level and in the House so I will not revisit those arguments.

(1600)

However I would like to renew our opposition to the way the government first conceived and then rammed those bills through the House. In case anyone has forgotten, Bill C-33 and Bill C-34 were negotiated over a period of some 20 years, a period of closed door meetings and backroom deals typical of our old governments and old political parties.

To make matters worse, the government then stifled debate in the month of June in the House by evoking time allocation. This entire process was wrong, indeed shameful. It was wrong for the government not to include Canadians and interested third parties in the negotiations. It was wrong for the government to proceed with debate just 24 hours after the voluminous bills were first tabled in the House. It was shameful for the government to limit debate on such crucial pieces of legislation.

Unfortunately this type of action appears to be the rule rather than the exception when it comes to legislation affecting native or aboriginal land claims settlements.

Just over a year ago, in June 1993, another shameful government with the concurrence of the Liberals and the NDP in opposition took the very same tack with Bill C-133. They passed that bill in one day in the House. There was only one member of the House who stood to speak against it. That bill resulted in the creation of Nunavut, a new territory encompassing one-fifth of the Canadian land mass. With one-fifth of Canada at stake because of Bill C-133 the House, with the

concurrence of all political parties, took one day to pass it. There was no debate and no public input. That is a shame.

The Reform Party agrees with the need to correct past injustices and to treat aboriginals with the same respect and dignity afforded to all other Canadians, but we do not agree with the means chosen to accomplish this end.

I said at the start of my address that I would also touch on some of the positive aspects of the bill. They are few and far between, but I have found at least one such example. To its credit the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has in fact consulted with the mining industry on Bill C-55. I know this because our critic in this area has also consulted with many interests with regard to the legislation.

Through our discussions it was learned that changes to the bill were made at several stages based on input from the mining industry. That is good news. It is indeed encouraging, especially given the rough ride the mining industry has received in recent times from all levels of government.

I might also add that I hope this spirit of co-operation will continue into the future and expand beyond the borders of Yukon to my own province of British Columbia where the interests of the mining industry have been forced to take a back seat to every lobby group with an axe to grind.

At any rate I commend the government for its consultative approach. However I also know that the mining industry is not entirely happy with the legislation in Bill C-55 or with its companion Bills C-33 and C-34.

(1605)

While all these pieces of legislation are far from perfect, the uncertainty is over, an uncertainty which has stifled investment in Yukon for more than 20 years. At least the legislation defines the playing field and although that field is still uneven it is a field that can now be played upon.

Another area of concern with the legislation on the creation of Yukon surface rights board is the question of appointments. The board will be appointed by the minister and therefore of course has the potential to become a patronage hotbed.

Appointments to the board must be made according to merit. Individuals with the qualifications and the expertise to make sound, logical decisions must be the ones appointed to the board; not simply those individuals with the oldest Liberal membership card or with the largest campaign contribution, appointments that would compromise the entire process and throw the rulings of the board into disrepute. We cannot emphasize too often that patronage appointments must go. We must cease and desist on all of them, whether it is the immigration board or this particular one on Yukon surface rights.

*Government Orders*

The board will also have the power to decide which cases it will hear. Its rulings will be final, binding and enforceable through the Supreme Court of the Yukon territory. This is a great deal of power which must not be placed in the hands of a few political friends and insiders. The Reform Party will be watching appointments to the board with a keen interest to ensure that such abuses do not occur.

I have already outlined the callous way in which the democratic process was subverted during the conception and births of Bill C-33, Bill C-34 and Bill C-133 a year ago. This bill is an extension of the process and therefore must be viewed with a healthy degree of scepticism. However we can take some solace in the hope that the government has learned and is learning from its past mistakes.

I would also like to urge the government to follow in the footsteps of my own province, British Columbia. I speak of Premier Harcourt's public pronouncement of September 20 when he stated several principles for openness in land claim negotiations. The principles enunciated include that open negotiations must be the starting point and closed negotiations the exception. The next point made was that all British Columbians must have the opportunity to provide meaningful input into the negotiating process.

His next point is that the negotiators' bottom lines would be made public and that the provinces would pursue the most effective means of opening up and sharing information about negotiating sessions as widely as possible. Finally the mandatory sign off of all treaty settlements would be made by the B.C. legislature.

In this regard I have to say on a parallel track that I had the occasion to meet with the federal negotiator for Vancouver Island on native land claims and with the British Columbia negotiator. The two gentlemen met in my constituency office a month or two ago. If I can take them at face value, we are going to have open negotiations with native land claims and they are actively soliciting input from the general public. I truly hope this is so. If I take them at face value it is so. I hope that is the way we are going. If we are, the future looks much better than it has for some time.

(1610)

The people of Canada deserve no less from their federal government on these important issues. The old closed door negotiations, complete with mandatory confidentiality clauses and no public input, only breed hostility and undermine public confidence in the process. The public too wants native land claims to be settled justly for all parties.

Bill C-33 and Bill C-34 are classic examples of old style politics. Admittedly Bill C-55 was conceived under less dubious circumstances, but it is still somewhat tainted by the earlier process.

In finishing I urge the government to carefully consider the comments made here today and the comments my colleagues will make. I hope the government will heed this advice as we head down the road of aboriginal self-government.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to speak on Bill C-55, an act to establish the Yukon Surface Rights Board.

I do not speak often on aboriginal matters but I thought this bill merited comment. In fact the last time I spoke on aboriginal matters in the House was to argue for an amendment to the private member's bill which declared ice hockey as Canada's national sport. The amendment which was accepted declared the great aboriginal sport of lacrosse to be Canada's summer national sport.

Aboriginal issues are important to me in particular and should be important to every member from British Columbia. As we know, most of the territory of the province of British Columbia is the subject of some form of land claim by our aboriginal peoples. It is my belief that the precedent set in Yukon may become the precedent for settling claims in British Columbia. Therefore it is important for me to address these issues.

I have a few preliminary comments to make before I get into a detailed discussion of the clauses of the bill. The bill is the third in a trilogy of bills dealing with the settlement of land claims in Yukon. The Reform Party opposed the first two bills which established the settlement of the land claims. Logically, therefore, we oppose Bill C-55 which establishes the mechanism to implement these settlements, or alternatively to settle disputes relating to the claim.

I understand the feeling that a mechanism should be found to resolve disputes without the necessity of going to court. Courts are expensive. Justice usually is not swift. However this leads me to make two comments.

First, perhaps the inefficient slow moving courts would be useful in these circumstances because the possibility of going to court would be seen as such a detriment that settlements may be more easily achieved by the parties involved. I think that is what we would want. Perhaps in this instance the threat of going to court is one to be preserved, not put aside.

My second point deals with the courts themselves. If the courts are in such a state that even the government does not want them involved in settling disputes of the kind presented by the Yukon land claims, maybe we should take a hard look at reforming the courts of the country.

Courts were established to settle disputes between parties. They exist. The infrastructure is there. The salaries of those involved are already paid. Why should we not then use them to settle disputes such as the ones presented here? If the courts because of inefficiencies are not seen to be the appropriate vehicle then maybe we should streamline our judicial system

*Government Orders*

instead of establishing a new board. We should address reform of our civil law courts.

However I realize that judicial and court reform will not happen before the bill is passed. The government has a majority in the House. We will soon be stuck with the Yukon Surface Rights Board. For this reason I wish to make the following general comment.

(1615)

I particularly wish to address the fact that this board will only deal with disputes after the parties themselves, the people involved in the dispute, have failed to reach an amicable solution. How will the board know the parties have failed to reach such a solution? Would it not be better if representatives of the board met with the parties prior to the parties going to the board? Such representatives could work with the parties in order to achieve an amicable settlement.

I am suggesting a two step process. In this two step process the first step would be the disputants contacting the board requesting mediation or help from a representative of the board. A representative or a staff person, not a board member obviously, would be dispatched to meet with the parties. If this person was not effective in helping the parties resolve the dispute then the matter could go to the board for a hearing.

Such a two step process, first by mediation with the help of the board representatives and second by a board hearing if mediation failed, might tend to speed up the process. Let's face it, a board such as this will build its own bureaucracy. Let us give these people something to do beyond shuffling paper. They could engage in mediation.

I wish to comment on some of the provisions of this bill which are especially disturbing to me. My first point, perhaps not surprisingly, is on the subject of clauses 8 to 15 which deal with the establishment and organization of the board. Some of my colleagues have commented on these clauses so I will keep my comments brief.

The composition suggested in the statute seems to be a recipe for divisiveness and eventual disaster. Half of the members other than the chairperson are to be appointed by the Council for Yukon Indians, the others by order in council on recommendation by the minister.

I hope it works and I wish those who designed this all the luck in the world. It seems to me that we are putting forward the possibility that the Council of Yukon Indians is simply going to become the judge of its own causes, conflict of interest or, if not the judge, then certainly an interested party at all hearings.

Virtually all disputes will involve one or more bands of Yukon Indians. Yukon Indians will be in a position of strength on the board and there is the possibility of block voting. As well we are establishing another organization to which Liberals can appoint Liberals. Surely we have enough of those already.

It might be more appropriate to mention here that the Government of the Yukon Territory should have input into the selection of the board members. Perhaps even the chairperson and some of the board members should be appointed through a nomination of the Government of the Yukon Territory. The rationale would be similar to the territorial government being more likely to appoint people who represent the interests of the public at large than is the minister who might appoint Liberals. They could be Liberal loyalists and probably will be who might stack the board full of members of one politically correct interest group. The Yukon government is considerably closer to the people of the Yukon than is the minister. Hence it is far less likely to make poor choices.

Barring the selection of board members through that process I offer an idea for a second selection process. The membership of this board could be appointed by the minister but on the approval of all three parties in the House of Commons. If the minister does not agree to appoint the whole board in this fashion at least the chair of the board should be approved by the two opposition parties in this House.

I also do not like the fact that we are setting up another body to be paid out of the public purse. Surely if the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development had been listening recently to the Minister of Finance he would know how badly in debt the country is and how we cannot afford any more expenditures.

Clause 19 gives the board the power to hire staff and consultants. Here we go again. We just cannot afford to give this kind of blanket authority without limiting the numbers to be hired. As well under clause 21 the board can acquire personal property in its name and dispose of it. This may be all right if we are talking about furnishing an office, but it might not take too long for this to be stretched into a major acquisition program. There should be some stipulation as to what the personal property is to be used for.

Clause 23 deals with the financing of the board. We on this side of the House would feel more comfortable if the matter of annual financing was referred directly to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs. I know it will be contained in the estimates, but we want to know specifically the moneys allocated to the board and how they are spent.

(1620)

Clause 24 of the bill requires that the board report to the minister upon his request. I would suggest that this clause be

changed so that the board reports to the minister on an annual basis and that these reports be tabled in the House of Commons and referred to committee.

Clause 26 on the subject of jurisdiction does not refer to the fact that the board should exercise its authority observing the rules of natural justice. Interestingly, this is one of the grounds for the appeal of ruling by the board, but it is not specifically listed as a requirement for its hearings. For greater certainty this requirement should be spelled out.

Clause 40 gives the board the right to set fees. I am torn between suggesting that the fees be low enough so as not to prohibit anyone from taking advantage of the jurisdiction of this board or suggesting the fees be high enough to ensure the board pays for itself. I find my last suggestion to be quite interesting even though it comes from me, and in keeping with my remarks on the affordability of this board, perhaps we should pursue it.

Clause 41 requires the rules made by the board to govern its operation to be published. I think this is a good requirement. However I am concerned that there may be significant disagreement among the stakeholders regarding particular rules.

I believe a method should be found by which these rules could be objected to by major groups and a hearing held on the fairness of the rules. Perhaps the board itself could hear these complaints.

Clauses 42 through 64 contain many areas which would better be the subject of discussion in committee. These clauses describe the main tasks which will be undertaken by the board. I am sure representatives of my party will have comments to make on them as the committee proceeds to clause by clause analysis.

Clauses 74 and 75 give the board the final authority in relation to findings of fact and establishing an appeal procedure to the Yukon Supreme Court. I hope this right of appeal is not abused. We are looking here for quick settlements and the board is established to effect such settlements.

It would be counterproductive to allow too many appeals to the courts. Also in relation to the issue on some judgments, perhaps the minister could consider placing a limit on the time the board has to make a decision, perhaps 30 days from the time the case is concluded.

Clause 79 gives the governor in council authority to make regulations dealing with the board. Again, as with the rules of the board, a procedure should be suggested whereby these regulations could be the subject of objection by the major stakeholders and the objections heard and subsequently dealt with.

Finally, I would suggest that this bill contain an automatic review clause so that we can be assured that it will come back before us so we can assess how effective it has been; perhaps a review in three years.

### *Government Orders*

We are opposed to this bill. It has many deficiencies, but most of all the content is wrong. There should be no need to spend taxpayers' money to set up a body which is designed to do what courts are in existence to do, resolve disputes.

**Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to reiterate some of the comments my colleagues have made and possibly some new ones on Bill C-55.

As we are aware this is the third component of the package in relation to the Yukon First Nations Land Act claims settlement and the Yukon First Nations self-government. This particular bill is essential for the effective implementation of the other two acts. It mainly addresses the federal government's legal requirements to facilitate these other two acts coming into force.

This bill is to establish a board of directors that will handle disputes that occur. These disputes could involve three different components. They could involve owners of settlement lands or owners of non-settlement lands and of course businesses that would be involved. There are three components the board will be facing in relation to disputes. The other main aspect of this board is the determination of compensation in relation to the expropriation of settlement lands.

(1625)

The orders of course from this board are binding. The board is not going to address disputes unless the two parties or three parties involved have tried to come to some sort of a mutual agreement before this. Should that not occur it will come to the board. Therefore, the board is actually in an arbitration kind of situation and its decision will be binding. Except for limited reasons, it can go to the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory.

This brings us to the structure of the actual board which I have some concerns about. I realize that my colleagues have touched on some of this, but I think they are important enough to reiterate to some degree. Clause 8(1) of the bill gives us an overview of what the board will consist of: a chairman and not less than two members and not more than ten other members. That would make a possible total of 11 members including the chairman. All these members would be appointed by the minister.

There are some conditions that apply on these appointments. Clause 8(2) indicates that the minister must establish a board of an odd number. That I would assume includes the chairman so that the board would also consist of an odd number of members.

Clause 9(1) indicates that the chairperson is appointed by the minister but on the recommendation of the board. Clause 9(2) addresses the other members. It could be up to 10 members. It indicates that half of those members would be appointed by the minister based on nominations from the Council of Yukon Indians and the other half would be appointed by the minister. It does not indicate where the nominations or the suggestions for those appointments would come from.

*Government Orders*

To round this up, clause 10(1) indicates that a majority in both of these components, those nominated by the council and those appointed by the minister, must consist of members who reside in the Yukon Territory.

What this to my mind does is put the board in a position of being two components, one being suggested from the Council of Yukon Indians and the other from the minister, wherever those suggestions may come from. This in itself may divide the board. Also, the chairman of the board who is appointed based on recommendations from the board could put the balance of power on the board in either component. For example, if the chair was someone who was appointed by the minister then the bulk of the members on the board would be members appointed by the minister. If the chair happened to be someone who was a nominee from the Council of Yukon Indians then the balance of power would be on that side.

I question why the chairman has to be appointed by the minister based on the recommendation of the board. To my mind that suggests a veto power by the minister. It would seem that the board could elect its chairman instead of making recommendations to the minister to appoint it.

The other concern that comes out of that composition would be the right or opportunity for patronage appointments. Another concern would be that somewhere in the bill I believe it says that disputes do not have to be handled by the full board. We can subgroup the board into panels of three or more and handle the disputes based on that. Again we will look at the composition of the panel. Having these two components on the board, what is the composition of this panel and how they are selected is a very grey area.

Another way of looking at the composition of this panel could be from a representation of the players involved, i.e. the three components: the businesspersons, the owners of non-settlement land or the owners of settlement land. One could possibly pursue having representation of these three components. Another way of looking at it would be representation from the two components, the membership from the Yukon council, or those appointed by the minister. That is a very grey area.

(1630)

The fact it does not indicate how these panels are composed or selected is also something that should be addressed possibly at committee. It could be based on members available at the time. It could be members in town at the time or whatever. Again it could become a lopsided membership based on these two components.

Another point that comes up would be term of office of the membership. Either clause 12 or 13 indicates that a member can stand for any number of terms. The appointment is for a three year period and then you can run again. There is no limitation.

You can run for this as long as you are appointed and it can be any number of years. That in itself may not be a problem but it should be looked at to see if there are any parameters or situations that may pose a problem.

I would like to offer some suggestions on board membership. Again one of my colleagues mentioned that appointments, if that is the route we choose to go, should be made on merit or some criteria other than just being appointed by the minister. There should be some criteria in there. If that becomes the case we would definitely like to see merit included.

Another way of looking at it would be to possibly elect this board as we do school boards or something along those lines. That brings up of course that we may have to have candidate qualifications so that all sides have representation depending on how you wish to look at it.

It does not necessarily indicate that the panel composition would indeed be three members. It could possibly be any number of members, but of course it cannot exceed 11 which would be a full committee. It also does not seem to indicate that the panel would be an odd number. That should be looked at as well.

Another thing to look at is the concept that this board will be independent from government. The way it is structured it certainly does not imply that is going to occur. Two main things come out that are very suggestive it will not be independent from government. Unless you get into the fine print of it or whatever and really search for a method as to how it is independent these two things come front and centre.

One is that if it is funded by the government and if all the members on the board are appointed by the minister, i.e. government, that certainly does not suggest the board is independent of government. That in itself also brings up a number of possible concerns in relation to one's membership on the board. If the minister has this kind of power to appoint or not appoint then one really does not want to be in the position of opposing the majority opinion. I think one would rather tread lightly if they wanted to continue to participate on the board.

Therefore we may in a way be inhibiting some members in participating in full debate in relation to disputes or compensation or whatever they are addressing. I see that as a potential problem. There may be some inhibition on membership participation. I would take that a step further in relation to membership and possibly clarification in these areas might help.

Clause 11(3) indicates the minister can remove for cause. It starts out that one can hold their membership on the board for good behaviour. There is really no qualification as to what good behaviour is. The minister can remove that member for cause or—not and, but or—on grounds set out in the bylaws of the board.

*Government Orders*

(1635)

What is happening is the board can be controlled from ministerial appointment, depending as I say on what background the chairman has and can set up what is grounds for membership. It appears that the minister for cause—and I do not know where this cause is coming from, if it is going to be a set of rules and regulations, but I think clause 18 makes reference to that and that implies to me that the board may be setting up what constitutes cause. It is very, very vague. I was first and still am of the opinion that cause is for the interpretation of the minister. That area is rather loose as far as membership is concerned.

The other thing that is missing which should be included would be some sort of recourse if one is found to be in that position where membership is going to be or has been revoked. There should be some sort of recourse for an unbiased hearing into the circumstances of it.

Some tightening up is needed in those areas. Many of the clauses seem to be all-encompassing and a lot is left to assumption.

In the part that deals with meetings, one clause caught my attention immediately. That was the one that said participation in these meetings could be by telephone or some other communication device. I strongly advise when this bill goes to committee that we address the issue of having people attend the meetings in person versus a telephone conference in which there is perhaps one member sitting in the room and everybody else is on the telephone somewhere in the Yukon territory. There should be some indication as to what a quorum is for attendance in person at a meeting.

A second very restrictive clause is where the meetings can be held. I believe it states they can be held in Whitehorse and/or other areas of the Yukon. I agree that is the most sensible area in which to hold meetings as that is the area it is related to but there may be cause to hold meetings elsewhere. If we are going to look at the letter of the law, which seems to be how our justice system is looking at things these days versus the spirit of it, I suggest that we open that one up a little bit so that meetings are not only held right in that area. That is what that clause suggests.

Much of what I am saying today is clause by clause analysis of the bill which will come up in committee, but those are some of the points I wish to highlight. A number of my colleagues have come up with the same types of points and I think that speaks for itself that there is some concern in those areas.

The last item would be the statement of accounts. I did not get the impression there would be open access to these accounts by the public. I got the impression they would be well documented, that there would be a very good system of accounts, that the appropriate people would do them, that they would be reviewed by the Auditor General, and so on, and submitted to govern-

ment. However there is no reference anywhere for access to these accounts on request.

With that I will close my remarks. Under the circumstances we realize this bill is the third part of the other two and it is necessary for this one to pass. However, in the composition of the bill there are a number of things that we should tidy it up before we actually put it out as the third part.

(1640)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before resuming debate, it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Chemical weapons; the hon. member for Oakville—Milton, Tourism; the hon. member for Lévis, Carrefour Jeunesse—Emploi; and the hon. member for Chicoutimi, National Defence.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my speech will be short if not particularly sweet for those across.

As has been mentioned many times already, Bill C-55 is a continuation of Bills C-33 and C-34. This places the Reform Party and myself in somewhat of an awkward position. Any support we may give at some point on Bill C-55 should most certainly not be interpreted as support for the previous ill-conceived legislation.

During his initial presentation of Bill C-55, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development stated that just before the summer recess we dealt with the legislation of Bills C-33 and C-34. That is false. We did not do that. What happened just before the summer recess was that the Liberals invoked closure, the very thing that when they sat on this side of the House they said was such a contemptible thing. It is interesting how their perspective changes as they walk across the floor. I sincerely hope it will not change our perspective when we walk across the floor three years from now.

The legislation contained in Bills C-33 and C-34 is absolutely incredible. They place us in the position we are now when dealing with land in the Yukon. If land settlements were made with all aboriginal people in Canada on the basis of the settlement made in Bill C-33, we would be looking at a land settlement area four times the size of my province of British Columbia. I believe that is absolutely unacceptable to virtually everyone.

On the matter of the intent of Bill C-55, I would first have to state that I support the slogan of the mining industry which is: keep mining in Canada. Certainly we would want to have some settlement of land disputes in the Yukon and we would like to see this move through the House quickly. However there are many flaws in Bill C-55 which must be corrected before it can proceed.

*Government Orders*

The government talks of consultation. It even lists in its presentation the consultation that supposedly took place in the preparation of Bill C-55. This is another of the Liberals' sleight of hands or flimflams. When one says they have consulted or have provided a list of people they have consulted someone looking at that document says: "This is good. Here are all the people they have consulted with. I guess if they have used what these people have told them and come up with this, it must be okay".

There is absolutely nothing in the process of consultation especially with the Liberals that says they have listened to anything they have received as a result of these consultations. The very fact they have gone out and spoken with some people means absolutely nothing.

Recently, after coming in from a rally on these very grounds of people concerned about the impending firearms legislation the justice minister said that this government will not base its legislation on head count. In other words: "We do not care what the people say. We know what is good for them". That certainly is a problem.

Another of the problems in this bill that must be addressed are patronage appointments by the minister. Once again their perspective changes when they walk across the floor. These are the same members who sat in opposition and lambasted the former Prime Minister and the Tory party for patronage appointments. It seems however that they learned at the feet of the master. Now that they have formed the government they are anxious to show that they are bigger and better at everything, including patronage, than the former Prime Minister.

(1645)

The appointments being made to this board are going to be made by the minister. Is that not nice? He gets to put together a little patronage haven of his own so that now people can pay homage and maybe support him so they can get one of these plum positions. The board gets to say who they want and then the chairman appoints them, but remember who put the people on the board in the first place.

I would like to remind the House, those who do not know can learn from this, of comments of a senior Liberal campaign official from a western riding who was anticipating his patronage appointment to the board of referees. When questioned on the fact that he had announced prematurely that he was getting this appointment and that it was clearly a patronage appointment, he was quoted in the Vancouver *Sun* as stating: "What's wrong with patronage? How else can we attract people to our party?" What a disgusting turn of events that we now find ourselves in, a patronage appointed board to do the bidding of the minister so that the minister can claim that the government is no longer directly involved.

What about the composition of the board? This is really interesting as well. The composition of the board is racially motivated. It is interesting. Why are the Liberals doing that? If we assume that there are going to be 10 on the board—if the minister has the opportunity to appoint why not appoint the maximum number and that way he gets the maximum benefits back—five are going to be aboriginal people and five are going to be non-aboriginal.

This brings into question first that they are dealing with all lands in the Yukon. That means that it should be Yukon people. There should not be a particular makeup that says there has to be a certain number of a certain type of people when they are dealing on land other than aboriginal land. If it were aboriginal land only, I agree that it should be aboriginal people who decide on their own land. When we are dealing with all of the Yukon it should be people in the Yukon, period.

One side asks: "Why should there be an arbitrary number of aboriginal people deciding on non-aboriginal land?" On the other hand it is argued that aboriginal people are competent. I am not arguing that. In fact they are the ones who live on the land and may in fact at times be the best qualified to make the decision for land use in the Yukon. Why then should the board be limited to five aboriginal people if in fact they may be the best qualified people? If seven of the best qualified people are aboriginal, why should two of them be denied so that it can go the other way, just the same as it works in reverse.

The final point that I have some concerns about is access to court. In the document it narrows and extremely limits access to court on appeal from the outcome of this board belonging to the minister of Indian and northern affairs. Why would one want to limit a person's access to court? Obviously the Liberal government is sort of predisposed to that. We have already seen the Minister of Transport do that in the Pearson deal.

It comes to a matter of property rights—

**Mr. Milliken:** Very wisely.

**Mr. Gouk:** Oh, yes, very wise indeed. Of course the more control you have, the more you can put in your own patronage people and have things the way you want totally unchallenged.

**Mr. Milliken:** You and the Tories wanted it.

**Mr. Gouk:** We have property rights in Canada, at least we think we do. The reality is we do not have any property rights at all. All land belongs to the government. All we have is the right of continued possession. If the government starts limiting our access to the court, the government can bring out more and more arcane laws all the time and have its own people in place and ram them through, no access to the courts, no appeal.

There are many flaws in this bill. I trust sincerely that if this bill makes it to the committee that the Liberals will do what is right. They will correct these injustices in the bill. They will start dealing with the accusations they made when they were on this side of the House. They will get rid of patronage. They will

*Government Orders*

get rid of all the other ill-tasting things that are in this bill and bring out something that is legitimate, meaningful and justifiable to the people of the Yukon.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a short question that I would like to put to the hon. member.

He is opposing this bill as is his party. It seems to me that every time the government has brought forward a bill dealing with aboriginal claims or aboriginal interests or dealings in land in any area that is inhabited by aboriginal peoples in this country, he and his party members have opposed the bill.

(1650)

I wonder if he is in a position to reconsider his party's opposition and realize perhaps their opposition is not based on reason but on a bias or prejudice that is coming through in opposition to these bills. Would he not want to rethink his policy and take a little more fair view of the entire thing and realize that this bill is in fact good for the Yukon territory as was the case with the two previous bills which we heard announced earlier this afternoon in another speech and turn it around and support this legislation?

**An hon. member:** Good question.

**Mr. Gouk:** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that whenever the Liberals take a page out of the Reform policy book to introduce legislation, they always seem to take only half a page and get it wrong.

It seems that when the hon. member listened to my presentation he only listened to half of it. I would first point out that he should check back in his records on the Split Lake agreement and see which way the Reform Party voted on that.

Second, I would point out that I said here that there is a bias, not by the Reform Party but on the part of the government on the racial makeup of the very board we are discussing here. It is limiting the number of people from any one race, and that includes the aboriginal people. If they are the best qualified, why are they limited to 50 per cent of the board? If they are the best people, let them be the the major part of the board. It is only because the minister wants to have absolute and complete control.

We need something that is fair and totally honest. We are not going to have honesty when those numbers on the committee are both manipulated and appointed as personal patronage plums of the minister of Indian and northern affairs.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am only going to speak briefly with

respect to Bill C-55 because like much of this government's legislation it resembles the Bishop's egg. It is excellent in parts, but it contains a lot of tainted material.

The administrative clauses of the bill are well drafted. They are quite similar to legislation in some provincial jurisdictions. The rules are comprehensible. I am perfectly aware that many mining industry executives regard acceptance of C-55 as preferable to continued regulatory uncertainty.

Having worked in that industry for many years, I think I understand the corporate mind. If a company is effectively blocked by bureaucratic stalemate, it will accept almost any compromise in order to survive. As the crofter said: "It is better to sleep with the devil than to lie a'cold".

My objections to the bill are based on the proposed composition and terms of the reference of the Yukon surface rights board. Like its evil older sisters, Bills C-33 and C-34, this bill is tainted by racial bias. The board will consist of a chairperson and from two to ten other members. Since these will be prize patronage appointments you can be sure that the higher number will prevail. At least half of the members shall be appointed, and I quote: "on the nomination of the Yukon Council of Indians" or to express it more crudely and directly: "They shall be Indians". As my hon. colleague has just said, this is a double-edged sword. Not only is it expressly directed that five members of a ten member group shall be Indians but it is also expressly directed that five of them shall not be Indians.

I thought I lived in Canada. Can anybody imagine the uproar that would ensue if the articles of a quasi-judicial provincial board, let us say in Ontario, required that a certain percentage of its members be Caucasian?

Just in case the board is not sufficiently biased, there is provision in clause 23 of the bill to budget funds for and again I quote: "cross-cultural orientation, education and other training". That is to say for social brainwashing.

(1655)

Perhaps in so far as the board's duties will deal partly with disputes involving native settlement lands, a little well-intentioned genetic bias can be justified, but why in the name of common sense should the colour of a person's skin determine eligibility to rule on disputes concerning non-settlement lands, that is to say on public lands?

Even if the biases were applied only to settlement lands, it should be remembered that the board will arbitrate compensation for expropriation of these lands. Yet half of its members are required by law to be beneficiaries of such compensation. Does that make sense?

*Government Orders*

Remember, this unaccountable board will have wide ranging powers and its decisions will have the force of law. Should not its independence be protected?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the division of the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday, November 14 at 6.30 p.m. at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I would invite you to seek unanimous consent to determine if we could defer this vote until Tuesday at 5.30 p.m.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

The House resumed from November 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to speak on Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada

Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

When I first had the chance to review the amendments contained in this bill it was immediately apparent that a good deal of time and effort have gone into determining ways in which the application rules for income security benefits could be made more flexible.

It is obvious that clients have complained about some of the application requirements and certain restrictions in the current legislation. Undoubtedly each of these requirements or restrictions had a reason for being at the time they were introduced. However, by listening to the public the government has found ways in which both the client and the integrity of the programs can both be well served.

(1700)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to highlight some of the amendments where this is most obvious. Under the Old Age Security Act the 60 to 64-year old spouse of a low income old age security pensioner can, on application, receive the spouse's allowance benefit. Also eligible for this income tested benefit are low-income widowed persons in the same age group.

The only requirement for the spouse's allowance apart from age and income is that the younger spouse must have lived in Canada for a minimum of 10 years after age 18. Because residence is a qualifier for the spouse's allowance benefit, applicants for the allowance provide a history of their residence in Canada after age 18 and up to age 60.

When spouse's allowance recipients turn age 65 they become eligible for the old age security pension in their own right. However, the amount of their old age security pension is dependent on the total number of years they have lived in Canada after age 18. For those who were in Canada prior to July 1, 1976, 10 years of residence in Canada immediately prior to age 65 entitles them to payment of the full pension.

For those who came to Canada after July 1, 1976 the amount of their pension is equal to one-fortieth for each year they resided in Canada after age 18.

For the most part the administration knows from the information provided on the spouses allowance application combined with the payment history of the spouses allowance how many years of residence the client has at age 65. Therefore it is possible to calculate the old age security pension entitlement without going back to the client.

Currently, however, the client is required to apply for the basic old age security pension and to provide the administration with much of the same information and documentation that the individual provided with his or her spouses allowance application.

*Government Orders*

Given that in the majority of cases the administration already has the spouses allowance recipient's residence history in Canada the requirement that this individual apply for old age security is unnecessary.

Therefore I am pleased to see that this bill proposes to give the Minister of Human Resources Development discretion to deem an old age security application to have been made by the 64-year old recipient of spouse's allowance. In addition, given that the administration already has the income information it requires the income tested guaranteed income supplement form will also not be required for the remainder of the GIS payment year.

Approximately 20,000 recipients of the spouse's allowance turn 65 each year. As the majority of these clients have lived in Canada for the required number of years to receive a full old age security benefit, this amendment will benefit a great many people.

This automatic conversion from spouse's allowance to old age security is not a new concept. Currently under the Canada pension plan 64-year old disability recipients do not have to apply for their retirement pension to commence at age 65.

A Canada pension plan retirement application is deemed to have been received because the administration already has the information necessary to put a retirement pension into play.

I am pleased that we are now offering the same quality service to 64-year old spouse's allowance recipients.

Another provision of the Canada pension plan is also being mirrored in the amendment in this bill which recognizes that some individuals because of incapacity are unable to apply for their old age security benefits on time. Specifically, the minister will be able to deem an application to have been received earlier than it actually was received if the lateness is due to incapacity.

Benefit entitlement to the basic old age security pension and the income tested guaranteed income supplement and spouse's allowance is contingent on an application being made for these benefits.

If this bill becomes law retroactivity for all of these benefits will be a consistent 12 months. Therefore anyone applying more than 12 months after the first month in which they could have received benefits loses some benefits.

For the most part a limited period of retroactivity is considered fair.

(1705)

Individuals have a certain responsibility to come forward in a timely manner to receive their correct benefit entitlement. However, there are cases in which the individual is mentally or physically incapacitated and this incapacity renders them incapable of making an application. Unless these individuals are fortunate enough to have someone who realizes that application

can be made on behalf of such an incapacitated person, benefit entitlement can be lost.

The amendments in this bill would allow the minister to deem an application to have been made by or on behalf of an applicant. This would only apply if the applicant were at the time of application incapable of forming or expressing an intention to make an application.

As I noted earlier, the Canada pension plan already has such a provision and this important protection is now being proposed for old age security clients as well.

Another very interesting amendment contained in this bill would allow old age security pensioners to cancel their benefit entitlement. On the face of it one wonders why such an amendment is necessary. Surely if someone does not want the benefit all they have to do is not apply. For the small number of individuals who do not want to receive the old age security pension the majority do not make application. However, in some cases it is only after becoming a pensioner that an individual decides that he or she no longer wants to receive the old age security benefit. The current legislation, because it does not provide for benefit cancellation, cannot accede to these requests.

As I am sure most people will agree, someone should not be forced to take the application they do not want. Therefore this bill would allow individuals to cancel their benefit. However, recognizing that circumstances can change, the bill will also make provision for a cancelled benefit to be reinstated if the pensioner should subsequently change his or her mind. The reinstatement would be effective the month following the month the request for reinstatement was made. A pensioner would be reinstated on the same calculation of residence that had been used when application for the old age security pension was first made.

A very similar type of amendment is also being made to the Canada pension plan. Currently the Canada pension plan allows for an assignment of retirement pensions between spouses in an ongoing relationship. A Canada pension plan retirement beneficiary whose spouse is over 60 and receiving any retirement benefits he or she is entitled to under either the Canada or Quebec pension plans can apply for and receive a share of the retirement benefits they both earned during the course of the marriage.

The legislation currently provides that the assignment ceases on the death of either spouse, on the twelfth month following the month the couple separates, the month the non-contributing spouse becomes a contributor or the month a divorce or annulment of marriage is finalized. Therefore, even though pension assignment is done at the request of the couple, the couple who remains together cannot cancel the assignment.

*Government Orders*

While the administration has received very few requests for a pension assignment to be cancelled, there is absolutely no good reason this should not be allowed. Therefore, I am pleased that this bill provides for cancellation at the written request of both spouses.

This type of amendment emphasizes that the government is listening to what clients want and what they have every right to expect.

The last amendment I want to deal with is another obvious example of listening to the desires of clients. As I am sure we are all aware, the Canada pension plan was amended in 1977 to provide for a division of pension credits between spouses should the marriage end in divorce or annulment. While these provisions have been extended and improved over the years, the amendment I want to talk about has to do with limitations that only existed up until 1987.

Specifically because the administration had no experience with this type of provision in 1977 the division of pension credits earned by both spouses under the Canada pension plan during the course of the marriage was only allowed if very strict conditions were met. The marriage had to have lasted a minimum of three years. An application for a division of pension credits had to have been made within three years of the divorce or annulment.

This latter requirement was felt necessary so that divorced individuals would have some idea of what their retirement benefits were going to be when they reached retirement age. It was felt at the time that a CPP contributor should not be left in limbo. He or she had a right to know if the pension credits were going to be divided. In this way the individual could better plan for his or her retirement years.

(1710)

Three years was considered to be long enough after the marriage was over for one of the spouses to make application for a division of pension credits. Unfortunately, what the original legislation did not provide was for an extension of the three-year time limit.

I am pleased to note that there are many divorced couples who hold no animosity toward each other. These individuals still want to ensure that their ex-spouses are treated fairly.

The administration has been approached by couples who were divorced prior to 1987 when the time limit was removed who would still like to have a division of pension credits. Such persons accept the fact that Canada pension plan contributions are a joint family asset to which both spouses contributed equally during the course of their marriage. Even though for the most part only the male partner made CPP contributions or at least consistently contributed to the plan during the course of the

marriage, he recognizes that his ex-wife has as much right to these credits as he did.

The people who are coming forward do not want a three-year time limit to prevent them from dividing their pension credits with their ex-spouse. Therefore, an amendment contained in Bill C-54 will allow the three-year time limit to be waived where both spouses request this waiver in writing.

The Canada pension plan is an income security program that truly belongs to its clients. The plan is totally funded by the contributions that employers and their employees make and the investment of any moneys not immediately needed to pay benefits and expenses. Therefore, this plan should definitely listen to the people to whom it belongs and the waiver of the three-year time limit for spouses who divorced prior to 1987 is proof positive that this government is willing to both listen and act on what it hears.

This government has a commitment to improve the way it does business. This bill before us today exemplifies how this commitment can be acted upon.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-54, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act. In other words, this bill directly concerns social programs.

I am puzzled since, throughout the election campaign, the Liberals kept referring to their red book and the creation of jobs and more jobs. However, the reality is that, since they took office, the Liberals are constantly looking at cuts in social program budgets.

The social policy reform provides a good example of the cuts which this government intends to make. Under the circumstances, I feel that the current debate is essential, since it concerns the poor. This bill deals with the benefits of an important group in our society, namely our seniors, our fathers and mothers, to whom we owe so much. These people played an active role in the economic life of our communities, and they still do, often in a volunteer capacity.

Seniors in my riding are of that calibre. However, they are not exempt from the problem of poverty which confronts many elderly persons. In 1992, the average income of seniors living alone was \$18,434. Moreover, 21 per cent of seniors belong to the low-income group. It is tragic to see people who helped build this country being faced with the prospect of poverty.

Regardless of what the Liberals in this House may think, the income level of many seniors coincides with the poverty line. These are real figures. Why then is the Liberal government so bent on getting tough and tightening up the social system by saving money at the expense of the poorest of the poor?

*Government Orders*

(1715)

Some of the objectives of Bill C-54 are acceptable, namely, improving client services, managing programs more efficiently, and taking the necessary steps to harmonize programs. The Bloc Québécois supports the objective of this bill which is to make the rules more flexible in order to make life easier for senior citizens. It even agrees with some of the amendments, which can only benefit seniors. However, the Bloc cannot condone the fact that savings are being achieved at the expense of already impoverished senior citizens. We must make sure that senior citizens do not lose what they have gained so far.

Despite its Good Samaritan act and all its talk about fairness, the Liberal government does want to standardize the Old Age Security programs by limiting retroactive payments to one year.

When we know that senior citizens can now receive retroactive Old Age benefits for five years, one must question what the government is doing. If it is not making it harder for senior citizens, what is it doing then? I say it is saving money by taking away from senior citizens what they had gained previously.

The Liberal government is waving a carrot, but the Bloc Québécois knows there is a stick. As to overpayments under the Old Age Security Program, pensioners are protected against any error by officials, that is to say they would not have to repay the sums received in excess of their entitlement. Presently, the legislation has provisions for a maximum two-year retroactivity period. Bill C-54 would abolish this, saving the government between one and two million dollars.

I would like the minister to explain where these savings are coming from, and whether pensioners will be protected the way they were previously.

I would also like the Minister of Human Resources Development to explain to me the provision of the bill granting the minister the right to acquire, use and manage assets. It is quite natural that I should question this provision since the intent of the minister is far from clear in this bill. He certainly lacks openness in this case, contrary to the openness he shows as far as personal information on pensioners is concerned.

The Liberal government, although it denied against all odds that CSIS was spying, wants to increase the number of departments and agencies which will have access to personal information.

The Bloc Québécois considers that the collection of information is legitimate, but it believes that the access to such information should be limited.

The Liberal government should clarify the rules for access to privileged information and the provisions dealing with sanctions in case of disclosure.

The integrity of this information must be respected. The government should be more specific and should demonstrate the need for a wider distribution of privileged information.

(1720)

Considering that the bill in its present form fails to reinforce the confidentiality of personal information pertaining to beneficiaries of programs for seniors and that the government is saving money at the expense of the poorest members of society, and that certain measures seem obscure, I will support the amendment presented by my colleague for Argenteuil—Papineauville.

*[English]*

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today on Bill C-54, something we as Reformers would like to address in an enormous way and revamp.

The bill is to streamline OAS, CPP and UIC systems. It is essentially a housekeeping bill. I hope these changes will result in increased efficiency and increased targeting for those who most need it, decreased expenditures and less abuse in the system, something we in the Reform Party stand for very strongly. However, given the usual situation with this and previous governments, I am very doubtful that will happen.

Let me give some examples. The Liberal proposals in the bill are simply not financially sustainable. In 15 years or less, spending on social programs plus interest will consume 100 per cent of all federal revenues. I will get back to that a bit later.

The proposals in the bill do not address the long term fiscal reality of declining dollars to spend on social programs and the dramatic increase in the numbers of seniors expected in the next 15 years. This mindset occurs on just about every committee the Liberal Party has chaired. Never are the ideas of how we are going to pay for all the programs we ask for ever addressed in the majority of committees that we sit on.

The Liberal proposals are not targeted to the truly needy. The Liberal proposals do not eliminate the duplication between various levels of government, a logical choice where we could officially cut costs to provide more money for other programs and to decreasing the deficit and the debt.

We in this party support the following options proposed in the minister's paper, I must admit: moving the UI system closer to a true insurance program; starting to target assistance to those most in need; a voucher system for students to replace post-secondary education; an income contingent repayment plan for student loans which would put it on the legs of financial and

*Government Orders*

fiscal sustainability; and placing more responsibility on the province for welfare programs. The problem and the single most important and fundamental threat to social programs is continued deficit spending by this and previous governments.

We have been accused in this party of being the slash and burn party that does not care about the poor, the dispossessed, the wronged, and those in the lowest socioeconomic backgrounds. That is wrong. That is a fallacy that continues to exist in the public's mind. I will try to show the House, the government and the public what we really stand for and to put forth the only solution that will rectify these problems and save social programs for those who truly need them.

Currently the debt and the interest payments are providing less money for social programs. I will explain how this happens. It will ultimately result in the collapse of all the programs because there simply will be no money for them. Who will that hurt? That will hurt those who are most needy.

The problem, as I said before, is that as the debt increases the amount of interest on it increases. Currently a quarter of all government revenues is paid purely on interest. This serves no function whatsoever. A quarter goes to spending on government services and a half to social spending.

Social spending is almost \$80 billion. As interest payments go up one or two things happen: they can either take away from social spending or other programs or they can tax more, which is absolutely ludicrous. The people in the country are taxed to the hilt.

**An hon. member:** That is the Liberal plan.

**Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** That is right. However there is a backlash. If they increase taxes people spend less. Fewer people are employed. Jobless rates go up. There is more of a demand on our social programs. Our debts go up. Our interest payments go up. The cycle repeats itself. It is a spiral that ultimately results in the collapse of the financial, economic and social backbone of our country.

(1725)

To put this into a more stark perspective, by the year 2010 interest payments and social spending will combine to swallow every single dollar this government or any government will take in. That is 100 per cent of revenues. That will mean there will be no money for government services including the armed forces, foreign affairs, RCMP, or the precious multiculturalism and bilingualism the government holds so dear.

At best, with government services amounting to \$42 billion, the most we can reasonably cut is between \$8 billion and \$10 billion. The rest must come from social spending. There is no way around this fact of life.

We in this party are not looking to slash social spending. We are looking to cutting a modest \$12 billion to \$16 billion which,

in combination with the other \$8 billion and the expected rise in GNP, will result in a balanced budget in the next three years.

The threat to government programs is already very evident. I will use the concrete example of health care that is close to the hearts of Canadians including my own. Our health care system is in crisis. The federal government is giving less and less money to the provinces and the provinces are funding less all the time because they simply do not have the money available. They are in exactly the same fiscal crunch the federal government is in.

This results in the deplorable situation of rationing, particularly the rationing of essential health care services. Less money, increased demands, an aging population and more expensive medical technologies all combine to comprise people's health. The most essential of health care services right now are being withheld from people, which will result in people suffering and people dying.

There is a five-month waiting list in Ottawa for heart surgery at the Ottawa Heart Institute. In the province of Quebec there are tens of thousands of individuals on hospital waiting lists, 800 of whom require urgent surgery now. That is absolutely deplorable. Seventy per cent of individuals in severe pain who need new hips, which generally applies to the aged, will wait at least five months and 40 per cent of them will wait 13 months to get hip transplants. Imagine ourselves, imagine our parents, imagine our grandparents suffering in severe pain waiting for a hip replacement that may never come.

The federal government is taking away money on one hand and forcing provincial governments to adhere to the archaic Canada Health Act. It in itself philosophically compromises the health care of every Canadian.

What do we propose to do in this party? We do not propose to destroy the Canada Health Act. We propose to amend the Canada Health Act to ensure that provinces have the ability to take care of their finances and to enable them to experiment with various funding models to be able to pay for the essential health care services people require.

Right now people are not getting essential services. How do we prevent a two-tier system wherein the poor will suffer? The way to do it is to define essential health care services, which is the job of the government. We are more than happy in this party to help the government toward this realization of defining the health care system and ensuring that those services will be covered for every Canadian in the country regardless of socioeconomic situation.

**An hon. member:** Liberal compassion, keep on spending.

**Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** This is Reform compassion. This is the way the Reform Party wants to deal with health care. The Reform Party wants to save publicly funded health care to ensure that all people in the country will receive the timely essential health care services they require. There is no other option. To further the health forum is going to take four years to make any substantive difference. It is only going to

*Government Orders*

offset the decisions that we in this party know have to be made now.

(1730)

I beg this government to heed what is being said here today and to accept our hand in working toward a coherent, forward thinking health care policy and social policy for all Canadians to ensure that all Canadians, particularly those in the lowest socioeconomic circles, will have their needs met.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is my turn to speak to Bill C-54. My speech will deal with two aspects. First, there is the whole issue of personal information. The reason we are opposed to this bill as it now stands is that the government wants to add Canada Post, among others, to the list of agencies and departments which already have access to this information. We may wonder why Canada Post needs to know this, but I think there is no reason to be concerned in this case.

Correctional Service Canada is a little more disturbing. Why Correctional Service? They may need it for criminal investigations, and that would be okay, I suppose. But the RCMP, the Minister of Justice, members of Parliament? At the moment, the management of intelligence services is raising many questions and creating a great deal of uncertainty among the general public.

I think that now is not the time to add to the list, especially when dealing with clients, in this case seniors, who may be more vulnerable to fuller disclosure of personal information or to allowing a larger number of government organizations, departments and agencies to look at seniors' files.

We know that seniors—it will be our turn some day—live in insecurity, especially those with few resources. We in the Official Opposition are very concerned about the provisions adding a significant number of government bodies to the list of those with access to personal information. That is why the other day the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel proposed an amendment which was rejected but which would have imposed some limits on the collection of personal information.

The second aspect is, of course, the efficiency measures. They want to improve service to seniors—as stated in the objectives of the bill—and simplify access to old age pensions, while at the same time taking measures to recover money from clients who, as I said earlier, are very worried. I saw people again this week in my riding office who are worried about social program reform. I do not want to indulge in grandstanding, but old age pensions are excluded from this reform. Meanwhile, the Minis-

ter of Finance is travelling across Canada and telling everybody that there will be a reform of social programs but that spending will also have to be cut.

Seniors—for whom I want to speak out—are worried. Again yesterday, two seniors told me the same thing at a meeting of the Committee on Human Resources Development. Can we guarantee that old age pensions will not be affected? Unfortunately, we see here some measures that reduce the retroactive period for an application to one year from five. Previously, seniors could apply to the government and had up to five years to do so. Now it is reduced to one.

(1735)

Eliminating the grace period would, it is estimated, save the government \$1 to \$2 million. The bill has a provision whereby the minister can stop making benefit payments while an appeal is reviewed.

Imagine someone who wants to appeal a decision under this bill. Now, all of a sudden, as a result of the minister's discretionary power or the department's delegated authority, his benefit payments would stop. This means that the burden of proof is on him, because he is penalized right away, and his old age pension payments are stopped until a decision is made on the appeal.

These economy measures are somewhat contrary to the purpose of the law, which it seems was meant to make the Canada Pension Plan procedures easier for seniors.

For these two main reasons, especially the increased number of agencies, if the bill is passed as is, it would give access to private information on individual seniors. Moreover, the savings would be made on the backs of people who are among the most vulnerable in our society, seniors, most of whom, as we know, are barely scraping by.

I think that the government—because the amounts saved are about \$1 or \$2 million in each case, for a total of around \$4 million for all of Canada—should not make seniors feel more insecure. These savings are not worth it. These people have contributed to society all their life and I think they deserve peace of mind and reassurance about their pensions.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Private Members' Business*

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45, I have been requested by the chief government whip to defer the division until a later time. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(6) the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday, November 14 at 6.30 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating myself I think you would find unanimous consent to further defer this vote until Tuesday, November 15 at 5.30 p.m.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find the House favourably disposed to proceed immediately to private members' hour.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before proceeding with Private Members' Business, I have a statement to make concerning Private Members' Business hour for tomorrow, Friday, November 4, 1994. I have received written notice from the hon. member for Don Valley North that he will be unable to move his motion during private members' hour tomorrow.

Since it has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 94(2)(a), I am directing the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

Pursuant to Standing Order 94(2)(b), private members' hour will thus be suspended tomorrow and the House will continue with the business before it prior to private members' hour.

It being 5.40 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**CREDENTIALS**

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should, in co-operation with the provinces, seek to put in place a process aimed at ensuring the portability of credentials obtained in and outside Canada in order to fully utilize the talents, skills and experience of all Canadians.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to open debate on my motion, No. M-303 as stated. This motion presents the House with the unique opportunity to assert its leadership and fulfil its duty to the people of Canada, to do them justice. This motion strikes to the heart of what Canada wants for its citizens and what citizens want from their Canada.

This motion ought to transcend partisan interests. Why? Because Canadians by birth and by choice want and need the dignity of work. They want and need to contribute to the economic and social fabric of their great nation. They want and need to find fulfilment and a sense of personal identity in their chosen occupations. They want and need to support themselves and their families.

I believe no one in this House or in this country would disagree that Canada wants her citizens to obtain these goals. Insuring the freedom, productivity, contentment and security of citizens is the chief interests of any democratic government. That is why I believe our federal and provincial governments must co-operate with one another and with other governments worldwide to see to it that Canada's citizens are able to maximize their productivity, their earning potential, their self-esteem and their creativity.

Simply put we in this House must work together to make the accreditation of foreign and out of province credentials a simple, orderly and timely as possible without compromising occupational standards for even a moment to ensure the full realization and utilization of the talents, skills and experience of all our citizens.

Professional and academic standards act as a kind of guarantee to the public. People can trust their affairs with a lawyer or trust their lives with a doctor, knowing that each of them has met local professional standards. As our children attend school from kindergarten through advanced degrees it seems only reasonable for us to believe that teachers are qualified in their fields. It is just as natural for us to want our children's academic achievements to be solid and substantial. We would like them to be as qualified as possible.

To retain the confidence of the public, regulatory bodies enforce a certain level of competence and knowledge. Professional standards are upheld. In general, most people in our communities accept that system.

The fairness of the system is tested when newcomers to Canada request that their credentials be recognized. In fairness to the public and to members of the professions and trades here in Canada, the domestic authorities must conduct rigorous and comprehensive examinations of foreign credentials.

(1745)

People who are familiar with the credentials issue know how complex it is. My motion is in no way a criticism of the people now working in the field. My hope is that we can better support their efforts.

There are costs associated with portability of credentials. I believe co-operation and co-ordination are the means to contain those costs effectively and to fairly allocate any expense that remains.

My motion calls for co-operation between our federal and provincial governments and on the international level. In academic and professional areas where provinces and territories have jurisdiction, the resources of the federal government can minimize the difficulty and expense. The benefits of an effective recognition process fully justify the efforts governments make to create it.

Job creation is the number one priority of this government. It is the foundation upon which this government has built a vision for Canada's entry into the 21st century. That vision encompasses the interests not only of Canadians here today but of those who will join us here tomorrow and rightly so.

Canada can and should do much more to ensure that immigrants and all citizens are able to participate fully in the labour force. Canada is a land of immigrants. Over the years, over the centuries, first one group and then another have come here to make new lives.

Some people were fleeing political turmoil. Many could find no opportunities in their countries of birth. Certainly, some of the people who came to Canada believed they would find adventure and excitement in the open spaces as well as economic and political freedom.

Some people come to Canada empty handed as political or economic refugees. The only fortune they can carry is their knowledge. A good education might be the only inheritance they can give their children. In all fairness we should help people make the most of what they have, not the least.

A Statistics Canada report released last July titled "Canada's Changing Immigrant Population" points out that the labour force participation rate for Canadian immigrants was lower than that of Canadians born in Canada, despite the similar propor-

### *Private Members' Business*

tions of university degree holders in the two groups. Based on this information, the report concludes that recent arrivals "may take more time to adapt to Canada's labour market".

I submit that the more plausible alternative explanation is the absence of an effective process or mechanism for accreditation of foreign-obtained credentials. As compelling as the statistical data in the report are, it is the people behind the numbers who make the strongest case for an orderly system of accreditation.

I would imagine that all members of this House are familiar with cases in which highly skilled immigrants have come to Canada only to find their foreign credentials do not entitle them to work in their field of expertise.

A striking example was recently documented in an *Ottawa Citizen* article titled "Educated immigrants face work barrier". This story detailed the case of a woman physician from Honduras who arrived as a refugee in Canada and has been forced to clean houses to support her family.

In my home province of Manitoba there are now close to 100 medical doctors who want to practise the healing art. Yet barriers exist to prevent them from doing so. I know of one physician who recently immigrated with his family from Ukraine. He is unable to practise despite his impeccable foreign obtained credentials.

This doctor and his family are not the only ones who suffer in this instance. Indeed our Winnipeg community incurs a loss as well, a loss of expertise. There are many more examples in many other disciplines and fields.

Throughout Canada there are hundreds and thousands of highly skilled engineers, technologists, technicians, teachers, accountants, lawyers, mechanics, electricians, plumbers, dentists, nurses and many more. They have one thing in common. They chose Canada as their new home in which to raise their families. They want to contribute to the development and prosperity of their chosen land. I ask, how can we in conscience turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to them? How can we?

(1750)

The issue of accreditation of foreign obtained credentials has been before this House since at least 1989 when this member took the issue before the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology and the committee on health and welfare, social affairs, seniors and the status of women.

I am pleased to note that both the Department of Human Resources Development and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration today have now seized on the importance of this issue. A four part report released last year states and I quote: "Few examples of mutual recognition of foreign credentials within an occupation and between countries exist. This is in part due to differences in standards and curricula that exist between provinces. Recognition of qualifications between provinces

*Private Members' Business*

must exist prior to mutual recognition of professional qualifications between two countries”.

The report adds, and I again quote: “Given the provincial nature of education and occupation regulation, the potential exists for duplication of effort—any lack of co-ordination between provinces could lead to—a foreign-trained worker receiving recognition in one province but not another”.

The acknowledgement in the report of the importance of this issue clearly illustrates the need for the federal government to assert its leadership role by co-ordinating the efforts of the provinces in the area of accreditation.

I am particularly pleased to see that a new government strategy released just two days ago by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has reinforced the intention of another department of this government to do just that.

In the new framework for immigration titled “Into the 21st Century” the citizenship and immigration minister clearly states his support of one particular objective of the Department of Human Resources Development as indicated in its social security review book released last October 5.

This objective is and I quote: “To facilitate adaptation so that recent immigrants who come to Canada with needed job skills and professional qualification can more easily gain access to employment services and succeed in the transition to the Canadian labour market”.

Furthermore, the document states that the two departments will work together to develop a national clearing house on accreditation in which the federal government will and I quote: “work with the provinces, employers, unions and voluntary groups to develop a Canada-wide system of credits recognition to assist immigrants to find and keep meaningful employment commensurate with their skills and knowledge”.

Portability of occupational credentials across provincial boundaries is an important and relevant part of my motion. I am therefore pleased the agreement on internal trade signed by first ministers on July 18 of this year contains a chapter on labour mobility which limits the use of residency requirements and establishes a process for mutual recognition of occupational qualifications and requirements.

This is crucial since without a co-ordinated national system of national accreditation, the idea of working with foreign governments to achieve the ultimate goal of mutual recognition seems more remote.

Why is this joint effort on the part of the provinces and the federal government necessary? I would submit that the sheer complexity of the issues facing those who seek accreditation of their foreign obtained credentials will need to be confronted head on by experts culled from all areas of the country and all sectors of the government and the labour force.

I am therefore pleased to note that at the immigration deputy ministers’ meetings in July and September of this year, a federal-provincial work group led by the provinces on access to trades and professions was established to advance co-operation on this issue.

This approach eliminates the potential for duplication of effort and ensures that all interested parties are pulling in the same direction and thereby saves cost, time and perhaps personal anguish.

We should remember that bureaucracies have a different sense of time than the people waiting for them to respond. What is swiftness for a government office can be agonizing delay to newcomers who are eager to work at their professions and trades and become part of their communities. The stage has been set for federal-provincial co-operation in this matter.

(1755)

That is why I again call upon all members of this House to support Motion No. 303, to support the efforts already under way to make accreditation of foreign credentials a more effective and efficient process. Accreditation of credentials should be a dynamic process, linking governments, professional bodies and schools.

New categories of employment and new professions are emerging faster than ever before. We know that. We need the creative energy, optimism and determination of all these players if the process of accreditation is to become an instrument for facilitating personal mobility, national productivity and, not least, human dignity.

Ultimately a successful accreditation system can ensure that Canadians, especially young Canadians, have qualifications which are respected and valued throughout the world, a truly urgent need and in our national interest. Indeed accreditation can open the world to Canada and to Canadians. In return, we open Canada to the world. Canada has much to offer and much to gain.

In conclusion, I believe those of us who have benefited from the portability of credentials have an obligation, a duty to make a case for so many others who are not here to speak for themselves.

I hope I have done them justice in my own little way. I hope this House will do them justice.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, at first glance, the motion tabled by the member for Winnipeg North may seem quite interesting, since it provides that the government should, in co-operation with the provinces, seek to put in place a process aimed at ensuring the portability of credentials obtained in and outside Canada in order to fully utilize the talents, skills and experience of all Canadians.

*Private Members' Business*

In other words, the member wants skills acquired in a province to be recognized in the other provinces as well as in other countries. To that end, the member proposes that the federal government, in co-operation with the provinces, seek to put in place a recognition process of credentials. However, one can see that this motion is very much in the spirit of the social program reform.

Indeed, one of the proposals made by the Minister of Human Resources Development in his discussion paper is the delivery of a learning passport. The passport would, in one place, document an individual's learning experience as well as any academic and vocational credentials, and would be recognized across the country by employers and learning institutions.

Such an initiative would require national education standards. However, it just so happens that, according to the Constitution, and this is something the Official Opposition keeps repeating, education falls under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. For the majority of provinces, except Quebec, manpower mobility does not pose any linguistic problem, since the English language is used. There might be a problem with New Brunswick, which has a large proportion of French-speaking people, but in the majority of provinces this does not present any problem.

(1800)

I have to relate an historical event, which occurred in 1990 and which disappointed many Quebecers. There was the Charlottetown Accord but, before that, the Meech Lake Accord was also rejected. One thing which disappointed a lot of Quebecers has to do with the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, based on its language and its culture. As sociologist Guy Rocher often points out, culture is a group's own way of thinking, acting and feeling. In other words, the difference is not merely of a linguistic nature.

In Quebec, not only do we have a different way of thinking, acting and feeling, but we also have a civil code which, as members opposite know, is totally different from the one used elsewhere in the country. In Quebec, we have a civil code based on the Napoleonic Code. It goes back a number of years but was updated last year by the previous Liberal government, involving a lot of work and extensive changes.

Incidentally, when we consider our legal system, all citizens are concerned and not just lawyers. We always go by the principle that everyone is supposed to know the law. But here, we have a whole collection of different standards.

If we allow mobility in the case of education, for instance, what about language? To have a standard that is acceptable across the country, how many hours of second language or first language courses should be offered from coast to coast? I see this as a major problem.

If a proposal in this respect were up to the provincial Ministers of Education who could try to define minimum standards that would be acceptable to all concerned, we could go along with that, because the Bloc Québécois does not think Quebecers should live in a vacuum. It has never been opposed to the principle of free trade, and I mean free trade in more than goods and services. Free trade also involves individuals who move around to sell and promote their products, for instance.

However, when we get to the question of manpower training and professional qualifications, Quebec does not operate the same way the other provinces do, with a few exceptions.

We do not want to be perceived as people who are against what English Canada wants to do, if it is against exchanges between the English-speaking provinces. And we are not, whether we are sovereign or operating under a federal system, against exchanges between individuals in Quebec and the other provinces, nor do we have any objection to Quebecers being able to work, for instance, in NAFTA member countries such as the United States, Mexico or elsewhere.

It is an interesting principle, but to implement the proposal made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, we must consider setting standards in the field of education. I understand the hon. member's emphasis on co-operation and I admire his democratic philosophy, but as far as implementing this approach is concerned, we must remember that for years there has been a very strong consensus in Quebec among all parties on professional training. However, for more than a decade, there has been no agreement on how governments should operate in this area.

(1805)

Considering that the Minister of Human Resources Development was unable to get the provincial ministers responsible for education and professional training on side, co-operation would seem to be a major problem. If we consider education and financial assistance, we saw, for instance, in Bill C-28 that the Minister of Human Resources Development had a number of new provisions to increase his discretionary powers, while formerly, it was up to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to determine who is the appropriate authority for education, while according to the new provisions, the minister himself would be able to designate the appropriate authority. He becomes some sort of a super education minister for the whole country, once again infringing upon an area of provincial jurisdiction.

If the invitation from the member for Winnipeg North was well received by the provincial education ministers, together, at their own level, they could define a set of minimum standards, regardless of the political context, be it sovereignty or the status quo. If these ministers could agree on some minimum standards, they may not have to be wall-to-wall in agreement to have specific provisions for Quebec, and recognize Quebec as a

*Private Members' Business*

distinct society, while having different standards for the rest of Canada.

The more I attend the meetings of the committee on human resources development, the more I listen to people from across Canada, the more I realize that in this country, there are two different countries and people with a totally different mind-set. In English Canada, people identify more strongly with the central government, that is the federal government, whereas in Quebec, we identify with our provincial government. In English Canada, when there is disagreement between the agencies and the province, people favour the federal government; this is somehow what the proposal from the member for Winnipeg North does. I believe it deserves to be taken into consideration, but in its present form, it is unacceptable to Quebec. The responsibility should lie solely with the provincial education ministers.

[English]

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this well intentioned motion.

I appreciate also the desire of my colleague to make the portability of credentials across the country easier for professionals and for those in the trades. There is no question that in our increasingly mobile society many people do experience difficulties and frustrations when trying to start a professional practice or to practise a trade in a different region.

I also appreciate better than most I suspect the frustration many new Canadians have with the credential process that exists across the country. Many individuals in my riding have expressed this concern to me and I understand where my hon. colleague is coming from.

However, I fear that my hon. colleague, the author of this motion does not understand the implication of the proposed measure. Further I believe we can conclude only one of two things about my hon. colleague and his government from this motion. Either he does not have a good understanding of how the business profession and trades work in this country or he does not care and is willing to see the imposition of a profound draconian government control over areas that should not be controlled.

Should this motion become a bill I have no doubt that tens of thousands of people who belong to professions that would be affected by this measure would make the folly of this motion very evident indeed. Allow me to lay out how it is that trades and professions such as the ones that would be affected by this motion are credentialled and what effect this motion if it actually became policy, which it will not, would have. Let us use the examples of doctors, lawyers and engineers.

(1810)

Doctors, whether inside or outside Canada, must receive degrees in medicine from recognized universities and then they must write exams under the observation of provincial medical associations. Only then will they be allowed to practise in the province and in Canada. Granted, recently some barriers have been placed in the way of doctors who want to practise in a province other than the one they have written an exam in, but those restrictions have happened because of a surplus of doctors in some areas and have reflected the best judgments of the provinces and the provincial medical boards.

Engineers educated in Canada and receiving their degrees must write an exam in each province they wish to practise in. The exam deals with local safety codes and local standards. The province specific exam is necessary since each province has its own safety standards and its own building and engineering codes. These are standards and practices unique in that province.

Should someone come into the country with a degree in engineering from a university that is not recognized and if that graduate has at least two years of experience they are permitted to write an additional examination more strenuous than the first for obvious reasons. It tests not only the knowledge of local codes and standards but also their general ability and knowledge of the field they are intending to practise in. After passing this exam they are able to practise in that province.

It has come to my attention that there are many engineering graduates educated abroad who are not able to pass the second more strenuous exam. While that difficulty is undoubtedly heartbreaking for the exam taker, we cannot avoid the observation that it reflects a lack of knowledge of standards and of techniques and practices in Canada. Those who are not up to the Canadian standard of knowledge and excellence should not, with all due respect, be allowed to practise.

I think my hon. colleague knows how the regulations of legal credentials work in Canada across the provinces. After an individual graduates from an English Canadian law school he or she must write a bar exam regulated by the provincial bar that allows him or her to practise in that province. My hon. colleague from the Bloc just pointed out some of the pitfalls in that region alone.

Is this protectionism? Is it guarding one's own turf? Of course it is and for good reason. I know I am stating the obvious, but this motion is so contrary to common sense when one sits down and really looks at it. A statement of the obvious is necessary to demonstrate that it is not workable.

Each province has its own laws, a wealth of laws, volumes and volumes of laws. Those specific laws require such a degree of specialized knowledge it is imperative that provincial bars

protect the consumers of the province by requiring tested knowledge of those laws.

**An hon. member:** Not in criminal law.

**Mr. Hanger:** Well criminal law is a partial exception but still there are requirements for the particular province. It is imperative to the consumers of the legal profession that local bars protect them from free floaters who would like to practise everywhere or anywhere in the country but would not have a degree of knowledge of the provincial laws that would allow for a proper and responsible practice.

I will admit that things might be easier to manage if the credential process were centralized if the feds took it over, or regulated credentialing. Easier is not necessarily better.

Yes, professionals and those with specialized trade skills are protected to some degree from overseas competition by strict credentialing. Granted, professionals in each province might even be protected to some degree by the control local professional guilds have over credentials but so is the consumer and so are standards of quality. The system is not perfect. Professional guilds can become protective and inward looking and there is no question about that. We have seen several examples of the barriers that are imposed.

However, we must ask the philosophical question: Who can do a better job of looking after quality standards of a profession and the interests of consumers of specialized services, professional guilds or the federal government? Who should be allowed to impose regulations, those who are intimately involved in the delivery of the specialized service or product, or the federal government?

(1815)

Where should the onus for protection of consumers and the regulations of local standards be located? Locally or in Ottawa? Needless to say the Reform Party believes that things affecting provinces directly must be under the direct purview of the provinces. The more local the better; the more decentralized the better.

There is a fundamental philosophical difference between myself and my party and my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North. We believe Ottawa should play as small a role as possible in the affairs of the provinces and in the affairs of business and the professions.

We believe consumers must be protected from abuse not by Ottawa but by the provinces. Where the private sector can do an adequate job of something we believe the government at any level has no business whatsoever getting involved. I know that is not the opinion of my colleague. Obviously not.

The proof is in the pudding. The motion if passed, which I hope it never will be, would establish a bureaucrat monster not unlike

### *Private Members' Business*

so many of the bureaucratic monsters that currently lurk in this town.

In closing I applaud the intentions of my colleague but this will not work and it should not be allowed to happen.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by applauding this initiative of my colleague from Winnipeg North. Why? Because it is a very important point. What is he seeking? He is not seeking any special power for Ottawa or trying to impose undue constraints. What he is trying to do is bring some justice to the men and women who come to Canada. He wants their degrees to be considered in a fair, objective and serious manner.

Why is he proposing this? Because we have a number of Canadian men and women, born and educated abroad, who are qualified for specialized jobs, but cannot get recognition due to the lack of any mechanism to review their degrees.

I am sorry, but the hon. member did not understand what my colleague is proposing. Why he is proposing this? Because the present situation not only creates injustices, it also deprives Canadians or landed immigrants from finding the job they are qualified for, the job that would challenge them, the job they really want.

My colleague is seeking a process, a mechanism which will not only bring some justice to these people, but will also allow them to work in their field of expertise. That is what he wants, nothing else.

[*English*]

The motion would achieve a couple of very important objectives. It would address out of country qualifications which we must do. It is a mess right now. It does not ask that Ottawa do it; it asks that it be done. Bring the partners together and work it out. Of course we are going to be sensitive to language.

[*Translation*]

Clearly, except in an emergency, we do not want to send somewhere a medical practitioner who speaks neither French nor English, and will not understand his patients. Of course we will be sensitive to that, we have to, and that is what my colleague is proposing.

[*English*]

It would also address the in-country qualifications. We are like 10 or 12 separate countries. My colleague and I understand that there are profound differences but there are also similarities. We are not asking anyone to give up their culture, their language, their constitutional responsibilities, or whatever it is they have to do. We are asking people if we can sit down and make it better for Canadians whether they were born in the

*Private Members' Business*

country or out of the country. That is what my colleague is recognizing.

The previous speaker said that he hoped this would not happen. I have news for him. It may. I note that the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration have recognized a need. I want to quote from a recent document which is a year old: "There are few examples of mutual recognition of foreign credentials within an occupation and between countries". In other words this does not exist. They have recognized that need. The report goes on to say: "Recognition of qualifications between provinces must exist prior to mutual recognition of professional qualifications between two countries". They could have added territories.

(1820)

In a more recent report entitled "Into the 21st Century" the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration had this to say: "To facilitate adaptation so that recent immigrants who come to Canada with needed job skills and professional qualifications can more easily gain access to employment services and succeed in the transition to the Canadian labour market".

That is what my colleague from Winnipeg North is trying to do. It is not to create a monster in Ottawa. It is not to try to crush people, to take away the constitutional responsibilities or to be insensitive to their cultural rights, imperatives, dreams and desires.

There is more. This is a key for the speaker who just preceded me. These two departments will "work with the provinces, employers, unions and voluntary groups to develop a Canada-wide system of credits recognition to assist immigrants to find and keep meaningful employment commensurate with their skills and knowledge". That is what these two departments will do. I applaud that initiative and the insight of those ministers.

I want to repeat, as my colleague said, that there was an agreement signed on July 18 by the first ministers, the agreement on internal trade which established a process for mutual recognition of occupational qualifications and requirements. A lot has been done.

Here we are with 10 to 12 separate jurisdictions and we are going to quarrel about whether or not a doctor, teacher, plumber or electrician can come and work on my turf. If I am having a serious heart attack, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not ask the doctor if he or she is from Manitoba; send him over very quickly.

Why is it that the European countries, even though they have different traditions and different languages, can come to grips with it and can resolve the problem? I guess my colleagues really think that we are not as able as the Europeans. I assure the House, with all due respect to those gentlemen and gentle ladies,

that we can do as much. Perhaps we can even do more because we can use their example and hopefully we can improve it.

I have more news for my colleagues. There is what we call the red seal initiative in Canada. It involves 42 trades and professions that can go from one part of the country to another. Nobody gives them any hassle. Why? It is because it was a process. They have the red seal. If we can do it in certain areas and we have done it, why can we not extend it? Where is that huge monster that has been created in coming to grips with that? There is no huge monster. It is in the imagination of men and women who sometimes do not let their spirits soar.

There is also the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials that helps people try to get some appropriate attention. I have more: the Council of Ministers of Education for Canada. I wish my colleague were still able to hear me; perhaps he can. There is so much information here that it may be overwhelming.

There will be a report out by September 1995 on public schools to say how we might be able to transfer more easily. Thank goodness. That is common sense. The Council of Ministers of Education intends to remove university barriers by the fall of 1996. There is more. Then it is the colleges. I would think it was about time.

I have some really good information for my friends in the Bloc.

[*Translation*]

He may not know it, but one of the best mechanisms to evaluate credentials is in Quebec.

I find it extraordinary, almost incredible, that he should be unable to support enthusiastically, energetically, my colleague's motion.

We have international agreements. We have GATT, we have NAFTA. We have all kinds of agreements everywhere in the world and more coming every day.

(1825)

We are supposed to want to be more open to the world, yet we have barriers that prevent us from talking to each other, helping one another and working together. Barriers erected by men and women, because they did not know enough, because they wanted to protect their own little world rather than open up and say: "Here is what we have, what do you have? Can we work together?"

[*English*]

I want to end on that note. We have all these international agreements and there will be more. We are opening up to the world and the world is unfolding. We need to unfold with it. We need to open our minds to the possibilities that are reflected in my colleague's insightful and very timely proposal.

*Private Members' Business*

There is no monster here. There is a search for fairness and justice and equity for those who are born outside of Canada as well as those born in Canada so that we can move more freely from one area of our great country to another and so that we can move to other countries in the world and so that others who come into our country can be appreciated for their just worth. Let it not be an arbitrary process. Let it be a process that good thinking men and women have thought out and have applied so that we can treat our fellow human beings with dignity.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I follow the member for St. Boniface. I would have preferred to speak before him. He has certainly given a very passionate and powerful articulation of support for my colleague for Winnipeg North.

In my own modest way I would also like to stand and give my own support to this member's motion. I have two personal situations I would like to put before the House with regard to this particular issue.

I worked previously in the field of employment equity with the Ontario universities before coming to the House as a parliamentarian. I would like to congratulate the member on this motion because he addresses something of real concern to the academic communities in this country. By addressing these concerns we will realize more equitable employment practices in our universities.

Often foreign credentials are rejected not on the basis of real difference in academic standards but have more to do with the perceptions that are based on stereotypes and lack of information.

The member for Winnipeg North has truly recognized an opportunity to provide all Canadians, those who have been here for a long time or those who are new to this country, the ability to fully contribute all of their skills to Canadian society.

The member has also identified another serious problem which is portability within this country. I draw an example from my own family to the attention of the House. My sister was a dental hygienist in Ontario. She moved to Alberta and had to go through a recertification and testing process. If the member opposite were concerned about bureaucracy and all of this I would suggest this is a real case of bureaucracy and wasted resources for my sister to have to go through this. As well, there was a considerable level of stress.

I would also like to point out, as my hon. colleague on this side of the House has already done, there were a number of things ignored by the member opposite in terms of some of his remarks. A lot of professions and trades have standard practices and there are no problems with portability across this country for accreditation.

With new Canadians coming to this country, particularly in the medical profession, he said they have to pass stringent medical tests. I agree with him. We want to ensure that we have capable and skilled individuals practising medicine in this

country. However, in many cases newcomers to this country are denied the opportunity to even take these exams.

If the member opposite has read any newspapers in recent months he would realize that the federal and provincial governments are moving to harmonization on many different fronts. This is just one example of how we can work together co-operatively in this country.

I mentioned bureaucracy. Let us talk about 11 kinds of bureaucracy in this country. We have to challenge those kinds of overlap and duplication.

(1830)

The costs. There is a cost to our society and to human talent in that they have to continually go through these things if they choose to move to another province.

We had an idea in the red book which I hope this government will continue to act on called the national apprenticeship program. This was lauded by industry and a number of people in my riding. I campaigned on this. If we take a look at a country like Germany, one of the reasons it is so strong industrially is because it has a very strong national apprenticeship program.

The process this government had proposed was to have these standards co-developed by industry, government and the educational sector. Again I would like to say that I fully support this member's motion. I thank him for bringing this very important issue to the attention of the House.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this motion with great pleasure because I have been very privileged to have received an education and also to have worked in the education field all of my life to this stage, some 31 years.

I taught high school for four years. It is illustrative to what the hon. member is saying when we talk about the portability of credentials to tell members about an occurrence when I first started my teaching career.

The hon. member for Saskatoon across the way will appreciate the fact that I am a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. When I first graduated from that illustrious institution and tried to get a job in my home province, because I had a high degree of loyalty, unfortunately most of the school boards in that province thought I was over qualified since I had two degrees. I was very young and inexperienced. They said they could get a teacher with some experience and less training for less money. I was not able to get a job, but they hired me in Alberta.

It was very interesting. I went to a rural county in Alberta. I applied for a job in writing. The superintendent phoned and asked me whether I could come and work. He offered me a job. I said: "Ho, you have not interviewed me. You have not seen my credentials". He said something that is very fitting to this debate: "We have hired a great number of teachers from

*Private Members' Business*

Saskatchewan and we have not yet regretted one of them". We could all applaud that for the University of Saskatchewan.

There are differences in credentials accruing to the place at which one got an education. The University of Saskatchewan built a reputation in western Canada that teachers trained in the faculty of education—it was called the College of Education at that time—were well trained and were able to compete.

Hon. members are going to have to think very carefully when I state this statistic because it is a catchy one. One of the people who was from Saskatchewan who taught in that rural county in southern Alberta said that the worst teachers from Saskatchewan go to Alberta and the teaching standards in both provinces rise. If one knows statistics they will get the significance of that statement.

I would like to also relate the fact that I taught at a post-secondary technical institute for 27 years. Here I have a point that is very important. We need to hear this. It is a waste of financial resources to try to train people who are not ready, who do not have the prerequisites. I believe it is very important as our students go all the way from kindergarten through grade 12 that at each level there be a good degree of quality control and that they be passed on to the next grade only when they have achieved a certain standard.

Teaching in a post-secondary institute for 27 years, I have experienced receiving there many students, some of whom were really sharp, whiz kids with good intelligence and good prior education. They did very well. Some of those students however were not as intelligent. They did not have the same mental capacity. There is nothing wrong with that. It is the same when I run in a race. I am at the tail end of the race, physically speaking. Mentally there is also a variation.

(1835)

I am proud to say that many students who were of average intelligence in the post-secondary institute where I worked did very well because they were able to compensate for that by good, solid, hard work. They did very well. They graduated, some of them with high marks, and they went on and chose their careers.

A number of my students passed me in earnings. A number of my students have already retired. They earned so much money they could afford to do that due to the training that they got. Not all of them were exceptional students. They were just hard workers.

I want to come to this point of international education. I also experienced on a number of occasions foreign students. We had a number of students from foreign countries who excelled just the same as we had students from Alberta, from other provinces

in Canada, some from the United States and many from other foreign countries.

We had them on the whole spectrum. Some were really good students. They breezed through the work. Some were average and there were some with difficulty. I am thinking of one young man from a foreign country who came to us. Our prerequisites in the programs I taught in required a grade 12 when they came in. That is from Alberta standards. I do not know how that compares with grade 13 here but it is probably comparable to grade 12.

This poor student—I liked him—did not have the prerequisites. Somehow he got into this country on the credentials of his government. He enrolled in our institute and consistently got zero in his exams. It just tore me apart but I could not begin to give him marks because I was training a person who was going to work, providing services to other people. I could not give him marks that did not reflect his actual ability.

I counselled him and tried to help him. I tried to persuade him to go backward, to take a lower level course, to get the prerequisites and to get up to speed. There we found a real problem because of the fact that there were no international standards, no agreement.

That part of what the member is proposing in this bill in terms of standards between provinces—we could extend that—should simply be expanded so that we have a quality control system, a testing system. Before students move on and particularly before they graduate they should be required to demonstrate an ability, a competency that is truly worthy of the profession or of the trade that they have entered.

My last comment is going to be with respect to the federal government's involvement. We all know that the constitutional mandate for education at the pre-post-secondary level is a provincial jurisdiction. We need to move in this country not to a federally mandated, federally controlled, federally organized, federal bureaucratic system but to a system whereby provincial governments will voluntarily get together in order to establish some national standards.

The same is true for post-secondary institutions, whether they are technical institutes like the one I worked at or universities or trades. It is very important. We need to have national standards so that there can be free trade among our trained people as well as among our goods. We need to have free trade in this country in order to be strong economically and to be able to compete internationally.

I would favour that. I would be opposed to the federal government doing that. Let it help in terms of getting the provinces together but let us not create another federal bureaucracy. I have found in my experience that when we work with a federal bureaucracy we all get pulled down to the lowest common denominator.

*Adjournment Debate*

Let us, rather, establish standards and allow the individual provinces to work and work hard in their organization, in their training, in their statistical quality control so that we have the very best trained people who we can possibly have.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to be able to add this to this debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The time has lapsed but I will underwrite a reply and recognize the member for Winnipeg North. This item is not votable, therefore I would ask the member to pose his remarks within the framework of no more than two minutes.

(1840)

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kind consideration. I would like to thank all the participants in the debate, those who supported the motion and even those who were not prepared to support the motion at this time. I am an optimistic person and I hope that in due course they will see the beauty and wisdom of this motion.

My point is to ensure that an orderly process, a mechanism, be put in place. The best way that I can think of is to challenge and allow the federal government to play the co-ordinating leadership role, not to take from the jurisdiction of the provinces but to ensure that in this process we will attain the ultimate goal and that is what Canada can do for its citizens and what citizens can give to their country.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

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

### CHEMICAL WEAPONS

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on October 21 I asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs when Canada would introduce legislation to ratify the chemical weapons convention and what Canada was doing to support the enforcement agency which was to be set up in The Hague.

The chemical weapons convention is the result of 24 years of work at the Geneva disarmament conference and had its origins in the first world war when poison gas attacks caused 1.3 million

casualties and 100,000 fatalities. Canadians will recall that many Canadian soldiers were killed by gas attacks in the first world war. Therefore this treaty should mean a lot.

Following the first world war and the horror of people all over the world at the use of gas during that conflict, there was an attempt to get a treaty to ban chemical weapons. We did get the 1925 Geneva protocol which banned the use of chemical weapons in war, but there was no enforcement agency and there was no provision against the production or stockpiling or trading in chemical weapons.

This treaty that I am talking about tonight was signed in Paris, France in the middle of January 1993. It bans the use of chemical weapons and also the development, manufacture, distribution, transfer and stockpiling of chemical weapons. It also provides for the monitoring, inspection and enforcement of the treaty and provides for penalties when the treaty is broken.

It is the most complete disarmament treaty ever developed and has the most comprehensive system of verification and compliance of any multilateral disarmament treaty.

The problem is that while the treaty was signed by 150 countries, it requires 65 ratifications to make it enforceable. So far only 16 have ratified after nearly two years. Only 16 have ratified and we need 65 to make it enforceable.

I put my question to the Minister for Foreign Affairs: When will Canada table legislation to ratify this treaty and what is it doing to support the enforcement agency which is called the organization for the prohibition of chemical weapons to be set up in The Hague in the Netherlands?

I would hope the minister's parliamentary secretary would have an answer for me tonight.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member is the past president of Parliamentarians for Global Action and is a continuing member on the international executive.

Through that organization I know the hon. member has devoted much time and energy to convince leaders and politicians around the world to ban the production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons.

In view of the fact that 150 countries signed such a treaty indicates that the will is there, but it must be disappointing to the hon. member that only 16 countries out of the 65 required have ratified the treaty in their Parliaments.

(1845)

I can assure the hon. member though that with his assistance our government will likely table the required bill in this House in the new year, contingent on interdepartmental and industry consultations which are currently under way.

*Adjournment Debate*

In addition to the information provided to the hon. member by the secretary of state I can tell him that pending ratification of the chemical weapons convention Canada pays a yearly contribution to support the activities of the preparatory commission for the prohibition of chemical weapons, the enforcement organization known as OPCW.

Canada has also created the chemical weapons convention action fund which provides grants to organizations or individuals who undertake activities to raise awareness about and compliance to the chemical weapons convention either internationally or within Canada.

In addition to this direct financial contribution, Canada has created two positions at our embassy in The Hague to participate in the various preparatory activities and to represent Canada's interests at the preparatory commission or the OPCW.

Other Canadian officials with special expertise have been made available to the OPCW for work on special committees, in particular a Canadian chairs the committee on chemical weapons storage issues which is responsible for drafting the model facility agreement which will be the basis for all future facility agreements.

I congratulate the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for taking international leadership in making this planet a safer place for our children and their children.

## TOURISM

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to emphasize the importance of the Prime Minister's announcement of October 26 which created the Canadian Tourism Commission and added a new boost of federal funding to the tourism industry.

Most Canadians do appreciate the features that our country has to offer from our shores to our plains to our mountains and the fact that these are simply backdrops for a variety of cultural and sporting pursuits that Canadians and visitors can follow.

I wonder if Canadians are aware that the care of those visitors employed 1.2 million people in 1993 and generated \$30 billion in revenue which lead to \$11 billion in tax receipts. These numbers are impressive but we know there is tremendous room for growth here because Canada has recently slipped from being the sixth most popular tourist destination in the world to the tenth today.

In this competitive world it is important to know your strengths and to emphasize them. That is why the Prime Minister has shown leadership here by recognizing this industry and this particular way that we might improve our economy by investing federal funds.

Today when most Canadians are concerned about the deficit and the financial situation of their country this is good news because this is going to be money well invested.

It also is an opportunity for Canadians to help with that deficit reduction, with that increase in jobs and increase in the economy because Canadians make decisions about their tourism destinations, where they are going to go on their vacation and how they are going to spend their money.

I think the Prime Minister is showing leadership and he is inviting Canadians to join in this effort to pick Canadian destinations, to show their children Canadian attractions, Canadian mountains, Canadian rivers, et cetera, and to help us in this pursuit.

Canadians have been asking me in my riding how they can assist with the deficit reduction. They are showing tremendous generosity and a team spirit in this effort and I wanted to share this idea with them today because perhaps they are planning their vacations for next year right now.

I would like to follow up my earlier question with a question to the parliamentary secretary, asking him what he sees as far as future job possibilities based on the Prime Minister's announcement of the Canadian Tourism Commission and the investing of a large number of federal funds in this industry.

**Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the characteristically eloquent and excellent question asked by the hon. member for Oakville—Milton on the tourism industry in Canada.

(1850)

As the member has indicated, the government has recently announced a tourism strategy that recognizes the importance of this industry. Tourism is big business in Canada.

As the member has also stated, it is an industry that provides hundreds of thousands of jobs and produces billions of dollars for our gross domestic product.

We believe that tourism also has the unique ability to create jobs not at the entry level alone but, contrary to the perception of some, in higher skilled, higher paid categories.

The Prime Minister's special advisor on tourism, Mr. Buchanan, stated in his report that a Team Canada approach is essential in the tourism industry. As the Prime Minister said, the federal government for its part accepts Mr. Buchanan's recommendations.

Mr. Buchanan and the Minister of Industry will work together to establish a Canadian tourism commission by the new year. This commission will be a partnership of the industry and both levels of government with the board of directors made up of

representatives of the tourism industry, provincial and territorial governments and the federal government. It will help us to co-ordinate our efforts and get the most out of limited resources.

We agreed with Mr. Buchanan and the hon. member that for the tourism industry to be able to create new jobs the federal government should increase its spending on tourism promotion at home and abroad. The federal government is increasing its spending on tourism by \$35 million to a budget of \$50 million. The goal in this new partnership is to create a \$100 million marketing fund that will re-establish Canada as a force in the global tourism industry.

When we fully achieve the partnership between government and the industry that the Buchanan report has recommended we will create many thousands of new jobs for Canadians all over the country. We will generate considerable new revenues for companies, for Canada and for all levels of government. I might add that we will substantially improve our balance of payments.

[*Translation*]

CARREFOUR JEUNESSE-EMPLOI

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tried to get an answer to my question. I hope to get one today. I am not sure who will answer. In any case, it is up to the government to decide.

Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Human Resources Development about an incident reported to the media. It involved a young unemployed who had been told not to go to Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi, in Gatineau, but instead go to another centre, to find work. The reason given was that Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi had a job-search group which had lost its funding of \$240,000. In spite of enjoying strong support from the community, that agency had not managed to convince the Department of Human Resources Development to review the decision. We know that the money thus saved was given to other centres, including a new one set up in the neighbouring riding, which just happens to be the riding of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

So, this was not a real saving: It was a transfer of funds. One excuse made was that Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi wanted to provide its services to people who were not getting UI benefits. In this case, the young man was entitled to unemployment insurance benefits, but could not avail himself of the new service provided by Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi, because the civil servant concerned forbade him to do so. He wanted the young man to go to another centre.

We asked the minister if he could justify this action. Unfortunately, the minister says that it is a judgment by employment counsellors as to the advice they give to clients of our employment centres as to the best services that can be provided to them.

*Adjournment Debate*

In other words, having delegated his authority, the minister was saying that nothing could be done. He allows civil servants to resort to blackmail. He added that the La Relance project has a 75 per cent success rate, which is why people were referred to it. Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi also has a 75 per cent success rate.

In the second part of his answer, the minister stated that cuts were made, but that Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi receives \$550,000 from the federal government, compared to only \$100,000 from the province of Quebec.

(1855)

On checking today, we find that the province contributes approximately \$600,000 to Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi and that the contribution of the constituency is \$50,000. This is far from the five to one ratio that the minister mentioned yesterday during Question Period, which was more a question period than an answer period, since the answer was not satisfactory.

As we can see, cuts are being made in youth training centres by the Department of Human Resources Development while consultations are being held on the social program reform. The government did not even wait for the consultation results to go ahead with these cuts. If only this was to achieve savings. But no. The money saved will be transferred to other ridings, and the province and the federal government will continue to wrestle with each other. This will only maintain the indescribable mess in manpower training in Quebec.

Meanwhile, the federal government is trying to establish the Canadian Youth Service Corps at \$10,000 per participant, when Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi in Gatineau only cost \$1,000 grant for each and every young participant. A survey of the people who found a job in previous years with the help of Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi shows that, with an investment of \$240,000, those who found a job paid \$1,385,000 in federal taxes.

So, it was profitable for the government. In spite of this, the government still continues to thwart Quebec's job training objectives, by going after a centre in Quebec which already was a one-stop service centre, and provided a great number of services to young people. And because one criterion to lower the number of people receiving unemployment insurance benefits is not being met, young men and women are being blackmailed.

I am hoping for a satisfactory answer and especially a comment indicating that this will stop.

[*English*]

**Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the priorities of this government is the training and adjustment needs of youths.

*Adjournment Debate*

Until recently two job finding clubs were in operation in the Outaouais region offering many of the same services. Given budget limitations and based on the needs of the local labour market in that area, the local Canada Employment Centre in consultation with the Outaouais community has chosen to finance La Relance which has a 75 per cent success rate in helping participants find a job within a three month period.

This choice will enable us to serve 25 per cent more clients than we would have had we kept both contracts with reduced budgets. This decision was supported by the community. L'association des services alternatifs de développement de l'employabilité de l'Outaouais unanimously proposed that there be only one job finding club in the area and supported La Relance job club proposal.

With respect to the hon. member's accusations, the department of human resources is responsible to Canadians as to the use of their tax dollars. Because of this responsibility, it must purchase the most effective programs available for its clients.

When referring UI claimants for training, employment counsellors ensure that the needs of the clients are met. Counsellors always try to be flexible in order to accommodate their client's wishes.

The local Canada Employment Centre will no doubt continue to refer some UI claimants to Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi. Even though the club's primary objective is focused on non-UI claimants, each case will be examined individually.

It will be noted that for 1994-95 Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi is receiving more than \$550,000 from human resources development to offer other training and job finding services to disadvantaged youth. This funding has been maintained.

This government is committed to assisting Canada's youth through programs and services that will help them integrate into the labour market as quickly as possible.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I put a question to the Minister of National Defence and did not receive a satisfactory answer. This evening, speaking on behalf of the people of Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean, I would appreciate a reply to this question.

The Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy submitted its report last Monday. The publication of this report has caused some concern among many people, especially in my riding, and not without reason, I believe.

(1900)

The importance of the base in Bagotville for the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area is ample justification for questioning the minister, to find out what his intentions are. The future of the base is closely linked to the development of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean, since several hundred people are employed on the base.

Should the representative for this area not have the right to demand a clear answer from the minister? One can hardly expect a whole region to wait indefinitely, without knowing what will happen.

Recent cuts in defence spending have led to the closing of the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean. Will this happen in the Saguenay as well? That is what we would like to know.

The Bloc Québécois dissociated itself from the report on Canada's defence policy on several points; one of the major points raised was of course the cuts which could further affect Quebec.

Yesterday, in my question, I stressed Quebec's neglected status. Quebec is one of the most disadvantaged regions when it comes to economic spin-offs from the Department of Defence. It is important to emphasize that only 13 per cent of Canadian defence infrastructure is located in Quebec compared to 34 per cent in western Canada, 27 per cent in the Maritimes, and 25.8 per cent in Ontario. And yet, Quebecers account for approximately 25 per cent of the defence budget.

In a brief presented on May 9 to the Joint Committee on Defence by the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean consultation and development regional council, people from my area stated their position as follows: "We believe that efforts must be made to bring some degree of fairness with respect to defence spending, infrastructure location, and personnel distribution in Quebec. The national defence policy review gives us the opportunity to take corrective action in favour of Quebec".

The Bloc Québécois has been asking the government to redefine its role within NORAD without delay.

The future of the four F-18 squadrons depends on Canada's willingness to participate in the protection of the North-American territory in full partnership with the United States.

Choices have to be made, significant cuts are required because of our economic situation and we think we have given the minister interesting suggestions on ways to save money, in line with a real redefinition of what our defence policy should be.

Government members have come up with proposals which are basically cosmetic, while our mandate was to do an in-depth review of our policy.

A fact remains, the government must answer to the people from my area and Quebec who are concerned with the future of Bagotville and the place it will have in the military infras-

*Adjournment Debate*

structure, since we get far less in military spin-offs than the 25 per cent we contribute.

The people from the riding of Saguenay—Lac—Saint—Jean are proud of Bagotville and they intend to keep it.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to have a good idea of what the Department of National Defence spends in Quebec, you must look at all the facts.

In 1993–94, 22.1 per cent of total military spending was in Quebec. This is an increase from 19.5 per cent in 1992–93.

In fact, Quebec received 33 per cent of military capital spending in 1993–94.

Of course, no single measure can provide an answer for such a complex subject as defence; the Canadian Forces do not exist primarily to ensure regional balance but to meet the defence needs of the country from coast to coast.

The military presence in Quebec is quite significant: the headquarters of the land forces command is in Saint-Hubert, one of the three brigades is based in Valcartier and one of the two main bases of operation for the CF-18 fighters is in Bagotville.

Six of 24 naval reserve divisions are still in Quebec. And a Naval Reserve school is presently under construction in Quebec.

As the Minister of National Defence told this House yesterday, the government will carefully consider the special joint committee's report, including those recommendations made by Bloc Quebecois members. All recommendations will be considered in the development of a new defence policy for Canada. Once that is done, the minister will take any necessary action.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.07 p.m.)

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thursday November 3, 1994

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Wheat Board Act

Bill C-50. Report stage. ....	7595
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 36; Nays, 159. ....	7595
Motion No. 4 negatived on division: Yeas, 73; Nays, 127 ....	7596
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 6; Nays, 195. ....	7597
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 45; Nays, 157. ....	7598
Motion for concurrence ....	7600
Mr. Goodale ....	7600
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 157; Nays, 45 ....	7600

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Order in Council Appointments

Mr. Milliken ....	7601
-------------------	------

### South Africa

Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ....	7601
Mr. Paré ....	7602
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ....	7603

### Committees of the House

#### Procedure and House Affairs

Motion for concurrence in 46th report ....	7604
Mr. Milliken ....	7604
(Motion agreed to.) ....	7604
Mr. Milliken ....	7604
Motion moved and agreed to ....	7604

### Petitions

#### Assisted Suicide

Mr. Hopkins ....	7604
------------------	------

**Young Offenders Act**

Mr. Bevilacqua ..... 7604

**Human Rights**

Mr. White (North Vancouver) ..... 7605

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) ..... 7605

**Assisted suicide**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) ..... 7605

**Young Offenders Act**

Mr. Hanrahan ..... 7605

**Human Rights**

Mr. Hanrahan ..... 7605

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 7605

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Marine Transportation Security Act**

Bill C-38. Motion for second reading ..... 7605

Mr. Robichaud ..... 7605

(Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.) ..... 7605

Mr. Robichaud ..... 7606

Motion for concurrence agreed to ..... 7606

**Canadian Wheat Board Act**

Bill C-50. Motion for third reading ..... 7606

Mr. Robichaud ..... 7606

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 7607

Mr. Benoit ..... 7610

Mr. Althouse ..... 7614

Mr. Taylor ..... 7616

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) ..... 7619

**Department of Canadian Heritage Act**

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of second reading motion. .... 7619

Mr. Bergeron .....	7619
Mr. Peric .....	7621
Miss Grey .....	7622

## **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **Greece**

Mrs. Bakopanos .....	7624
----------------------	------

### **Literacy**

Mrs. Lalonde .....	7624
--------------------	------

### **Rose Charlie**

Mr. Strahl .....	7624
------------------	------

### **Royal Canadian Legions**

Mr. Adams .....	7624
-----------------	------

### **Bloc Quebecois**

Mr. Bellemare .....	7624
---------------------	------

### **Career Week**

Mrs. Terrana .....	7625
--------------------	------

### **Remembrance Day**

Mrs. Picard .....	7625
-------------------	------

### **Young Offenders Act**

Mrs. Hayes .....	7625
------------------	------

### **Frobisher Bay**

Mr. Nault .....	7625
-----------------	------

### **Literacy**

Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	7625
--	------

## **China**

Mr. Duhamel ..... 7626

## **Remembrance Day**

Mr. Godin ..... 7626

## **Literacy**

Mrs. Jennings ..... 7626

## **Railways**

Mr. Blaikie ..... 7626

## **Leader of the Reform Party**

Mr. Kirkby ..... 7627

## **Bloc Quebecois Leader**

Mr. Patry ..... 7627

## **Literacy**

Mr. Zed ..... 7627

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **Government Spending**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7627

Mr. Eggleton ..... 7628

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7628

Mr. Massé ..... 7628

Mr. Bouchard ..... 7628

Ms. Copps ..... 7628

## **Pharmaceutical Industry**

Mr. Rocheleau ..... 7628

Ms. Copps ..... 7628

Mr. Rocheleau ..... 7628

Ms. Copps ..... 7628

**Ethics**

Miss Grey ..... 7629  
Ms. Copps ..... 7629  
Miss Grey ..... 7629  
Ms. Copps ..... 7629  
Miss Grey ..... 7629

**Human Rights**

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil) ..... 7629  
Mr. Chan ..... 7629  
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil) ..... 7630  
Ms. Copps ..... 7630

**Immigration**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7630  
Mr. Marchi ..... 7630  
Mr. Hanger ..... 7630  
Mr. Marchi ..... 7630

**Government Spending**

Mr. Bélisle ..... 7630  
Mr. Eggleton ..... 7630  
Mr. Bélisle ..... 7630  
Ms. Copps ..... 7631

**Immigration**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 7631  
Mr. Marchi ..... 7631  
Mr. Mayfield ..... 7631  
Mr. Marchi ..... 7631

**Marine Transportation**

Mr. Sauvageau ..... 7631  
Mr. Young ..... 7631

Mr. Sauvageau .....	7631
Mr. Young .....	7631

**Law of the Sea**

Mr. Caccia .....	7632
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	7632

**Young Offenders Act**

Mr. Thompson .....	7632
Mr. MacLellan .....	7632
Mr. Thompson .....	7632
Mr. MacLellan .....	7632

**Marine Transportation**

Mrs. Guay .....	7632
Mr. Young .....	7632
Mrs. Guay .....	7633
Mr. Young .....	7633

**Justice**

Ms. Meredith .....	7633
Mr. MacLellan .....	7633
Ms. Meredith .....	7633
Mr. MacLellan .....	7633

**Business Loans**

Mr. Ianno .....	7633
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	7633

**Royal Military College of Kingston**

Mr. Bachand .....	7634
Mr. Collenette .....	7634
Mr. Bachand .....	7634
Mr. Collenette .....	7634

**Esprit de Corps**

Mr. McClelland .....	7634
----------------------	------

Mr. Collenette .....	7634
Mr. McClelland .....	7634
Mr. Collenette .....	7635

**International Trade**

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton) .....	7635
Mr. MacLaren .....	7635

**Royal Bank of Canada**

Mr. Riis .....	7635
Mr. Peters .....	7635

**Business of the House**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	7635
Mr. Gagliano .....	7635

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Department of Canadian Heritage Act**

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment ...	7636
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	7636
Mr. Sauvageau .....	7637
Mr. McTeague .....	7638
Mr. Schmidt .....	7639
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	7640
Mr. Taylor .....	7642
Vote on motion deferred .....	7643

**Yukon Surface Rights Board Act**

Bill C-55. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	7644
Mr. Ringma .....	7644
Mrs. Jennings .....	7645
Ms. Bridgman .....	7647
Mr. Gouk .....	7649
Mr. Milliken .....	7651
Mr. Morrison .....	7651

Division on motion deferred .....	7652
-----------------------------------	------

**Social Security Programs**

Bill C-54. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	7652
Mr. Bodnar .....	7652
Mr. Fillion .....	7654
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	7655
Mr. Dubé .....	7657
Division on motion deferred .....	7658

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Credentials**

Motion .....	7658
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	7658
Mr. Dubé .....	7660
Mr. Hanger .....	7662
Mr. Duhamel .....	7663
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	7665
Mr. Epp .....	7665
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	7667

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

**Chemical Weapons**

Mr. Allmand .....	7667
Mr. Flis .....	7667

**Tourism**

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton) .....	7668
Mr. English .....	7668

**Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi**

Mr. Dubé .....	7669
Mr. English .....	7669

**National Defence**

Mr. Fillion .....	7670
Mr. Lincoln .....	7671