



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 121

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, November 4, 1994

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 4, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MARINE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (for the Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-38, an act to provide for the security of marine transportation, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure as an Atlantic Canadian to have an opportunity to speak on this very important bill.

(1005)

I rise in the House in support of the Marine Transportation Security Act and to explain to members of this House the need for a single comprehensive act to prevent acts of violence which could be detrimental to Canada's marine interests.

Canada is for the most part a haven from violence for many other parts of the world. To maintain our security we must, just as we admonish our children, be prepared and avoid danger. It is far better to prevent violence than to suffer its consequences. Canadians as evidenced by their abhorrence of violence and their support for strengthened firearms control want to end the needless loss and tragedy caused by preventable acts of violence.

The Marine Transportation Security Act will help prevent needless loss to Canadians, their marine transportation system and its operators, users, employees and dependants. The bill we are debating today recognizes that Canada is not currently facing any dire threat. However it also acknowledges that threats do occur and that to minimize potential injury we must be ready to deal with these threats in their earliest stages.

Security is commendable at ports under the control of Canada Ports Corporation particularly at the port of Vancouver where vessel and port operators practise co-operative security. This

bill will ensure that Canada has an appropriate legislative framework which enables the implementation of basic levels of security wherever required and with the flexibility to respond rapidly should danger increase.

Legislation does exist which enables the Minister of Transport to take measures to prevent acts of violence occurring by air and rail transportation. However, it should be a matter of concern to members of this House that there is not at the present time any comprehensive legislation in Canada authorizing the government to take preventive security action to protect Canada's marine interests.

Canada endorsed and promoted compliance with voluntary international security measures designed to protect passengers and crews on board ships. Use of these measures in Canada and other nations has however been inconsistent. Our marine industry and those it touches remain vulnerable.

Security provisions in existing marine transportation legislation such as they are are fragmented and inadequate. Different legislation applies dependent on flag state, type of vessel, port, waterway and marine facility.

No Canadian legislation is specifically concerned with preventing acts of violence. None ties together the various elements of the marine industry in a way that can provide the appropriate and timely response necessary to react to security threats.

The variety of legislation that might apply to any vessel, facility, waterway or person depending on the location and segment of the marine industry involved serves to delay rather than expedite response to threatening situations.

In addition to the potential for confusion, the lack of an appropriate legislative vehicle for marine security does not allow effective response. Use of different legal frameworks to provide for security would result in different security regimes with more confusion, less compliance and higher costs.

In examining solutions to the lack of preventive security authority, the government considered the use of existing legislation and found it to be inappropriate to the task.

The Emergencies Act for example, while allowing preventive regulations to be made, applies only when an emergency has been declared. This limits its preventive utility. Further, members will recall this act was not invoked even during the 1991 Persian Gulf crisis.

Government Orders

(1010)

The Criminal Code and the Security Offences Act while providing authority to respond to security incidents do not sanction preventive action.

The Canada Shipping Act is principally concerned with the safety of life at sea and the protection of the marine environment but it is not germane to security from acts of violence in the broad context of the marine industry.

The Canada Shipping Act, the Canada Ports Corporation Act, the Harbour Commissions Act, the Toronto Harbour Commissioners Act, the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners Act, the Public Harbours and Ports Facilities Act and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act, apart from their obvious territorial and jurisdictional limitations do not provide specific authority or enforcement capacity with respect to preventive security measures.

Before bringing these proposals forward non-statutory methods of preventing acts of violence against marine targets were also considered. There are however a variety of problems with this approach. In considering self-regulations the fact that the seaborne element of the industry is largely under foreign flag would create unequal conditions between vessels and would be unenforceable in a similar vein.

Canadian ports operate under mixed ownership with different statutes and authorities. Equality in application and enforcement of requirements under self-regulation would also be unachievable regarding such ports. It would be unrealistic to believe that either voluntary compliance or self-regulation would provide a rapid, consistent response to any threat in such a diverse industry.

As I mentioned earlier, despite the performance of Ports Canada police and the North West CruiseShip Association, voluntary compliance with marine security measures in Canada and elsewhere in the world has been generally low. It is apparent there is little practical alternative to regulation. The high degree of non-compliance with voluntary security standards for international passenger vessels and the predominant view of other major commercial segments of the industry that there is no need due to the current lack of threat underline particularly the need for regulated preparation. The fact there is no threat to Canada at the present time should not prevent us and deter us from being prepared for such an eventuality.

Options to a single, newly minted act have also been considered, including the retention of the current regime, amending existing marine transportation legislation on an act by act basis, and amending the various transportation legislation. Amending

all existing marine transportation security acts by an omnibus bill was also considered.

After thorough consideration of various options for achieving appropriate security regarding the marine transportation system including voluntary compliance, self-regulation and the various legislative alternatives, the government has concluded that the most reasonable, efficient and effective method is to enact a comprehensive Marine Transportation Security Act.

This act has come with a good deal of consideration by the Department of Transport. The Marine Transportation Security Act is such a comprehensive act providing the requirement I have spoken to previously. It incorporates all appropriate security authorities and provisions in one document, thereby allowing for ease of maintenance and compliance. The bill will permit consistent, equitable implementation and enforcement and can, if need be, apply to all elements of the industry in Canada regardless of their location or nationality. It will ensure the government's ability to respond quickly and appropriately to changing threat conditions.

(1015)

The Marine Transportation Security Act does not apply to vessels and facilities under the authority of the Minister of National Defence. Government vessels or facilities, where no commercial activity is involved, will not be subject to regulation because they are adequately provided for by the government's security policy and the government's ability to control them. Pleasure craft, fishing vessels and small commercial craft in ports are also not candidates for regulation as they do not provide the same attractiveness as terrorist targets as do other segments of the industry.

The international cruise vessel industry and the ports serving it would be the main regulatory priority once this legislation is in place. Except for relatively few agencies such as the North West CruiseShip Association, compliance with voluntary international security standards by the cruise industry while in Canada has been inconsistent, in part no doubt because of the lack of a perceived threat there.

There is no lack of perceived threat here I think.

Mr. Anderson: It's a big impression.

Mr. MacLellan: This priority is in line with Canada's commitment to the practical standards developed by the international marine organization and the determination of this government that the history of violent acts against cruise vessel passengers elsewhere in the world will not be replayed here in Canada.

To Atlantic Canada which is a part of the country that receives considerable benefits from visiting cruise ships this is very important. The cruise ship industry on the west and east coasts is very important to the country. We are proud to show the beauties and advantages of Canada to our visitors.

Government Orders

People the world over rely on Canada as a safe haven and a stable country that will provide safety and enjoyment while they are within our boundaries, including our offshore jurisdictions.

I do not think we can let these people down. We have to live up to this standard and in doing so we have to be prepared as Canadians to safeguard our visitors. This major piece of legislation will do just that.

Major commercial vessels, ports and other marine facilities which serve them are the second priority for preventive security regulation. Cargo vessels carrying dangerous substances, and ferries in ports where large numbers of people may be exposed should be adequately prepared to respond to security threats. Regulation envisioned for this segment of the marine industry is primarily in the domain of contingency planning.

The best time for preventive legislation is not after a disaster, it is before one can occur. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation so that a preventive security framework providing appropriate and timely protection for Canadians and Canada's marine interests can be established.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-38 is a technical bill that tightens up measures pertaining to marine safety on passenger ships, ferries and others. It is the marine equivalent to similar bills that have existed for some time with respect to aviation. It brings Canada's marine industry more in line with similar legislation already passed in Britain, the United States and several of the more sensitive Mediterranean countries.

(1020)

Communications with user groups and other affected people produce some concerns with the bill's original wording but virtually all of these concerns have been addressed by amendments made at the committee level.

The Reform Party supports this bill but does not intend to offer any further amendments or any additional speakers. It appears there is all-party support for the bill as amended.

It is very ironic that we have so much time to debate bills on which there is no dispute when the government saw fit to invoke closure last spring on a number of very contentious bills. The dictionary defines contempt as the feeling that a person, act or thing is mean, low or worthless. The invoking of closure was something the Liberals found contemptible when they sat in opposition. Somehow during the walk across the floor to the government side of the House their perspective changed. My position echoes their old position. In fact, I find the invoking of closure to be actually beyond contempt.

Since Bill C-38 is under the transport ministry let us look for a minute at other actions of this department as it is the body that is responsible for Bill C-38.

During the last federal election the Liberals were looking for some campaign issues to raise their profile. They found one in Toronto with the Pearson airport contract. They stated that the contract was a rotten one, full of crooked dealings between the Tories and their friends. They stated that if they were elected they would investigate this contract, expose the wrongdoing and then cancel it.

They left something out on the follow-up to that promise. They never exposed any wrongdoing. Was there any? We do not know, do they? There are two possibilities on this issue. One is that when the so-called independent review took place they could not find any wrongdoing. If so, they had a problem. After all, with all screaming about what a rotten deal the Pearson contract was, it would be embarrassing to admit they were wrong.

The solution to this scenario was to continue the claim that the deal was rotten, cancel it and make sure the legislation banning the contract holders from going to court where they might expose the fact that there were no rotten deals was passed. The other possibility is that they did find a lot wrong with the way the contract was obtained, but the guilty party was the Liberal connected portion of the contract holders. It would not do to expose that in court, so we have the same solution.

During the committee stage of Bill C-22 I offered an amendment that would require any settlements to flow through the transport standing committee. This would have kept the amounts of payment and the payees public. The public certainly had the right to know how this was being handled. Government members refused. I reintroduced the same amendment at third reading, but again the government voted it down.

The issue at stake was not so much the Pearson contract but rather the basic rights of Canadians, whether they were companies or individuals. If the government can arbitrarily revoke someone's rights, as it did in the case of the Pearson contract, it can do it anywhere, to anyone, in any situation, maybe even in the enforcement of the provisions of a marine security act. That is beyond contempt.

If questionable activities were limited to the transport problem that would be one thing. In that situation we could probably accept Bill C-38 at face value. However, revoking or ignoring the needs and rights of Canadians seems to be a general theme of this new Liberal Party with its new found perspective. This means we must look much closer at the emerging pattern provided by the Liberal cabinet in order to determine what is its real agenda.

For example, consider the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the recent developments showing that he interfered with the

Government Orders

activities of the CRTC. Further examination revealed that this was not the first time he had done so. That is beyond contempt. Further it underlines the concerns I have in dealing with Liberals in all areas, including Bill C-38.

The Minister of Human Resources Development recently tore a page from the Reform policy on funding for post-secondary education. We have advocated the use of student vouchers to channel federal moneys for universities through students to the universities of their choice. This would have neither increased nor decreased tuition for students. It was simply meant to be a more effective way to make the universities more responsive to the needs of students.

(1025)

However the minister in tearing out that page must have left most of it behind. The proposal he made was to propose issuing a voucher that was in fact a loan repayable to the government, and then cut off federal transfer payments in support of post-secondary education. This would have effectively doubled tuition costs for students who are already having trouble affording an education. That is beyond contempt.

Bill C-38 deals with the security of those who use the oceans. In that context let us look at recent actions or the lack of action by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Millions of west coast salmon have recently gone missing. Even though the salmon may never surface again, evidence that the recommendations of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans which may have prevented this catastrophe were ignored by the minister. This evidence is surfacing regularly. That is beyond contempt.

Safety and security are the main points of Bill C-38. The health and safety of the Canadian public were the subjects of a recent private member's bill dealing with HIV testing for immigration applicants, submitted by the member for Calgary Northeast. Although a few Liberals were prepared to go against the grain and vote in favour of the bill, unbelievably the majority under the direction of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration defeated this basic measure to ensure the health and safety of Canadians. That is beyond contempt.

Enforcement measures under the marine safety and security bill will fall in some part into the realm of justice. Let us take a look at the integrity of the justice minister. This is the minister who was planning to introduce new restrictive firearms legislation without one shred of evidence it will do a single thing to prevent the criminal misuse of firearms.

This is the minister who stated: "I will not legislate according to head count. I will do what I believe is in the best interests of Canadians". That statement interprets to: "I do not care what Canadians want, I know what is best for them". That is a rather scary concept. We might have this same minister involved in

decisions that challenge matters arising out of Bill C-38. I find the minister's attitude to be beyond contempt.

One thing we have not heard is when the government intends to invoke concerns about aboriginal people into this bill. It may well be that with potential land settlement claims eventually some port may end up being owned by an aboriginal group. If that happens the Minister of Transport would have to work in consultation with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whose record on legislative fairness is the worst of all the ministers we have discussed thus far.

He is the minister who introduced Bills C-33 and C-34. These two bills were rushed through the House to the extent that the Liberals invoked closure to finalize the bills on which even aboriginal people were writing to us with their concerns. If the land settlements contained in these bills were to be used as a precedent for all aboriginal people in Canada, we would need a land area four times the size of my home province of British Columbia to settle. These bills establish self-government at an unprecedented level and apparently revoke the Charter of Rights and Freedoms from the aboriginal people affected by this bill. This type of action and attitude is beyond contempt.

The Prime Minister is the person who is ultimately responsible for all ministers and all legislation. Bill C-38 is no exception. He is the person who recently claimed to have consulted with the ethics counsellor but had not talked with him at all. He later stated that he had not met nor talked to the ethics counsellor personally, but rather had directed his staff to do so. All this time the Prime Minister was referring to advice that he received from the ethics counsellor. Now we find that no one consulted with the ethics counsellor. This is a measure of integrity from the person on whom the responsibility for Bill C-38 rests? Not only is this very unsettling, it is beyond contempt.

Let us look at the Standing Committee on Transport, the committee that dealt with Bill C-38. At a recent meeting this committee went through the process of electing chairs and vice-chairs for the committee. At that meeting I asked for the voting on positions to be done by secret ballot. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport objected to this request suggesting that the Reform Party was trying to introduce unacceptable secret dealings into the committee.

I was forced to point out to the parliamentary secretary that this procedure was recommended in the Liberal's little red book. What is more it is the very method by which the Speaker of this House is elected.

(1030)

My motion was defeated and the Liberals once again elected a member of the party who is dedicated to breaking up this country to be the vice-chair of the transport committee. This procedure was repeated in every committee in this House. I find that beyond contempt.

Government Orders

I said at the beginning I would support Bill C-38 and I will. The reason I am supporting it is due in part to my consultation with users whose concerns have been addressed.

There is some potential for integrity on the other side. It is hopeful. Some members chose to vote in favour of the bill on HIV testing for immigrants. Notwithstanding the actions of the transport committee on the election of vice-chairs it appeared to be at most times a reasonable group working to resolve problems facing Canadians, I guess because there are no cabinet ministers who sit on committees. Because of this I will continue my support of the bill but it does not end my basic concern that the attitudes and actions of many government ministers in this House are beyond contempt.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-38 to provide for the security of marine transportation now before us meets an obvious need. Our party is in agreement with the principle of this bill and approves the enforcement procedure. Rather than waste my colleagues' time, I will limit myself to recalling briefly the bill's objectives, its highlights and its reception by the stakeholders. Unlike my predecessor, I will leave considerations not directly related to the bill aside.

First, the objectives. The bill's objective is to introduce in the marine sector the same security principles found in the air and rail transportation sectors. Although these sectors have security measures regarding boarding, there are none in the case of marine transportation. The government cannot, therefore, intervene in emergency situations, such as when a vessel is threatened by unlawful activities or poses a risk to a port facility.

The legislation focuses primarily on transportation of passengers. Screening measures will be instituted in ports to ensure that weapons and other explosives are not brought on board. This measure is aimed at preventing hijacking, sabotage and hostage-taking.

We all remember the tragedy of the *Achille Lauro* about ten years ago—and we are only now considering action. A group of Palestinian terrorists took over a Greek ship by force and took the passengers and crew hostage. Since then, the International Maritime Organization has established security standards to be observed in port facilities and on vessels. These standards, which were first developed in 1986, were ratified by Canada in 1993. The purpose of the bill before us is to implement these security measures.

It should be noted that 85 per cent of passengers on cruise ships are Americans and that the American government carries out surveillance of port security measures worldwide. In certain cases, it may recommend that American citizens avoid certain

ports. Guaranteeing security in our ports is a way of protecting our tourist industry.

The bill puts in place the legislative framework and authorizes the minister to make regulations to deny certain vessels access to Canadian waters and re-direct vessels posing security concerns to a secure place. For example, a vessel subjected to a bomb threat would be directed to proceed to a place where it poses less of a security threat to persons, vessels and marine facilities, before undergoing authorized screening by Canadian officers.

The bill makes it illegal for passengers or crew to have on board weapons or materials such as explosives that could be used as weapons. It will apply to all vessels in Canada, whether registered in Canada or not, and shipowners and port authorities will be required to install a security system including sensor equipment like the ones used in airports. The legislation will also apply to port facilities and drilling rigs. Naturally, vessels and facilities under National Defence authority will be exempted.

(1035)

The legislation will have teeth: in the case of a corporation, the maximum fine will be \$200,000. I might add that the bill was well received by the community. It met with the full approval of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Canada Ports Corporation.

For these reasons, the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-38.

[English]

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to add my voice to those who have addressed this House today in support of the Marine Transportation Security Act, Bill C-38.

The primary purpose of the Marine Transportation Security Act is the prevention of violent acts which could result in the loss of lives or impairment of the national transportation system. It is necessary however to also consider the financial implications of the bill before us now.

This government has a responsibility but even more this government has an obligation to ensure the security in marine transport, not only for Canadians but for our guests and visitors to this great country.

The Government of Canada has promised that regulations subsequent to this act will be made in full consultation with interested parties, consultation which is beyond that normally required for regulation. These consultations will include parties which have already contributed a great deal to the development and promotion of good security practices in Canada such as

Government Orders

Canada Ports Corporation and the North West CruiseShip Association.

I know that my colleague, the Minister of Transport, will ensure that such consultations are pursued with full vigour in order to ensure achievement of the optimum method of protecting the system while at the same time enhancing its competitiveness.

This legislation has been specifically designed with the flexibility to require enhanced security measures when threats are increased thereby requiring minimum expenditures in time and dollars when there is no apparent danger. This approach is in keeping with the current lack of threat to Canadian marine interests. The government has also promised to utilize to the fullest extent possible best industry practices and performance standards instead of detailed technical specifications. These commitments by the government will result in the most appropriate regime at the very lowest cost.

Very little in this world is free. The financial resources that a regulatory regime pursuant to this act will require the marine industry to expend are truly very minimal. We know that most passenger vessels have the technical and human resources to comply with very little effort should they choose to do so.

Unfortunately because Canada has such a good reputation as a safe destination, a safe haven, some operators tend to be less than diligent here in their observation of security precautions. This legislation will help ensure that passenger vessels do the things that are necessary and not only the things that are minimal to avoid becoming victims of unlawful acts while in Canada.

Other elements of the industry such as major cargo vessels, major ferries and the ports which serve them will have to expend a small amount of time to develop and practise contingency plans and conduct security surveys. Employees of major Canadian ports will also have to take basic preventive security training in line with regulatory requirements. Many of the ports implicated already have security plans and surveys. Some go well beyond the requirements envisaged.

(1040)

For those areas that will have to expend limited resources, it is certainly not more than would be required to conform with good business practice and management. The government will add from its existing base of expertise in the Department of Transport, administration, training, monitoring and co-ordination resources that will make the sum of the security efforts greater than the individual parts.

The international cruise trade is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to Canada annually. This trade over the last 10 years has

grown at an average of 10 per cent a year. It shows no sign of abating. One incident of violence against a cruise vessel in the Mediterranean, the *Achille Lauro*, resulted in major losses, direct losses to the Greek economy of more than \$300 million U.S. This does not account for losses in subsequent years of recovery. The preventive insurance this bill proposes is insignificant in comparison to such potential losses.

My colleagues have pointed out that other nations have increased their marine security. In particular, we know that the U.S. has security legislation already in place and that it will likely implement a marine security regime this year. The U.S. already has the authority to issue travel warnings regarding destinations it considers not to provide adequate security. I would remind members of this House that approximately 85 per cent of Canada's cruise ship trade is made up of American citizens. They come to Canada because they feel safe in Canada.

It would be folly to treat visitors to our land or indeed to treat Canadians themselves moving within each jurisdiction within this land with less concern and less respect than our American neighbours do. Will we not be good hosts as many nations already are, requiring security which adds to the ultimate enjoyment of travel? I would suggest that considering the cost of the security proposal before us, failing to offer it to our guests and to Canadians alike would be like buying friends a meal in a fine restaurant but refusing them a dinner mint after because of the cost. Failing to provide adequate protection certainly runs the risk of discouraging tourism and losing important revenue.

It was only last week that our Prime Minister was speaking on tourism for Canada, admitting that we will put money, billions of dollars, into the industry luring international conventions and trade to come here. They will come here because they feel good about Canada and they feel safe about Canada. Their interests will be better protected with this legislation.

I do not think I am far out on a limb when I suggest that safety in travel is a primary concern of all travellers, for all citizens. All responsible nations, including Canada, have a range of laws to ensure that our planes, trains, ships and cars travel with security. Now it is time that we ensure that marine travel is also guaranteed that same security. We offer to our people less safety and perhaps a threat of death if we do not engage in this legislation in this House. We have still more laws governing operation of the transportation system such as capacity to drive rights of way, waterways, roads, et cetera. People simply would not travel if they were in fear of tragedy of death en route.

None here can have forgotten the tragedy of the Air India disaster. Security in mass transportation is as critical as a failed engine or as an impaired driver. It is an important element that travellers and tourists need and want and that we must ensure.

Government Orders

(1045)

The Saint John *Evening Times Globe* in a March 4 article about cruise lines stated: "For passengers from Miami, New York and Los Angeles security is a huge consideration. Cruise lines like to go places where they know their passengers are safe, and not just from pickpockets but safe from terrorism and the whole works". They want safety first. There can be little doubt that security is critical to life, but it is important to competition and to the economy and cannot be overlooked.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill to ensure that Canada has this important competitive advantage. In so doing it will ensure that visitors to Canada enjoy the beauty of the country, the serenity of the landscape, and arrive and depart with memories of Canadians that will live on forever and, above all, will ensure their immediate and quick return to Canada.

I live in Nova Scotia. I live on the water. Cruise ship lines come into our ports annually. Their great desire to come to these small ports, to these unique and scenic landscapes, is growing immensely. It increases more than 10 per cent a year in the east. We look forward to promoting it even more. The potential is tremendous not only for the pleasure of it but for the economic value. Those people tell us in the follow up reports that they love Canadians and want to come back.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill. It is imperative and obligatory that we serve Canadians and our visitors with dignity and security of safety.

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise following the very eloquent remarks of my colleague who has described the importance of the legislation from an east coast perspective. I concur in what she said about the importance of the industry. It is important not only for Quebec, the Gulf of St. Lawrence area, Nova Scotia and indeed all Atlantic Canada but it is immensely important on the west coast.

What has been introduced by the parliamentary secretary is enabling legislation that will allow regulations to be put in place and, in addition to regulations, some security measures and rules. Some are of less importance, less legal standing than regulations, but nevertheless are legislation, security measures or rules. They all have the same objective: to ensure a greater level of safety for the cruise ship industry operating in Canada. This is very important. My colleague has very correctly given some figures. I may be repeating one or two of them. However the cruise ship industry is estimated to be worth \$500 million to Canada's economy.

Let me remind the House that we are facing a tourist account deficit in the country of \$8 billion per year. This is a major financial hemorrhage to the national accounts. Every effort must be made by Canadians over the next few years to rectify that

balance and to improve the opportunities in Canada for tourism. That is precisely what my colleague's legislation will do.

Cruise ship operations create a demand for port services. Victoria and Vancouver in particular are very fortunate to have the opportunity of taking advantage of foreign ships, which may be of Panamanian, Dutch, German or British registry, that come to our ports and then take people north up the inland passage and ultimately to Alaska.

Generally the process is for the passengers to get off at that point, participate in some tourism in Alaska or in Yukon, which is very important to those areas, and then fly back to their home destinations. At that point another group of tourists will arrive by air and board the ship for the return trip to Vancouver and Victoria. In our cities they live aboard the ship. However once the ship turns around with another group of tourists to go home, many of the people stay behind for a few extra days.

(1050)

Cruise ship companies are enormously supportive of efforts to extend the tourist period of their passengers in Canada and, I might add, in the area of the United States adjacent to us. We are trying to keep them in B.C. and Washington. We are trying to give packages. I give cruise ship companies full credit for the efforts they make to assist us in having the people stay longer in our part of the world. They have allowed promotional materials and packages to be promoted on their vessels, which is immensely helpful to our balance of payments position.

Virtually all operating vessels are registered outside Canada. Most of them are not of American registry. Most are from outside North America. We are getting a few more of the so-called pocket cruise ships with anywhere from a hundred to a couple of hundred passengers on board. Some have even fewer than that. They are important as well. A new niche area is the private yacht type cruise with 50 or 150 on board, not the massive cruise ships as we know them. There is expansion in the industry. People are moving into different areas which have not been exploited previously.

The Canadian shipping industry in Canada has been depressed in recent years because of rising costs, changes in Canadian ownership requirements and, very important, the recession. As my colleague mentioned, in the cruise ship industry there have been 10 consecutive years of growth and an increase of 190 per cent in traffic in that period.

In 1991 there was a total of approximately 714 cruise ship sailings, nearly half a million embarking passengers and a total number of passengers of nearly three quarters of a million. I should add that it is still increasing dramatically.

Thanks to American legislation it is more advantageous for a foreign flag vessel to use a Canadian port. The Jones act requires that American ships be used between two American ports. Going up to Alaska it is advantageous to foreign ships to use Canadian

Points of Order

ports. If they could not do so they would simply be out of the business.

We know well of the importance of safety to this industry. We know well because there have been a series of accidents, fires in particular, in the Caribbean and elsewhere which have led to loss of life. We have all heard of the tragic loss of a ferry in the Baltic in recent weeks. It is an industry which can be dramatically affected by accident.

It is also an industry that can be dramatically affected by other people's regulations. I remind the House of the impact of American regulations on the Caribbean cruise ship industry some years ago following a series of fires that essentially enforced American law throughout the Caribbean regardless of the flag of the vessel involved.

With the legislation we are trying to put in place a system whereby we will be able to regulate and put in place security measures and rules for vessels so that we can guarantee the goose will lay a very important golden egg. We want to ensure that we keep costs to the industry down.

Our belief is the extra cost that could possibly come as a result of these measures would be less than \$1 per passenger and probably closer to 80 to 85 cents. The extra cost would not be borne by Canadian taxpayers or by Canadian ports but by the industry. I might add that many cruise ship companies will have absolutely no extra costs as a result of meeting Canadian regulations because their standards are extremely high; they have very safe and seaworthy vessels at all times. This is not a major expenditure item that will impact adversely upon the industry.

(1055)

I do not know the exact amount of time, but we will have some period of time after the legislation comes into effect to consult with industry and analyse the impact, where the costs can best be borne and how the charges can best be made. We will ensure we work as closely as possible with other regulatory agencies internationally to ensure that we do not get out of sync with international regulations.

We will be able to show to potential tourists that we have a system in place in Canada which will go a long way toward assuring their safety at sea. There have been accidents in Canada. Cruise ships have hit rocks or had other unfortunate mishaps. It is important for us to be able to show that we have gone an extra mile and have done what was necessary to ensure safety in the industry.

As a west coast person I rise to join with my colleagues from elsewhere in supporting this piece of legislation. Its major purpose is the safety of people who use cruise ships that are major contributors to a very important and growing area of our tourist industry. Given the balance of payments considerations I repeat the importance of having everything possible done to insist that we in Canada gather the maximum advantage from tourism. This is the type of low cost measure that will assist us in doing so. Therefore I am delighted to be here in support of the legislation.

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

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to clarify matters that have appeared in the press today which may have an impact on question period or later in the day in the Chamber.

The New Democratic Party caucus has for some time expressed concern about its ability to raise issues in question period on behalf of those Canadians who are looking for alternative views and questions to be discussed in this place.

This week as a caucus we have taken a specific analysis of question period to the Speaker. That analysis is currently being examined by the Speaker and the clerks at the table. As a caucus we are waiting for the Speaker to complete his review of our concern. We are then prepared to meet with the Speaker to discuss how we can improve our access to question period to ensure the views of all the people who voted for us in 1993 and who support us today are heard in this place.

Our caucus concerns remain, but as a caucus please let it be understood that it is not our intention to imply in any way the Speaker is or has shown any favouritism during question period.

On behalf of the New Democratic caucus in Parliament and as the House leader for the New Democratic Party, I say that we are looking forward to continuing our discussions with the Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake for making that clarification to the House at the earliest opportunity.

It being 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

S. O. 31

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

DOWN'S SYNDROME AWARENESS WEEK

Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette—Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind members of the House that Down's Syndrome Awareness Week runs from November 1 to 7, 1994.

About one person in 700 is born with Down's syndrome. During this week, the Canadian Down's Syndrome Society is making the public aware of the abilities, strengths and needs of Canadians who have Down's syndrome.

For a child or adult, as well as the parents, family and health, education and social science professionals, Down's syndrome is a challenge which must be met so that everyone with this syndrome can develop their full potential.

Together let us wish the Canadian Down's Syndrome Society an excellent awareness week!

* * *

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the President of the Treasury Board tabled in this House the federal government's regular Supplementary Estimates, which call for additional expenditures of \$1.9 billion. They show that the Liberal government intends to spend \$5.3 billion more than originally anticipated.

The Minister of Finance plans to spend another \$3.3 billion on debt servicing because of his mistake in forecasting interest rates. This increase is offset by a \$3.4-billion reduction in UI benefits.

Without this reduction in UI benefits, this week's Supplementary Estimates would have amounted to \$5.3 billion instead of \$1.9 billion. When will UI benefits be cut next? The next time interest rates fluctuate! The Minister of Finance and his Treasury Board colleague should tell us so clearly.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this week is Community Safety and Crime Prevention Week. It has special significance for me and my constituency of Surrey North because of the many tragedies that the community has experienced in the past few years.

The list of victims keeps getting longer: Jesse Cadman, Sian Simmonds, Laurie Wood, Linda Williams, Chris Lussier, Paul McDaniel, Graham Niven, Sukhjot Sangha and now Pam Cameron.

It might be expected that tragedies such as this would sap a community of its strength. Instead the people of Surrey have been galvanized by these tragedies and have become proactive in preventing further misfortunes. Community groups such as CRY have sprung up and have been able to turn the anger of individual citizens into a constructive group trying to change our justice system.

Let this week become a constant reminder of the need for legislation conducive to establishing and maintaining a constructive and co-ordinated partnership involving the laws, the enforcers and the citizens.

* * *

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to speak to the occasion of Remembrance Day, which falls next Friday, November 11.

It reminds us of our veterans, of our heroes, living or dead. It reminds me today of one World War II hero from my riding of Winnipeg North, Pilot Officer Andrew Mynarski, to whom a memorial was dedicated last June 12.

Officer Mynarski in a real sense was the very archetype of a hero in that he gave his life that others may live in freedom, in peace and in prosperity. Thus he exemplifies the service, courage and self-sacrifice that our veterans have displayed throughout Canada's history.

On this occasion it is not only a reminder to all Canadians to remember their heroic deeds but a reminder to us in Parliament to assist veterans and their families in their independent living that is their due.

Remembrance Day is an occasion to recall the deeds of our heroes, the sacrifices of their families and to do our public duty to them.

* * *

MICHAEL SMITH AWARD

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week Acadia University's division of continuing education in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants was selected as the recipient of the 1994 Michael Smith award for science promotion.

This award is presented to individuals and groups that have demonstrated strong efforts to encourage young people's interest and abilities in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Staff and students alike can take pride in being recommended by a jury of their peers in science promotion and education.

S. O. 31

Acadia University and its division of continuing education have long been considered centres for science education.

I had the pleasure to attend this ceremony in Ottawa and I am proud of the accomplishments of this outstanding program.

(1105)

I encourage all members of this House to join me in saluting this achievement by Acadia University.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENERGY

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I wish to give the House an update on the program to increase energy efficiency.

[*English*]

Next week in Bathurst the energy and environment ministers will get together to discuss voluntary measures to increase energy efficiency.

In September of this year the federal ministers of natural resources and environment along with the provincial representatives of this initiative sent letters to about 250 CEOs of major companies involved in industry such as forestry, manufacturing, and oil and gas seeking voluntary commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions. To date we have received about 100 replies indicating an overwhelming support for such measures. This support should be duly recognized.

May the efforts of the ministers next week in New Brunswick advance this important initiative.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOVEREIGNISTS

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a government member castigated the Bloc Québécois for the success of its festivities marking the first anniversary of real power with our friends, the Premier of Quebec, many Quebec ministers and over 800 supporters.

Quebec sovereignists are not afraid of appearing in broad daylight to show their allegiance to a sovereign Quebec. Sovereignists always meet openly.

However, the Prime Minister of Canada and Daniel Johnson meet secretly behind closed doors, taking special care not to

alert the media. Federalists are preparing for the referendum battle, which is fine. But they should do so openly.

Stop hiding and use the same weapons we are using, namely frankness, intellectual honesty and openness. Face to face, I have no doubt that we will win.

* * *

[*English*]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, through a well timed leak we understand that the Minister of Justice now has the Liberal caucus on side on the issue of gun control.

The compromise agreed upon would be a voluntary registration of all guns over five years at which point it would become mandatory. I say what an absolutely spineless, weak kneed cop out on the interests of their constituents.

The Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister say all Canadians register their motor vehicles so why would they object to registering their firearms. I respond to that by saying that the registration of motor vehicles in great measure has been a move to tax Canadians for the use of their motor vehicles. This move to register all firearms in reality is a move to allow this government to tax all firearms to pay for this unjust firearms control policy and the bureaucracy it creates.

I ask all those backbench Liberals who would support this proposal, is this representing the interests of your constituents or are you simply hanging your heads in front of the Liberal whip?

* * *

[*Translation*]

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, violence is unacceptable in our society and women are particularly exposed to that problem.

Indeed, firearms are used against women in family homes. The majority of firearms used in domestic homicides are legally obtained. The presence of firearms in the home is dangerous.

Our government is taking concrete measures to make our streets and our homes safer by passing more strict legislation on gun control. I was pleased to hear representatives of the Coalition for Gun Control and of women's groups remind us of the importance of the measures which we intend to take in that regard.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNOR GENERAL SCHOLARSHIP

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the great honour of presenting

S. O. 31

three Governor General scholarships in environmental sciences to three Nova Scotia women studying at the Nova Scotia Agricultural College.

Tracy Shinnars, Charlotte Stratton and Danielle Vienneau were the only three university students in eastern Canada out of a total of 25 in Canada to receive this high scholastic award in environmental sciences. All three students attend the Nova Scotia Agricultural College and all three plan to seek post-graduate degrees in environmental science and medicine.

This high academic achievement speaks very well and very highly not only of our students but of the professional staff at the Nova Scotia Agricultural College. I congratulate them in this prestigious House for their very good work.

* * *

(1110)

[Translation]

GUN CONTROL

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned that a group of Liberal MP's wrote a report on gun control in which they ask the Minister of Justice to put the accent on harsher sentences for crimes committed with arms.

Those Liberal members are therefore endorsing the philosophy of the arms lobby, which believes in imposing harsher sentences to criminals in order to stop violence.

However, the American experience shows that, without any doubt, such an approach is doomed to failure.

Moreover, the recommendations of those Liberal MP's go against the commitments made by the Prime Minister himself last spring.

The Bloc Québécois is in favour of more effective control regarding firearms, so as to make them harder to get for criminals. We urge the government not to listen to the right wingers in the Liberal Party, as in the case of young offenders.

* * *

[English]

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, next Friday in cities, towns and villages across this land Canadians will gather to remember our war dead and to give silent thanks for the years of peace bought with their sacrifice. Those brave men and women gave up their families and homes to fight Canada's wars, many of whom never saw this land again.

This is a special year of remembrance for those who fought in World War II. Along with our veterans we will honour those who gave their lives for democracy and freedom 50 years ago.

In the peace and tranquillity of this land, this exceptional country, war may seem far removed. Let us remember that our peace was bought with the blood of our sailors, our merchant seamen, our soldiers and our airmen.

I call on all Canadians on November 11 and during this special year of remembrance to think of those who are not with us here today because they found this country to be something worth fighting for, something worth dying for.

We must never forget.

* * *

ETHANOL

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in a recent announcement that the government may ban the octane boosting gasoline additive MMT by January, the Minister of the Environment suggested that this ban would foster the development of safer grain based ethanol alternatives and that Canada plans to promote the development of ethanol in other countries.

I support the development of the ethanol industry in this country, including specific proposals from communities such as Big River and Turtleford in my own Saskatchewan constituency.

In this regard I would urge the Minister of the Environment to take action that would support community based ethanol development in Canada, including extending the present 8.5 cent per litre federal excise tax exemption for ethanol.

* * *

WALLACEBURG

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the good news continues as we courageously climb out of the recession.

The town of Wallaceburg in my riding is leading the way. Seventeen of 24 local industries either have expansions under way or are planning one in the near future. Just a few examples: AAR-KEL is adding 2,000 square feet; Durachrome is putting on a 15,000 square foot addition; and Accurcast leads the way with a new 32,000 square foot expansion with new die cast machines.

The growth in the industrial area of this community bodes well for a brighter employment picture. Wallaceburg is the sparkplug of Kent county's economy. I applaud local workers and industry leaders for their confidence in the future.

Oral Questions

Liberal policies are working to instil a new spirit in Canadians. It is truly good news.

* * *

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION

Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of Cambridge received some great news yesterday. Toyota Motor Corporation announced that it will be expanding its operation in my riding of Cambridge by investing an additional \$600 million in its Corolla plant.

This move will create an additional 1,200 direct new jobs and hundreds of jobs in spinoff industries by 1997. Production at the plant will increase from 80,000 to 200,000 vehicles per year.

Yesterday Toyota informed the rest of Canada and the world that Cambridge is a community with a skilled workforce, one worthy of investment.

I would like to thank Toyota for having faith in the people of Cambridge and of Canada. I look forward to a long and good working relationship with this exceptional corporate citizen.

* * *

(1115)

EDMONTON

Mr. John Loney (Edmonton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Edmonton is noted for having one of the largest urban parkland areas per capita in North America. This spectacular river valley park system, combined with the city's role as the gateway to the northern forests of Alberta, led to the designation of Edmonton as the 1994 national forestry capital.

The purpose of this designation is to promote a better understanding of the dynamic nature of sustainable forests, to highlight the significance of the forest industry on the economic prosperity of the community and to recognize the historical contribution of the forests to Edmonton for two centuries.

Recently I had an opportunity to participate in the ceremonial sod breaking for the John Walter Forest Interpretive Centre. The Interpretive Centre is part of a major legacy project involving a forest capital trail in the river valley and other educational projects.

The John Walter Interpretive Centre is an excellent example of what can be achieved when all levels of government, industry and community interest groups work together to achieve a common goal. The Interpretive Centre will be a major educational legacy for future generations.

I would like to congratulate the city of Edmonton and the organizers from the Forestry Capital of Canada Society for having the vision and initiative to undertake this impressive project.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Within less than a year, three different estimates of the balance of the Unemployment Insurance Fund were announced. Last March, there was a deficit of \$216 million; in September, a surplus of \$240 million; and in October, a surplus of \$2.2 billion. This week, the Supplementary Estimates indicated that this year, there has been a reduction in \$3.4 billion of unemployment insurance benefits.

Would the Minister of Finance confirm that the Unemployment Insurance Fund will have a surplus in excess of \$2 billion this year and that the surplus will be used to reduce the cumulative debt of the fund?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the year, the Unemployment Insurance Fund had a deficit of around \$5.9 or \$6 billion, I believe.

This year, we expect a surplus for the current year. However, that will still leave us with a cumulative deficit in the account. I think it would be premature for me to give any figures, which will certainly be less than \$6 billion, but I think we will have to wait until the end of the year. In any case, at that time we will still have a deficit.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when he brought down his budget, the Minister of Finance said that premium increases were killing jobs and that he would create 40,000 jobs by reducing these premiums starting next January.

What explanation does he have for the fact that with a surplus of \$2.2 billion, a surplus that is growing very rapidly, he did not immediately announce a reduction in unemployment insurance premiums in order to create thousands of jobs? Was that not his priority?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that despite this year's surplus, the cumulative UI account will show a deficit. Obviously, we will have to eliminate that deficit before we have a cumulative surplus.

That being said, the hon. member is quite right when he says that we want to reduce unemployment insurance premiums. We certainly do. In fact, that is the position I announced before, and it certainly is the position of the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Oral Questions

What is even more important is, that when we lower unemployment insurance premiums, we will be able to keep them down. This means we must be able to give the business community the assurance that the account is in good enough shape to keep premiums down.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance made a slip that was very revealing. He referred to bringing down unemployment insurance premiums. In fact, we now know that he is far more inclined to reduce the benefits paid to the unemployed than to reduce the premiums paid by workers.

(1120)

Would the minister agree that this enormous surplus in the Unemployment Insurance Fund, which, I may add, is growing very rapidly, was partly accumulated at the expense of workers that the government's social security reform has excluded from the unemployment insurance program and thus prevented from drawing benefits?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the unemployment insurance account still shows a deficit. We will have to deal with this deficit, and that is what is happening.

I would have thought the hon. member would wish to commend us, as the government, for the fact that as a result of our economic philosophy, we are at last bringing down this deficit and putting ourselves into a surplus position.

I may add that the reason we are now bringing down the deficit and giving ourselves a surplus is, that as a government, we are creating jobs at record levels. I am very pleased to say that the unemployment rate in Quebec went down again this month.

* * *

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-91 protects pharmaceutical manufacturers who invest in research and development; they have major investments in the Montreal area.

In most industrialized countries, these manufacturers benefit from legislation that protects the results of their research for at least 20 years. Now, manufacturers of generic products, most of whom are in Ontario, have put tremendous pressure on the government to eliminate these same guarantees in Canada.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Given the importance of the brand-name drug industry in the Montreal area and the concern raised in this industry by the attitude of some Liberal members, can the Deputy Prime Minister rule out any threat to amend Bill C-91 and its regulations?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question seemed to suggest that only Liberal members were interested in this issue. Obviously, the people throughout the country who have to pay the cost of drugs, organizations of all kinds, seniors and so on are very interested in it as well.

I want to assure my hon. colleague that although a committee of the House is looking at Bill C-91, the Government of Canada is very clear in its commitment to check all the data concerning this law, as the law itself provides, or any other legislation which must be reviewed at the appropriate time.

The original law already provided for a review of Bill C-91 at some point. We will do what must be done, but do not believe that just because a House committee is looking into some issue, the government's policy will change.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the minister responsible for the Montreal region.

Could the minister for once defend the interests of the Montreal region and formally commit himself in front of this House to defend Bill C-91 in Cabinet and against all comers?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will obey the law, which requires us to review the regulations before 1997. We will obey the law and I hope that the member opposite wants us to obey the law.

* * *

*[English]***IMMIGRATION**

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government recently released its much ado about nothing immigration plan for 1995.

Included among the things that were expected to be reformed but were not was the strengthening of the enforcement branch of immigration. No firm action was taken to beef up Canada's woefully inadequate deportation system. The government said that Bill C-44 would ensure that those who are ordered deported actually get deported.

My question is very specific. What effect would Bill C-44 have on those who have been ordered deported for violations of immigration law as opposed to criminal law to the minister of immigration?

(1125)

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

Oral Questions

I hope it means that the hon. member and his party will be supporting Bill C-44. Bill C-44 will ensure that deportations take place in the required time with all due speed and that the laws of Canada are properly enforced.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, six filing cabinets full of deportation warrants were recently discovered in Ontario. Tragically, they were discovered in the same office as the misplaced deportation file of Clinton Gayle who stands accused of killing a Toronto police officer.

These warrants are for violations of immigration law. Therefore they are not subject to any of the terms of Bill C-44, are not addressed by the 1995 immigration plan and would not be given priority by the minister's so-called task force.

Why has the government, the minister and the department done nothing this year to address the enormous and dangerous backlog of removal orders relating to immigration violations?

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the hon. member for his question. I am delighted he asked it because a number of misconceptions are out there with regard to the story.

It was an inaccurate story. These files were not lost. They had been screened by the department of immigration. They have been input into the Canadian police information computer and are in the process of being input into the immigration department's computer.

I want to reassure the member that things are going as they should. I thank him again for his question and the opportunity to set the record straight.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is making much ado about the tiny steps that have been taken to push criminal immigrants out the back door while she and the immigration department and refugee board appointees, at least one of whom was an illegal immigrant, are allowing with no screening whatsoever thousands of refugees with criminal records in through the front door.

Will the minister or parliamentary secretary admit that the RCMP refugee identification section has found in the first part of this year that fully one-quarter of all successful refugee claimants to Canada were identified after the fact as having criminal records or having made multiple illegal refugee claims?

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows or should know, this problem is one that affects all refugee receiving countries.

The minister travelled to Russia very recently to deal with international concerns in this matter. An international confer-

ence will be taking place within the next month to deal with this very serious matter.

Again I am delighted that the member has shown such an interest. I hope this means his party will be supporting Bill C-44 and our endeavours to clean up problems with regard to criminality.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. At the Rio Summit, the previous government undertook to stabilize carbon dioxide emissions responsible for the greenhouse effect at their 1990 levels, and to do so by the year 2000. In their red book, the Liberals went further, promising to cut these emissions by 20 per cent from 1988 levels by the year 2005. But the Minister of the Environment has admitted publicly for the first time that she will not be able to fulfil this election promise.

Does the minister still intend to fulfil one of the most basic environmental undertakings in the red book, namely cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 20 per cent from 1988 levels?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I never said that we would not fulfil our commitment. What I said is that, in order to achieve a 20 per cent reduction, as provided by government of Canada policy, co-operation will be required from both the private sector and the provinces. That is why I am really looking forward to seeing, on Monday, what policies the governments of Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia have, so that we can develop a plan of action not only for federal institutions but also at the provincial level. We need the support of the provinces to succeed. I hope that the hon. member opposite will speak to her Quebec counterpart to convince him to develop a plan of action in conjunction with the federal government.

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the minister reconcile the answer she just gave with a recent statement made in Vancouver to the effect that the government did not think it would be able to fulfil its commitments with respect to greenhouse gas emission control?

(1130)

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, the hon. member opposite said that we could not have a Canadian environment act because environmental issues fall under provincial jurisdiction. Her leader approved of the bill, yet voted against it.

Today, she is suggesting that a plan of action affecting industries in every province be developed without getting the provinces involved.

Oral Questions

As I said—I repeat it here today and I will repeat it in Bathurst on Monday—the federal government will do its utmost to try and achieve a 20 per cent reduction, but we need the co-operation of all provincial governments, including the Quebec government. And I do hope that Mr. Brassard will join us.

* * *

[English]

SALMON FISHERY

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a Department of Fisheries and Oceans document reveals that on March 25 of this year, three months before the opening of the salmon season, senior fisheries officials on the west coast were warning of a disaster if the level of enforcement was further downgraded on the Fraser River. They warned of a “repeat of the missing sockeye problems that occurred in the 1992 season”.

Why did the minister ignore these warnings and initiate the reduction in the enforcement effort which led to the disaster of 1994?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I know of his genuine concern about the state of the salmon stock. Many stakeholders in British Columbia are concerned about the state of the salmon stock.

I do not know what document the member is referring to. It is evident that many enforcement officers who work for DFO in the Pacific region have expressed concerns through the system about the state of enforcement. Indeed, as I said several weeks ago, many of those concerns and detail have not reached me.

It is for that reason two nights ago, for two and a half hours, that I as Minister of Fisheries and Oceans sat down with 40 enforcement officers from all over the Pacific region to hear from them firsthand their concerns about the state of the stock and their suggestions for improving the situation.

I have given them a commitment that I will come back to them through the department with a solid plan within our fiscal means to ensure proper enforcement everywhere the salmon run to do the job that is necessary.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I warned the minister last spring and others tried to and he refused to listen.

As we learned on BCTV last night, rather than accept blame for his incompetence the minister is fanning the flames of racism by saying: “The biggest goddam conservation problem on the Fraser River is the Sto:Lo”—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I would urge members feeling as passionately and as strongly as they do in

this place of vigorous debate on all issues of importance, and this one specifically, to choose their words carefully.

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, I was quoting the minister. He said: “The biggest—conservation problem on the Fraser River is the Sto:Lo”. Will the minister admit that he is afraid that a real judicial inquiry will simply point the finger at his own incompetence?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if anybody has been playing games that seek to generalize about an entire group of people, an irresponsible attitude about an entire group of people in the fishing industry, it is the Reform Party that does it with respect to Canada’s First Nations, that does it with respect to Canada’s immigrants, that does it with respect to Canada’s poor, that does it with respect to anybody who does not have a right wing, narrow minded, bigoted attitude about people in the country.

Mr. Cummins: That is wrong.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, let me say something. What I have said in the province of British Columbia, what I have said to everybody I have—

Mr. Cummins: We know what you said right here.

Mr. Tobin: Excuse me, you have asked a question. Now take the answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. First I remind everyone to direct their interventions through the Chair. Second, in order that we might get as many questions and answers on the record as possible today, both should be succinct and brief.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, what I said to every one of the groups I met in British Columbia—and I met with aboriginal leaders, the leadership from the commercial sector and people from the sport and recreational sector—is that all groups without exception, if the truth is to be heard in this place, must accept obligation for conservation, enforcement and compliance whether they came to this nation first or came to this nation last.

(1135)

If the member is not trying to cull selectively from meetings, I said that whenever there is a problem in whichever group there is a problem, be it commercial, sport, recreational or aboriginal, we will stand, call the problem a problem and bring about the necessary enforcement measures.

* * *

[Translation]

MIL DAVIE SHIPYARDS

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Hibernia consortium recently awarded an untendered contract to Saint John’s Shipbuilding in New Brunswick. This \$35-million contract represents several hundred jobs. This decision is outrageous since the MIL Davie shipyard in Quebec had already bid

Oral Questions

on this contract, unlike Saint John's Shipbuilding which never did.

My question is for the minister responsible for regional development in Quebec. How can the minister explain that he did not step in to keep the Hibernia board of directors from awarding without tender a \$35-million contract to Saint John's Shipbuilding, without a bid from this company, when MIL Davie had already submitted a bid?

[English]

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows this matter has been under review by the agency responsible for offshore gas and oil in Newfoundland. The whole subject matter will be studied and a report will be given. We do not want to prejudge what that agency is going to do.

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister responsible for regional development does not answer, I will put my question to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister not admit that awarding this contract without taking MIL Davie's bid into account is unfair to the Quebec shipyard, which is struggling to survive with all the energy it has left and which is better qualified to fill this order?

[English]

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I just said, it is being reviewed. The whole matter will be considered by the agency. I think it would be ill advised for the government to get involved in it at this particular time. When all is done, fairness will have won out.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Extrajudicial executions, incarceration without trial and torture are widespread in China. Given the Prime Minister is going to raise China's human rights record with its government, will the Deputy Prime Minister give us her assurances that soon after his return the Prime Minister will report to the House on the outcome of these private information meetings?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously in two weeks the Prime Minister will be back in the House and the member is free to pose any question on any subject he wants.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that was not much of an answer but that is not uncommon.

Canada was very actively involved in sanctions against Serbia, South Africa and Haiti. I would like to know what the government is prepared to do to ensure that China will reverse its dismal human rights record. What action is the government going to take?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific answered that very question most appropriately yesterday.

* * *

[Translation]

FLAGS OF CONVENIENCE

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Last spring, the Official Opposition asked the minister about two ships belonging to the Canadian government that were flying the flag of the Bahamas. At the time, the minister indicated that he would check on the reasons of such a practice and provide a valid explanation.

(1140)

Can the Minister of Transport tell us if he checked the facts and corrected the situation?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we were indeed informed of that situation and we examined the facts concerning the ferries, which are the ships at issue. It is true that these ships fly a foreign flag and, at times, some crew members are foreigners.

We asked management at Marine Atlantic Inc. to check all the implications of a transfer, so that these ships can fly the Canadian flag. There are several issues involved, including the rather high costs of such a conversion, but we are looking at the situation.

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government takes so long to solve problems. The issue was raised five months ago.

What sort of example is the Minister of Transport setting for shipowners by operating Canadian government ships under the Bahamian flag?

[English]

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand the member's frustration. We are trying to do the best we can. We have been here for a year now. I am sure everybody recognizes that we are trying to do as much as we can in a year.

May I say with respect to many of these issues that they went on for years and years under the previous administration. It was not able to deal with them through eight or nine years. We are going to try to get it done as quickly as we can.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of agriculture. On October 31 the U.S. department of agriculture announced the 1994–95 allocation for subsidized exports under its export enhancement program for barley and malting barley at 2.6 million tonnes.

The targeting of South Korea with a 50,000 tonne barley export is a direct affront and challenge to a market opened up by Canadian exporters. This trade action violates the intent of our agreement with the United States and creates further market distortion.

Considering the minister has described the American EEP as “the worst trade distorting policy on the face of the earth”, could he now indicate to the House what specific action Canada will be taking to respond to this new and damaging application of U.S. trade policy?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member’s aggravation about this particular situation can be exceeded only by my own.

The federal government is very disappointed by the U.S. government’s continued use of the export enhancement program, which is a major market destabilizing export subsidy. Not only are we concerned by the recent U.S. announcement allowing for the subsidization of 2.6 million tonnes for barley and malting barley, Canada finds particularly distressing the 50,000 tonne allocation of U.S. barley to South Korea.

Canada is in the process of considering the form and the content of the appropriate protest to be lodged with the United States about this allocation. The Minister of International Trade and I will be pursuing that issue at the very earliest opportunity.

As the hon. member pointed out this is especially aggravating because it was Canada that worked very hard to achieve the opening in the Korean market. It is disturbing, to say the least, to see the United States attempting to undermine that through the use of export subsidies. We will make the Canadian position abundantly clear.

* * *

LAURIER CLUB

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister will know that the government must enjoy the moral authority to govern if it hopes to implement the very difficult but necessary decisions ahead. Part of that moral authority is derived from the certain knowledge of citizens, that we are all equal before the law and before Parliament.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister tell the House how private privileged meetings among the Prime Minister, ministers of the

Oral Questions

crown, and those willing to pay \$1,000 to join the Liberal Laurier Club will help to build trust and confidence between the governed and the government?

(1145)

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should be aware of the fact that the Laurier Club is a public club. If he cares to walk down to 200 Laurier Street he can get a copy of the membership list. The club has been in effect for almost a decade and the contribution of every single member of the Laurier Club is a matter of public record.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I would remind colleagues that questions should refer to the administrative responsibilities of government. We are walking a fine line here. I know we have been sensitive to some of the issues that have been raised over the last number of days. I would ask members to keep that in mind.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is again for the Acting Prime Minister.

This week a private reception of members of the Laurier Club was held in Montreal organized by Senator Leo Kolber, a man closely connected with the Pearson Development Corporation, a group now locked in battle with the federal government over the closure of the Pearson airport.

Has the Deputy Prime Minister consulted with the ethics counsellor as to the propriety of such privileged access to ministers of the crown or would that consultation be done retroactively?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only party that is supporting the Pearson deal in this House is the Reform Party.

* * *

[Translation]

GUN SMUGGLING

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

For most crimes committed with firearms in Canada, the weapons were smuggled from the United States. The Solicitor General has told this House many times that the RCMP and other police forces were stepping up their efforts to stop gun smuggling.

Can the Solicitor General tell us what concrete action he has taken since this commitment was made and how the RCMP is intensifying its efforts against guns being smuggled from the United States?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the national anti-smuggling program announced last February was aimed not only at cigarettes but at other forms of smuggling, like the smuggling of weapons.

The added resources both of the mounted police and of the Department of National Revenue are working to deal with the smuggling of arms as well as the smuggling of other goods. This co-operation has intensified and the objectives of the plan, therefore, are being pursued as we said they would be.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister made some commitments last spring.

Can he give us clear examples of specific results obtained by the RCMP in the fight against gun smuggling?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will see what additional information I can obtain for the hon. member.

I also point out that this area of the smuggling of arms is one that is being examined and worked on by the Minister of Justice, the Minister of National Revenue and myself to be dealt with as part of our package for stronger gun control.

I hope the hon. member's question indicates that he and other members of the House, but especially his party, will give us strong support when we bring forward those measures.

* * *

LIGHTHOUSES

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in a news release sent out yesterday the government announced it will hold 60 public consultation meetings on light station destaffing. This consultation process was not to determine whether or not people accept destaffing. Previous consultation showed that west coast communities, boaters, fishermen and coastal pilots do not want this. This consultation is on implementation of the very policy the government previously agreed not to implement.

My question for the Minister of Transport is why is this government cutting back on operational jobs which affect public safety instead of cutting back on senior bureaucrat jobs that only affect the spending of the Canadian taxpayers' dollars?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it boggles the mind even on a Friday morning that Reform comes along and tells us not to try to save the Canada taxpayers money.

The fact of the matter is that in the United States there is one lighthouse that is still staffed and it is a historical site. The United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, countries around the world have destaffed their lighthouses.

(1150)

I understand the importance historically of lighthouses in British Columbia and Newfoundland, on both coasts of this country.

If the Reform Party wants to be consistent it should understand that even the Vancouver *Sun* had a headline that said: "It is time to switch off our lighthouse keepers". It is time for the Reform Party to switch on the light to reality as it relates to some of these technological changes.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the government is going to follow the example of other countries, I hope the justice minister will take note that Australia cancelled its firearms registration because it did not work.

The minister's departmental publication "West Coast Lighthouses" states that despite technological changes over the past 200 years in the automation of equipment, the human element has proven essential in warning of unpredictable changes in weather, aiding in search and rescue activities and providing essential services to mariners.

Will the minister tell us why he is ignoring his own department and jeopardizing safety to save money by cutting operational people instead of bureaucrats?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will say in response to my hon. friend that we are not being very picky at Transport Canada about what we are cutting.

People who are looking at what we are attempting to do in this department recognize that we are trying to be even handed about it. We are trying to reflect new technologies. We are trying to make sure that we have a very safe environment for Canadians to travel in this country.

I want to make it very clear that I cannot continue to accept questions like this coming from a member who says he thinks there is nothing wrong with the Pearson deal and then expects me to take him seriously when he is talking about lighthouses.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is on climate change and is for the Minister of the Environment.

Next week provincial and federal environment and energy ministers will meet to discuss the reduction in carbon dioxide emissions to deal with climate change.

Can the minister indicate to this House what kind of co-operation would be needed from the provinces and from the private sector in order to reach the desired target of minus 20 per cent in carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2005?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, at this point in time we are about 11 per cent short of our goal for stabilization.

To meet even the stabilization goals, the bare minimum goal established by the previous government at Rio, we would need to have an action plan tabled by the national government and by every provincial government in advance of the Berlin meeting.

We believe that science is telling us that we have to go further. We are convinced that at the meeting in Bathurst we will get the full support of energy and environment ministers across the country to go beyond voluntary action. We need voluntary action but we also need other legislative action to make sure that we meet our goals of stabilization and 20 per cent reduction.

* * *

[Translation]

FILM INDUSTRY

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The minister has not yet rejected the recommendations contained in the SECOR report on the future of cultural industries. Yet, all are unanimous in saying that if the minister implements the recommendation regarding Telefilm Canada, to the effect that the government should only invest in presumably profitable projects from a commercial point of view, the whole independent motion picture industry will be jeopardized.

Does the minister realize that the recommendations giving priority to major profitable corporations would have the effect of eliminating the whole cultural dimension of Telefilm Canada, and does he agree that this strictly commercial approach would adversely affect the arrival of new creators on the market?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the SECOR report was submitted by a consultant who has ideas and who made suggestions. That study was commissioned by the previous Conservative government.

Oral Questions

Obviously, there are other sources of advice and the Minister of Canadian Heritage will make a decision in due time.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the study was indeed commissioned by the Conservatives, but the contract was awarded to a prominent Liberal.

Does the minister not realize that he is losing all credibility within the cultural community and, in order to reassure once and for all the creative artists and those who will follow into their footsteps, will he categorically dissociate himself from the recommendations of the SECOR report? Yes or no?

(1155)

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants me to make decisions right now in this House to answer her questions.

However, when I make decisions, it is precisely in consultation with the people she claims to be protecting. In fact, I am doing just that right now. I have responded. I said that policies would be implemented after those concerned had been consulted.

* * *

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Farmers who lose their land due to debt settlement are being treated unfairly due to the taxation of capital gains. When land is taken back in debt settlement it is deemed to have been sold for the amount of the debt with interest. The deemed proceeds usually exceed the value of the land. This results in a taxable capital gain. The taxpayers lose land, livelihood, child tax credits or benefits and they have to pay provincial tax as a result of the fictitious calculation.

Will the minister confirm that the Income Tax Act will be amended to retroactively rectify this situation?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is good news and bad news here. The good news is that the member gave me advance notice of this question. The bad news is that he gave me advance notice about three months ago and I am not sure I can remember the answer.

The fact is that the department has taken the member's question under consideration and I believe that we are going to be in a position if not to satisfy all of the question, certainly to give a favourable response. We are working on it.

Oral Questions

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the reason I did not press for an answer sooner after having given notice is that the minister is so rarely in the House.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Morrison: Anyway, I thank the minister for his positive response and I will await with some eagerness the outcome of this.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way: As soon as I got notice I was in the House every day, but after about two months—

* * *

LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign the Liberals promised Canadians they would bring honesty and integrity to government. Yet earlier this week the Prime Minister slipped out of Ottawa to meet with 350 Canadians who paid \$1,000 each to the Liberal Party to buy access to the Prime Minister.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister who will remember that when the previous government carried on these sorts of activities she and her colleagues aggressively criticized that Prime Minister. Will she indicate how these secret meetings with those who pay for access and influence square with words about honesty and integrity that this government has spent so much time expressing?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the hon. member. We did not raise this issue when his leader had a boat cruise. We understand there is a legitimate function for fundraising in all political parties. Take a look at the Reform Party. There is a recent annotation that it received \$75,000 from Sabre Energy Limited, \$25,000 from Canadian Pacific, \$20,000 from Hollinger Inc., \$15,000 from Company No. 135482. Obviously parties have to raise money.

In the instance of the Laurier Club, the Laurier Club membership is even open to the member from the New Democratic Party. It is a public document. Membership is available to anybody who wants to walk four blocks down to 200 Laurier Avenue.

I can tell you that in the Liberal Party, unlike the Bloc that does not want to tell people who gave it money before the election, we are prepared to open our books and let everybody in.

(1200)

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

The Canadian government bought a year of peace for wheat exports to the United States by signing a very bad agreement.

Among unresolved agricultural issues, the U.S. is still using NAFTA to challenge the tariffs filed by Canada under the GATT agreement on supply-managed agricultural products, namely milk products, poultry and eggs. Section 424 of the GATT bill before the U.S. Congress requires the President of the United States to personally deal with this dispute and report back within a few months.

Can the minister give us an update on the negotiations in this specific matter and tell us why, on the eve of a new trade dispute with the U.S., he is not using the conciliation mechanisms provided for under GATT and NAFTA?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to the hon. member's question. One of those relates to the wheat agreement recently signed between Canada and the United States.

The hon. member characterizes it as a bad deal. He ought to know that the volume of access that we have secured by this agreement is higher than any other year in history except one year in which U.S. production was distorted by the worst flooding in 300 years.

This is a high level of access that we have secured for Canadian wheat. Those who argue the contrary should explain why they would take about \$150 million out of the pockets of Canadian grain producers by forcing them into a trade war situation.

With respect to the quota situation dealing with supply managed products, those items were under discussion with the United States at the end of last year and the beginning of this year. The United States preferred in the month of June to focus exclusively on the wheat issue. It will at some point I presume in the future again raise these issues with Canada.

However, it is our view that tariff equivalents that we have filed under the GATT agreement are perfectly legitimate and proper in the context of international practice. If they should be challenged by the United States we have indicated that we will defend the Canadian position.

*Points of Order***PORTS CANADA**

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at its last meeting the board of directors of Ports Canada decided to close down the grain elevator at Churchill.

A draft of the minutes containing that decision was sent to the Minister of Transport, not a popular decision for the Manitoba Liberal leader with a provincial election looming. When the official minutes came out, magic—no mention of this Ports Canada decision.

Can the Minister of Transport tell this House who is responsible for doctoring the minutes, the long time Liberal Party loyalist who chairs the board or the minister himself?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a question like that obviously reflects the total lack of respect that the Reform Party has for members of this House.

If the hon. member thinks I have doctored anything she should say so, say it in here and say it outside. I do not take lightly my responsibilities as a minister. If there is any doctoring to do I think perhaps the hon. member should see if there is something that can be done for her.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

REMARKS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 18 with respect to disrespectful or offensive language.

Earlier in question period the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans referred to the member for Delta or the Reformers as bigots. There was no intervention on your part, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that language and yet while the member for Delta was quoting the minister's very own words you rose and held him back.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what your ruling would be on that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Let me see if I can be helpful to the House. Clearly I heard the words from the member for Delta as reported by the hon. member for Calgary Centre and I reacted. However, as clearly I did not hear other words that would have led me to rise in the same fashion and react as the House would deem appropriate and also as the Chair would.

I would remind members while I am on my feet to always use more judicious words. I will also undertake to review the blues and report back to the House if necessary.

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during Question Period I did use words which are unparliamentary, words which I want to withdraw.

One of the words was "racist" and the other word was "bigoted".

(1205)

However, the member who has just risen will know that his colleague who sits just beyond his arm's reach, in asking the question, which prompted that response which I have withdrawn unequivocally, used the words "racist comments" in referring to me. The member thinks those kind of words are unacceptable. I have withdrawn them. I ask the member opposite to do the same.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I do thank the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for his unequivocal withdrawal.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I was not involved in the interchange between the two members. Second, the member for Delta in reference to the word "racist" was using it in the context of a question. He was not referring to the minister as being racist because we know the minister is not racist.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I understand, because once or twice in the 15 years I have been here I have been guilty of using words that one would not want to use. However, the member for Delta used the word "racist". I heard it, which is what caused my—

Mr. Cummins: Racism.

Mr. Tobin: "Racism" is the word he used, referring to my comments. I am sorry. That is what the member said. I would ask him to withdraw that. I would ask that the members of the Reform Party adopt a standard at least equal to that which they preach or seek from other members in this House.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to the minister as racist. What I did say was that he was fanning the flames of racism. I think that is an entirely different point.

Mr. Tobin: Withdraw. You heard it now, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Having been apprised of the remarks, the quotes from the hon. member for Delta, I would ask him to withdraw.

Mr. Cummins: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to do that.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hate to continue on the same train of thought, except that another member, namely the member for Mission—Coquitlam, accused the hon. Minister of Transport of falsifying government documents during question period. That is a very serious accusation. Needless to say it is far more serious than that which has been previously withdrawn. I would seek the guidance of the Chair with regard to that issue as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Colleagues, there is a very fine line. We remind one another to use more judicious words. It sounds repetitive but I think it bears repeating. I would hope that as we break today for a week back in our consti-

Routine Proceedings

tuencies with family, friends and constituents we would give that due thought upon returning.

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, actually in my question I believe I was asking for clarification. I certainly hope no one is suggesting here in this House that I would question the honourability of any member, cabinet minister or anyone else.

I think my performance in this House in not quite a year here indicates the respect with which I treat others.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

(1210)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding selection of votable items in accordance with Standing Order 92. This report is deemed adopted on presentation.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ACT

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-58, an act to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present four petitions duly signed by constituents from my riding of Calgary Southeast.

The first petition is signed by 54 constituents. The second is signed by 189 constituents. In both petitions they pray that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of

homosexuality by including in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is signed by 41 constituents and the fourth is signed by 221 constituents.

In both petitions they pray that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

EUTHANASIA

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present two petitions on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre. The first is on the issue of euthanasia. The petitioners request that current laws regarding active euthanasia be enforced.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I wish to present requests that the Government of Canada not amend the Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition duly certified by the Clerk of Petitions and signed by 36 citizens of my riding of Okanagan—Shuswap.

It asks that Parliament not change criminal law against assisted suicide and euthanasia because such actions would lead to degrading the value of human life. It also asks Parliament to increase pain relieving care for the terminally ill.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present three petitions to the House today.

In the first one the petitioners are praying and requesting that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners are praying that Parliament will act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to

extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to the unborn human being.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the petitioners are praying that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I would like to present two petitions, one on behalf of my constituents asking the government to ensure that present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada which prohibit assisted suicide be enforced.

GRANDPARENTS RIGHTS

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting more petitions on behalf of Canadian grandchildren and grandparents. It is long overdue and I sincerely hope that our government recognizes the urgent need to stop punishing a large percentage of our grandchildren by not allowing them access to their grandparents.

My private member's bill to grant grandparents continuous access to their grandchildren is soon to be debated in this House. I ask all members of this House to support our Canadian grandchildren.

(1215)

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present three petitions from constituents of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

The first petition calls on Parliament to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls on Parliament to ensure that Parliament rigorously enforce provisions in the Criminal Code of Canada to prohibit assisted suicide.

The petitioners also call on Parliament to make no changes in the law which would allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or euthanasia.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition calls on Parliament not to amend

Routine Proceedings

the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships and homosexuality, including amending the Canadian Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the phrase sexual orientation.

ETHANOL

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to present a petition on behalf of my constituents who are calling on the government to support ethanol and especially the world scale ethanol plant slated for Chatham, Ontario.

This brings the total signatures from my riding to over 11,000, a tremendous show of support for this environmentally friendly, job creating and renewable fuel industry.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 72 and 73.

[Text]

Question No. 72—**Mr. Caccia:**

With respect to the buried radioactive waste at Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's Chalk River plant, (a) to what extent, if any, has tritium spread into the environment within a radius of 50 kilometres, (b) to what extent has tritium been measured in drinking water and is this considered a safe level, (c) is the disposal site safely insulated and (d) is there any danger to humans emanating from the disposal site?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), tritium emissions from the waste site at Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's Chalk River plant do migrate to some degree within a radius of 50 kilometres of the plant. However, tritium emission limits are set so that hypothetical doses to the public are always well below the regulatory limits set by the Atomic Energy Control Board. In practice, nuclear facilities do not operate anywhere near their emission limits and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited's Chalk River plant is no exception. The tritium releases from the plant are well below the regulatory limits.

In response to (b), local drinking water is monitored for tritium and the levels observed, being very much less than regulatory limits for the public, are considered safe. Daily samplings are collected at the Pembroke main water supply intake and these are measured monthly to confirm that releases are a small fraction of the regulatory limits.

In response to (c), yes, the radioactive waste disposal site is safely insulated. It is located well inside the plant boundary and is not accessible to the public. The releases of tritium from this site are well below the regulatory limit.

Routine Proceedings

In response to (d), the radioactive waste site is safe and poses no undue risk to humans.

Question No. 73—Mr. Caccia:

Is 40,000 becquerels of tritium in a litre of drinking water considered a safe level?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, 40,000 becquerels per litre is the regulated standard for drinking water and corresponds to 10 per cent of the legal public dose limit of 5 millisieverts per year. Even if a person's water supply through a whole year were to be at 40,000 becquerels per litre, the radiation dose to that individual would be less than the current dose limit for members of the public. It would also be below the reduced limit that is recommended by international authorities.

[English]

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Could the hon. parliamentary secretary give the Chair a moment?

I have taken somewhat of a liberty. Since we are getting ready to go home to our families, friends and constituents and since this break particularly marks the occasion of Remembrance Day, I have asked the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, the senior member of the House, to please say a few words on our behalf.

* * *

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every November 11 Canadians take time out to remember those who served in two world wars and in the Korean war. Now must be added the several peacekeeping and peacemaking expeditions where several young Canadians have lost their lives.

Korea was the first big test for the United Nations when the North Koreans crossed the 38th parallel. It was a case of the United Nations proving itself and its role within the international community by keeping boundaries stable or losing its clout in the world.

Sixteen nations went to the aid of the United Nations and between 1950 and 1953 brought order back from the chaos of that particular area of the world. Five hundred and sixteen young Canadians today rest in Korea.

During World Wars I and II the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Canadian Merchant Navy and the

Royal Canadian Army and Canadians who served with other forces played their roles.

In World War I, 66,605 young Canadians lost their lives. That talent was lost to this Parliament, to municipal governments, to provincial governments and to all walks of life.

In 1939–45, 45,000 more young Canadians lost their lives in battle; 55,000 came home wounded. All told, including our peacekeeping expeditions, this great nation has lost more than 114,000 young Canadians in war.

(1220)

Can we as members of the House of Commons today, right now, fully realize the atmosphere that prevailed in this Chamber when Canada declared war in World Wars I and II and the Korean war?

On September 1, 1939 Germany and Russia invaded Poland and Poland collapsed. France and Britain had promised that they would come to Poland's aid, and they both declared war on Germany. On September 7 the House of Commons of Canada was called into special session to decide what Canada was to do. By September 9 it had decided it would support Britain and France. On September 10, 1939 Canada officially declared war.

The battles of Dieppe, Hong Kong, the Italian campaign, the Battle of Britain, the freeing of Holland, the north Atlantic battle and the war at sea generally, and the D-Day campaign were among many in which Canada participated. The only great conclusion is that no matter where these campaigns took place, wherever they will take place, war is hell.

The joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate has recommended a one day debate per year on Canada's international role, a very important debate. If we do not work toward keeping peace in the world, we are not keeping faith with those 114,000 young Canadians whom I mentioned earlier.

The world is not a happy place today. It has some 75 to 80 hot spots. The greatest service we can do is to try to keep cooling them off. This process is to a great extent shaping our world today.

On behalf of all members in the House, I congratulate the 1,700-plus Legion branches across Canada for inviting all Canadians to attend a November 11 Remembrance Day ceremony to remember those young Canadians who left their high schools, their universities and their careers, who left their jobs in the factory or the corner store, who left their ploughs and cultivators and their farms; people from all walks of life who left loved ones to go out to fight for freedom and for eventual peace.

Canada has a great role to play in the negotiations for peace in the world. Think of those today who are far away from home on peacekeeping duties. Think of their families who are at home awaiting the return of their loved ones. These people are keeping the faith with those who died. If we do not give them our support

Routine Proceedings

and if we do not play our role around the peacekeeping tables and at the United Nations, then we are not keeping faith with those who died.

By our own neglect we may well be promoting another debacle and more loss of Canadian lives. As we leave the House of Commons today, let us remember them. Let us not just remember them on Friday next as we stand around the Cenotaph. Let us remember them 365 days of the year because they gave their all.

What we should do as Canadian parliamentarians and as Canadians is work toward the peace and the sanity of a good world for our young people. We must not neglect our duties and allow international plans that might hinder their lives.

Let us think of our families and all young Canadians who are looking forward to a future. If we keep faith with those who died and keep faith in international relations we will indeed be remembering them.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask all members of the House to rise for one moment's remembrance.

[Editor's Note: The House stood in silence.]

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before I get back to the parliamentary secretary, perhaps I may add the following on a more personal note. I draw your attention to the Table today. Our Senior Clerk, Mr. Camille Montpetit, arrived here on the Hill on November 4, 1968, so this is his 26th anniversary.

On behalf of all previous and present members, we want to thank you for your good offices and your friendship.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, after those very moving words from you and from the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, I think you might find there is unanimous consent to call it 2.30 in light of the excellent progress we have made today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, November 14, 1994 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12.29 p.m.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Friday, November 4, 1994

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Marine Transportation Security Act

Bill C-38. Motion for third reading.	7673
Mr. Eggleton	7673
Mr. MacLellan	7673
Mr. Gouk	7675
Mr. Mercier	7677
Mrs. Brushett	7677
Mr. Anderson	7679
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)	7680

Points of Order

New Democratic Party

Mr. Taylor	7680
------------------	------

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Down's Syndrome Awareness Week

Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais	7681
------------------------------	------

Government Spending

Mr. Caron	7681
-----------------	------

Justice

Ms. Bridgman	7681
--------------------	------

Remembrance Day

Mr. Pagtakhan	7681
---------------------	------

Michael Smith Award

Mr. Murphy 7681

Energy

Mr. Rideout 7682

Sovereignists

Mr. Pomerleau 7682

Gun Control

Mr. Chatters 7682

Gun Control

Ms. Clancy 7682

Governor General Scholarship

Mrs. Brushett 7682

Gun Control

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) 7683

Remembrance Day

Mr. Hart 7683

Ethanol

Mr. Taylor 7683

Wallaceburg

Mr. Crawford 7683

Toyota Motor Corporation

Mr. Peric 7684

Edmonton

Mr. Loney 7684

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Unemployment Insurance

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	7684
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7684
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	7684
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7684
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	7685
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7685

Pharmaceutical Industry

Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral	7685
Mr. Young	7685
Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral	7685
Ms. Copps	7685

Immigration

Mr. Silye	7685
Ms. Clancy	7685
Mr. Silye	7686
Ms. Clancy	7686
Mr. Silye	7686
Ms. Clancy	7686

The Environment

Mrs. Guay	7686
Ms. Copps	7686
Mrs. Guay	7686
Ms. Copps	7686

Salmon Fishery

Mr. Cummins	7687
Mr. Tobin	7687
Mr. Cummins	7687
Mr. Tobin	7687

MIL Davie Shipyards

Mr. Dubé	7687
Mr. Rideout	7688
Mr. Dubé	7688
Mr. Rideout	7688

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7688
Ms. Copps	7688
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	7688
Ms. Copps	7688

Flags of Convenience

Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	7688
Mr. Young	7688
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	7688
Mr. Young	7688

Agriculture

Mr. Easter	7689
Mr. Goodale	7689

Laurier Club

Mr. McClelland	7689
Ms. Copps	7689
Mr. McClelland	7689
Ms. Copps	7689

Gun Smuggling

Mr. Bellehumeur	7689
Mr. Gray	7690
Mr. Bellehumeur	7690
Mr. Gray	7690

Lighthouses

Mr. Gouk	7690
----------------	------

Mr. Young	7690
Mr. Gouk	7690
Mr. Young	7690

Climate Change

Mr. Caccia	7691
Ms. Copps	7691

Film Industry

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	7691
Mr. Dupuy	7691
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	7691
Mr. Dupuy	7691

Income Tax Act

Mr. Morrison	7691
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7691
Mr. Morrison	7692
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	7692

Liberal Government

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark’s Crossing)	7692
Ms. Copps	7692

International Trade

Mr. Bergeron	7692
Mr. Goodale	7692

Ports Canada

Mrs. Jennings	7693
Mr. Young	7693

Points of Order

Remarks During Question Period

Mr. Silye	7693
-----------------	------

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger)	7693
Mr. Tobin	7693
Mr. Cummins	7693
Mr. Boudria	7693
Mrs. Jennings	7694

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Milliken	7694
--------------------	------

Public Service Staff Relations Act

Bill C-58. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	7694
Mr. Gray	7694

Petitions

Human Rights

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	7694
--------------------------------------	------

Assisted Suicide

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	7694
--------------------------------------	------

Euthanasia

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	7694
----------------------------------	------

Human Rights

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	7694
----------------------------------	------

Assisted Suicide

Mr. Stinson	7694
-------------------	------

Human Rights

Ms. Meredith	7694
--------------------	------

Rights of the unborn

Ms. Meredith	7694
--------------------	------

Assisted Suicide

Ms. Meredith 7695
Mrs. Jennings 7695

Grandparents rights

Mrs. Jennings 7695

Rights of the Unborn

Mr. Murphy 7695

Assisted Suicide

Mr. Murphy 7695

Human Rights

Mr. Murphy 7695

Ethanol

Mr. Crawford 7695

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken 7695

Remembrance Day

Mr. Hopkins 7696