



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 126

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, November 18, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 18, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## PRIVILEGE

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE REVIEWING CANADA'S FOREIGN  
POLICY—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Red Deer on November 15, 1994 concerning media disclosure of portions of the content of the report of the Special Joint Committee Reviewing Canada's Foreign Policy prior to the report's presentation to the House.

I would like to thank the hon. member for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands for his intervention.

[*Translation*]

I wish to state at the outset that I view such matters very seriously, and I expect all members to do the same. The work of committees is very important and can only be successful if members can function knowing that their deliberations in the preparation of their reports can be kept confidential until presented in the House. All those involved in committee activity must know that they, along with the members of the committee, bear the responsibility to ensure that such committee matters are kept confidential.

[*English*]

If our parliamentary system is to work efficiently and effectively committee members must be able to function without the fear that the fruits of their investigations will be disseminated to the public before they have been finalized and before the House has had an opportunity to see the product of their labours. This is why committee reports are confidential until tabled and why to break this confidentiality is a breach of privilege. This is not a new problem and as the hon. member for Red Deer noted I have commented on it in this session.

The hon. member quite rightly pointed out referring to citation 877(1) of Beauchesne's sixth edition that the premature

disclosure of a committee report constitutes a breach of privilege.

This unauthorized release of committee information is indeed a contempt of Parliament. I must therefore commend the hon. member for having respected our traditions by refraining from commenting on the report before it was presented to the House. However now that the report has been tabled the member will have opportunities both inside and outside the House to explain his party's views on the contents of the report and to correct any misconceptions which may have been formed by the member's silence.

(1005)

[*Translation*]

The member has also cited section (2) of Beauchesne citation 877 which notes that for a question of privilege to be *prima facie* in these circumstances, it must be more specific that a blanket accusation against the publication of a confidential document by the press. This citation is based on an extensive ruling given by Speaker Jerome on June 23, 1977 at pages 1203 to 1210 of the *Journals*.

I appreciate the hon. member's attempt to tie his argument to this portion of the citation. However, in carefully reading Speaker Jerome's ruling, it is clear that the point he was trying to make, and this is important for us today, was that it is necessary to look at our conduct in this matter. This, I feel, can only be done if specific allegations are raised about the conduct of a specific individual or group of individuals, as the Speaker ruled in 1977. Indeed, when similar matters have come before the House in recent years, most notably in 1987 and 1988, the practice has been to pursue the issue only when a specific individual can be cited.

[*English*]

In 1987 it was alleged that a member revealed information about in camera committee proceedings. The committee in question reviewed the matter and upon its reporting to the House the Speaker found the incident to be a *prima facie* question of privilege. The matter was referred to the then Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure for examination.

The 1988 case involved the leaking of information to the media concerning a draft report of the Standing Committee on Finance. An unnamed employee of the member was found to have released the information but the issue was resolved by members of the committee who brought the matter to the attention of the House by way of a question of privilege. At that

*Government Orders*

time Speaker Fraser ruled that the issue had been dealt with by the committee and there was therefore not a prima facie question of privilege.

This said, as the hon. member for Red Deer has not made allegations against any particular individual I must state that at this time I am unable to accept this matter as a prima facie question of privilege. We are nonetheless faced with a very serious matter, for leaks of committee reports are not to be treated lightly.

As all members are aware the Speaker is loath to intervene in committee matters. Difficulties arising in committee are traditionally brought to the attention of the House by way of a report from the committee. In circumstances similar to those currently before us a standing committee might decide to examine the matter of a breach of confidentiality and make a report to the House.

The matter before us however is quite different for here we are dealing with a special joint committee which has tabled its final report. It has traditionally been interpreted that once a special committee tables its final report the committee ceases to exist.

As I stated earlier, while I do not find that there is a prima facie question of privilege, the seriousness of a leak of confidential committee information should not go unchallenged. Should the House consent to have the question of premature disclosure of the committee report examined, there is nothing to prevent the House from doing so by way of a special order of reference to a committee.

[Translation]

The matter of confidentiality is one of great importance to the House and I remind all members of their responsibility to ensure that confidential proceedings and reports of committees remain so.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1010)

[English]

### SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The House resumed from November 17 consideration of the motion.

**Mr. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be speaking on social security review and particularly on the unemployment program.

Before I do that I would like to say that the social security review is very timely for Canadians. It is very important for government and for all members of Parliament to look at it. Too often governments bring in programs or legislation which

become obsolete and do not reflect the realities as some of our social security programs do, but do not get examined with the promptness they should.

I am glad we are looking at the whole social security program for a variety of reasons. One is that some programs were brought in some 40 years ago. The economic realities have changed. The family structure has changed. The social circumstances have changed and our fiscal situation has changed. The global economy in terms of the types of jobs out there has changed. The demands on our business communities have changed. All of those changes result in the type of social security program we need that will take us into the next century and which will take into consideration the new realities we face.

The social security review is very timely. It is important that Canadians are participating in ensuring the type of programs we come up with will be sustainable, affordable and effective. With the input of Canadians and other members of Parliament we will be able to put together that type of program.

For now I am pleased to have the opportunity to explain the government's idea for renewal of our unemployment insurance program presented in the recent supplementary paper on UI. I am sure hon. members appreciate it is a key component in the reform of our social security system. The UI program has served us well, but because of the structural changes to the economy there are now numerous situations in which the program no longer does what it was originally intended to do.

The UI program was created to provide workers with temporary income support between jobs, but the program no longer adequately addresses the changing nature of employment. Today many workers use it to supplement their income. That was not and is not its purpose. Workers and employers finance UI through their contributions.

It is simply costing too much. For example in 1980 the program cost \$4.4 billion. Last year it cost \$19.7 billion. We cannot allow this escalation in UI costs to continue. The government is proposing that we spend more wisely. Often some people think that sometimes the more money thrown at a program, the better the program gets. We realize that what we have to do is spend more smartly and wisely. Our emphasis is to shift UI funds from income support to investing in helping people obtain jobs and become self-reliant.

Some hon. members will ask about the seasonal workers. Seasonal workers make up about 40 per cent of UI clients and as much as 60 per cent of frequent claimants. Government recognizes it must address their specific circumstances and we are doing that.

The Minister of Human Resources Development has established a working group on seasonal workers and UI. It is consulting with other stakeholders to come up with innovative ways to address the needs of seasonal industries. That includes reducing their frequent dependency on the UI program.

*Government Orders*

(1015)

We know people need experience in the workplace. Therefore, to help people gain the experience and training required to keep a job, the government is testing new approaches such as community projects that offer work experience or earning supplements or assistance to entrepreneurs who wish to start their own businesses. The reason for that is quite straightforward. The government's top priority is to ensure a climate for continuing job creation.

In the past year there have been 275,000 new jobs created. We want to keep the momentum going. One way of doing that will be through the reduced premium rates that will result from UI reform.

As hon. members know, in 1995 we have already announced a premium reduction from 3.07 to 3.00. Estimates indicate that this reduction will help create or preserve jobs. We are proposing to keep moving in that direction.

Another idea presented in the discussion paper regarding UI eligibility is the possibility of income testing, but this would apply only to people who use UI frequently.

We need to use our limited resources to help those most in need. I wonder if hon. members realize that in 1991, 18 per cent of frequent claimants had incomes of over \$50,000. An additional 28 per cent had family incomes ranging from \$30,000 to \$50,000. The benefits received by frequent claimants go beyond insurance. They are more like supplementary income. The system can no longer support this misuse of funds.

Some hon. members have expressed understandable concern about the effects of UI reform in Atlantic Canada. Atlantic Canadians are a proud people and we have to take measures to help them generate economic and social renewal. That is not just the government's opinion. Last year an Environics poll indicated that 60 per cent of all Atlantic residents acknowledged that the current UI program acts as a disincentive to finding work. Not only that but the Atlantic premiers stated that easy access to unemployment insurance benefits has created an economic malaise in the region.

The strategy the government is recommending for Atlantic Canada is consistent with our general approach for the rest of the country and that is to invest in people through employment development services. This is the positive approach that will help Atlantic Canadians to get and keep satisfying jobs.

Because of the changing nature of employment that I spoke of earlier, we no longer have any choice but to respond to the growth of non-standard work. I am referring to part timers, the

self-employed, temporary workers and people with multiple jobs. Last year more than 60 per cent of all new jobs were part time. Many of those workers were not fully covered or not covered at all. We must address their needs.

We are currently experimenting with initiatives such as earning supplements and consolidation of hours for UI insurability. The government is determined to find effective solutions to help all Canadians move toward long lasting self-sufficiency.

As well, concerns have been expressed that employment development services will be too costly to offer to everyone who might want to use them. However, everything is not going to happen at once. We can meet the needs of some people through less expensive programs. I am thinking of such measures as wage subsidies, earning supplementation and assistance in searching for a job. Training capacity will be expanded gradually and eventually everyone interested will have access to employment development services.

(1020)

UI reform is not going to happen overnight. First we have to gather input from all Canadians on this process. The Standing Committee on Human Resources Development is currently travelling across Canada listening to the views of a wide variety of Canadians. The committee will be reporting its findings and we will have to evaluate the various ideas to determine what is feasible and what is the best way to structure a new program.

Having done all that, major changes to the UI system would be phased in over a number of years. Everyone affected would have adequate time to adjust. The exact timing might use the three and five rule. That means if changes are implemented in 1995 the new program would not be fully operational until 1998. The timeframe will depend on the complexities of the changes.

The key to successful reform of our unemployment insurance program will be to strike an appropriate balance between UIC's role as a temporary income support and its broader social role, to redistribute income and address narrowing regional disparities.

The government will take an approach that is mindful of just how significant UI is in many provinces and in the lives of many people. We will not pull support from under anyone and leave him or her high and dry. But we will devise and implement a more flexible system, one that encourages adjustment and generates a climate for job creation and growth, a system that helps people to help themselves become self-supporting and contributing members of Canadian society.

I invite all hon. colleagues to join the government in this crucial undertaking.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments of the hon. member about the future of the UI system and the review of social policy. I thank him for his comments.

I have a couple of questions for him. He mentioned near the end of his presentation that the role of UI is to redistribute wealth and be a tool of regional development. Could he clarify if that should be the role of UI or whether it should really be an insurance type program for the temporary loss of employment? I personally do not see it as a tool to redistribute wealth, nor is it a particularly effective tool for regional development.

I would bring to his attention the figures which came out last week. They pointed out that the dollars contributed to the UI program and the ones paid out of the program in British Columbia are almost a one to one ratio. In Alberta they get short changed considerably. I think they get 76 cents paid back for every dollar they contribute. In the Atlantic provinces it is as high as five to one. Right now UI is being used as a tool to redistribute wealth. I wonder if the member wants that to continue? Does he think that is a valid role?

Could he also tell me if he thinks the qualification period for UI should be standardized across the country? Should it be the same in the member's riding as it is in Chicoutimi or Gander? Should there be a standardized qualification period?

If he could answer those few questions for me for clarification, I would appreciate it.

**Mr. Dhaliwal:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Fraser Valley East for taking an interest in this. I have often visited his riding, which has many farming communities, and I know many people in his riding. I know his area has a particular interest in this review, because there are many seasonal workers in his riding.

(1025)

Let me try to address his two questions, first of all in terms of the broader goals of redistribution involved.

We want standards right across the nation. We do not want tremendous poverty in one province and tremendous wealth in another province. We want to be able to deal with the regional disparity. We want to make sure that where help is needed to create employment, to develop better employment programs, that we respond as a nation, that we respond to areas that are having greater economic difficulty than those with economic prosperity.

That is what makes this country so great, that we want to deal with those issues. We want to deal with the regional disparities that exist across the country. We do not want to say that if a certain part of the country has a much lower standard of living

than other parts that we do not really care. That is not what this is all about. As a country we must care for Canadians no matter where they live and ensure that we have basic standards right across the country, including employment opportunities.

In terms of the requirements for stamps to collect UIC, this must be looked at once again. Different areas of the country have different needs and those regional needs reflect the UI reform program. Just as in the hon. member's riding there are different needs, we have to look at the needs of seasonal workers and respond to them as well. One of the ways we can respond, as stated in our discussion paper, is to have a two tier program, a basic insurance program and an adjustment insurance program. Those people who use UI more frequently perhaps should be treated differently in terms of the premiums or of the benefits they receive, as opposed to those who have the basic insurance program.

I hope that deals somewhat with the questions of the hon. member.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Vancouver South for his informative remarks.

I also want to take this moment to thank the member for York North who in his capacity as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Human Resources Development is criss-crossing this great country visiting in ridings at the invitation of members of Parliament and listening to the people, hearing from groups and organizations on the subject of this important social security review.

When in Hamilton just a couple of weeks ago to hear from Hamiltonians on this social security review, the member for York North and I heard from a dozen organizations, groups and individuals at the beautiful Hamilton Art Gallery. We repeatedly asked the question at the end of their representations: Is the status quo acceptable? In each and every case the answer we got back was no, it was not, no matter what organization, no matter what individual spoke.

There does need to be change. Our current programs, while necessary, are not effective. They are outdated and simply not working, not doing the job they were intended to do.

I want to ask the member for Vancouver South if this has been his experience when he has heard from the people, groups and organizations in his riding and across the country?

**Mr. Dhaliwal:** I want to thank the hon. member for his question. Canadians I have talked to across the country recognize the need for change. They recognize there has to be a change made in the social security programs because they see that 450,000 parents are on single parent social assistance, and 90 per cent of them are women. That is a problem we have to deal with.

*Government Orders*

What does that say for the children? We have to deal with the situation. One child of every five children grows up in poverty. That is a problem we have to deal with. Mahatma Gandhi once said that poverty is the worst type of violence against an individual.

We have to deal with those issues under the social security programs. We know they are not working well because some of these problems would not exist if they were working. Our expenses on social assistance have continued to go up.

(1030)

We have to look at why. We cannot just spend money. We have to get at the root of the problem and ensure that people have the training and the skills. We must take away the disincentives that stop them from getting gainful employment, that stop them from getting into the workforce. For example, we need more day care facilities so that we give people a path, a way to get out of the cycle of dependency, making them independent and self-reliant.

That is what social security reform is all about. It is giving those people an opportunity to be gainfully employed. We must tear down the barriers that stop them from seeking gainful employment and take away the disincentives so that they do have an opportunity. They want to work. They are not interested in staying on social assistance. The system does not let them come back.

Those are the things that Canadians are looking for. Canadians are telling us yes, we need to change the system and we need to look at the way we do things because there is a better way. That is what we are searching for.

I thank the hon. member for a very good question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will share my time with a colleague from the Bloc Québécois; after that, all the speakers for the Bloc will do the same.

For several days now, I have been hearing the arguments put forward by the proponents of the social security reform presented by the Minister of Human Resources Development. We are told that, in Canada, we need to reform social security. It is obvious that no matter what the field, the status quo is usually not acceptable. Society changes, ideas evolve. We must always look at the results of a given situation and see if it can be improved.

You can be sure that a Bloc Québécois member who, with a sovereignist agenda, is proposing a radical reform of the geopolitical situation in Canada, is not going to oppose change. Obviously not.

Therefore, by definition, Bloc members do not object to a review or a reform of Canadian social programs. However, what we particularly question is the underlying ideology as well as the motives for the reform.

A reform aimed at improving the system? Perfect! We could not agree more. But a reform to impose a new way of life, a reform aimed at cutting government expenditures in a roundabout way at the expense of the poorest members of society, we say no to that.

Let us look at the ideological nature of the reform presented to us. As you know, for the past 10 to 15 years, in the Western World, we have witnessed the revival of the old neo-liberalism, that is to say, the rule of the market, the law of the jungle, so to speak. We were told that individuals must take care of themselves and be responsible for themselves. If they get rich, it is to their credit; if they are poor, well, it is their own fault. This ideology was dominant during the 19th century.

Throughout the 20th century, people who pondered the fate of the poorest members of society as well as workers who organized, took issue over this type of society. They fought to obtain rights. These rights were hard won, they were not vested rights. People fought for better wages and living conditions, and for adequate social security against illness, accidents, old age and unemployment.

In my view, the bill before us today calls into question these hard won social rights, the social model that has existed in Western Europe and Canada for fifty years now.

(1035)

The first attack on the social framework created in recent decades took place in Britain fifteen years ago. That country dismantled its social security system.

Those in favour of the move told us that the British economy would only benefit. Fifteen years later, this is not immediately apparent. What we see is more poverty and people with less social security. What we do not see are newspaper articles telling us that economists, businessmen and politicians from around the world are flocking to Britain to study the extraordinary success of the British model.

Fifteen years later, there is some doubt about the results. What is certain, however, is that the very people who needed social security are less well off than they were fifteen years ago.

What I personally see behind this reform is the trend in Western society, driven by the new neo-liberal ideology, to question social security systems. When I look at the documents published in support of the reform, I see detailed analyses, statistical and economic arguments, and a highly developed theoretical framework. This is not the kind of thing that can be done within six, four or two months. I suggest that this is the

*Government Orders*

kind of reform Ms. Campbell would have proposed if she had won the last election. The same philosophy underpins the whole reform effort.

Another reason why I do not find the government's intentions very credible, although some members seem sincere in defending the system, is that this reform is based on the premise that government expenditures must be cut.

We are told that Canada's debt is enormous. Everyone agrees, but when we look at the debt, we must think in terms of assets and liabilities. On the liabilities side, we are told that our debt is getting larger every second, every minute, every day. True, but what about our national wealth? We are told that the debt now amounts to 100 per cent of GDP. According to some economists, our national wealth adds up to 900 per cent of GDP. This means that Canada's economy as a whole is comprised of both debts and assets. We have different kinds of debts.

Our debt includes not only the Prime Minister's limo and cook but also infrastructure, educational, health and investment expenditures. Any businessman will tell you that a loan taken out for investment purposes generates wealth down the line; it is not the same as money borrowed to pay for groceries.

Those who invoke the national debt to justify all the cutbacks, to justify all kinds of measures that will ultimately hurt the less fortunate in our society, should at some point be honest enough to show us the whole picture.

If they had told us that they would undertake a reform and if, after consultations with Parliament and with Canadians, they realized that the same amount should be spent on social security in Canada, I think that it would have been easier for me to agree that something must be done, that we would have been more willing to review the situation in Canada. But that is not what happened.

(1040)

The Minister of Finance told us that \$7, \$8 or \$9 billion had to be cut from all social programs. I have started consulting Canadians in my riding. I sent the paper on the reform to 200 people who are interested in social issues and I scheduled meetings where we can discuss exactly what is going on with this reform. If you tell people at the beginning, "We are consulting you but you should know at the start that we must make deep cuts in social security spending", people will then ask if they are really being consulted and whether the decision has not already been made.

To conclude, I will say something about unemployment insurance. I read the document on unemployment insurance which says that we should move from unemployment insurance to employment insurance. But I have the feeling that a qualitative analysis of the system was done. I do not have much time, but I will try to talk about my two concerns at the end of my

speech. The first thing is that I feel we accept the high unemployment rate. The unemployed and unemployment are seen as a problem, but we do not realize that the problem is not unemployment and the unemployed; it is employment.

I wish that the documents which the Liberal government presented to us showed this concern for employment in Canada. I would like to see commissions of inquiry travelling around to talk about jobs with Canadians and not just about cuts, difficulties and debts. We must take a positive attitude to this whole question of social security and realize that if people work, they pay taxes, and the country can distribute this tax revenue throughout society, especially to the most disadvantaged people.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his speech.

[English]

That is as much as I will try this morning. I'm working on it and it will come along, I'm sure.

I would like to comment on two or three points that the member raised. I have not heard in the House for some time if ever phrases such as the neo-conservative outlook and so on. I thought a lot of those comments had gone with the demise of the NDP. I had hoped that a lot of those phrases had gone into the past.

There are two or three things I would like him to comment on. One is that we should not worry so much about the debt, that the debt and deficit are not a serious concern. He feels it is like a businessman who is investing in the future. I would point out to him first of all that no businessman is afraid of borrowing but a businessman is frequently afraid of borrowing year after year because of the inevitability of what that means. It means he will go broke.

I would ask the hon. member to comment on how long he thinks it is good to borrow, if he thinks we should continue to go in debt indefinitely or whether there should be an end in sight.

Second, as an example of what will happen if we do not control this debt and deficit, I ask him to look at today's *Globe and Mail*. There is an article about the fact that Ontario is now being forced to search out niche markets to sell its bonds. This year it has gone to a 40-year bond option because no one will buy the 30-year bond. It is looking for tiny markets, tiny being \$800 million this year, niche markets where it can sell more bonds. It is having trouble selling its bonds which means it is having trouble financing its debt.

Every year that goes by that we continually go in debt makes it difficult to the point at which our wealthiest or at least our biggest province is now having to search out niche markets to sell bonds. I find that incredible.

*Government Orders*

I would like the hon. member to comment on how long he thinks a country, province, or any organization should continue to go in debt and why he thinks that Canada, Quebec or any region is immune from market forces, in other words the forces which say it is going to be increasingly hard to finance that debt.

(1045)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Caron:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments and his question. Obviously, everyone is affected by market forces. However, when you are in debt, you usually try to figure out why. The last thing you cut is the money required for children and needy members of the family.

Instead, you start by not going out as much and by cutting into the least useful expenditures. I do not think that the federal government has done that. When we first came to the House of Commons we asked for a review of all public spending, but this was not done. We were told that the standing committees could conduct such an exercise. A year later, it has become obvious that these committees will not do that.

The federal government must first tighten its belt, before telling Canadians to do so. If the Prime Minister starts taking a taxi or a bus to get to work, then I might say that efforts are being made at every level of the government administration to reduce spending. However, as long as the Prime Minister has a cook costing taxpayers \$50,000 a year, as well as a limousine, bodyguards, a residence and a very nice office, the federal government should take a close look at the situation before trying to make cuts and deprive Canadians of the basics.

If the government does conduct a review of its spending, then it will have the necessary credibility to make cuts and suggest new ways of doing things. Until then, the government and those who propose reforms have very little credibility.

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I see the member for Nepean rising. Just as a matter of explanation, Bloc members have indicated that they were splitting their time so there will be two speakers from the official opposition.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, upon opening the Green Paper, entitled *Improving Social Security in Canada*, I read the following, and I quote: "Canada's social security programs are envied throughout the world. They have helped make life better for generations of Canadians. But they have not kept pace with a changing world, and now many Canadians are falling through the cracks. Too many people find themselves having to use Unemployment Insurance time and time again. And they stay unemployed too

long. Too many people are stuck on social assistance. Too many of our children live in poverty".

The Green Paper goes on to say that last year, 13 per cent of all unemployed Canadians had been out of work for a year or more. Furthermore, and I quote: "Our employment programs do not do enough to help the unemployed adjust to change and find new jobs. One in five Canadian children is growing up poor". The Green Paper is full of such statements that point to the failure of federal social security programs.

When the federal government tabled its reform package, which was supposed to be a Liberal masterpiece, one would have expected, first of all, that it would take a responsible approach by identifying real problems that create poverty, so as to provide the appropriate solutions. Second, that the federal government would protect the most vulnerable members of our society and concentrate on job creation. Third, that the federal Liberals would take advantage of this opportunity to demonstrate that federalism works, by reacting favourably and positively to the broad consensus in Quebec on manpower training.

Unfortunately, they did not. As usual, the Liberal federal government introduced a centralist Green Paper that blithely encroaches on areas of provincial jurisdiction and, on top of that, aims to reduce the deficit at the expense of the most vulnerable in our society. Since my time is limited, I will touch briefly on three aspects of particular concern to me: unemployment insurance, post-secondary education and child tax benefits.

The Green Paper on social security reform admits that job programs have failed to deliver. These programs are often poorly adapted and easily abused, according to the Green Paper.

(1050)

The federal government is therefore proposing various options for unemployment insurance reform. A proposal to reduce the amount of unemployment insurance benefits for low-income individuals would, according to the Quebec Minister responsible for Income Security, put an additional 40,000 Quebec households on welfare.

The federal government's proposal to raise the number of weeks required to establish eligibility for the Unemployment Insurance Program from 12 to 14 would cost the Quebec Treasury close to \$28 million and cause an additional 3,275 households to join the ranks of those already dependent on Quebec's income security program.

A second proposal concerning unemployment insurance would create two classes of unemployed: frequent claimants and occasional claimants. Frequent claimants are people who claim unemployment insurance benefits three times within five years. The minister's Green Paper even considers them on a par with people who abuse the system.

*Government Orders*

This is what the document says, and I quote: “The program is easily abused. Some workers and employers plan their work schedules around the UI program—alternating employment with UI benefits as a way of life. As a result, workers and employers in some industries subsidize those in other industries who use UI regularly”.

Some new terms have been added, such as adjustment insurance, which is intended for frequent UI claimants. It states that while these benefits might be lower than basic coverage, more support would be provided to recipients to find work.

What a novel idea, Mr. Speaker! The Quebec minister responsible for income security described this measure as despicable. To reduce benefits paid to workers, using as an excuse the fact that, in return, they will be trained for jobs that do not exist anyway, that is beyond all understanding. We all know that, in regions where the economy depends on seasonal activity, we do not need training programs that lead to non-employment, but a radical restructuring of the economy.

What makes these proposals even less acceptable is the very fact that the very job development program, or JDP, put in place by the federal government has undergone major cuts over the past two years. In Rimouski for example, the JDP budget was reduced by 30 per cent in two years, from \$1,275,000 to \$790,000, in spite of the fact that the rate of unemployment remained high and relatively the same in the Lower St. Lawrence region.

In sum, the federal government is penalizing seasonal workers and has once again failed to seize a golden opportunity to demonstrate that federalism could be profitable.

For the sake of the 800,000 Quebecers who are out of work, with respect to unemployment and manpower, the government could have acted on the motion that was carried unanimously at the Quebec National Assembly on April 14, requesting that Mr. Jean Chrétien and the federal Liberal government respect the unanimous consensus on the need for Quebec to have exclusive jurisdiction over manpower training.

It would be too easy to make Canada work. In its Machiavelian plan, the government decided instead to lead the people to believe that the big bad separatists are to blame for all our problems. It does not show, but the government is actually increasing overlap and duplication, which is unacceptable in times of fiscal restraint, especially as the major part of the proposed reform represents federal encroachment on a provincial jurisdiction. Unemployment benefits are being cut while the public service grows and the number of disputes between the two levels of government increases.

There are approximately 150 manpower training programs run by about 10 Quebec and federal government departments.

Some of these programs often have several components. So how can we expect unemployed people from Montreal, Rimouski or Hull to sort out this mess?

The government is not doing much better for our post-secondary institutions, since it proposes replacing cash transfer payments with a new student loan program.

(1055)

This decision by the federal government would leave the Quebec government with a \$300-million shortfall, which would have to be made up elsewhere.

The main consequence of this proposal would be a major hike in tuition fees. The rector of McGill University did not hesitate to say that his institution's tuition fees could reach up to \$8,000 a year. It goes without saying that this measure would restrict access to higher education, especially among the poor.

As far as child benefits are concerned, the government admitted its failure by reminding us that one child in five, in Canada, lives in poverty. To address this problem, the green paper suggests among other things redirecting middle-class family benefits to less fortunate families. This measure—it must be reiterated—encroaches on an area of provincial jurisdiction. It also thrusts into poverty middle-class families forced to shoulder an excessive part of the deficit burden.

All that the government has put on the table so far to reduce the deficit spares the rich and is designed to impoverish the Canadian middle class and to bring misery to those of us already living in poverty. This, in due time, will be remembered by everyone.

What the Minister of Human Resources Development proposes is not a matter of reform but of shovelling part of the federal deficit into the provinces' back yards.

So I leave the last word to Pierre Graveline, who in *Le Devoir* on October 20 summarized the goals pursued by the Minister of Human Resources Development in his reform of social programs thus: “The Axworthy reform pursues two contradictory objectives at the same time: maintain and strengthen Ottawa's presence everywhere without giving an inch to Quebec, while significantly reducing social spending in order to slow the alarming growth in the federal debt”.

Therefore, you will understand that, like my colleagues, I oppose the minister's motion, which reads:

—take note of the progress made to date on the government's forthcoming reform of social security programs and of the views expressed by Canadians with regard to this reform.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata will have five minutes for questions and comments after Question Period.

S. O. 31

[English]

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.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### TRIPARTITE AIR STUDY

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Transport has embarked on a tripartite air study which will focus on the government's new national airports policy, the status of bilateral air negotiations with the United States, and the proposed commercialization of the air navigation system.

The future management and ownership of Canadian airports and their ability to compete depend upon the successful implementation of the national airports policy. Furthermore the successful conclusion of a new, more open bilateral air agreement with the United States and the modernization of the air navigation system are crucial to the future viability and competitiveness of our airport system.

As chairperson of the Standing Committee on Transport, I encourage all my colleagues in the House to inform the individuals and organizations involved in airport operations in various ridings across the country of our public committee hearings on the tripartite air study.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### EASTERN QUEBEC DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I denounce the inertia of the present government, which is not keeping its commitments and its election promises. It promised to maintain and extend the Eastern Quebec Development Plan until 1998.

For months, things have been dragging out. This government's lack of leadership is creating an untenable and discouraging situation for the 5,800 forestry workers in eastern Quebec and the Gaspé. They want to work. This government, which clamored "jobs, jobs" during the election campaign, now refuses to give real support to those who want to work.

This government does not give a damn about rural communities and it is taking the forestry workers hostage. When will it give an answer? It should be as soon as possible.

\* \* \*

[English]

### LIGHTHOUSES

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Minister of Transport announced his intention to destaff 35 B.C. lighthouses. A massive protest prompted the minister to announce public consultations with mariners in British Columbia prior to any final decision to destaff. However a consultant hired by the government, Mr. Norman Mathews, a former secretary general of the International Association for Lighthouse Authority, has recently made comments in the press in advance of the public meetings that destaffing lighthouses is a done deal.

Given Mr. Mathews' statements the people of British Columbia, and I am sure all people of Canada, want to know why the minister would perpetrate this sham of consultation when his department has already received its marching orders.

This appearance of public consultation is both expensive and cruel. It raises hopes in the hearts of many that manned lighthouses will be maintained and it is costly.

I ask the Prime Minister: Is this the kind of public consultation the Liberals had in mind when drafting their infamous red book?

\* \* \*

### DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, November has been proclaimed Diabetes Awareness Month by the Canadian Diabetes Association.

Over one million Canadians have diabetes, with more than 13 per cent between 65 and 74 years of age. Diabetes is a major cause of premature death, blindness, kidney disease, heart disease, stroke, limb amputation and other significant health problems. It costs Canada an estimated \$9 billion annually.

The Canadian Diabetes Association is a supporter of diabetes research in Canada and provides a wide range of services for and advocacy on behalf of persons with diabetes and their families.

I am proud to say that the federal government also plays an important role by supporting diabetes research and among other ventures a special initiative with regard to diabetes among Canada's native peoples.

Please join with me in wishing the Canadian Diabetes Association and its many volunteers a very successful Diabetes Awareness Month.

*S. O. 31*

### ENDANGERED SPECIES

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of the Environment for the discussion paper on endangered species legislation released yesterday. The legislation will finally give the federal government the power to protect all plant and animal life in Canada.

I also congratulate the Body Shop, the Canadian Nature Federation and the Sierra Defence Fund for their campaign "There Otter be a Law" which is mobilizing public opinion about the matter.

Yesterday I attended a presentation where three children from across Canada spoke out on behalf of all Canadians and presented thousands of letters, drawings and petitions bearing over 75,000 names to the Minister of the Environment. This presentation was an emotional experience for me. We must protect our planet for our children.

I assure the hon. minister that I will do everything possible to support endangered species legislation in the House.

\* \* \*

### JUSTICE

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as a legislator in the House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada it really grieves me to stand here and express my sadness that Canada's courts and law are making decisions that absolve persons of any criminality who are extremely intoxicated or have snorted high levels of cocaine or who have killed behind the wheel of an automobile.

I grieve for the victims of these crimes, in many cases women. I grieve for those who have died at the hands of an abusing person. These victims did not condone or encourage intoxication or drug inducement.

As a legislator I stand here today and make a promise to those victims, both those living and in memory of those who died. I pledge to them my immediate commitment to work with the Minister of Justice toward reforming the Criminal Code through adding new crimes of intoxication, whether drugs or alcohol, to ensure that the perpetrators and not the victims are the ones convicted in our courts of law.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### MOUVEMENT DESJARDINS

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the chairman of the Mouvement Desjardins, Mr. Claude Béland,

urged Quebecers to actively participate in the referendum campaign and support Quebec's sovereignty.

The Mouvement Desjardins is a vast network of co-operatives, financial institutions and insurance companies with assets totalling \$75 billion. It has played an active role in the economic and social development of Quebec throughout the 20th century.

Mr. Béland is now inviting Quebecers to get out of the current deadlock. He said: "We merely tried to negotiate the concept of a distinct society and we were rebuffed. The same thing is now happening with the issue of occupational training".

The current deadlock means that Quebecers have to choose between taking control of their own destiny or an unaffordable status quo.

\* \* \*

[English]

### NATIONAL CHILD DAY

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, every day innocent and defenceless children become victims. Murder, rape, kidnapping and violent assault are threatening our youngest Canadians.

(1105)

In my constituency of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt eight cases of violent assaults on children are currently pending. In one case a previous sexual offender who repeatedly molested a young child was apparently released on his own recognisance. This slap in the face only adds to the agony suffered by the victim and the family. The abduction and murder of eight-year old Mindy Trann has raised loud cries of outrage throughout the Okanagan. These offensive and disgusting violations must stop.

The Canadian justice system must take steps to ensure the safety of our children. Offenders convicted of crimes against a child should serve their sentences without parole. Previously convicted offenders charged with a crime against a child should be kept in jail without bail.

Sunday, November 20 is National Child Day. I call on the government now to protect families and keep our children safe.

\* \* \*

### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, like most MPs in the Chamber on all sides of the House, I am anxious to help government cut wasteful spending.

With that in mind, I had occasion to ask officials in various ministries to supply me with the actual grant applications of certain special interest groups that regularly receive government funding.

S. O. 31

I have been denied those applications. They have been withheld pending formal rulings under the Access to Information and Privacy Acts. I have been told, and I know it sounds incredible, that the names and addresses on the forms may be confidential.

This is crazy. The legislation that is supposed to open government is closing it. There is no excuse for not being able to see, on demand, what special interest groups actually promised to do in exchange for the government grants they receive.

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL CHILD DAY

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, November 20 is National Child Day.

On this historic day in 1991 Canada adopted and signed the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, an agreement that would commit our country to ensuring the survival, protection, development and participation of all children.

We must as a society safeguard the well-being of our children, especially those at risk of criminal victimization, exploitation and neglect. We must promote prevention as a means of helping children at risk. We must invest in our children's education. We must provide them with the chance to lead happy and productive lives. As a society we have a responsibility to our children because they are our future.

I had the honour of sponsoring Bill C-371 which was supported by children's organizations such as Our Kids, Results Canada, the Coalition for the Rights of the Child, as well as many other groups across Canada.

On behalf of all my colleagues in the House of Commons, along with Janice Machin of Our Kids and Results Canada, we invite all Canadians to join in celebrating National Child Day on November 20 and making it a very special day.

To those born on November 20, a very happy birthday.

\* \* \*

### HUGH O'NEIL

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the career of one of most respected and accomplished parliamentarians of the province of Ontario. Hugh O'Neil announced yesterday that he would not be seeking re-election.

Hugh O'Neil was first elected to the provincial legislature for the riding of Quinte in 1975. Since then his 20-year career has seen him go from being the lone voice of the Liberal Party in eastern Ontario to being a senior and trusted minister of the cabinet under Premier David Peterson. He has led Liberals to

unprecedented heights in eastern Ontario with electoral victories, including my own to this Chamber in 1988.

His dedication to serving the community and his unerring ability to get the job done against all odds have been the hallmarks of his remarkable career. No amount of credit or praise can express the appreciation and gratitude that I feel he deserves for his outstanding service and for his unparalleled political accomplishments.

The people of the Quinte area will be the lesser with the loss of his strong voice in Toronto. I know all members of the House, particularly those who know Hugh, join me today in wishing him and his wife Donna all the very best for a well deserved retirement.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

**Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian ambassador to the U.S. is trying to muzzle Quebec's representatives in Washington by imposing a chaperon from the embassy at every one of their meetings.

Bloc Quebecois members strongly oppose such interference in provincial affairs by the Canadian ambassador. Quebec directly looks after its own interests in Paris, London, Tokyo, Mexico City and New York. Why is the federal government desperately trying to keep it from doing the same in Washington?

As long as Quebec remains part of Canada, the government must respect the basic principle whereby the provinces' constitutional jurisdiction also applies abroad.

(1110)

Clearly, the flag war is on again, and the federal government as well as the Prime Minister must both assume full responsibility for the situation.

\* \* \*

[English]

### NATIONAL CHILD DAY

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I too rise to recognize that this Sunday is the second anniversary of National Child Day in Canada. It is a day as all days to listen to children, to respect them and to marvel at all they have to offer.

As 1994 marks the International Year of the Family this is also a day to honour the important role of the family in children's lives. Families are the place where nurturing and respect shape young lives, where identity, culture and values are passed from one generation to the next. Families are truly the cornerstone of society. They equip children with the tools they need to become caring responsible citizens.

*S. O. 31*

For all this we owe the families of our country a great deal from children to grandparents. Let us not forget that grandparents can offer the unconditional love and understanding our children and grandchildren need.

Let us act now to create a better and brighter future for all children because they are our country's most valuable resource and because children matter.

\* \* \*

**LOUIS RIEL**

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week Metis people across Canada held ceremonies to recognize the 109th anniversary of the hanging of Louis Riel for treason. Unfortunately Riel has been portrayed as either a traitor or a madman. In fact he was a founder of Manitoba, a member of the House, and a teacher who fought racism and unsympathetic authorities as he championed the cause of human rights.

Riel fought hard for Metis rights and worked to voice the concerns of early western Canadians. He was a man who inspired and carried Metis dreams in 1885 and refused to abandon his people. In doing so he gave all aboriginal people the will to push forth and fight for their dreams and beliefs.

This week is a good opportunity for Canadians and members of the House to remember all of the Metis and aboriginal people who have made the country a better place to live. Louis Riel and the other great Indian leaders such as Chief Poundmaker and Chief Big Bear died for what they believed in and passed on a proud legacy which continues to be carried by the Metis and aboriginal people today.

\* \* \*

**JACK MINER**

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Jack Miner, Canada's greatest naturalist. Jack Miner is best known as the founder of the Jack Miner Sanctuary near Kingsville, Ontario.

Jack was an incredible person who was honoured by kings, queens, presidents and prime ministers for his great work in conservation. Jack was a very practical man who planted trees, not for a shady resting place for his retirement but for the appreciation and benefit of future generations.

He banded the legs of thousands of Canada geese to identify their North American flyways. By placing a line of scripture on the band he used these legions of geese to spread the gospel throughout North America.

To make certain this sanctuary would not be burdened by taxpayers, Jack Miner spent years lecturing about nature around the world. He set up a perpetual trust fund to pay for the operation of the Jack Miner Foundation.

Jack Miner's family, Manley, Jasper, Kirk, and Cheryl have dedicated their lives to carry on the great tradition of Jack Miner.

\* \* \*

**MARINE ATLANTIC**

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the decision to eliminate shore based [stevedoring positions] on the Marine Atlantic ferries makes no sense whatsoever. Dozens of full time workers and replacement crew in the Port aux Basques area alone will lose their jobs. It will hurt the local economy at the worst possible time.

This issue is of great concern to everyone for another reason. There is fear that if the plan goes ahead the safety of the public will be compromised for the sake of efficiency.

There is a real need for Marine Atlantic to take another look at the issue to see the logic of keeping the [stevedoring position] at those ports including Port aux Basques and North Sydney where it has served so well for so many years.

\* \* \*

**EDUCATION**

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in total amazement that on Wednesday afternoon the Minister of Human Resources Development challenged the student protesters to sit down and present their ideas.

In my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona four different university groups requested to speak before the human resources committee and were originally turned down. These groups found out late yesterday that they would be appearing before the committee and would be receiving only 15 minutes each to present their arguments. I wonder how much time has been allocated to each of the 165 organizations whose noses are still in the public trough as they received almost \$4 million in intervening funding.

(1115)

It seems clear to me that the Liberals are following the previous government's actions of talking to whom they wish and then having the audacity to call it public consultations. Canadians are not stupid. If the Liberals continue this shameful display they too will be able to hold their caucus meetings in a telephone booth just like the Tories.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[Translation]***COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Despite the constructive offer from the mayor of Saint-Jean that was announced this week, the federal government insists on closing the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, on the grounds that it would save \$23 million annually by making the RMC in Kingston a bilingual institution that would welcome francophone officer cadets.

How can the minister maintain that he will save \$23 million annually by closing the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, considering that very substantial additional spending will be required to help the RMC in Kingston make the necessary adjustments to accommodate students transferred from Saint-Jean and hire additional staff?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not have full possession of the facts.

There were a number of expenses that were authorized by the previous government a couple of years ago for construction to start in 1995 for improvements to the Royal Military College in Kingston. Those are proceeding.

With respect to the accommodation of students that will be required as a result of the closing of Royal Roads and CMR, there will only be minor modifications required with respect to the additional facilities at Kingston. Some of the provisions can be met by using existing military facilities and barracks at Kingston.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister should give us the details we have requested for over a year.

Why does he refuse to admit that the so-called savings of \$23 million exist only in his own mind and is just a gross exaggeration by the government to justify its rash decision to close the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, a decision that was rushed through at the very last minute before the budget?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again it was

not a decision that was taken at the last minute. The closing of the two military colleges was something that was planned in preparation for us to meet our red book requirement to reduce military spending at the beginning of the year 1994-95. We have been through those arguments before.

However, as far as the \$23 million is concerned in terms of savings that is absolute, that is fixed. I would ask the hon. member to consult with his colleague, the member for Roberval, who came to the standing committee on defence and veterans affairs and questioned very precisely officials of the Department of National Defence and I believe got a full accounting.

There is no fudging of figures. The \$23 million in savings from CMR is real.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we asked the hon. member for Roberval about this, and the answers he was given lead to conclusions that are entirely different from those produced by the minister. He knows perfectly well that the decision made before the budget was to close the colleges in Saint-Jean and Victoria. The decision had been made.

The minister also knows perfectly well that Quebec has only 13 per cent of Canada's military infrastructures and that they decided to close CMR because at the last minute, they realized they needed an excuse that would satisfy English Canada, and that excuse was closing the CMR. The decision was not based on financial considerations but was merely a face-saving gesture. That is the real reason.

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to discuss the reasons that led to the closing of the CMR. We have made statements in the House on other occasions, and I think our position is quite clear.

(1120)

*[English]*

I have to say that much of what the hon. member asserts in this particular matter is absolutely false. We are not going to revisit the fact that the budget last year called for a certain reduction in expenditures in defence. It called for the closing of the two colleges. Those two colleges will close.

What is really the issue and something that he should be concerned about is that the former Government of Quebec signed a deal that would meet the Department of National Defence's needs, the Government of Canada's needs, and also assist in the transformation of CMR into a civilian institution. The Government of Quebec is refusing to honour that deal.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of National Defence.

Following disturbing revelations by major Barry Armstrong, senior medical officer of the unit several members of which were charged with the murder and torture of Somalian civilians, the Minister of National Defence announced yesterday a civilian public inquiry. Most of the decisions handed down so far have been appealed and the inquiry will take place after the appeals are heard.

Does the Minister of National Defence intend to vest this inquiry with the same powers as a regular commission of inquiry, in particular subpoena and search powers, and the power to send officers with a warrant to obtain all relevant documents wherever they may be?

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is appropriate for me to go further in the interests of ensuring the cause of justice be served by giving any more details about the inquiry that I announced yesterday. It will be an inquiry held under the auspices of the National Defence Act. It will be fully public. It will be totally civilian, including the chair. Members of the previous inquiry will be invited to participate in some particular way.

As to the powers of that inquiry and the terms of reference, those will be drafted in the next couple of months. What I have to worry about and what the hon. member should worry about is the timing of such an inquiry. As legislators we cannot do anything that would serve to undermine the judicial process now under way.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister assure that this inquiry will also get to the bottom of things regarding the behaviour of several other soldiers belonging to the second commando of the Petawawa airborne regiment, and in particular the behaviour of high-ranking officers who supposedly allowed a group called the "Rebels" to fly a flag symbolizing white supremacy, for several months, on the Petawawa base, with complete impunity?

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the inquiry will deal with all the aspects of the deployment of our forces in Somalia and all the activities of the airborne regiment. This is what I said we would do and I stand by that decision.

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House a very serious matter. This week the drunken and cocaine defence arguments acquitted a person charged with a serious crime once again since the Supreme Court ruled that intoxication could be used as a defence in any crime.

Will the government commit to introducing a bill promptly in order to deal with this critical inadequacy in the law?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's concern in this question. It is a concern to all of us in this House of Commons.

The Minister of Justice has stated on occasion his concern on the matter. He has released a discussion paper which will seek the opinions of people right across the country up until February 28, at which point he will then do what he has to do and what needs to be done as quickly as possible to correct this deficiency.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians' nerves are fraying over this matter. The parliamentary secretary refers to a discussion paper, but in reality we should snap to some common sense in this place and do something.

The Minister of Justice knows that under the common law judges are guided by previous decisions in similar cases. Criminals are on to this scam, realizing that they can get drunk or shoot up before or even after a crime if they are clever enough and be acquitted.

(1125)

Once again, will the minister commit today to a date before Christmas by which he will introduce legislation closing this loophole in the Criminal Code so that this travesty of justice can be stopped?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, of the groups in this country that have spoken to the Minister of Justice, almost completely all of them have stated that the Minister of Justice must proceed cautiously on this point. They want a good law to come from this consultation. They do not want something thrown out that is not going to be appropriate under these circumstances. The Minister of Justice is taking this very seriously and he is going to come forward with this law. It is going to be a suitable one.

I would also say to the hon. member that two of these cases are under appeal and there is a very strong possibility that there could be a change in the decision on appeal.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if this government was really taking this matter seriously it would move with much more speed than it is.

There is no excuse for delay. The minister acted with amazing speed to eliminate the cultural defence. We applaud that, but he is dragging his feet over the drunken defence. One has to wonder about his commitment to eliminating this defence.

Why does the Minister of Justice refuse to stop this madness today? Why does he not get in step with Canadians and place this item ahead of his own pet agenda of sexual orientation and gun control legislation?

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think in the history of this country have we had a Minister of Justice that has moved on so many subjects as quickly as this Minister of Justice.

The Daviault case was decided. The decision was released by the Supreme Court of Canada on September 30. The Minister of Justice has been working on this question. He brought forward the discussion paper and we want a good result. We want to hear the opinion of Canadians. We do not want a knee-jerk reaction. That is not what Canadians want and that is not what Canadians deserve.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, recent information regarding the Canadian frigate program reveals that Unisys GSG, a company responsible for integrating the defence department's electronic systems, proved unable to meet the requirements of the department. It was learned that the Canadian Navy will not have the necessary systems to train its technicians, and yet taxpayers will still have to pay a \$90 million bill. Instead of getting tough, the Department of National Defence chose to sack its own team of auditors who had brought the problem with Unisys to light.

How can the minister explain that he chose to disband his team of auditors, who were responsible for monitoring Unisys's work, instead of taking the appropriate action against a company which, obviously, is not even able to meet its contractual obligations to the Canadian government?

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that we have with project management, which was involved in the development of the Canadian patrol frigates and

has been the problem in the development of other armed forces equipment, is that often the expenditures that ultimately are incurred are much greater than originally anticipated because new technologies are being developed.

Unisys is a company based in Montreal that has done some outstanding work over the years and is in the vanguard of development of high technology integrated systems within this country. I would hope that as a member of Parliament and also one that represents a constituency in Quebec the hon. member would not want to denigrate in any way the good work that is done by that company.

With respect to the specific question on the Canadian patrol frigates, yes, there obviously were some teething problems. There were some cost overruns. These have been accommodated with negotiation between the company and the crown. As far as we are concerned the frigates now are fully operational. There may be the odd problem that surfaced because of the new technologies, but I do not think the member should be unduly worried.

[Translation]

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, now that we know that the minister has not yet replaced his team of auditors, how can he explain that his department kept on making payments to Unisys GSG, even though he knew that this company was unable to deliver the products ordered by his department?

(1130)

[English]

**Hon. David Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again I am shocked at the tone of this question that denigrates an outstanding Canadian high technology company and one that is based in the province of Quebec. I would like the hon. member to explain that to his constituents in the province of Quebec.

The fact is that Unisys is meeting its obligations. Where there may be some problems in terms of expenditures or some minor modifications that have to be made to the systems that are integrated within the Canadian patrol frigates, those are being addressed in the normal way.

\* \* \*

**DANGEROUS OFFENDERS**

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today Correctional Services will be releasing Wray Budreo. Despite having a 30-year history of molesting children, Budreo has to be released because his latest sentence has expired.

*Oral Questions*

In the past the Solicitor General has always stated that the government felt these individuals could be detained under the provincial Mental Health Act. That did not work in Budreo's case.

What steps will the government take now to protect society from sexual predators like Wray Budreo?

[Translation]

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed Mr. Budreo was released this morning after serving his full sentence. However, I could tell the hon. member that all police forces—federal, provincial and municipal—have been informed of his presence in Ontario.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this House has my Bill C-240 before it, which could prevent the release of dangerous offenders like Budreo. However, the government says it will not support Bill C-240 because it may be against the charter rights of sexual predators like Budreo.

When is this government going to have the courage to concern itself with the rights of victims and potential victims of predators like Budreo?

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do share the concerns of the hon. member.

I remind the hon. member there currently is a federal task force concerning high risk offenders. It is presently examining effective ways to deal with these offenders. A report will be handed in sometime in January.

I should also add that the Solicitor General also rendered public the existence of a national system on trying to screen out sex offenders who might try to come into contact with children through various organizations across Canada. It is a priority of this government to protect children from sex offenders.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

The case of the Canadian patrol frigates demonstrates that the government paid for products which were never delivered or which did not meet the requirements of the department. We have learned that of the 37 applications of the combat training system which were to be designed by Unisys GSG, only one has been delivered.

How can the minister explain that he paid Unisys for a complete combat training system and is getting only one of the 37 applications requested?

[English]

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again I am surprised at the line of questioning in terms of criticizing the work of this company.

I explained to the hon. member's colleague earlier that when one develops new high technology systems inevitably problems will occur in the development, especially when dealing with integrated high tech systems.

The requirements made by the CPF program from Unisys had some problems in development. They have since been resolved or are in the process of being resolved. I fail to see why the hon. member continues to persist in trying to undermine not only the integrity of this company, but the fact that the Canadian patrol frigate is the best of its class in the world.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, why is the Minister of National Defence not launching a public inquiry which would show that the federal government is incapable of managing its large capital programs?

(1135)

[English]

**Hon. David Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the one positive thing I can say is that we announced in the budget that in the future we would be moving to the acquisition of off the shelf products in military procurement as much as we could. This means that the teething problems caused by research and development in high technology equipment for the armed forces will be borne by a commercial manufacturer. Such equipment that we would buy would be commercial but would have a military application.

Hopefully in the future we can get away from some of the problems the hon. member has described. It is interesting to note that the special committee on defence policy also recommended that the government pursue this line of acquisition more vigorously.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Does this minister believe in democracy and the democratic rights of farmers to control their own industry?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to know exactly what the hon. member is getting at, except I have an inkling it has to do with marketing systems in western Canada. Obviously the government believes in democracy.

*Oral Questions*

With respect to the issue of marketing systems, as the hon. member knows, that is a subject upon which different farmers in western Canada hold profoundly different opinions. There has been a variety of meetings, rallies and demonstrations on the subject on both sides of the issue.

That is why I have undertaken to provide the opportunity for a very thorough forum through these winter months. Farmers from the different points of view on the issue will have a full opportunity to discuss that matter in an open, logical, objective fashion and not with the excesses of rhetoric that we hear from the Reform Party.

**Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously has a funny way of showing his belief in democracy.

This is another classic case of Liberal democracy. Farmers in western Canada have developed a new special crops act. Yet the Canadian Grain Commission has ordered seed cleaning and special crop elevator operators to pay up to \$20,000 in licensing and bonding fees or get shut down by the law.

If the minister believes in democracy, when will he get his bureaucrats under control and get them working for farmers? Why will he not immediately introduce new special crops legislation?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** The simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that the decision with respect to special crops takes some time is that there are a good many farmers in western Canada who disagree with the proposals that have been advanced.

It is important to thoroughly analyse all of the various options that are available for the regulation of special crops. The issue is one of the level of protection that ought to be provided under the law to ensure that farmers have security in dealing with special crops dealers. That is the issue we are examining among other technical ones having to do with special crops.

It is very important to ensure that the appropriate regulatory structure be put in place and not one that is too onerous upon farmers or upon the industry.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**AIR TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

The chambers of commerce in several regions of Quebec have accused Air Canada and Canadian International of conspiring to eliminate competition in the regions. These companies are

allegedly fixing higher prices for area service in order to subsidize international flights, where the competition is fierce.

Does the Minister of Transport agree that the staggering increase in airfare since 1988 is killing our regional economies and that it shows that deregulation is ineffective in stimulating competition in the airline industry?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises some very important questions.

(1140)

Allegations of a conspiracy by airlines to fix prices and so forth raise some very thorny questions, and I would like to emphasize that if those who are concerned about this problem are really looking for answers and want to look into the matter more thoroughly, they should exercise their right to express their concerns to the National Transportation Agency, in addition to perhaps consulting the Competition Act.

The allegations made are serious ones, and I believe that the airlines and all those involved in the sector have the right to see these allegations made and directed to the right quarter. If an investigation is necessary, then one should be held, in order to shed some light on the question raised by the hon. member.

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, given that these questions are indeed very sensitive, thorny to use the minister's word, does he intend to look into the allegations made by the Quebec chambers of commerce and ask the competition bureau to conduct an investigation into the allegations of collusion, for we are talking about allegations of collusion, an extremely serious charge, between the major airline carriers and their subsidiaries in order to eliminate regional competition?

[English]

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat my concern for the rights of companies and the shareholders of those companies to have an opportunity to deal with the issues raised by the hon. member.

There is a competition bureau as well as the National Transportation Agency. I would think that members of the opposition would understand why a minister of the crown would be very hesitant to consider directing those agencies. They are quasi-judicial agencies of which we have heard a great deal from the opposition over the past few weeks.

If there is a legitimate grievance that reflects the concerns raised by the hon. member, the chambers of commerce or interested citizens should direct their complaints and the allegations that have been referred to by the hon. member directly to the competition bureau and/or the National Transportation Agency. They can be dealt with by those quasi-judicial agencies

*Oral Questions*

that have to operate under their own rules under the law and not under the direction of any minister of the crown.

\* \* \*

**HIGHWAY 416**

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. It has to do with highway 416 in eastern Ontario.

The current Ontario government's lack of commitment to eastern Ontario was never better illustrated than the recent suggestion of a user pay highway from the 401 into the nation's capital. The federal government's commitment to this project on a shared cost basis is well known and I applaud the minister for condemning outright the idea of a toll road.

With no interest in financing the toll road, what alternative for getting the project moving is the minister exploring at this time?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the need for this highway and I also know of the vigorous effort put forward by the member for Leeds—Grenville in this endeavour.

I therefore suggested to the provincial government in the springtime that we fund it under the Canada—Ontario infrastructure works program. It did not respond to that and did not put in an application. In fact the provincial government indicated a reluctance.

In the summertime I suggested a strategic transportation improvement program as another way it might be able to rework some priorities to help fund this. That is a shared program as well. The only response came back just a few weeks ago in terms of the proposition of tolls. If the province of Ontario is going to do this by tolls we are not interested in getting into the funding. I also wonder whether it even meets the province's criteria for what would qualify as a toll road.

I would be quite happy and in fact would like to meet with the new minister of transport in Ontario to further explore the infrastructure works program and the strategic transportation improvement program for funding of this necessary project.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri—Food.

Recent polls and rallies have shown that farmers want an elected board of directors to run the Canadian Wheat Board.

What action is the minister prepared to take to give farmers their wish to have an elected board instead of an appointed one?

(1145)

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri—Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that very interesting proposition is one of the ideas that will be discussed during the winter in the forum we are conducting with respect to marketing systems in western Canada, particularly the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Other marketing agencies around the world could be examined as models for their precedential value in corporate governance, matters relating to marketing systems.

It is an idea that a number of farmers have suggested. In some studies conducted previously four or five years ago the idea was advanced as an alternative in terms of corporate governance. It is an idea I am sure farmers will want to explore very thoroughly and I am determined to provide them with the opportunity to do that.

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the minister. Farmers know what they want and it is time to listen to their demands.

Why will the minister never listen to farmers' wishes or input but continually gives his ear to special interest groups no matter what farmers' concerns are?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri—Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I probably spend the majority of my time as minister of agriculture listening very carefully to farmers.

From time to time they are represented by their official organizations. On other occasions and very valuably, individual farmers take the opportunity to raise concerns with me either in person, by mail or in public meetings of various kinds.

The input from farmers is the most valuable advice that a minister of agriculture can receive. It is important to note the distinction between the valid and legitimate advice and opinion that is offered by farmers and the sometimes rather twisted point of view one hears from the Reform Party.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**AIR SAFETY**

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond—Guiral (Laval—Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

On October 28, the Official Opposition called the minister's attention to excerpts of a Transport Canada's inspection report in which major irregularities were noted with respect to the maintenance control system for aircraft owned by Royal Aviation Inc.

*Oral Questions*

The minister was to look into the situation and take corrective action. Now that he has had the time to look into this situation, does the minister not agree that this carrier's maintenance control program is totally inadequate? And can he tell us what steps were taken to remedy the situation?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when the issue was raised, as the hon. member pointed out, we looked into the matter. There were indeed deficiencies in the control system. There were problems and these were corrected.

I want to reassure my hon. colleague that not only was the situation looked into, but that appropriate corrective action was taken and the company now operates within the regulations issued by Transport Canada.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval-Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell this House whether the control measures contemplated include surprise inspections by his department. Should carriers that pose a risk not be placed under the direct supervision of Transport Canada?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of safety is a very important one. It is the primary responsibility of the Department of Transport. I can assure my hon. colleague that we will continue to exercise all due diligence to ensure that all air carriers abide by the existing regulations.

Problems can always arise, but, as far as possible, we want to leave no doubt in the minds of Canadians and foreigners travelling in Canada as to the safety and efficiency of our air transportation system.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Ontario wheat farmers have been electing their wheat board directors for some time. This system seems to work very well for them. Are western farmers less capable, less deserving?

(1150)

Why does the minister of agriculture absolutely refuse to permit western farmers to elect their wheat board directors?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I point out to the hon. member that it was a previous Liberal government that provided the first electoral process with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board, that is the election of the advisory committee.

As far as future changes that might take place within the corporate government structure is concerned, it is a subject on which farmers will be having discussions this winter. I will be very interested to hear the varying points of view from farmers on that particular approach to corporate governance.

One of the technical matters that the hon. member should bear in mind concerning the difference between the Canadian Wheat Board and the Ontario Wheat Producers Marketing Board is that under the Canadian Wheat Board system we have the provision under federal legislation for government financial guarantees concerning initial payments. That obviously is a substantial financial distinction between the operations of the two boards and indicates why in some circumstances the methods of corporate governance might well be different.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is really stupid. Too much time and too little action.

The question is, democracy or dictatorship? That is the question. Do we have a democracy or are we going to continue with this dictatorship?

Is the minister going to continue to deny farmers democracy and continue with this present dictatorship?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as usual in the rather simplistic approach of the Reform Party its members are missing a very fundamental point.

It is important to make intelligent, thoughtful decisions after everyone, in a fully democratic manner, has had an opportunity to discuss the matter and state their points of view, rather than pre-empting all of the discussion and simply opting for a proposal put forward by a political party that has already made up its mind, in the form of the Reform Party. It does not represent the majority of western Canadian farmers.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN NATIONAL

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

I wrote to Canadian National real estate on February 10 asking about the CN abandoned railway line between Renfrew and Arnprior. I received no reply. I wrote again on June 10—no answer. Repeated phone calls finally produced a letter on October 25 ignoring my concerns.

Canadian National real estate cancelled an appointment to meet with me this week.

Will the Minister of Transport tell the president of Canadian National that the corporation has the responsibility to answer mail from members of Parliament and that it has no right to treat Parliament with contempt? We have to represent constituents.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in listening to the member's question I can only say to him and to other members that I will take steps today to check to see what happened in the member's particular situation.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and even my friends the Reformers who I know are not in favour of writing letters—they do not put pen to paper very often, they do everything by telephone—I will ensure that the officials of Canadian National respond rapidly and appropriately to all members of Parliament on all sides of the House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUEBEC CITY BRIDGE**

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. The Quebec City bridge has been designated a historic monument by the American Society of Civil Engineers and is one of the finest engineering structures in Canada. This bridge, which was built between 1900 and 1919, now needs major repairs which, according to experts, would cost \$45 million over a six-year period.

(1155)

Since the owner, Canadian National, did not allocate the resources needed to keep it in good condition, the bridge has deteriorated considerably.

Given the importance of the Quebec City bridge as a rail link between the two shores of the St. Lawrence at Quebec City and its historic and tourist potential for that region, does the minister not think that this bridge should undergo major repairs and that the work should start as soon as possible?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that the Quebec City bridge he is referring to belongs to Canadian National. If repairs are needed—and I readily accept what the hon. member said about the condition of the bridge—we will ask CN to review the matter and see if it is possible to announce the measures they will take to try to repair the bridge.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Pearson airport question is a matter of the right of due process. In this context the fact that Bill C-22 deals with Pearson airport at all is coincidental and could just as easily deal with a rail privatization contract, a government construction

contract or an airport contract under the minister's proposed national airports program.

Can the Minister of Transport advise the House how he justifies denying any Canadian the right of due process?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the question was not so serious because of the importance of Pearson, I would be tempted to contrast the approach the Reform Party takes to taxing Canadian taxpayers with a \$445 million bill which would be the result. If the contract was found to be valid, entered into in good faith, damages awarded, it could be \$445 million.

I am tempted to contrast that with the view of Reformers when they are dealing with some of the questions they bring up here where they show no respect for the law and no respect for the courts, but they want their friends who are involved in this deal to be in the courts so that they can rip us off for \$445 million.

\* \* \*

**GRAIN TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the minister of agriculture in announcing that the Liberals will change the Crow benefit has betrayed a long held commitment to prairie farmers and the communities that they support.

Has the minister failed to understand the importance of the Crow benefit to the economic viability of the prairies or is he just ignoring the views of thousands of farmers heard in recent public hearings?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in asking the question is overlooking the impact of the soon to be implemented General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and particularly the new World Trade Organization which brings to bear some important disciplines in the world on the use of export subsidies.

We will insist that other countries around the world adhere to their obligations under the new GATT. That will mean for example that countries like the United States will for the first time in a long time have to bring down some of its export subsidies such as the export enhancement program.

While we expect every other country in the world to abide by their obligations, Canada must abide by those same obligations. Within the terms of the new GATT agreement a portion of the Western Grain Transportation Act is defined as an export subsidy. In those circumstances we can do one of two things. We can either change the Western Grain Transportation Act so it no longer falls within the definition of an export subsidy or we can leave it the way it is and live within those new highly restrictive disciplines.

Obviously it is to the advantage of western farmers to change the Western Grain Transportation Act rather than suffer the tough disciplines under the new World Trade Organization.

\* \* \*

### TRADE

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

The Prime Minister is the first to acknowledge that deals are done by businessmen and women, that they depend on their abilities and those of management and workers. Yet every team needs a leader.

(1200)

Considering the positive tone set by the Prime Minister and the doors he opened, can the minister inform the House what results were obtained in Canada's largest ever trade mission abroad?

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are two theories. The first theory states that for every \$1 billion in trade, we create up to 9,000 jobs. Another theory states that for every \$1 billion in trade, we create up to 15,000 jobs.

If we take the worst possible scenario, this trip will generate up to \$10 billion in revenues to Canada's industries. If we multiply that by 9,000 that will give us 90,000 jobs at least. If we look at the best possible scenario, it will give us 150,000 jobs over the next few years.

While I am on my feet I want to say that the trade figures—

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order, please.

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, the House has been deprived of the best answer we have heard all week. Wait until you hear the rest of it.

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

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### HEALTH

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109 I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the first report of the Standing Committee on Health entitled "Toward Zero Consumption, Generic Packaging of Tobacco Products".

## Routine Proceedings

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109 I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the second report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources entitled "Canada: A Model Forest Nation in the Making".

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

[English]

This report relates to Bill C-57, an act to implement the agreement establishing the World Trade Organization. The committee considered the bill and presents the report, with amendments.

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development regarding Bill C-55, an act to establish a board having jurisdiction concerning disputes respecting surface rights in respect of land in the Yukon Territory, and to amend other acts in relation thereto, without amendment.

\* \* \*

### PETITIONS

#### RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition by many constituents and many people from both inside and outside the constituency in places like Calabogie within, Bancroft without, Cobden, Eganville within, Kanata without, Chapeau, Quebec outside and from many other points in Canada.

*Routine Proceedings*

The petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions today. The first is a petition from many individuals asking that Parliament desist from passing further legislation dealing with firearms and ammunition and to direct attention to the adequate punishment of the criminal element in society.

(1205)

## MINING

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the other petition is about the mining industry in Canada. The petitioners call upon Parliament to take action to help employment to grow in this particular sector, promote exploration and rebuild Canada's mineral reserves, sustain mining communities and keep mining in Canada.

This is a petition that I fully endorse.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present the following petition, signed by citizens from many different ridings in British Columbia.

This petition requests that Parliament refuse to accept the justice minister's anti-firearms proposals and insist that he bring forth legislation to convict and punish criminals rather than persecuting the innocent.

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting a petition on behalf of British Columbians from all regions of B.C. on anti-firearms legislation.

I think the directions are so clear they should be read: "That Justice Minister Allan Rock is proposing anti-firearms legislation that will virtually do nothing to reduce violent crime, but will severely restrict the rights and freedoms of millions of innocent firearms owners, contrary to the very principles of justice".

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please, members, do not read petitions. It would take us all day. Please give a summary of them. The hon. member may continue briefly.

**Mrs. Jennings:** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. Therefore, the petitioners request that we address the case at hand, the firearms legislation. Please replace it.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present four different petitions.

The first is from a variety of communities throughout the riding of Kootenay West—Revelstoke. The petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code and the Human Rights Act to provide anything that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relations, homosexuality, including the human rights code to include the prohibitive grounds of discrimination in the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners pray that Parliament ensure that the current provisions of the Criminal Code prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes to the law which would sanction, aid or abet suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from my riding in which the petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## BILL C-206

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the final petition is also from my riding. The petitioners call upon Parliament to enact Bill C-206 at the earliest opportunity so as to provide a statutory foundation for a national witness relocation and protection program.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my honour to table a petition bearing 113 signatures, mostly from the village of Pambrun in my riding.

The petitioners pray that Parliament ensures the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## BILL C-256

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition bearing 50 signatures. These people are in support of Bill C-256, presented by my colleague the member for Mississauga South, which is to compensate spouses working in the home and caring for preschool children.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions that I would like to present to the House.

The first petition deals with the Young Offenders Act. The petitioners in memory of Ryan and in support of Stu and Marg Garrioch and family request that Parliament recognize that crimes of violence are serious and out of control, putting all of society at risk. They ask the House to amend the Young Offenders Act and give society the protection it deserves. There are 280 names on that petition.

(1210)

## PAROLE

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is with regard to parole. The undersigned request that Parliament recognize that crimes of violence are serious and out of control, putting all of society at risk and that life should be life with no parole for violent offenders convicted of first degree murder and a minimum of 25 years without parole for those convicted of second degree murder. There are 285 signatures.

## CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there is a third petition on capital punishment with 358 signatures. The undersigned request that Parliament recognize that those who commit murder never be released from prison. To that end we ask that capital punishment be reinstated for all offenders.

I heartily agree with this petition.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a fourth petition is on sexual orientation. The petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or homosexuality, including amending the Human Rights Act to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation. There are 305 signatures.

## EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three other petitions on the matter of euthanasia. There are 1,142 signatures of petitioners asking that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way and to uphold the Supreme Court of Canada decision of September 30, 1993, to disallow assisted suicide euthanasia.

I heartily agree with all of these petitions.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table three petitions. The first petition is

*Routine Proceedings*

from residents in my constituency including 100 Mile House, Lone Butte and 108 Mile Ranch.

My constituents call upon Parliament to act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second and third petitions from residents of my constituency including Williams Lake, 100 Mile House, 108 Mile Ranch, Lone Butte, Forest Grove and Ninety Three Mile House call upon Parliament not to 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 for discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

These petitions come with my concurrence.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions with a total of 74 signatures against assisted suicide and requesting that Parliament make no change in the law to allow or abet suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have another petition with 31 signatures requesting that protection be extended to the unborn child.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Questions Nos. 82, 89 and 90 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 82—**Mr. Cummins:**

What effect did the late signing of the Aboriginal Fishing Agreements in British Columbia have on the Department of Fisheries and Oceans enforcement of the Agreements and fisheries regulations in 1994?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** While negotiations on agreements with aboriginal groups for management of aboriginal salmon fishing were in many cases protracted, leading to delays in signing of agreements, these delays had little impact on the enforcement of agreements and fisheries regulations. Procedures and protocols for managing aboriginal fisheries had been developed under the aboriginal

*Routine Proceedings*

fisheries strategy in previous years. These procedures were not in dispute, allowing both the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the aboriginal groups to proceed with planning for management and enforcement while negotiations on allocation numbers were ongoing.

All aboriginal salmon fisheries were licensed under the communal licence regulations with the licences reflecting established management procedures. In many cases aboriginal groups were able to prepare for and participate in management of the fishery through bridge funding arrangements even while negotiations were ongoing. In some cases, uncertainty as to final levels of funding to be established through negotiations did curtail aboriginal participation in the management of the fishery.

The department is currently reviewing all enforcement concerns recently raised. The purpose is to identify program weaknesses and develop solutions to prevent reoccurrence. As well, the minister has set up an independent review board to examine all factors related to the management of Fraser River sockeye stocks. The board is to provide its final report to the minister by January 31, 1995 including recommendations for corrective action.

**Question No. 89—Mr. Fillion:**

Is the Department of Fisheries and Oceans planning to rebuild the wharf in L'Anse Saint-Jean in the riding of Chicoutimi, to re-evaluate this project in fiscal year 1995-96 and to begin negotiations with the municipality of L'Anse Saint-Jean?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** The Government of Canada has been aware of the municipality's interest in rebuilding the wharf at L'Anse St-Jean since the fire of August 22, 1992. Since that time, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) has been discussing the situation with the municipality.

In 1993/94 and 1994/95, DFO approved expenditures totaling \$300K for the pre-engineering studies, and for the plans and specifications for the reconstruction of the wharf. This was done to facilitate the wharf's reconstruction, should funds become available. At that time the government could not make a commitment to proceed with the work.

Public Works and Government Services Canada's recent technical assessment and planning documents indicate that the demolition of the outer end of the wharf and its reconstruction and the renovations to the remaining portion of the wharf will cost an estimated \$2 million.

In light of the current climate of fiscal restraint, competing demands for funds to carry out repair and reconstruction projects at federally owned harbours across Canada cannot all be accommodated within the limited budget for the small craft harbours program. Under the current program review, government is seriously questioning whether we can continue to spend

diminishing funds or operate improved or reconstructed recreational harbours at the expense of doing essential repairs at commercial fishing harbours. DFO has assigned a higher priority to repair projects at commercial fishing harbours than to recreational harbours and this leaves no funds for large recreational projects. As a consequence, DFO is unable to make a commitment to rebuilding the wharf at L'Anse St-Jean at this time, and it is unlikely that this situation will change in 1995/96.

DFO is prepared to co-operate should other interests provide the funds necessary to reconstruct the wharf.

**Question No. 90—Mr. Fillion:**

Will the post offices in the riding of Chicoutimi be reorganized and if so, how and what effect will this have on employment and the quality of customer service?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Starting on February 13, 1995, Canada Post will improve collection and delivery in the riding of Chicoutimi by introducing motorized mail courier service to the area. Also, letter carrier operations currently located at the Chicoutimi Racine and Chicoutimi Nord facilities as well as mail processing operations currently located at the Chicoutimi CTC will be consolidated into a new facility at 1939 Des Sapins Street in Chicoutimi. Retail customers will not be inconvenienced, as CPC products and services will continue to be available in the Chicoutimi Nord and Chicoutimi Racine establishments.

Though CPC employees will be transferred to the new facility, there will be no job loss associated with this rationalization.

The project will result in better postal service for the region, as Canada Post introduces a modern collection and delivery system well adapted to the future needs of its customers.

[English]

**Mr. Milliken:** I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am told that the hon. member for Verchères has asked to present a petition. Does the House agree to return to Presenting Petitions?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## UNIVERSALITY OF TAX CREDIT

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues.

*Government Orders*

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table in this House today a petition signed by 156 residents of the riding of Verchères, more particularly, the municipality of Varennes.

Referring to the abolition of universality for the age credit for income tax, the signers of this petition believe that the present government is unduly attacking the income of retired people.

The signers also consider these measures to be very discriminatory in fiscal terms since they attack people who have already made a major contribution to the Canadian economy; these measures would deprive these people of hope for an improved standard of living in the coming years.

(1215)

Accordingly, the 156 signers of this petition ask Parliament to vote against any measure that would lower the income of retired people. Needless to say, I share the analysis of the situation presented in this petition and I strongly support my fellow citizens' request.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

*[English]*

### SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in the House today on social security reform. I will direct my comments specifically to the unemployment insurance aspect of it and how the proposed changes will affect women and families.

This debate takes place at a critical time in the history of Canada's social programs. The Minister of Human Resources Development launched the social security reform debate in the House last January. At that time he challenged Canadians to define what effective social programs would look like in a world shaped by the economic and social trends we see around us today.

During the following months the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development have both heard the same things from a large number of Canadians. Quite simply our social programs are losing the confidence of the people who pay taxes. They see the inconsistencies and the gaps.

Like every member of the House I have received numerous letters and phone calls on the topic. The polls say it. Our mail says it. Canadians are not satisfied with the status quo. They know that a more effective and a more cost effective social safety net is not just possible; it is necessary. That is why the

government released the discussion paper on social security reform on October 5.

We want a debate for all Canadians. One element of the debate is fairness. Canadians clearly reject the idea that we should have a slash and burn approach to social programs. They just want them to work better. They want the money and services to meet the greatest needs with the greatest impact.

Certainly unemployment insurance was not meant to create the cycle of dependency that has developed in too many communities for too many workers. A large and growing share of people who get UI are frequent claimants. Thirty-eight per cent have made three claims in five years. With the best of intentions we have allowed the system to develop into one that encourages low skilled, seasonal and temporary work in high unemployment regions. It does little to encourage people to improve their skills and their options.

A place where that is certainly the case is in the unemployment insurance area. To hear some of the comments in the House on the topic one could conclude that UI is about to be destroyed in some fiendish plot driven by the titans of high finance. One could conclude that the government is bound and determined to roll back the gains that women have made in the labour force over the past generation. One could conclude that we are determined to make poor families suffer. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I want to concentrate my remarks today on how the green paper proposals on UI relate to the needs and the realities of women and families in Canada. UI has been serving Canadian workers for over 50 years. For most employees it works as it was intended to. It is insurance to tide them over the time between jobs.

The labour market has changed greatly since 1942 when the first claim was filed. Now people do not just lose one job and move on to another. Structural change in our economy means that people may not just move between jobs; they may move between industries or communities. UI was not designed to deal with that type of situation.

In contrast, as hon. members will recall, is the second option of a system of employment insurance. Within it there could be basic insurance that would work in the way UI does now. People who make a UI claim only infrequently would see no real change. People who need the help with the special benefits such as maternity, parental, adoption, or sickness benefits would still be able to get that help.

(1220)

At a time when we are asking how we can invest funds to make people employable across all social programs we have to ask the same questions about UI. The discussion paper lays out two different approaches we could take to address the fact that some people need far more help than UI can give them through income support alone.

*Government Orders*

The first is simply tightening the status quo. Higher eligibility rules, shorter duration of benefits and lower weekly benefits are all options. The only problem is that it does little to address the needs for more active labour force programs. It nibbles at the edges of the program without really challenging the big questions surrounding UI.

People who make relatively frequent use of UI would move into the adjustment insurance category. For these people there would be a greater emphasis on help to find the skills to get and keep better longer term work. The government recognizes that some industries are seasonal and that some communities have little work in parts of the year. That is why we are open to ways to make this approach work well.

Some critics have raised the idea that people who might be eligible for adjustment insurance could have their benefits set on the basis of family income. This has been opposed by some people as a giant step back for women. Before any more interest groups howl about this let us again look at the facts.

First, very few women would be affected by this proposal if it actually came to pass. Women account for only about one-third of all frequent claimants. The program is good for about seven out of ten women. Adjustment insurance would not matter. Their needs would be met by the basic insurance program.

Second, women would still have good access to the special benefits under the system. A study states that women account for 59 per cent of all sickness claims. We know they account for the maternity claims. We can guess that they probably account for the majority of claims raised for adoptions and parental benefits. There would be no change for the vast majority of women who call on UI for help. It will still be there to help them.

Where the debate exists is over a proposal that would base adjustment insurance benefits in part on family earnings. Third, low income people would get the full benefit. A sliding scale would lower the benefits for people with higher incomes. Immediately some protested this might undermine the self-esteem of a woman or it might undermine her financial independence. I disagree with that statement.

In 1991, 18 per cent of frequent claimants had annual incomes of over \$50,000. A further 28 per cent had family incomes of between \$30,000 and \$50,000. Frankly the image one gets is that UI for these people is a regular top-up to family income and not a protection against hardship. Canadians have the right to ask if this is the best way to spend their dollars. I suspect that Canadians will agree that it is not. They will agree that these people claim the money because of a feeling of entitlement, not need. UI is not a publicly subsidized savings account.

The prospect is that by focusing attention on people most in need whose work patterns are the most marginal we can help them break out of a cycle of dependence. The premiers of the Atlantic provinces agree. Economic analyses agree. Canadians agree. The old pattern of 10:42 simply does not work. The answer is not to cut people off and say sink or swim. The answer is to get programs and services in place to help.

Women will benefit from this approach. The idea is to put more emphasis on employment development services of all kinds: counselling, job search skills and work experience training. The idea is to move money from less important places to more important places.

Among the proposals in the green paper was one that raised the question of improving UI coverage for part time and seasonal workers. Most of the people who would benefit from it are women. Twenty-eight per cent of women workers are in part time jobs whereas only ten per cent of men are. The ideas we have suggested could directly address the needs of those women better than the status quo.

(1225)

Many women need the kinds of programs social security reform will make available. Let us take the example of single mothers. Almost 60 per cent of lone parent families with children under 18 live on low incomes and 95.9 per cent of single parent mother led families live below the poverty line. They often lack support services such as child care that would help them get back to work. Those on social assistance often find that the value of support services like dental care are much greater than what they can earn with the limited skills they may have.

The government has embarked on a series of experiments with the provinces to explore better ways of helping these mothers get back into the workforce. We now have a pilot project in Manitoba that will provide 4,000 lone parents on welfare with employment skills and support. The program is called "Taking Charge". It is specifically to help those people do just that, to take charge of their lives.

We will continue to solicit the ideas and views of Canadians. I am glad to see that the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development has attracted not only many submissions but substantial attention in the media. The issue is very important. It deserves a full debate. That is why the government has provided financial resources to 19 women's organizations to enable them to participate in the consultative process.

Many times we in the House hear different people ask why we are providing financial resources to organizations so that they can attack the government. This is a case where we are providing financial resources to women's organizations not to attack the

*Government Orders*

government but to give us the ideas we need to provide help for women.

Our current set of programs were designed at a time when most people needed relatively few skills to get and keep a job. What they picked up in school and on the job was usually enough to build a lifetime of earnings. People needed financial help between jobs. Others needed support if they could not work at all due to disability or family commitments. The old system was based on a stable world with stable skills and stable jobs for the vast majority of working people.

I would like to refer to my own case. My husband and I raised five children who have all been in the workforce for a few years. They were all able to complete university and get jobs. They are now contributing citizens. Not one of them has ever collected a day's UI in their lives. That is not the way it is today. Times have changed. Students coming out of university are having a very difficult time and we have to address that problem.

Our support for programs like New Brunswick Works in New Brunswick and Job Link in Ontario and the Northwest Territories is investing in people and is helping us find better ways to help the most disadvantaged, to help their children break the welfare cycle and to have self-esteem at work. Social security reform can help women and their families far better than any of the patchwork programs we now have in place.

In the end the value to women of social security reform is much the same as it is for men. At the centre of any social security network lies a guiding principle. In a time of constant change that principle must be employability. Real security for Canadians comes from the ability to get and keep a job. Our programs must reflect the fact that this is more complex now than it was in the past. That is true for both men and women.

We cannot stop changes; we can help people provide the skills and supports to meet the realities of change. From letters I have seen and the people to whom I have spoken, that is all most people are asking for. Social security reform addresses important questions that affect women and all Canadians. It points to a new approach to working, to learning and to security. Everyone can benefit from that.

My speech today has been narrow in its focus because I have specifically dealt with women and UI and how the changes we are talking about in our social security reform will affect them. The whole package of social security reform is broad and will affect all Canadians. I felt this particular aspect was so important that I wanted to focus and narrow in on specifically UI and women's issues and I was pleased to do so.

(1230)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said earlier that her children never had to rely on UI benefits. This is great, but it is not the case for us. Our mothers and fathers have a lot of heart. Still, many children

claim UI benefits not because they want to, but because they have to.

The government will create two classes of unemployed. One for those who occasionally claim UI benefits, like once every five years, and the other for those who do so almost annually.

Where I come from, around November, workers have to claim UI benefits again, because they are out of work. They are jobless.

I worked for the agency and for other organizations to generate work. Back home, a great number of people do their utmost to create jobs, not only through programs but in the field. People in my region are extremely disappointed by the minister's reform. They know that they have no choice but to rely on UI benefits every year. Yet, the new reform provides for cuts in those benefits as well as for more work weeks, something which is impossible in the Gaspé Peninsula.

We asked, among other things, that the Eastern Quebec Development Plan for forestry workers be extended. We made representations. This morning I made a statement pursuant to Standing Order 31. This is cumbersome. The government does not understand. It does not understand that, in the Gaspé Peninsula, the Lower St. Lawrence region and the riding of Matapédia—Matane, the issues are not necessarily the same as in Toronto or Calgary.

The hon. member told us that her children never had to rely on UI benefits. I congratulate her and her children, but I also tell her that the situation is not the same for everyone. I hope she will realize that.

I want to make another point. If tuition fees go up, a very large number of students from the Gaspé, Matapédia—Matane and Lower St. Lawrence regions will not be able to attend university. In my region, the university is located in Rimouski and not every subject is taught there. Consequently, some students have to go to Laval university, in Quebec City, or to Montreal, thus incurring extra costs. If they go home once a month, they have to pay for their transportation costs and also spend extra money on food and lodging. If, on top of that, tuition fees are increased, as many as half the student population in my region may not be able to go on. Even today, the total number of those who can afford to attend university is lower than elsewhere. Therefore, my region is adversely affected by this measure.

If the hon. member cares about those who live in rural and remote areas and who will not be able to go to university because of that reform, what would she tell the unemployed in my region who want to work but cannot find jobs? I would appreciate an answer on these two issues.

*Government Orders**[English]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Nepean will have as much time as her colleague had to give her answer.

(1235)

**Mrs. Gaffney:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Matapédia—Matane for his question.

I hope in mentioning my children that I did not create a wrong impression with the member for Matapédia—Matane because that was not the intent of my mentioning them.

I was making a comparison of young people coming out of university, high school or college a few years ago and obtaining a job and today. If they had a certificate or diploma from a university it was almost a guarantee that they could get a job. It was much easier. That is gone. It is no longer in effect. Young people graduating today who might have a masters or PhD still have to spend two years looking for a job. The situation has changed.

My children were raised in a very fortunate time in the history of Canada. They were able to access a job immediately. They were fortunate they did not have to go into the UI system and that money was able to stay there for those who needed it. It was not necessary for them to participate in a government program that was there to benefit those who could not find work.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the people who live in an environment or in a territory of Canada, such as the member lives, where their work is seasonal and it is very difficult for them to find work for 12 months of the year.

These are the types of reforms we are talking about in the human resources development program. They are specifically to deal with the people who live in the member's region, and in the Atlantic region or in the northern part of Canada where work is seasonal.

This is part of the consultation process. They will be consulting with the people in Quebec and asking how this program suits its needs. That is a major portion of the consultation program and is what is so important. We are not just saying that what is suitable for my riding of Nepean, Ontario is suitable for the member's riding in the province of Quebec. Every riding is different and that is what is very unique about Canada. We are very unique not only in each province but as we move from region to region. This is what the program of reforms is trying to address, again through the consultation process.

Some students will not be able to afford to go to university if the tuition rates are raised. As Mr. Axworthy said on the steps of Parliament Hill the other day, he is not putting less money into education, he is putting more money into education. He is trying to ensure that students who do not have a university in their town—as my children did, as students in the member's area who have to travel to Rimouski to go to university—that funds are in place so they can go. The students of wealthy families should

have a responsibility to support those in less wealthy families who are from less wealthy regions.

I firmly believe we are headed in the right direction. Obviously the consultation process is going to prove us wrong if we are wrong or prove us right if we are right. We are there and we are very much prepared to listen.

I thank you very much, deputy, for your two very good questions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I would ask hon. members to please not refer to each other by name. Members of the House are to be referred to either by the member for *x* or the minister for *y*.

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoyed the comments of the member for Nepean. She got into a narrow realm, as she explained, of unemployment and women.

I enjoyed as much the question from the member for Matapédia—Matane because he expresses, as a representative of a totally different part of the country, the particular concerns of that area. That is the value of the House of Commons. We must listen to one another. I hope the process will go forward with the review committee as they tour Canada and pick up all of these comments, all of which are valid. If we are to tackle the enormous problem of the debt and the deficit year by year, we badly need a review of the social spending that we are undertaking.

(1240)

A leaked government memo indicates a need to reduce social spending by \$7.5 billion. This demonstrates that even the Liberals realize the necessity of cutting in this area.

A quick look at where the government spends its money will show why we need to cut in the area of social spending. But unlike the member for Nepean who took a narrow view I, as the first Reform Party speaker on this subject today, would like to take an overview of the whole situation to set the scene.

We have a debt of roughly \$540 billion at the federal level. Our deficit spending at this time is running at about \$40 billion per year. This means we are getting ever deeper and deeper into debt. At the same time government spending annually is roughly \$160 billion. One-quarter of that annual spending, roughly \$40 billion, \$39.4 billion goes to interest payments. This amount cannot be altered or reduced until we balance the budget. Think of it again, and I address this to the public in Canada, \$40 billion a year alone in interest payments on our debt.

Another quarter of our annual spending, just over \$40 billion, goes for government services. This includes the armed forces, foreign affairs, the RCMP police, subsidies to business, multiculturalism, bilingualism, Parliament, the civil service among others. These areas must be drastically cut before we touch social programs. However, even if we cut this roughly 25 per cent of our spending to the bone, we can only save \$8 billion to

*Government Orders*

\$10 billion a year. The mathematics is there. It is just not enough to balance the budget.

The remainder of government spending, \$79 billion, consists of transfers to the provinces and social programs. This spending has to be reduced by \$12 billion to \$17 billion if we hope to balance the budget in a number of years. That is an awfully big reduction.

Let us now look to see what the government is going to do to help address the whole problem. The finance minister brought down a lacklustre budget earlier this year. Not only were there few cuts but spending actually increased. Each day, as we are all aware, the government is spending \$110 million more than it is taking in from revenues. We cannot go on doing that.

Despite these facts, however, the finance minister defended this weak fiscal plan and stated the government will have no problem in meeting its debt reduction target of 3 per cent of the gross domestic product as promised in the red ink book. The finance minister now admits his projections may be off and earlier this month informed the finance committee that cuts totalling more than \$9 billion would have to be made over the next two years.

(1245)

It is encouraging to see that the finance minister is finally beginning to realize the gravity of the situation. I suspect he is being pummelled by this country's financial institutions saying: "Minister, look at the reality". We have yet to see the finance minister's actions come close to matching his words.

Similarly, we must look at what action the minister of human resources has taken to tackle his share of the problem. His is a big share of the problem, no question.

For more than a year now we have waited for his social policy review paper. Instead of the action promised in the red ink book, all we have had until last month has been foot dragging. Given his reluctance to release the paper before the Quebec provincial election on September 12 it is surprising the minister even released the paper in advance of the promised Quebec referendum, but he did. This type of blatant politicking only serves to exacerbate the problem because it delays the move toward a badly needed solution.

Be that as it may we finally have the review paper. Looking at it however, what do we really have? So far that paper is nothing more than an eclectic grab-bag of reworked Liberal programs from the 1960s and 1970s along with a continuation of some Tory proposals.

The minister also denies that this process has anything to do with budget cuts. Well it surely has and it must. I do not think Canadians are fooled by this attempt to sugarcoat the truth. In fact, some Canadians might find the minister's sales pitch somewhat insulting.

We all know what the problem is. The real question is: How do we solve it? We solve it collectively in an open and honest way while ensuring that those really in need do not suffer. We must protect the people who need our help.

We have to eliminate the deficit by carefully reviewing all of the government spending including sacred cows like official languages and multiculturalism. Every time we mention that in this House we get bombarded that they cannot be touched. Well the time has come when we have to touch them and examine them in detail. We must ask ourselves if we are getting value for every dollar we spend and whether we can live without the program.

The process has to be done objectively and fairly treating all provinces alike and all individuals with compassion. Once we eliminate deficit spending we can begin to chip away at the debt. Only through this method can we ensure the continued viability of Canada's valued social programs. In the meantime it is obvious some cuts are needed in social spending but the big question of the day is where to cut.

We have heard a dissertation on unemployment insurance. Last year the program cost Canadians \$20 billion. The minister's review paper talks about making this a two tier system, or simply making it harder to be eligible for benefits. I suggest that both of these proposals are nothing more than a continuation of Tory policies.

(1250)

The unemployment insurance system must be returned to a true insurance plan. It must eliminate regional differences in qualifying periods, benefits and non-insurance components. This area alone could save roughly \$5 billion.

The Canada assistance plan helps the provinces fund welfare programs at an annual cost of \$8 billion. The government suggests this program be made more flexible to allow provinces to experiment. This may help the provinces. It may help to prevent some of the abuses of the welfare system but we are still going to be spending the same amount.

It may be better to cut much of this spending in favour of a new child tax credit which could be targeted at low income households. As I said earlier this whole process has to target those who absolutely need the help. We cannot afford to continue with the past approach of universality. In any event the new child tax credit would not only ensure the money gets to those who need it most, but it could also produce savings in the area of three to five billion dollars.

In the area of education the government is proposing a system in which RRSPs could be used to pay for tuition. Many years ago there was a registered education savings plan. This was eliminated when it was found to be ineffective. Therefore why does the government continue to believe that a failed program from the past can work today?

*Government Orders*

Instead of giving money directly to students and not through increased loans as the review paper suggests, how about doing it through a voucher system? That has been discussed in this House. It has merit and really should be looked at.

It would ensure that money is spent on education rather than just going into provincial general revenue funds. It would make post-secondary institutions more accountable and receptive to the changing needs of students and the job market. The savings would not be great but a more efficient use of current resources would be ensured. Education is an area we have to protect to the maximum degree possible.

The review paper does not talk about reforming health care. Health care costs Canadians over \$70 billion each year of which the federal government pays about \$15 billion one way or another. The health system is increasingly overburdened.

Reform stated during the 1993 election campaign that it would maintain transfer payments for health care at current levels. The medicare system in Canada is something I think every Canadian says we must have. It is of highest priority for protection. What do we have to do then? We have to experiment with ways to get more bang for our buck out of the health system.

This would mean allowing provinces more freedom to design their own health initiatives based on their own needs. The provinces are close to it. They are the ones who have to deliver the services. Let them make more decisions. While it is important in the health system for national standards to apply, those standards should not be so rigid as to disallow provincial experimentation, such as private clinics.

The Liberals decry this type of thinking claiming it will create a two tiered system, which is already a fact in Canada. Why do the Liberals think that is so terrible in the area of health yet they proclaim it as a possible saviour for unemployment insurance? This is an example of the type of double talk the government is becoming famous for.

(1255)

I have only begun to touch on the many programs in Canada's social safety net and we have already identified about \$9 billion in potential annual savings. I have also attempted to ensure that those who are truly in need of help are not adversely affected.

It is possible to save money in this area by carefully targeting where the money goes and rethinking the way we deliver these services. I hope the government has listened and continues to listen when my Reform colleagues add their valuable input over the remaining hours of this debate.

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in the House today.

Six weeks ago the Minister of Human Resources Development released a discussion paper on social security in Canada in order to engender a lively debate across this country about what kind of social security system we want in the future. A debate should be based on facts not rumours and scare stories so let us make sure we all understand those facts.

We have created an excellent and highly accessible post-secondary education system in Canada but it is increasingly under pressure. Resources for everything are tight and there is a growing need for more access to the system. Our challenge is to ensure that we maintain and improve the system and broaden access.

First, why broaden access? Because there are three million people already in the workforce who want to improve and upgrade their skills in order to keep jobs. More and more people should be getting a post-secondary education. Of the new jobs created during the last three years 17 per cent went to people with university education. There were 19 per cent fewer jobs for those with less than high school.

Governments do not have any more money to pay for education. In fact most governments have less money to spend. The federal government is not proposing that we cut \$2.6 billion out of the system as some people would suggest. Our proposal will put more in the system as I will explain.

Let us look at how education is paid for. Students pay about one-fifth of the costs of their college or university education through tuition fees. More than half of the students graduate without borrowing money or by borrowing very small amounts. Taxpayers pay about four-fifths or 80 per cent of the cost of post-secondary education, whether or not they personally benefit. That is a lot more than in most countries where students pay a larger share of tuition costs in recognition of the fact that they earn higher salaries and wages during their working lifetime.

Provincial governments are responsible for education, but the federal government pays half the costs for colleges and universities, about \$8 billion a year. This currently includes \$3.5 billion in tax points that allow the provinces to collect taxes for colleges and universities and \$2.6 billion in transfers to provinces in cash. There is an additional \$2 billion, mostly in support to university research and the cost of student loans through the Canada student loans program.

The \$3.5 billion in tax points will always be there and it will keep growing. The tax points contribution will grow by an estimated \$2 billion over the next decade, replacing the cash portion that will run out over the next 10 years.

*Government Orders*

(1300)

Under the present system the cash will run out in about 10 years. Without extra government money it is likely that tuition fees will keep rising. That is why the government is considering an alternative, taking some of that cash before it disappears and using it to set up a permanent expanded student aid program. This would provide as much as \$2 billion extra in student loans each year.

Under such a scheme the total amount of federal contributions to post-secondary education would increase by more than \$10 billion over the next 10 years. Instead of leaving the system as it is now, which would put the federal government contribution at a total of about \$60 billion over 10 years, it would be about \$70 billion.

A new kind of student loans program would make it easier to finance education, not just for traditional students but for older Canadians who want to go back to school but do not qualify for student loans now. More people would be able to go to college or university. College and university fees could rise but it seems like a reasonable investment given the fact that university graduates' lifetime earnings will be 40 per cent higher than if they had not made that investment. That is about one-quarter million dollars more.

In addition if we were to make the replacement of student loans contingent on earnings after graduation, students would have a guarantee that their investment in learning will not burden them with impossible loan payments.

These are the ideas we have put forward for discussion. Canadians will have an opportunity to respond. They can fill out the work book which we have available for all Canadians to have their say on the reform of social programs. The booklet is available in postal outlets, Canada Employment Centres, YM-YWCAs and many grocery stores or by calling the toll free 1-800 number.

Social security reform affects all Canadians. The government encourages open debate to find the best solutions to take us into the next century.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am pleased to rise today and speak on the social reform issue, which I believe will be of great significance during the coming months for a number of reasons.

I would like to take a moment to demonstrate that the Liberal government is facing an unsurmountable problem, trying desperately as it has been for the past year to defend the Constitution. I am referring of course to the federal system as we know it, this system that the Prime Minister described as profitable federalism over a decade ago.

In fact, this profitable federalism that we keep hearing about without ever seeing any results, this much-vaunted profitable federalism has no room left to move because it is throwing everything in reverse as we will see later. And there are only two ways out the deadlock for the federal system: to tax the middle-class to excess or cut social services.

This is the context in which I think the social reform proposals before us must be seen. While the previous government, a Conservative government, became famous mainly for increasing the tax load of middle-income earners, the present Liberal government seems to want to make a name for itself with social service cuts affecting first and foremost the less affluent.

All of this boils down to what was described as the vicious circle in which the Canadian economy is trapped. You start by overtaxing middle-income earners, thereby reducing their buying power which in turn forces them to change their consumer habits and definitely buy less. This results in fewer jobs and higher unemployment. The low-income population is growing at the expense of the middle-income one. The decline in employment causes the government's tax revenues to drop as well.

(1305)

Similarly, since unemployment and social assistance costs are going up, the government must spend more. The deficit is growing every day, while the government's manoeuvring room is getting narrower.

Faced with this situation, the well-off often transfer their assets to other countries before it melts away here. Again, this eliminates jobs, raises the unemployment rate, cuts government revenue and increases public spending, which in turn narrows the government's room to manoeuvre.

To address the problem, the government has decided to reduce its services. In this regard, this government is not so different from the former Conservative government, since its proposed social reform reflects the philosophy behind the various UI reform initiatives put forward by the Tories when they were in power. To be convinced of this, one only has to look at the main elements of this reform. First of all, the government has created two classes of unemployed: the occasional UI claimants and the frequent claimants. We may well ask ourselves if the workers now benefiting from the infrastructure program put in place by the government last year will become frequent or occasional claimants when they lose their short-term jobs.

Since it creates these two classes of unemployed people, the government also creates two classes of benefits: basic insurance and adjustment insurance, as it is called. Basic insurance is for occasional claimants. It is pretty much the same as the present system which the government finds inadequate. In the second case, adjustment insurance, the government perpetuates the vicious circle of the Canadian economy which I mentioned earlier.

*Government Orders*

In fact, the reform of social programs which the government has presented to us provides no real policy to stimulate employment. So one may well ask what claimants of adjustment insurance can adjust to.

To deal with this situation, the government intends to require frequent claimants to do community work or take training courses in order to qualify for benefits. We see how ridiculous the situation is, because these are bandaid solutions. Once these unemployed people have completed their community work to which the Department of Human Resources Development will assign them, they will all return to unemployment as even more frequently unemployed, since in the mean time the government will have provided nothing to stimulate employment.

So we go from one vicious circle to another, making the unemployed pay for this government's lack of initiative when it comes to job creation. However, this little game is just fine in the context of the vicious circle prevailing in Canada. First, the government no longer has any margin. Consequently, it forces the unemployed to participate in new employment expansion and development programs. So as to lower their production costs, companies use these programs to hire workers whose salaries are lower, and therefore competitive with those already being paid.

Consequently, in the medium term, well-paying jobs become more and more rare, thus reducing even more the purchasing power of the middle class. Since employment income tends to diminish, it results in lower tax revenue for the government, which then has even less of a margin. The result is that the government must make new cuts in services to meet its budget goals. And the vicious circle starts all over again for the Canadian economy.

The introduction of this social program reform by the Liberals only confirms what the majority of Quebec voters figured out last year: To vote for the Liberals or the Conservatives was just the same. The Conservatives overtaxed the middle class, while the Liberals will cut aid to the poor. At least one Liberal MP, the hon. member for York South—Weston, recognized this when he said that, during the ten years that the Liberals formed the Official Opposition, they accused the Conservatives of reducing the deficit on the back of the poor, but that they were now doing the same thing.

(1310)

It is useless to vote for a party that supports a constitutional framework that is dragging us down into bankruptcy. The problem is that all this is being done at the expense of the vulnerable in our society. The rich are never affected by these reforms. To illustrate my point, I may refer to a letter sent

recently by a Liberal member, the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls, to the Minister of Finance. In this letter, which was published in the media either yesterday or today, the hon. member said, and this was to the Minister of Finance, that he was particularly upset about the shocking and immoral deductions allowed as entertainment expenses, for instance, the purchase of \$200 bottles of wine, cruises, escort services, and so forth. What is the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls actually saying?

Every year, one of my neighbours in my riding, Mr. Tremblay, has one or two corn roasts for his friends. He buys corn, of course, some wine and some cake, and he entertains his guests. Of course, Mr. Tremblay does this at his own expense. Meanwhile, large corporations entertain their guests, serving cocktails, petits fours and champagne, and that is tax deductible. Who is paying? Mr. Tremblay, through his taxes. So Mr. Tremblay is paying for everyone. That is why corn is expensive, and that is why it is so expensive to be poor.

In his letter, the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls estimated that amounts spent on wine, petits fours and champagne were costing the government \$200 million.

The hon. member, who did some research at Revenue Canada, also pointed out that forward averaging of taxes by companies now amounted to nearly \$40 billion. Forward averaging refers to amounts that are payable but may be spread over subsequent returns. Nearly 1,200 companies recorded profits of at least \$1 million without paying a cent of income tax, according to the hon. member. In concluding, he said more or less the following: As the minister can see, the \$9 billion he is looking for could be found by collecting the taxes that should have been paid by companies on their profits.

I agree with the hon. member of the Reform Party. I think that before cutting social services, we should first get the money that is out there so that we have some degree of social justice. Where are we heading, politically speaking? I am sorry to put it this way, but I really think we are starting to look like a banana republic. A banana republic is not a republic where people pick bananas. It is a republic where the people who pick the bananas do not grow them. This means a republic with only two classes: the poor and the rich. The rich always get richer and the poor get poorer. If this proposal is passed, as it will be within the next few months, we will witness the undeniable signs of "bananization". Obviously, we cannot support this reform package.

*[English]*

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's remarks with great attention, particularly his comments about social services reform in the context of federalism.

*Government Orders*

We are all agreed, in the House and in the country at large, that the previous government, because it concentrated so much on constitutional issues, left our house in a state of great disorder not only in the accumulation of debt but also in failing to address these very crucial problems of social security reform.

I would like to suggest to the member opposite that we now have exactly the same situation. We have another leader in Canada pushing a constitutional agenda which will take us away from the focus on necessary reforms involving social services and reducing the debt. I suggest to the member that person is Mr. Jacques Parizeau. I wonder how he can explain that Mr. Parizeau is not directing us away from where we should really be looking, that is looking after Canadians, finding jobs and increasing the benefits in the economy.

(1315)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Pomerleau:** Mr. Speaker, I think that we will indeed have to pay increasing attention to the Constitution in the months to come. Sadly, this problem could have been resolved a while back, if only the Charlottetown agreements had been passed. We know what happened to these agreements that put at end to the negotiations between Quebec and Canada.

Quebec said no to the agreements, and so did Canada. This means that very soon the people of Quebec will have to choose between taking Canada such as it is and building a new country in Quebec. We have been expressing this need of ours for greater self-reliance to the rest of Canada for 125 years, and no effort was spared during these 125 years. But apparently, no one can find a solution to this problem.

The only solution that seems fair to us consists in building a country in Quebec and letting Canada develop as it pleases, according to its own interests. Basically, Canadians would decide what they want to do and how they want to do it, while we would do the exact same thing in Quebec.

As for employment development, let me tell my hon. colleague that it is not by making massive cuts on the backs of welfare recipients that you boost job creation. I think that, with or without Quebec, a comprehensive tax reform is required—and I firmly believe this—in Canada. Unfortunately, if this is not done, Canada, with or without Quebec, will face huge difficulties in the years to come, because the low and middle-income class will get poorer and poorer. The Prime Minister himself once said that \$1 million knows no language barriers and moves quickly. Some people will move their assets out of Canada and we will go through very hard times.

*[English]*

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the terminology I heard was bananas, and that is absolutely right. Bananas, I repeat it.

I read a little quote: “A strong economy is the essence of a strong society. My government will focus on a jobs and growth agenda. We will work with all our partners, provincial governments, business, labour, voluntary groups and individual Canadians”. That is a quote from the Prime Minister of Canada.

I could carry it on a little further by referring to the opening of the green paper: “My commitment is to listen and to work with all Canadians, different governments, groups, organizations, so that we can develop in partnership a framework that makes sense, is effective and is founded on basic Canadian values of compassion and justice. And I invite you to join in the discussion and debate”.

The point is that the green paper tabled by the minister is a consultation paper. The minister has pleaded with with the party across the way in the opposition to participate. There certainly are some alternatives laid forth in the green paper. At the same time the minister has been very open time and time again: if there is a better suggestion, a better idea, a better alternative, come forward with it. He is open to discussion; he is open to points of view on this subject matter.

As a matter of fact he has gone out of his way to invite all Canadians to participate. It is important to people from the province of Quebec. It is important to people from the province of New Brunswick. Indeed it is important for all Canadians. This is your opportunity, members of the opposition party, to focus on citizens in the province of Quebec and have them come forward.

(1320)

Why is the approach not to get these points of view across to the minister? I know he is open to them.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the member, I would ask all members to put their remarks through the Chair. It is designed to keep the pressure down in here; it is not just because we have to have everything addressed to the people who occupy the chair.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Pomerleau:** Mr. Speaker, we have examined closely the famous green paper and we have made comments up to now. We believe essentially that the minister focuses mainly on social program reform. In doing so, he forces people to consider this reform. He starts by saying that the problem in Canada comes from small and medium-income people and that this is where savings can be made because the problems come from that group.

Besides, the Prime Minister himself did not hesitate to refer to these people as beer-drinking couch potatoes. What we say is

*Government Orders*

that there is indeed a problem in Canada and whether Quebec stays or not, Canada will have to go through a complete overhaul of its taxation system but the reform must start at the top. We must start with those who use these expenditures for their own benefit, those who pay no income tax. Billions of dollars are involved here.

I quoted earlier the Liberal member for Gander—Grand Falls who has studied the matter, as did many others. I believe we are open to discussion. As we have been saying since we came here, we should open the books to Canadians, not only the third chapter, not the first, all the books. We agree with that.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the hon. member but I found an air of doom and gloom in his scenario. I would suggest that the nature of work in many respects has changed. A lot of people work successfully at home and on flex time. A lot of people volunteer and do a lot of work.

We have to face the fact that some people who work at lower salaries and pay their taxes are getting a little tired of waste and of those who abuse the system. However we are not going to solve the problems by attacking only those who abuse the system, because the system patently does not work well enough in this age.

What is wrong with someone asking for some community service work from frequent users of the UI program, which is supposed to be an insurance program and not a welfare program? What in the world is wrong with requesting people who receive something to do a little something in return, or at least to take responsibility within their community to assist in cleaning it up, in it being better run or perhaps assist seniors and children?

Would my friend care to explain how if we did that it would somehow, as he suggested, impact upon better paying work, upon more higher paying jobs? I do not see it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pomerleau:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just told us that the system is abused—I fully agree. There is abuse at all levels, that is what we mean. We must not consider only how people at the bottom of the scale abuse the system. The system is also abused by people all the way to the top.

Our position is extremely clear and is illustrated by a colourful image: when you want to clean a staircase, you clean it completely, not just the bottom step or the two lowest steps. You start at the top and work your way down. The Bloc Québécois fully agrees with the government on that point; we are prepared to open all the books and review them in public. That is all I had to say on the question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must inform hon. members that the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier has advised me in writing that he is unable to present his motion during the time provided for Private Members' Business on Monday, November 21, 1994.

(1325)

[*English*]

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 94. Accordingly I would request the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

[*Translation*]

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business will therefore be suspended and, pursuant to Standing Order 99, the House will meet at eleven o'clock on Monday morning to consider Government Orders. I am very sorry about this, hon. members.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add some comments to the debate because it is a very important one.

When we look at the social safety net and its origins all members in the Chamber would agree it essentially a Liberal creation. In the post-war years there were successive Liberal governments. There was a period when we had a Conservative government under John Diefenbaker. However I think the Liberals, particularly those under Prime Minister Pearson, can take credit for many of the social safety net reforms we have today.

There is no doubt anything that is put together will eventually develop flaws and difficulties and will be subject to change and reform. What has happened here and the reason why we are having this debate right now is that reform of the social safety net is long overdue, not just because we cannot afford it but because it is not working as well as it should.

I would not like to discuss the reforms in detail in this debate, but my experience in the last month has been that Canadians are ready for the type of debate and the type of reforms being contemplated now. We do not know what the final answer will be on unemployment insurance. We will have to see. It is a very contentious issue. However we have to address it and Canadians are ready.

I can give a couple of examples. Every year there is a very popular fall fair in my area. This is typical of the ridings of most MPs; they have fall fairs in their ridings. I took the green paper of the Minister of Human Resources Development to the fall fair and sat it on a table there. In the course of two days I gave out 200 copies of it.

*Private Members' Business*

People would come up to me and ask: "What is that?" I would say: "You have to read this because it is something that is going to affect every Canadian". People from all walks of life at the fall fair took the paper, promised to examine it, read it carefully, and send in their reactions.

I now have in my office at least 300 replies, not all of them sophisticated papers from special interests groups about which the Reform Party and perhaps myself love to talk from time to time. They were ordinary Canadians reacting to a very important initiative by the government, one that has to be debated thoroughly not only in the Chamber but in the community.

I took the green paper one step further. Once a month I have a cable TV program. I use it as an open line show. A local journalist comes down. It is quite interesting. Actually it is a lot of fun to do because there is no pre-preparation; we do not work out the questions beforehand. We simply sit there and talk and people call in.

People often think that cable TV is not well watched but I can assure the House that this program is very well watched. I had a tremendous response. The lines were flooded, particularly on the subject of the social safety net or reform of our social systems. I had all kinds of people call in, but the most compelling people who called were are on welfare, the people who are the beneficiaries of the system or are seen to be the beneficiaries of the system but are also the ones who are losing the most by it. One person called in and identified herself as a young single woman on welfare with a child; I cannot remember whether she had one or two children. She said that she felt terribly trapped.

I conclude by saying that the debate we are engaged in, whether in the House or in society, is one of the most important debates of this Parliament.

(1330)

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### LESTER B. PEARSON ACT

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-276, an act respecting Lester B. Pearson Day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Gagliano:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member, but I want to raise this point of order at the beginning of this hour concerning private member's bills because I want to make a very important point.

Since the beginning of this Parliament we have had a system where a subcommittee of the House decides which private members' bills are votable or not votable. However, there is a tendency in the House for members at the end of the debate to ask for unanimous consent for a bill which is not votable, such as this one is today, to become votable.

From the government side, it is our responsibility to make sure that the rules are respected. If members feel that all private members' bills should be votable, that question should be addressed to the House committee on procedure instead of making the point each time. In this case, even though we would like the hon. leader, Lester B. Pearson, to have a national holiday, the government definitely cannot support such an idea.

**The Deputy Speaker:** No such motion has been made on this bill. There may have been discussions between the minister and the member, but as much as possible this hour is reserved for private members, not for statements of government policy.

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to debate the merits of my private member's bill entitled an act to establish Lester B. Pearson Day.

The purpose of my bill is to establish a national holiday in honour of the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson in recognition of his great contributions to Canada and the international community. In short, I have proposed that the second Monday in February of each year be designated as Lester B. Pearson Day for reasons which I will outline in my comments.

While I am certain that members are familiar with the many achievements of this great man, I feel it was important to state some of his accomplishments for the record. Although Lester B. Pearson, often known as Mike Pearson, served as Canada's Prime Minister from April 22, 1963 to April 20, 1968, he began serving Canada long before moving into the Prime Minister's office.

Prior to joining the department of external affairs in 1928, Pearson served in the Canadian Army Medical and Flying Corps from 1914 to 1918. As a diplomat with external affairs, he held several senior posts abroad, including first secretary to the Canadian High Commission in London from 1935 to 1941 and eventually became Canadian ambassador to the United States in 1945.

These high profile diplomatic posts contributed to his recognition on the world stage and propelled him to the chairmanship of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization between 1951 and 1952 and then to the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly in 1952.

While Lester Pearson was well known on the international scene, it was really in 1957 that he became a household name. On October 14, 1957 Lester Pearson was awarded the Nobel peace prize. To date he is the first and only Canadian to receive the peace prize and I am really proud of him.

*Private Members' Business*

(1335)

The Nobel committee voted to bestow the peace prize on Mr. Pearson primarily because of his role in the Suez crisis of 1956. In an effort to resolve the crisis between Egyptians and Israelis, Pearson proposed the creation of a UN military force to act as a buffer between the belligerents. His proposal received overwhelming approval, 57 for and none against. The first modern UN peacekeeping force was established, thanks to Lester B. Pearson.

Gunnar Jahn, the chairman of the Nobel committee later stated that Pearson had been awarded the peace prize because of his "never tiring determination and his exceptional ability to put forward constructive ideas for the solution of problems".

Others would echo those comments, including UN General Assembly President Leslie Munro, who described Pearson as a great Canadian who is one of the foremost citizens of the world. The *New York Times* reported that Pearson was: "A big man from a country that is a small power" and that he was probably better known abroad than at home. Pearson's victory prompted Toronto Mayor Nathan Phillips to declare December 19, 1957 Lester Pearson Day. Unfortunately I do not believe the tradition has been continued.

Pearson's success on the international stage and his receipt of the Nobel peace prize finally helped him to get the recognition he deserved in his own country. Canadians began to take notice of him and in 1958 Lester Pearson became the leader of the Liberal Party. After a few years in opposition, he went on to become the Prime Minister of Canada in 1963.

In addition to his success on the international stage, Pearson also accomplished a great deal as Prime Minister. During his tenure Canadians were given the Canada pension plan, a program central to our nation's social safety net. Pearson was also responsible for giving Canadians a national flag, a true symbol of our nationhood and independence.

Other notable achievements include the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement, both of which have had a significant impact on Canadian life as we know it today.

Although Lester Pearson left this earth on December 27, 1972 his legacy lives on in world peacekeeping. Canada is a peacekeeping nation because of Mr. Pearson. We are proud of our record as world peacekeepers and in fact many believe that peacekeeping personifies what it means to be Canadian. To date, more than 90,000 Canadians have participated in UN and other peacekeeping missions.

As of this fall, close to 3,000 Canadian peacekeepers were participating in missions around the world, including a significant number in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Haiti and Macedonia.

If the recent report of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy is any indication of our commitment to peacekeeping, we can plan on being in the business for many more years to come. Canadians have more often than not failed to honour those individuals of whom they are most proud. A quick review of all of our national holidays show there is not one holiday, with perhaps the exception of Remembrance Day, which pays tribute to a truly remarkable Canadian.

(1340)

Although I can understand why we celebrate Queen Victoria's birthday and many other of our statutory holidays, I have never been able to understand why we cannot pay tribute to our own heroes, to those who have had a significant impact on Canadian life as we know it, like Lester B. Pearson.

Unlike Canada, many other nations take time to pay tribute to their heroes. The Americans celebrate George Washington's birthday; the British celebrate their monarchs and the Russians once had a holiday to honour Lenin. Is it because we feel there is no one worthy of our recognition? I say not.

Some have asked me why in my bill I have chosen the second Monday in February as a day on which to honour our former Prime Minister. Originally I had hoped to select a day of significance to the life of Lester Pearson. I considered April 23, his birthday, but of course Easter is in April. Then I thought of October 14, the day it was announced that Pearson had won the Nobel peace prize, but Thanksgiving is too close. Then I considered December 27, the day of his death, which falls extremely close to Christmas and Boxing Day.

I opted for February, the one month of the year that Canadians do not get a break and the month that most Canadians find to be the coldest and most depressing month of the year. A few years ago some statistics indicated that a majority of suicides take place in February, leading me to believe that Canadians really need something to look forward to in the second month of the year.

I also opted for February because I felt that having two or more holidays in April, October or December might pose an excessive burden on those Canadians that operate businesses.

I have also been asked by some members whether this bill is political in nature because Pearson was a Liberal. I want to assure all members that politics was not behind this initiative. This man was a great Canadian. As stated earlier, he is the only Nobel peace prize winner from Canada. He is the father of international peacekeeping. I simply want to honour a man who

has given so much to the people of this nation. I want to pay homage to a great Canadian and his political stripe has nothing to do with it.

At this stage in our history when many Canadians are asking themselves what it truly means to be a Canadian and some are even asking whether they should continue to remain in Canada, we must make every effort to show our citizens there are Canadians of whom they can be proud, Canadians who have made a difference to their lives today and to the lives of many people around the world.

Lester Pearson is such a Canadian. By enacting a national holiday to honour the Right Hon. Lester Pearson, we would be providing Canadians with a day to reflect on this great country of ours and on this great man and his valuable contribution to our nation. Let us bring a little bit of nationalism and pride to Canada that it truly Canadian in nature. Let us honour one of our own heroes for a change.

I will wrap up here because two of my colleagues who were privileged to know and work with Lester Pearson are anxious to share their experience and thoughts on this great man.

(1345)

In closing, I would urge all members to support this initiative.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalfond-Guiral (Laval-Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of the Bloc Québécois to support Bill C-276, An Act respecting Lester B. Pearson Day. This is a perfect opportunity to take a look at the life and career of an illustrious man, who was Prime Minister of Canada from 1963 to 1968, and who made a remarkable contribution to Canadian diplomacy.

After a brief military career, Mr. Pearson joined the diplomatic circuit. It is there that, from 1935 to 1946, he developed his exceptional skills in foreign policy and gained a solid reputation at the international level. After being Deputy Minister in 1946, and then Minister of External Affairs in 1948, Lester B. Pearson was well prepared to face the new challenges which awaited Canada in the post-war era.

As the architect of the new Canadian foreign policy, he helped our country gain full status at the international level. The long tradition of Canada as a passive observer on the international scene was over. After the Second World War, our country had become a middle power. Pearson understood more than anyone else that Canada had to adopt a distinct and more independent foreign policy with its traditional partners, Great Britain and the United States.

### *Private Members' Business*

Consequently, he opened the door to multilateralism and imposed an expansionist vision of Canadian foreign policy. This resulted in Canada joining and actively participating in new international organizations such as the UN. For a peace proposal like Pearson, Canada's involvement in such an organization was crucial for his foreign policy.

However, there were limits to what the United Nations could do. Taking into consideration the Cold War and the fact that no international authority could ensure order and stability on a world-wide basis, Pearson, then deputy minister of External Affairs, believed that Canada needed to join forces with its strategic allies under a collective defence pact. Pearson thought that, by signing the North Atlantic Treaty, Canada's security needs were being met, but also that NATO would become a deterrent and a defence instrument against Soviet imperialism.

Guided by an international vision quite rare in North America at that time and having taken stock of the events in Prague in 1948, Mr. Pearson unreservedly supported the creation of this organization in 1949. However, the North Atlantic Treaty remains a regional agreement. Since 1945, international relations have been marked by new forms of violence. All of the ideological confrontations between the super-powers and the decolonization process, led to many conflicts throughout the world.

Obviously, the Charter of the United Nations cannot prevent war, since the veto of the five superpowers sitting on the Security Council limits the scope of the activities of the international community. To counter the powerlessness of the only agency of the United Nations authorized to use coercion to settle international conflicts, the General Assembly passed a resolution concerning peacekeeping in 1950.

In 1956, during the Suez Canal crisis, Mr. Pearson proposed that a peacekeeping force be set up. The UN having implemented his recommendation, Pearson was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957. In fact, he had provided the United Nations with a new response capability. As a result of his international reputation, Lester B. Pearson was twice approached to fill the prestige position of Secretary General of the United Nations. In 1952, he had been president of the UN General Assembly, playing a pivotal role in the creation of specialized agencies like the UN Food and Agriculture Organization.

(1350)

During his term as Prime Minister, when decolonization and the emerging non-aligned movement were important elements on the international scene, Pearson became known as an eminent artisan of the North-South dialogue. He was in favour of an open policy vis-à-vis the Third World and enjoyed a privileged relationship with leaders like Nehru.

*Private Members' Business*

His vision of Canada and the federal system would reflect the same open attitude. Pearson was on very good terms with Quebec and the other provinces during his first mandate.

It was the time of the Quiet Revolution, as the Quebec nation State was emerging. Political leaders in Quebec were developing the tools the new State would need to affirm its right to exist. Quebec was to recover jurisdictions recognized in the Constitution Act, 1867, but never claimed by Canada's provinces.

At the time, Pearson agreed that Quebec was justified in its insistence on some of these rights, and until 1965, he was on excellent terms with his Quebec counterparts, so that negotiations with the province were relatively harmonious.

Pearson was in favour of co-operative federalism and, to show that he meant what he said, after he won the election in 1963, he appointed the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission on Official Languages. Under his government, federal-provincial negotiations led to a number of administrative agreements and also, although there were some problems, to the creation of the Quebec Pension Plan and the Caisse de dépôt et de placement.

It is hard to understand the complete reversal in Mr. Pearson's attitude to Quebec during his second term. He went so far as to deny Quebec's international personality and to see the province's attempts to create ties with other nations as those of a rebellious province intent on usurping powers that he felt were exclusive to the federal government.

It is amazing that this passionate defender of decolonization throughout the world was so unwilling to entertain Quebec's aspirations. What made him suddenly become impervious to the legitimate demands of a province that wanted to claim the jurisdictions to which it was entitled? Some attribute this to the rise of the indépendantiste movement in Quebec or to new constitutional demands being made by Quebec leaders. At the time, it was Daniel Johnson, with his "Égalité ou indépendance". Some say it was due to the increasing influence of Trudeau, Marchand and other members of his cabinet.

After Lester B. Pearson, Canada-Quebec relations were never again as harmonious as they were before. After the Victoria fiasco, the night of the long knives in 1982 was to lead to Meech and Charlottetown. Despite some shadow areas, Lester B. Pearson was a man of great stature, that is how Canadians and Quebecers remember him. However, it is unfortunate that his successors either failed or refused to continue his tradition of openness and his conciliatory approach.

We can only hope that Lester B. Pearson Day will remind men and women in Quebec and Canada that openness and respect for diversity are qualities that are essential to the individual and the national maturity.

[English]

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure today to second the motion of the hon. member for Cambridge as he brings in his Lester B. Pearson day bill. I congratulate him and compliment him to the nth degree on his recognition of Canadian statesmanship. This is the hon. member's first term in this Parliament and this bill is a good example of his national and international vision. I am sure that he will have a long stay in this place.

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

(1355)

**Mr. Hopkins:** He has a national spirit that he is projecting today in this bill. He has stated he is proud of Lester Bowles Pearson.

I compliment the hon. member for Laval Centre for some of her remarks. Some of them I would not agree with. Everyone has their own perspective. As I speak I am not going to be partisan in this debate either. Lester B. Pearson was Prime Minister sitting just down here when I was first elected. He was my first Prime Minister. He did not have a mean bone in his body. One could fully understand sitting in this House with the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson that he was a diplomat from day one.

Indeed, that caused him some of his heartaches during the time he was Prime Minister. He was too kind to some people who were not very kind to him.

Having known Mr. Pearson on a very personal first name basis, I had great respect for him. I was one of those first elected in 1965, that great election that Walter Gordon persuaded Lester B. Pearson to call. The only benefit the Liberal Party received from that election was the 53 of us who were new to the House of Commons. When the election was called at the advice of Walter Gordon to the Prime Minister, the Liberal government in this House had 129 seats and when the final count was in on election night the Liberal Party had 131 seats. Walter Gordon had promised Pearson a majority government. He resigned from the cabinet because he had given the Prime Minister bad advice.

When we look at the background of Mr. Pearson's life he had a very happy childhood. One thing that really strikes me, as the hon. member for Cambridge mentioned, was Mr. Pearson's experience in World War I. Can you imagine what the Royal Flying Corps in Europe looked like in World War I? Mr. Pearson was a member of that flying corps for three years.

This undoubtedly was a great experience for Prime Minister Pearson. It prepared him for the great flag debate of the 1960s which to him at times must have reminded him of World War I but he persevered through that battle.

*Private Members' Business*

It is rather interesting that the hon. member for Cambridge suggests that Lester B. Pearson day should be the second Monday in February because it was in the month of February that the Canadian flag was first unfurled, I believe, on Parliament Hill. It is very fitting that Lester B. Pearson who led the debate for a new Canadian flag should be honoured in the same month as the Canadian flag is honoured today.

This rather timid man had many accomplishments. When you first met him he was very pleasant and accommodating. He would always talk to you about things in your riding. It gave you that feeling that this man really knows his country and his local geography.

I remember the last time I had a chance to have a chat with Mike Pearson. It was one day after he retired. He was ill at the time. He was out for a walk. I met him at the flame on Parliament Hill. His first words to me were: "Well, Len, how are things in Pembroke today?". We had a nice chat there. Then he went into hospital. It was not long after that that he passed away. Here is a Canadian who gave Canada its flag. Today our Canadian forces honour his name in the way they carry the Canadian flag around the world and when they take part in peacekeeping duties which as has already been stated he originated in settling the Suez crisis and the peacekeeping mission of 1956.

(1400)

Here was a man with immense ideas. This man when he was in external affairs had a national, indeed an international vision. He looked at the Soviet Union and saw the threat sitting in the east. He saw the threat when the Warsaw pact was formed. He saw the need for a North Atlantic Treaty Organization. To a large extent he was a formative builder of that great peace organization that saw the western world through the cold war crisis. It was the match for the Warsaw pact. It held the enemy at bay. It was a matter of which side went broke first. It turned out to be the Soviet Union and the Warsaw pact.

He was president of the United Nations in 1962-63. I was looking up the date of Mr. Pearson's first formal election to this House. He was appointed Minister for External Affairs in 1948. Is it not ironic that on October 25, 1948, Lester B. Pearson became the member of Parliament for Algoma East and came to Ottawa and carried on his duties as Minister for External Affairs. He won that election by 1,200 and some votes.

The hon. member for Cambridge mentioned the lack of Canadians' enthusiasm and desire to recognize their own national figures. Here was a national figure, a man who had played a major role in the founding of the United Nations. This was a man who had played a role in the founding of the NATO alliance. He came back home and ran for election and won the election by 1,200 and some votes.

Then we go on to the election campaign of 1958. I particularly like to look back on that election for one reason alone. That is that the last political meeting Mr. Pearson had in that famous campaign of 1958 when he was slaughtered politically by the Diefenbaker forces was held in the town of Deep River in my initial riding of Renfrew North. It was before an audience in the high school auditorium. He sat on a table in the middle of a platform dangling his feet and answering questions like they were rolling off a log. He knew he was going to lose the election, but he was so candid and at ease. He came back to Ottawa and ended up with 48 seats in this House for the Liberal Party of Canada.

In 1963 he finally won the election as Prime Minister. There were all kinds of issues to be faced during the 1960s. It is much like today when every time we turn around there is a new issue facing members of Parliament. Lester B. Pearson took on many of those challenges.

He realized that Quebec no longer wanted to live under British symbols. That was very clear in his mind. That was the reason he put forward such a fight for the Canadian flag. The Quebec caucus strongly supported him on that issue all the way through even when the going got very difficult. Today Canada is known around the world by that great Canadian symbol that first flew over Parliament Hill in February 1965. That was one of his ideas of Canadian unity, but he reached out to all regions of Canada to try to bring them together.

(1405)

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could continue. You are giving me the signal that my time is up.

I would like to talk about being with Mr. Pearson in caucus without giving away any major caucus secrets. I remember one morning I was delivering a speech in caucus. I came into—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the member to have one or two more minutes?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Hopkins:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the members of this House.

On a Wednesday morning in caucus I delivered what I thought was a great dynamic speech. After that I was sitting in the House right over there in the back row where the hon. member for Brandon—Souris is sitting right now. A note was sent to me across the floor from the opposition. That note from a member of the opposition contained the exact words I had stated in caucus that morning.

I sent the note down to the Prime Minister and the Hon. Mitchell Sharp who were sitting together. They turned to me and shook their heads because the first thing that came into their minds was that members of our caucus were leaking information. Actually that was the period when the Liberal caucus room

*Private Members' Business*

was wired and certain members of the opposition were listening to every word that was being said in the Liberal caucus room. They sure had my speech right.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for allowing me that extra time. I thank the hon. member for Cambridge for recognizing a tremendous individual. One of the reasons that made him great was that he had some great people around him.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot give you any personal descriptions of Mr. Pearson, but I too welcome the opportunity of speaking to Bill C-276 concerning Mr. Lester B. Pearson day.

Certainly to establish this as a holiday in honour of former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson is something to be considered, but today I want to raise some of the other considerations that we must have when we talk about such a day. As well, I do hope to pay some tribute to the former Prime Minister because it certainly is worthy.

It is clear from the member's speech that he holds the former Prime Minister in very high regard. I would never fault him for this since Lester Pearson did indeed leave the country a considerable legacy. I will talk about this a little later on in my speech and emphasize the things I remember him for.

To my mind politicians such as Mr. Pearson entered the public service for many reasons. At least two of those would be to help Canada grow and mature as a nation and because they were fascinated by the public life and all it had to offer and what they could offer it.

I do not believe when he ran for the job that Mr. Pearson would have expected to have a Canadian holiday named after him. After doing some research on him I think possibly he might have been somewhat embarrassed by such an offer. There are a number of better ways to honour the memory of a former Prime Minister.

For example everyone who tours around the Parliament Buildings will have noticed the dignified statues of our former Prime Ministers prominently displayed on the grounds of the Hill. Mr. Pearson's statue is among them and Canadians visiting the capital will see him in his favourite chair overlooking the front lawn.

(1410)

As a former Minister of External Affairs and Prime Minister I am sure Mr. Pearson would also be proud that the building which houses the Department of Foreign Affairs bears his name, the Lester B. Pearson building.

These types of displays and other similar ones that may be proposed are quite appropriate and do a very nice job of honouring the achievements and memory of Mr. Pearson. I believe they are also a sufficient tribute.

On the other hand a Canadian holiday in honour of Lester Pearson is excessive no matter how well intentioned and sincere my esteemed colleague from Cambridge may be. As I quickly

ran through the holidays in my head I found that only Jesus Christ and Queen Victoria had a statutory holiday and only two saints, St. Patrick and St. Valentine, had named holidays.

Coincidentally the second Monday of February which my colleague would like to be known as Lester B. Pearson day would have fallen on St. Valentine's day this year. Not only would I suggest naming a national holiday after a politician would be excessive but the date suggested will frequently fall on another holiday, albeit not a government holiday.

It is my understanding that the member for Cambridge would like to see a statutory holiday for Mr. Pearson just like the other two we have mentioned. If this happened, then what would be next? Would the third Monday of February be Diefenbaker day and the following Monday be Laurier day or John A. Macdonald day? If we start going down this path then we will have a holiday for every week of the year. We would not have a Mulroney day and we would probably at least all agree on that.

Above and beyond the principle of naming holidays after politicians there is the cost which should be considered. How much does a Canadian holiday really cost? If it is only a government holiday then the cost would be in the millions but if all Canadians were to take a day off work, what would that mean?

Not really knowing how such a calculation might be done, someone suggested to me that maybe I should take Canada's gross domestic product and divide it by 365 days. I admit this is a fairly primitive way of making the calculation but it is certainly more conservative than using the GNP numbers. If we divide the GDP by 365 we come up with a figure of \$1.95 billion. I know that number might be exaggerated but I think the point we have to make is that the Canadian economy just cannot afford that sort of expense.

In addition, for businesses such as restaurants, corner stores and others which would stay open, such a holiday would force them to pay additional wages to their staff. For businesses struggling to survive the last thing they need is an unnecessary added expense.

While I do not agree with the idea that there should be a Canadian holiday for Mr. Pearson, this is not to suggest I do not think his achievements are praiseworthy. Any one person who could be ambassador to the United States, deputy minister of External Affairs, Minister of External Affairs, president of the UN General Assembly, Prime Minister and winner of the Nobel peace prize is obviously someone who has made a tremendous contribution to Canada and to the world.

While I have this opportunity to speak I would briefly like to discuss Mr. Pearson's Nobel peace prize. As we all know in order to bring an end to the Suez crisis in 1956 Mr. Pearson developed the idea of the UN peacekeeping force which could intervene and keep combatants separated. Of course it worked in the case of Suez and has been used ever since as a useful tool of international diplomacy and conflict resolution.

*Private Members' Business*

As Reform's foreign affairs critic I cannot help but reflect on this transition which peacekeeping has undergone since Mr. Pearson's days. Under the original formulation peacekeepers would only enter a country once there was a ceasefire agreement in place. They would then monitor this agreement and make sure that no flare ups occurred. In principle while the combatants were separated this would provide a window of opportunity for negotiations to bring about a lasting peaceful solution to hostilities.

Since the first peacekeeping missions, Canada has contributed troops all over the world and at every opportunity. However the requests for our help have continued to increase by the year and our resources are now stretched to the limit. I mean this in two senses. The personnel of the Canadian forces are stretched and our financial resources are limited.

Not only has our participation in peacekeeping become more of a burden, but the nature of peacekeeping has changed. Today our peacekeepers are going into more dangerous situations, often without the benefit of ceasefire and much more uncertain mandates.

(1415)

Therefore, I was pleased to participate in the Canadian foreign policy review during which we discussed the peacekeeping legacy of Mr. Pearson in quite a bit of detail. It was decided during this review and with the input of Canadians from coast to coast that our peacekeeping tradition, begun by Mr. Pearson, was still a very important expression of Canadian foreign policy and that we would like to see the armed forces restructured in such a way that they can optimize their participation in future UN interventions.

Nonetheless, it was also realized that Canada can no longer be the 911 phone number for the world. In the future Canada must be more selective about the peacekeeping missions it goes on. I would like to personally ask this Parliament for the opportunity to debate the question of what specific criteria Canada should use to determine which peacekeeping missions will be the most appropriate for our participation.

I would like to see Mr. Pearson's legacy continue and I would like Parliament to deal with this whole issue in a way that will allow Canada to continue its role as an international peacekeeper into the next century.

In conclusion, there is no doubt the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson made a very important contribution to the development of this country, and for that he does deserve honour, but this must be done in an appropriate way. While a holiday is too expensive for the Canadian economy and would set a dangerous precedent for opening the floodgates to more holidays for other

political leaders from our past, I have no objection to the other tributes which already exist to honour Mr. Lester.

I commend the member for Cambridge for his loyalty and for bringing this bill forward. I was pleased to speak on it today.

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to support the bill of my colleague, the hon. member for Cambridge.

I come at it in quite a different way. The reason I appreciate so much that he has brought this issue forward is that I believe he is quite right that we so often fail as Canadians to recognize our heroes. We have many heroes; heroes of literature, heroes of history, heroes in Quebec, heroes in the west. We do not recognize them enough. Sometimes I believe that one of the reasons why we have problems as a country is because we do not have a strong enough sense of self.

When it comes to Mr. Pearson as a person who would be appropriate to be celebrated on a particular day, I do not believe the member is suggesting a statutory holiday but he is suggesting a name day, a recognition day. When it comes to Mr. Pearson, the politician, I find myself inclining toward the views of my colleague in the Reform Party, although from a different way. This is the reason.

In another life I am a little bit of an historian and I am familiar with other aspects of Mr. Pearson's life. I can tell the hon. member for Cambridge that one of the problems with politicians, and particularly leaders, is that history tells more about them as the years go by than we might know or appreciate at the time. In the case of Mr. Pearson, documents that are now becoming available, as they are in Britain regarding Churchill, are revealing that Mr. Pearson was very much involved in the intelligence world in co-operation with the United States and Britain, and that Mr. Pearson was very, very conscious of the threat of communism. That was mentioned. Mr. Pearson was actually a bit of a hawk rather than a dove when it came to the Soviet Union.

As he was talked into a very close relationship with the Americans at the intelligence level, during the Suez crisis, as the hon. member will remember, it was a situation where the British and the French had attacked the Sinai and the Americans were opposed to it. The Americans and Canadians were opposed to it.

What happened there, as we now know from documents, was that the British and the French were reading Egyptian ciphers, codes and ciphers. The Americans and Canadians were reading the codes and ciphers of all the other Arab nations. When it came to sending the forces into the Middle East, Mr. Pearson by benefit of the Americans had the advantage of terrific intelligence. He was not at risk of losing lives or making a bad decision.

*Private Members' Business*

(1420)

Furthermore, there is evidence today that Mr. Pearson's initiative in the Middle East in solving the Suez crisis with UN peacekeeping forces was an initiative that was worked out with the Americans. He got the Nobel Prize for it, but I think as the years go by we will see a little more about what actually happened there.

This is not to take away from Mr. Pearson in any way, manner or form because, as the hon. member for Laval Centre so eloquently said, Mr. Pearson contributed marvellously to this country, not only in terms of foreign policy but in terms of opening up this this government to francophones from Quebec.

Prior to the second world war there was not anything like that accessibility from Quebec. Mr. Pearson recognized that Quebec was moving forward after the second world war. Mr. Pearson tried to join with that.

That is a problem. When it comes to naming politicians, as my Reform party colleague was saying, it is a little delicate when we set aside days to commemorate them. Something might come up in the future that would give us second thoughts about it or we might decide that it is not that appropriate. When we look down, I will agree with the member for Cambridge that I could not think of another statesman or politician in this country who would be more suitable or almost.

Certainly if we look down the roll of Prime Ministers, only Mr. Pearson has the stature that would qualify for the type of recognition the member proposes. Oddly enough, I would make one exception. In speaking from the heart, from my experience of life in this country in the last 30 years, I would make one exception of a leader in this country who showed he had a heart that went beyond politics, having his country at heart and a real sense of the country. The member for Laval Centre will just love this. It was René Levesque. Mr. Levesque was a man who spoke for not just the people of Quebec. He spoke for all Canadians with what he brought to the fore. At least in my mind he gave me in that entire debate, now quite a few years ago, a sense of what being a Canadian really was.

I want members to know, members of the Bloc Québécois particularly, that René Levesque, who I saw in action, was an incredibly human man, so easy to relate to, not a person like Trudeau who tended to be arrogant, or a person like Mr. Turner who tended to be inaccessible. I always felt he was a man of the people. That was the warmth. He brought us forward as a nation, not just Quebec, but as a nation at large.

I do not feel the same way about Jacques Parizeau. I feel very strongly that what Mr. Levesque created in raising the sense of Canadian identity was largely destroyed by a subsequent Prime Minister who led us into a fruitless debate and brought us to

where we are now. I am very confident, on the other hand, that we will remember the spirit of Mr. Levesque and that will come out of the debate now on the subject of separatism. We will come to be a much stronger country. I am very convinced of that.

Obviously we are not going to have a day recognizing Mr. Levesque in the near future.

This is a delicate thing I would say to the hon. member for Cambridge. When one raises the issue of a recognition day for prominent politicians it does risk running aground on the rock of politics of the day. I would suggest to the hon. member that maybe we should look for another sort of hero. There is no doubt that as Canadians we constantly overlook our heroes.

I would like to suggest to him there is a heroine we constantly overlook as Canadians, whereas the whole world recognizes this particular person. I speak of Anne of Green Gables. Do we realize in this House that a fictional heroine—

**Mrs. Gaffney:** What about Lucy Maud Montgomery?

**Mr. Bryden:** No, I know who wrote *Anne of Green Gables*, but I do not think Lucy Maud Montgomery day would have the same shall we say caché as Anne of Green Gables. I point out that while in Japan they have *Anne of Green Gables* on their school programs, nowhere in Canada have I ever heard of a school or university teaching it. Yet this book, published in 1908, has run through more copies and more languages than just about any book of fiction in the world. It is known worldwide.

(1425)

My colleagues from Prince Edward Island tell me that approximately 700,000 tourists come to the Island every year and about 40,000 of those are Japanese. They come to see the farm where Lucy Maud Montgomery, the author of *Anne of Green Gables*, lived and to see the house that was described in the novels.

I suggest we avoid falling into difficult political traps when we want to recognize a fine Canadian who is recognized worldwide. Perhaps we should look to the young lady of *The Lake of Shining Waters*. It is appropriate that we as Canadians recognize a person who is recognized in the world's imagination.

**Mr. Peric:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wish to seek unanimous consent to have the bill withdrawn and have the subject matter referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It has been moved:

That the bill be not now read the second time but that bill be withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

*Private Members' Business*

**The Deputy Speaker:** There are two minutes left in the debate.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are but two or three minutes left.

I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Cambridge.

[*Translation*]

A few years ago, I introduced in this House a motion to have a statue of the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson erected on Parliament Hill. I had the privilege of choosing the spot where the memorial to this great Canadian would stand.

I wanted to take a few minutes to tell the House how much I like and support the motion in front of the House today. I would also like to tell Canadian men and women that, like many of them, I consider Lester B. Pearson to be the greatest Prime Minister this country ever had, even though some might not think so.

I always appreciated his sense of humility. If he were here today, he would probably blush and he would certainly be embarrassed by such a motion, he who never accepted that something be named after him or that a statue be erected in his

honour. His grave, in the Ottawa area—in Quebec, in fact, as several members opposite know—is very simple. That is the way he lived.

His humility might be reason why we now see him as a great statesman. This is also the reason why the hon. member for Cambridge wanted to recognize Lester B. Pearson.

I agree with his statement. I would have liked Parliament to send this document to a parliamentary committee for further review. Anyway, I will use the few seconds I have left to congratulate the member for Cambridge for recognizing in Lester B. Pearson a great Canadian political figure, a statesman, the father of the flag which stands besides your chair, Mr. Speaker, and the originator of Canadian diplomacy. I want to join the member in telling Canadians how important it is to take steps to honour great Canadians such as Lester B. Pearson.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Colleagues, the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being 2.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Friday, November 18, 1994

---

## Privilege

<b>Special Joint Committee Reviewing Canada's Foreign Policy—Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Speaker .....	7971

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Social Security Program

Consideration resumed of motion .....	7972
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	7972
Mr. Strahl .....	7974
Mr. Keyes .....	7974
Mr. Caron .....	7975
Mr. Strahl .....	7976
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7977

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Tripartite Air Study

Mr. Keyes .....	7979
-----------------	------

### Eastern Quebec Development Plan

Mr. Canuel .....	7979
------------------	------

### Lighthouses

Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	7979
--------------------------	------

### Diabetes Awareness Month

Mr. Peric .....	7979
-----------------	------

### Endangered Species

Mr. Finlay .....	7980
------------------	------

**Justice**

Mrs. Gaffney ..... 7980

**Mouvement Desjardins**

Mr. Caron ..... 7980

**National Child Day**

Mr. Hart ..... 7980

**Government Funding**

Mr. Bryden ..... 7980

**National Child Day**

Mr. Harb ..... 7981

**Hugh O’Neil**

Mr. Vanclief ..... 7981

**Canadian Ambassador to the United States**

Mr. Laurin ..... 7981

**National Child Day**

Mrs. Jennings ..... 7981

**Louis Riel**

Mr. Taylor ..... 7982

**Jack Miner**

Mr. Pickard ..... 7982

**Marine Atlantic**

Mr. Simmons ..... 7982

**Education**

Mr. Hanrahan ..... 7982

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean

Mr. Duceppe .....	7983
Mr. Collenette .....	7983
Mr. Duceppe .....	7983
Mr. Collenette .....	7983
Mr. Duceppe .....	7983
Mr. Collenette .....	7983

### National Defence

Mr. Bellehumeur .....	7984
Mr. Collenette .....	7984
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	7984
Mr. Collenette .....	7984

### Justice

Mr. Hermanson .....	7984
Mr. MacLellan .....	7984
Mr. Hermanson .....	7984
Mr. MacLellan .....	7984
Mr. Hermanson .....	7985
Mr. MacLellan .....	7985

### National Defence

Mr. Pomerleau .....	7985
Mr. Collenette .....	7985
Mr. Pomerleau .....	7985
Mr. Collenette .....	7985

### Dangerous offenders

Ms. Meredith .....	7985
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	7986
Ms. Meredith .....	7986
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	7986

## **National Defence**

Mr. Dumas .....	7986
Mr. Collenette .....	7986
Mr. Dumas .....	7986
Mr. Collenette .....	7986

## **Agriculture**

Mr. Kerpan .....	7986
Mr. Goodale .....	7986
Mr. Kerpan .....	7987
Mr. Goodale .....	7987

## **Air Transportation**

Mr. St-Laurent .....	7987
Mr. Young .....	7987
Mr. St-Laurent .....	7987
Mr. Young .....	7987

## **Highway 416**

Mr. Jordan .....	7988
Mr. Eggleton .....	7988

## **Canadian Wheat Board**

Mr. Hoepfner .....	7988
Mr. Goodale .....	7988
Mr. Hoepfner .....	7988
Mr. Goodale .....	7988

## **Air Safety**

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	7988
Mr. Young .....	7989
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	7989
Mr. Young .....	7989

## **Agriculture**

Mr. Benoit .....	7989
------------------	------

Mr. Goodale .....	7989
Mr. Benoit .....	7989
Mr. Goodale .....	7989

**Canadian National**

Mr. Hopkins .....	7989
Mr. Young .....	7990

**Quebec City Bridge**

Mr. Dubé .....	7990
Mr. Young .....	7990

**Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Gouk .....	7990
Mr. Young .....	7990

**Grain Transportation**

Mr. Taylor .....	7990
Mr. Goodale .....	7990

**Trade**

Mr. Berger .....	7991
Mr. Harb .....	7991

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Committees of the House**

**Health**

Ms. Marleau .....	7991
-------------------	------

**Natural Resources**

Ms. McLellan .....	7991
--------------------	------

**Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken .....	7991
--------------------	------

## **Committees of the House**

### **Foreign Affairs and International Trade**

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) ..... 7991

### **Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

Mr. Kirkby ..... 7991

## **Petitions**

### **Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Hopkins ..... 7991

### **Gun Control**

Mr. Bodnar ..... 7992

### **Mining**

Mr. Bodnar ..... 7992

### **Gun Control**

Mr. Grubel ..... 7992

Mrs. Jennings ..... 7992

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Gouk ..... 7992

### **Assisted suicide**

Mr. Gouk ..... 7992

### **Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Gouk ..... 7992

### **Bill C-206**

Mr. Gouk ..... 7992

### **Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Morrison ..... 7992

### **Bill C-256**

Mrs. Gaffney ..... 7992

**Young Offenders Act**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7992

**Parole**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7993

**Capital Punishment**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7993

**Human Rights**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7993

**Euthanasia**

Mr. Hanger ..... 7993

**Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 7993

**Human Rights**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 7993

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. DeVillers ..... 7993

**Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. DeVillers ..... 7993

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 7993

**Petitions**

**Universality of Tax Credit**

Mr. Bergeron ..... 7994

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Social Security Program**

Consideration resumed of motion ..... 7995

Mrs. Gaffney .....	7995
Mr. Canuel .....	7997
Mr. Ringma .....	7998
Mr. Bodnar .....	8000
Mr. Pomerleau .....	8001
Mr. Bryden .....	8002
Mr. Culbert .....	8003
Mr. Finlay .....	8004
Mr. Bryden .....	8004

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **Lester B. Pearson Act**

Bill C-276. Motion for second reading .....	8005
Mr. Peric .....	8005
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	8007
Mr. Hopkins .....	8008
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	8010
Mr. Bryden .....	8011
Mr. Boudria .....	8013