



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 184

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, April 5, 1995**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Bard of Avon, William Shakespeare, whose birthday we commemorate on April 23.

A weekend of special events including a silent auction, a cake decorating contest and a gala birthday dinner will take place in my riding to mark this occasion. The Lakeside Seniors, and Hamlet School which is putting on a play, and many hundreds of people are involved in this celebration. I congratulate everyone who is involved in this, particularly Ted Blowes and Debra Huggins.

On the heels of this celebration, the Stratford Festival is opening its 43rd season which will take place on May 29. I encourage all members of the House and all Canadians to attend the productions this summer. I am confident it will be a theatrical experience to cherish.

Members of volunteer organizations are the very heart and support of this Shakespearian festival. This year the festival will be missing one of the western world's leading classical actors with the death of Mr. Nicholas Pennell. He will be missed this summer.

I wish the festival every success in the upcoming season as the Stratford adventure continues. I have put a playbill on each member's desk today.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### LABOUR RELATIONS

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Ogilvie Mills workers have, once again, demanded that the Minister of Labour table an antiscab bill aimed at businesses

under federal jurisdiction. The minister responded like her predecessor, saying simply that she was reviewing the matter.

The government has been studying the issue for nearly a year and a half and the only reason for this delay is a total lack of political will. The federal government is quite familiar with the type of provisions already in effect in Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia.

The Bloc Quebecois, for its part, recently tabled in this House a bill which would provide adequate protection for the workers currently hurt by their employers' disloyal practices. The minister is quick to trample workers' rights, as she did in the rail labour dispute, but she is unacceptably slow in responding to their legitimate demands.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, half a century ago North America's first medicare plan, Saskatchewan Health Region Number 1, was established in what is now my riding.

It was an experiment, a prototype and it was a Godsend. It worked well and it cost little. This was partly because people accustomed to doing without medical care did not abuse or over use it and partly because it was run mostly at the local level by country doctors and municipal reeves.

Unfortunately, the lessons of the experiment were quickly forgotten. A great system was eventually suffocated by the cold dead hands of political and federal bureaucracy.

The Liberals say there is nothing wrong with our health care but Canadians know better. They know about the waiting lists and the lack of accessibility.

It is time to be bold, as our Saskatchewan predecessors were, and using common sense rather than grand schemes, revise the Canada Health Act to allow the provinces to bring health care back to health.

\* \* \*

### PARTRIDGE ISLAND

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Transport Canada has declared surplus the land holdings on Partridge Island and Public Works Canada plans to dispose of the island.

*S. O. 31*

Partridge Island, a small island in the middle of Saint John harbour, is a piece of Canadian heritage. It was used as a quarantine station and welcomed over three million immigrants and mariners between 1785 and 1942. Two thousand quarantined immigrants died on the island and their graves are located there. Partridge Island was designated a national historic site in 1974.

The year 1997 marks the official observance of the 150th anniversary of the great Irish famine. Saint John's Irish community will be marking the next three years on the island with special exhibits as well as an Irish homecoming and memorial service in 1997.

I, as well as the people of the most Irish city in Canada, Saint John, and the province of New Brunswick, call on this government to revisit the decision to sell this national historic site of Partridge Island. We ask that it be transferred to the Department of Canadian Heritage for preservation.

\* \* \*

**GRAND RIVER HOSPITAL**

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House of the birth in my community of the Grand River Hospital on April 1, 1995. This dynamic new beginning in health care in the Waterloo region came together with the amalgamation of the Kitchener-Waterloo hospital and the Freeport hospital. The Kitchener-Waterloo hospital and the Freeport hospital represent 175 years of caring with their unique strengths and proud history of service.

The new Grand River Hospital will be governed by one board of trustees and managed on two sites by one administration. It will continue to provide the high standard of quality, innovation and accomplishment to the residents of Waterloo region. What is unique about this event is that it was initiated by two former hospitals with the aim of delivering the best possible quality of service and maximizing existing resources.

The people comprising the leadership of the two former hospitals are to be commended for their vision in pioneering this union under the aegis of the Grand River Hospital. Their efforts are to be applauded by all Canadians.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT MINISTERS**

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the people of Guelph—Wellington know that leadership requires risk taking and real leaders do not back down from doing what is right. That is why they are proud of our Prime Minister, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister of Labour.

These leaders have acted and succeeded where many others would have failed. One has worked hard to make the world

aware of the impact of overfishing. The other, knowing how the country was suffering, put an end to the rail strike.

These ministers could have listened to the usual negative remarks of the Reform Party and the destructive policies of the Bloc. Instead, they took risks and did what was best for Canada, because what they did was right.

We are fortunate they are our leaders who are not afraid to act. We thank them for standing strong.

\* \* \*

(1405)

[Translation]

**INTERNATIONAL HAEMOPHILIA DAY**

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, April 17 is International Haemophilia Day, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Canadian Haemophilia Society for its excellent work.

[English]

The Canadian Hemophilia Society was founded in 1953 by people with hemophilia as a self-help group. Today the range of people it helps and the ways in which the help is offered have broadened considerably.

In the 1980s about 40 per cent of hemophiliacs and 1,200 other Canadians became infected with HIV through contaminated blood. The primary goal of the Canadian Hemophilia Society is to ensure safe access to the Canadian blood supply.

[Translation]

Much progress has been made. Today, thanks to greater awareness and technical developments, the risks of contamination through blood transfusions are almost nonexistent.

[English]

We can all help too by donating blood, time, or money. After all, we are all related by blood.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BURUNDI**

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, referring to the current tensions in Burundi, I asked the Minister of Foreign Affairs whether he recognized that concrete action was urgently needed, by supporting the deployment of a monitoring force in that country among other things, as the Burundian ambassador to Canada requested on March 23 before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In response, all the minister said was that no request had been received from the Government of Burundi along the lines of the moving plea made by the Burundian ambassador. The minister should know that the Government of Burundi has no leeway.

S. O. 31

This response from the minister confirmed our worst fears. This government is turning a blind eye to the tragedy waiting to happen in Burundi. The optimist front put up by the minister, who talks about an illusive will to reconcile, brings back sad memories of the tragedy in Rwanda, where the international community was confronted with a crisis it was unable to prevent.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, April marks the beginning of spring, a time for new growth and a time of hope. It is particularly fitting that April is Canadian Cancer Society month.

The society works diligently to find a cure for cancer, to open the pathways of discovery and to change the lives of Canadians. Thousands upon thousands of Canadians benefit every year from the research the Canadian Cancer Society performs.

Since 1948 the society's fundraising month of April has brought Canadians together to contribute to the fight against cancer. Last year more than \$44.2 million was raised during the campaign. This year's goal is \$47.6 million.

I ask that my colleagues in the House join with me in supporting this society for even one of our own members in this House, the hon. member for Nepean, is now recovering from this scourge.

With the work of the Canadian Cancer Society and the will of the Canadian people, cancer will be beaten.

\* \* \*

#### INTEREST RATES

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal interest rate policy is killing the hopes and dreams of Canadians to own their own homes. As well it is severely hurting our Canadian economic recovery.

Since the Liberal government jammed the interest rates upward last fall, the result has been that the last half of 1994 was the most brutal on record for house sales. The high unpredictable interest rate policy is also forcing residential construction into a nosedive which is costing thousands of jobs.

This Liberal government has not learned its lesson from the last time it was in office when its high interest rate policy caused the 1980 recession.

I am telling the Liberal government to listen. High interest rates mean fewer home sales, less consumer spending, smaller economic growth and fewer jobs. The Liberal high interest rates are wiping out any chance Canada has of seeing an economic recovery and it is hurting families desperately.

Canadians are worried about their future, but this government is not interested in home buyers or Canadian consumers. It is only interested in keeping the banks and the moneychangers happy and wealthy.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

**Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette—Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a ceremony was held today in the Hall of Honour to reaffirm our Canadian citizenship. That ceremony gives us an opportunity to show the importance which we attach to our rights, our privileges and our responsibilities as citizens of this great country.

I want to thank the Liberal member for Don Valley North for organizing a ceremony which allows all of us, in spite of our cultural diversity, to get together and to show how proud we are to be Canadians.

[English]

This reaffirmation marks not only the importance of staying united in order to be prosperous, but proves once again to the world that Canada and its citizens are number one in this Parliament. We should be proud of our accomplishments as a young nation providing world leadership and an enviable quality of life.

Vive le Canada. Long live Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### YOUNG QUEBECERS

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we recently learned that 92 per cent of young Quebecers between the ages of 18 and 35 feel happy and are primarily concerned with the work world.

(1410)

It must be pointed out that separation is not one of their priorities. In fact, the separatist movement is in rough shape these days. A study conducted by McGill University confirms that support for separation among young Quebecers has drastically diminished since the 1980 referendum.

The Liberal government is doing something about the concerns of that generation by creating jobs, while the Bloc Quebecois and the Parti Quebecois are stuck with their outdated option.

Young Quebecers are happy in Canada and they want to remain part of it because they know that it is the best country to live in. Again, we can clearly see that the separatists are totally disconnected from the real concerns of young people.

*S. O. 31*

### BLOC QUEBECOIS

**Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what is it about Ottawa—its air, its bilingual culture, its architecture, its tulip festival or the Rideau Canal—that makes more and more members of the Bloc Québécois want to settle here permanently?

Two days before their convention, we learn that a few Bloc Québécois riding associations want to change the status of the party to make it permanent.

This sudden interest in Canadian politics is surprising, to say the least, particularly in the light of the remarks made by the leader of the Bloc Québécois on November 27 to the effect that the members of the Bloc were not sent to Ottawa to make a career out of it, that the situation could never become permanent.

\* \* \*

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Michèle Fortin, Vice-President for Television, at Radio-Canada, spoke to the metropolitan Montreal Board of Trade. Some of her remarks echoed concerns of the Bloc Québécois about broad, varied and accessible television programming. In addition, she reiterated her warning about the cuts to Radio-Canada announced in the budget. She noted that the SRC is of vital importance to francophones in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada, having a much greater impact on its audiences than the CBC does on anglophone audiences.

Now that Mr. Beatty is ready to implement the budget cuts, it is essential that he not lose sight, in making his decisions, of the performance of French television and of the success it enjoys with its audiences. Draconian cuts to the French network will jeopardize the growth and development of our culture.

\* \* \*

[English]

### POST POLIO SYNDROME

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, new midlife medical nightmares are surfacing, but childhood cruelty still revisits polio victims.

Post polio syndrome undermines an adult future so many of us take for granted with healthy active lives and being in charge of our futures. It is not so for these adults who are stricken with PPS. Muscular weakness, fatigue, joint pain and respiratory problems result in necessary and dramatic lifestyle changes.

Today I acknowledge the courage of Dodie Spittal, Charly O'Brien, Reny Chamberlain and Vern Hamm. They are with us today and bring their stories of post polio survival to Ottawa.

I also salute Paul Martin, Sr., responsible for ensuring that hundreds of thousands of Canadian children received the Salk vaccine. His tenacity in securing the vaccine was evident in his remarks taken from the *Calgary Herald*: "On the basis of this extensive experience and the safeguards provided, it is the unanimous feeling of the provincial health authorities that the vaccine is safe and no changes in the immunization program are contemplated".

Polio is not—

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### BLOC QUEBECOIS

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Bloc québécois has always maintained that the Bloc québécois was in Ottawa on a temporary basis. Last fall, he said, and I quote: "And to make the options quite clear, I think Quebecers should realize, if they have not done so already, that the Bloc québécois is not an accessory that comes with federalism as well as sovereignty; you cannot be a federalist and expect to keep the Bloc québécois in Ottawa indefinitely".

Today, a number of BQ riding associations want to make their party permanent. The leader of the Bloc québécois will have a difficult choice to make: maintain his vision of a temporary party or respond to the wishes of the grassroots and stay in Ottawa indefinitely.

\* \* \*

[English]

### FORD WORLD CURLING CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, from April 8 to April 16, the 1995 Ford World Curling Championships will be held at the Keystone Centre in Brandon, Manitoba.

Leading the event will be the Canadian men's and women's champions, all behind the broom and delivering from the province of Manitoba.

(1415)

Skipping across the world we will see over 30 countries in the hack, sliding, sweeping and speling for the world title.

Second to none, this international event will be attended by over 12,000 fans per day, drawing weight from over 1,000 international visitors at each end.

Third in the history of Brandon's hosting of national and international curling events, countless exhibits will be featured at the curling world with the first ever Olympic flag flying overhead.

*Oral Questions*

Off the ice and out of the rink, during the day and well into the night, I invite and encourage everyone to get involved in the nine fun-filled days in Brandon, the button of world curling.

\* \* \*

**LIBERAL PARTY**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it was quite a sight yesterday to see the Liberal cheerleaders celebrating the Prime Minister's 32nd anniversary as a member of Parliament. Imagine our surprise when we learned that the Prime Minister was elected on April 8, 1963, not April 4, and that he has been an MP for 28 years, not 32.

I guess the health minister was too busy trying to protect her own job to check the facts. Actually, it comes as no shock to Reformers that the Liberals have such trouble with numbers. After all, this is the same party that gave us a massive deficit, a huge public debt and out of control government spending.

The Prime Minister shrugged off the mistake, saying what is four days among friends and that there is not much difference between 28 and 32 years. Numbers are important and I have a few that this government should take note of.

The national debt is \$548 billion. The federal government spends nine times as much on debt payments as it does on education and five times as much as on health. The national unemployment rate is 9.6 per cent and 1.5 million people in this country are unemployed.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*Translation*]

**FISHERIES**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government continues to claim that the agreement in principle reached by Canada and the European Union will soon lead to a genuine agreement. However, Spain and Portugal have rejected the very terms of the agreement in principle.

My question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Could the minister report on the status of negotiations between Canada and the European Union and tell us whether the problem is still the introduction of enforcement and conservation mechanisms?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has spoken to the president of the EU commission. Negotiators are meeting again today, and conservation of the resource is a priority. Our main

objective is to obtain an agreement with teeth on conservation and enforcement.

[*English*]

Canada remains committed to an effective conservation regime. I can say to the Leader of the Opposition that we have negotiated in detail what we consider to be an effective enforcement and conservation regime. What we are waiting on now, as the opposition leader will know, is for the rather complex and difficult and may I say time-consuming workings and mechanics of the European Union to conclude the process at that end.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I think we all support the efforts of the government and the minister, who by the way has done a very good job, to provide partners in the fisheries, the various countries that are part of this operation, with a vigorous enforcement mechanism to preserve the resource.

However, that being said, what reason does the minister have to be optimistic that he will manage to get this kind of result, when two member countries of the European Union, Spain and Portugal, who happen to be the main parties concerned, have rejected the very terms of the draft agreement?

[*English*]

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has noted before and notes again today the clear support of the Bloc Quebecois and the Leader of the Opposition for the position the government has taken.

The Leader of the Opposition gave advice to the government some time ago. He said it would take a mixture of firm resolve, firm action and diplomacy to bring about a successful conclusion to this dispute. That is precisely the manner in which the government is approaching this problem.

I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that Canada is negotiating bilaterally with the European Union. The bilateral negotiation with the European Union has shown great progress. It is not yet complete but progress is made every day. A detailed text is now on the table. Frankly it is a matter for the European Union to ensure that each of the member states complies with all the clauses contained in the draft agreement.

(1420)

For the moment we still do not have the formal acceptance of the European Union of the draft agreement.

I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that the negotiators by and large have finished their work and have put forward a joint draft text. It is a text that meets the objectives of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. We expect the European Union to do as we shall do, embrace it with both arms.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is of course right when he says that we are negotiating bilaterally with the European Union as a comprehensive unit, but how does he expect to overcome the problem arising from the fact that yesterday, the representative of the European Union made it quite clear that he could not conclude an agreement without the support of member countries Spain and Portugal?

*[English]*

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has negotiated in good faith.

Canada has never approached the negotiation from any perspective other than that of achieving a conservation regime, a means of preventing further destruction of fish stocks and the rebuilding of the six species now under moratorium.

The response from around the world has been tremendous, including that of the vast majority of EU member states. Populations are generally saying this is right, this is good, this is a question that affects the common heritage of mankind.

Even where the political will may be somewhat lacking, the public expression of a commitment to preserving a resource that belongs to the planet will win out and we will have an effective regime agreed by both sides.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***CANADA SOCIAL TRANSFER**

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

By setting up the Canada social transfer as a block payment for health care, post-secondary education and social assistance, the federal government has given itself more power to impose national standards while continuing to reduce transfer payments for these programs.

Will the Minister of Finance admit that the Canada social transfer will allow him both to continue reducing transfer payments to the provinces and to tighten his grip on social programs under cover of the new standards being planned now for health care and eventually for social assistance and post-secondary education?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the last budget, we gave the federal and provincial governments a mechanism to tailor their deficits to their financial means. It was very clear that this was a joint effort, and we gave the provinces the requisite prior notice.

The issue of national standards is very clear. We said in the budget that we were not going to abolish the Canada Health Act nor tamper with the issue of residency for social assistance. The Minister of Human Resources Development will negotiate all other issues with the provinces. He is going to sit down with them and discuss the issues.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, two things are clear. First, the Minister of Finance is cutting transfer payments, second, he is trying to get a stranglehold on provincial programs to serve his own purposes. Everybody agrees that this much is obvious.

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

**Mr. Gauthier:** Will the Minister of Finance admit that withdrawing his financial commitment and changing the rules go hand in hand? He is putting this in practice now with the Canada social transfer, in order to give himself the means to ensure compliance with current and future national standards, for example in the areas of health care, post-secondary education and social assistance.

Will he at last reveal his intentions?

(1425)

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the one thing that is clear to me is that we have given the provinces what they asked for: flexibility to reduce their costs. We have given them the flexibility that they need to improve the management of their programs. Therefore, we have met the expectations of the provinces and of Canadians.

\* \* \*

*[English]***INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, three of my Reform colleagues have just returned from a fact finding tour of the indiscriminate logging that has taken place on the Stoney Reserve in Alberta.

The member for North Island—Powell River, who has over 20 years of forestry experience, said he has never witnessed as much timber cut in one place at one time.

The minister of Indian affairs, through the Indian Act and the Indian timber regulations, has a legal obligation to ensure sound logging practices and prevent environmental disasters on reserves. The minister knew about the logging on this reserve yet did nothing to stop it.

Why did the minister not act to prevent the destruction of the forest on the Stoney Reserve in Alberta?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the assertion of the Reform leader is incorrect. We did act. We do have someone on site. We

have a forester there. We have fly-overs. I went out personally and told the chief what I thought of what he was doing.

We are meeting with the chiefs. I do not think what they did was correct. We told them so very forthrightly. If they do the right thing, as they do in northern Saskatchewan or at the National Forestry Institute that the aboriginal people have, then we will support them. However, when they do it incorrectly we are there to tell them so.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, when I asked why the minister did not act I meant why does he not enforce his department's own forestry management plans?

The department issued permits for 600 truckloads of logs per year. Since last spring, however, at least 14,000 truckloads of old growth forest has been harvested. Department officials knew of the flagrant violations of the management plan but refused to stop it.

Why did the minister's officials not discharge their responsibilities to ensure sound logging practices on the Stoney Reserve in Alberta?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is an under-assertion that these were totally aboriginal people. White cutters came to the native people and said: "Here is the money, let us take your trees".

Let us talk about who these people are. They are not specifically aboriginal people. If you do not want to listen, fine. However, if you want to hear the answer I will give it to you.

The RCMP are on the reserve investigating. I cannot get involved with the RCMP investigation in any way, shape or form. Charges may or may not be laid. However, we went in there with force and we do not think what was done was right.

**The Speaker:** Ever so gently, I remind members to please address your answers and the questions to the chair.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are not blaming the people on the Stoney Reserve. We are not blaming anyone. We are asking how come the department itself did not enforce its own rules.

Through the inactions of the minister and his department, he has permitted the destruction of an old growth forest on the Stoney Reserve. Because of the federal government's apparent unwillingness to treat all Canadians equally with respect to environmental regulations, Canadians have lost trees that stood for centuries. This cannot be allowed to happen again.

How does the minister intend to ensure that the forest management plans endorsed by his department are not only sound but strictly enforced?

### Oral Questions

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again the leader of the Reform is talking out of both sides of his mouth.

At his press conference when he tried to explain his policy, which no one understood, he said that my department has to be dismantled and decentralized in its function of funding transfers to local aboriginal agencies and governments.

**Some hon. members:** More, more.

**Mr. Irwin:** Having said that, he sent his Greek chorus throughout B.C. This is what the church said about what they have done.

(1430)

"The Anglican bishop for northern B.C. has accused the region's Reform MPs of breeding unnecessary fear about the Nishga land claim negotiations. A series of public meetings sponsored by Skeena MP, Mike Scott, is spreading half truths and anxieties among whites about the Nishga land claims".

"The Bishop of Caledonia, Don Hannen said that that is exactly what is being done here today". It is always the Indians' fault, nobody else's. These are half truths.

The Reform leader should talk to his minions and have them go out there and tell the truth to the people of Canada.

**The Speaker:** I am sure there is no question that all members are interested in the truth. We speak the truth in this House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### WINNIPEG JETS

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification.

The future of certain Canadian team franchises in the National Hockey League may be jeopardized by financial difficulties and limited markets. According to some sources, the Minister of Human Resources Development promised to give the Winnipeg Jets \$10 million in federal funds for the construction of a new amphitheatre.

Does the minister responsible for Western economic diversification confirm that discussions took place or are under way to grant \$10 million to build a new amphitheatre for the Winnipeg Jets?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm that the private sector group that is engaged in raising private sector funds has made an application under the infrastructure program similar to those applications that were submitted by the cities of

*Oral Questions*

Quebec, Calgary, Edmonton and many others for similar help in developing facilities.

I would suggest that the private sector initiative in Winnipeg is no different from that which took place in the member's home city.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I gather that the answer is "yes" for the Winnipeg Jets.

Is the minister in a position to confirm that, depending on the results of the provincial election in Manitoba, the federal government could contribute as much as \$20 million?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall very well how the federal government was a major contributor in his home city for the development of the Centre de congrès, which is a very important addition to that community.

A number of other cities across the country have benefited from both the development of job creation and also the development of new facilities coming out of the infrastructure program.

It is certainly the right of any city to make an application on infrastructure. That is what they are doing in Winnipeg. They are simply following the good example of the good people of Quebec City.

\* \* \*

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question follows the question from my leader and is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

I would like to quickly say that we foster sensible dialogue, and in our aboriginal town halls in British Columbia offered a very welcome and refreshing point of view.

I would like the minister, in response to the question about the Stoney Reserve, to tell the House the current market value of the timber removed in the last year and how he intends to collect revenues lost to the band plus the reduced stream of future revenues accruing to the band, which has now been lost.

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the Reform is asking for a quite a bit of detail.

I would appreciate if he would let me know about this detail before question period. I will take the question as notice and get him as much information as I can.

(1435)

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the timber removed from the reserve in the last 12 months conservatively exceeds \$35 million. The minister's department knew logging at Stoney Reserve exceeded the permits last April, one year ago.

Can the minister tell the House who is liable for these lost revenues?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have already responded to the Reform leader on three separate questions. My friend should read the notes when they come out.

I might add this. This is the same member who said when we brought in the Sahtu legislation that the sky would fall, but it did not. This is the same member who said when we brought in the Manitoba dismantling that the sky would fall, but it did not. This is the same member who said what we did in the Yukon would not work and it has. This is the same member going around B.C. saying land claims should be stopped in B.C.

We did not listen to him on three separate occasions and we are not going to listen to him now.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CIDA**

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

CIDA recently announced, at a week's notice, its intention to stop funding organizations involved in public awareness of international development that do not participate in overseas projects.

Does the Minister of Foreign Affairs not realize that, in so doing, the government is chopping nearly half the international development network available to NGOs in Canada, although funds provided to these organizations amount to only half of one per cent of the official development assistance budget?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has to understand that choices had to be made and it was decided to focus on poorer countries. In

that context, CIDA was right of course in deciding to stop subsidizing public awareness organizations here, in Canada, because, if they realize how important public awareness of development assistance is, they do not have to be paid to do the job.

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, how can the minister, after spending nearly \$1 million on the Canadian foreign policy review, ignore a joint committee recommendation to increase funding levels for the Public Participation Program?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, numerous organizations, in Quebec in particular, but also across Canada, do outstanding work in international development. I am thinking of OXFAM Québec, the Léger foundation, the Lajoie foundation and many other organizations carrying out worthwhile development projects abroad.

What we are saying is that we will not only continue to support but in fact increase our support to these organizations in their development programs abroad. We hope that, as far as public awareness is concerned, this work can continue without Canadian organizations taking money that should normally go to the poorest of the poor in the neediest countries.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am from Wild Rose and Stoney Reserve is in Wild Rose. I flew to that site myself just the other day. I know very little about logging so I took two experts with me who do know.

I have never seen such a mess in all my life. It is a disaster. It is worse than the cod. That is how bad it is. Why will the minister not stand on his feet and explain to the House why something was not done for 12 full months?

(1440)

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, why does the member not start pointing the finger at who actually went in there? B.C. cutters went in there, big time, with a heck of a lot of money for inducement. The logs have to be shared.

What happened there was not right. It was not all Indian doing. Where did those logs go? Those logs went to some big companies in B.C.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, maybe some day we can change this from question period to answer period.

I never said the blame was on anybody. I did not blame one individual. I want to know why this department sat back and let that go on for so long and did nothing?

#### Oral Questions

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to lower the rhetoric.

I refer to what Bishop Hannen of Caledonia said: "It is the duty of Christians to address more than 100 years of native injustice—

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### CIDA

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs. We just learned that CIDA has completely cut its support to non-governmental organizations promoting public awareness to international development. That decision directly threatens the survival of over 80 of these NGOs in Quebec and in Canada, as well as that of the Quebec association for international co-operation organizations.

How can the Minister of Foreign Affairs justify cutting CIDA's support to NGOs promoting international co-operation, while awarding a generous contract of \$99,510 to his friend, the unsuccessful Liberal candidate in La Prairie, Jacques Saada, for developing a simple communication plan on CIDA's program for the Maghreb?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the hon. member, who got elected the last time, that he had better be good and ready, because next time he will not get re-elected.

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

**Mr. Ouellet:** He is not impressing his voters with this kind of accusations.

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the minister that, in the meantime, he is financially supporting the Liberal candidate who was defeated in the October 1993 election, with the money of the taxpayers of Quebec and Canada.

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

**Mr. Bélisle:** Will the minister confirm that, by setting the amount of the contract at \$99,510, he was making sure that it would be awarded to his friend Jacques Saada, since, had he gone over \$100,000, the contract would have had to be awarded through the tender call procedure?

(1445)

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it—

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

**The Speaker:** We want to hear the answer. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has the floor.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the contract was awarded in accordance with the established criteria—

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

**Mr. Ouellet:**—that is the standards which were in effect at CIDA when the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Conservative government. These criteria have not changed. They are still the same as when the opposition leader was a member of the previous government.

Mr. Saada is competent, he does an excellent job and he is being paid for the work he is carrying out.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we hear an awful lot from the Liberal government about sustainable development.

I flew to Stoney Reserve last Friday. The sustainable cut on that reserve was 600 truckloads per year. What went out was 14,000 truckloads per year. Twenty-five to thirty years of sustainable wood went out in one year.

Why did the minister of Indian affairs allow this to happen?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the same answer. Why can that party not be so forthright in directing us and the Solicitor General to send the RCMP into B.C. and charge these companies there with the money, knowing what they were doing was incorrect? Why is that party not saying that? Why is it leaving the impression this is Indian wrongdoing?

There is a heavier onus on the cutters in B.C. from big companies who know the law, who have lawyers, who have money and have the skills to do exactly what they did. Their chainsaws did it.

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister would have us believe people from B.C. would float into the Indian reserve and take those trees out. Where is the responsibility of the minister? Where is the responsibility of Indian affairs?

Again, why did he allow this to happen on the Indian reserve when it is his responsibility to make sure it does not happen?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I hope this is the last supplementary. I want to advise the hon. member that as of March 31 the RCMP has been in, has made a seizure and has laid a charge.

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

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

**The Speaker:** It is a good thing Wednesday only comes once a week.

\* \* \*

**BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN**

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I could have been so lucky to draw Wednesday to ask a question.

My question is for the Minister of Health. As the minister is aware, recombinant bovine somatotropin cannot be sold or used commercially in Canada.

(1450)

Knowing the controversy surrounding the use of rbST, even among dairy farmers, can the minister tell the House about how her department is dealing with this decision and when Canadian dairy farmers can expect an answer on compliance from the Minister of Health?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, rbST has not been approved for sale in Canada. Its use is illegal in Canada.

Scientists at the Bureau of Veterinary Drugs are reviewing the drug. It will be approved only when the scientists have determined it is safe and effective.

At this time there also is a voluntary moratorium to which the company that would be producing rbST has agreed. However, the moratorium has absolutely nothing to do with the approval of the drug and the approval process under way at Health Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS**

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice.

Since the Liberal government was elected in October 1993, the Minister of Justice has awarded 186 contracts for professional and special services, for a total value of \$7 million. This money is used to fund criminological and legal research.

Could the minister tell us why individuals and companies from Quebec have obtained only 5 per cent of the value of these contracts awarded by his department, 15 times less than the percentage obtained by persons and companies in Ontario?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take the hon. member's question under advisement and provide a detailed response to her as soon as possible.

An immediate response to the question is that much of the business of the Department of Justice has to do with retaining

*Oral Questions*

lawyers in private practice to represent the interests of the government in cases from time to time. It may well be that much of that work is done in other parts of the country.

I will get the facts and respond to the hon. member in due course.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister will have to take my next question under advisement as well.

In the Ottawa-Hull area, it is even worse. The value of contracts awarded to Quebecers is around 2 per cent, as opposed to 98 per cent for Ontario. Furthermore, 99 per cent of all research papers are drafted in English only.

What explanation does the Minister of Justice have for this tendency among his departmental officials to prefer suppliers in English Canada and a unilingual English approach?

[*English*]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will take note of the question, I will get the facts and I will respond.

In the meantime, I am constrained to answer right off the top that the business of the Department of Justice is in both official languages.

\* \* \*

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan-Shuswap, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

In 1992 the Auditor General's report warned the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development needed to get a grip on what was happening in forestry practices on the reserves. That potential was there for what has happened on the Stoney Reserve.

Did you read that report? Did you pay any attention to that report?

**The Speaker:** I ask all hon. members to please address the Chair in their questions.

(1455)

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will give a couple of comparisons. We have a problem on the Stoney Reserve. I have been there, the police have been there and my ministry has been there. That problem has existed for one year.

The member stands up in the House, with all his truckloads going out last week for the first time from a First Nation in his riding; he has probably discovered the problem.

In B.C., where my critic sits—

**Mr. Abbott:** We are talking about Alberta.

**Mr. Irwin:** It is the same philosophy no matter where the Reform sits or where the Nishga sit, who have been trying to settle their claim on forestry for at least two decades. The Reform sits quietly while it represents the Nishga while a load of lumber leaves their territory every four minutes. Yet my critic and the Reform remain silent. I have been there and I am doing something about it. Maybe the Reform should do the same.

**Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan-Shuswap, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, after a year of this happening and the minister having had lots of time to look into it, could he assure us this is not happening anywhere else?

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Beaches—Woodbine.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT SPENDING**

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

All Canadians want to ensure their tax dollars are used in a responsible way. Many complained that last minute shopping spree by departments at the end of the fiscal year should be monitored and controlled.

Can the minister outline what Treasury Board has done to put an end to the March madness spending binge?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I share the hon. member's concern about year end spending and so did the Auditor General of Canada in his two reports in the 1980s in which that issue was raised.

The Auditor General did not raise the issue in the sense that he criticized what the money was being spent on, as he said the purposes were well defined, but that there was a lot of spending toward the end of the year and we needed better cash management practices.

I am pleased to say we have instituted a 5 per cent operating budget carry forward for departments so they do not get into that year end spending spree. Furthermore, I have written my colleagues in the ministry and my deputy minister has written his counterparts to help ensure the procedure to cut out the year end spending rush is followed.

We have asked for audits of each of the departments and have asked that they be submitted by June 30 of this year so we can get better control of the cash management of taxpayers money.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

This morning, Immigration officials were to deport another family of Romanian refugees, the family of Carmen and Alexandru Dima. This family, well integrated into Quebec society, had appealed, as a last resort, to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to intervene.

How can the minister justify his refusal to intervene on behalf of the Dima family, which had adjusted very well to life in Quebec, when he has intervened in other cases of families that could remain in Canada and have become well integrated?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member needs to become familiar with the immigration system and with the Canada-Quebec accord, because we determined that these individuals were not refugees. They had access to the best system in the world.

Mr. Dima appealed and applied on compassionate and humanitarian grounds to the department. We said there were no special circumstances precluding their return to Romania.

(1500)

Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Province of Quebec to establish independent immigration. I had declared that the individuals were not refugees. We cannot allow everyone denied refugee status to be accepted as immigrants. Last year, 3,000 Romanians immigrated to Canada under the usual immigration process.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FORESTRY**

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my constituency, Kootenay East, and the companies and the loggers in my constituency consumed about 60 per cent of the logs that we are talking about.

They have a moral responsibility, but this minister has a legal responsibility for the fact that there was \$35 million paid to the Indian band. Why will he not own up to that responsibility? I suggest that the minister's department has shown gross incompetence.

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest once again that the Reform has shown its true colours.

I will repeat that the ministry is in there; we have a forester in there. We have fly-overs. We have the RCMP and a charge has been laid.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health, who will know by media reports this morning that the Conservative government in Alberta has indicated that it is going to be asking for amendments to the Canada Health Act to allow for private hospitals and that the premier of Alberta is supporting a two-tier health care system.

She will also know that his supporters voted on the weekend to free abandoned hospitals for the private sector.

Since the Minister of Health has cut back so severely in terms of health care payments to the provinces, how on earth could she do anything to stop this erosion of medicare and health care in Canada that we have known over the last number of decades?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have repeated and repeated that we are going to ensure a healthy health care system by maintaining the principles of the Canada Health Act.

There is not one commission that has been called for across this country that has said that more money is needed. The B.C. Royal Commission on Health Care and Costs said it is more management that is needed, not more money.

We know that the premier of Alberta is advancing different propositions, and we will respond as we get these propositions.

Let me remind absolutely everyone here that the health care system does not become more affordable just by moving budgets, dollars and costs from the public sector to the private sector. It certainly does not and we will not allow that to happen.

**The Speaker:** This brings to a conclusion our question period.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I wish to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Patricia L. Black, Minister of Energy of the Province of Alberta.

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

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2)(i), I wish to table in both official languages two documents describing Department of National Defence policies. One is entitled "Housing for the Canadian Forces" and the other is "Canadian Forces Compensation".

Mr. Speaker, I tabled both documents at once; therefore, I will now table the second document.

\* \* \*

(1505)

### 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 40 petitions.

\* \* \*

### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-320, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act (registration of political parties).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a private member's bill entitled an act to amend the Canada Elections Act.

The intention of the bill is threefold. First, this bill amends the Canada Elections Act to allow registration of a political party by the Chief Electoral Officer when the party nominates candidates in at least 12 electoral districts throughout the country. This is down from a present requirement of 50 electoral districts.

Under the present act, the Chief Electoral Officer must de-register a party that does not meet the conditions set out in subsection 28(2) of the act. Formerly, it was at the discretion of the Chief Electoral Officer to de-register a party that failed to meet these conditions.

Second, the bill removes the obligation placed on the chief agent of a political party to liquidate the assets of that party when it is deleted from the registry of political parties by the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada.

Finally, the bill lowers the amount required for deposit with the returning officer at the same time the nomination papers are filed.

### Routine Proceedings

This bill has received widespread support throughout Canada. I would invite all members of this House to support this important democratic initiative.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-321, an act to amend the Criminal Code (juvenile prostitution outside of Canada).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling today a bill entitled: an Act to amend the Criminal Code (juvenile prostitution outside of Canada). This bill is intended to combat a criminal practice and to prohibit the use of prostitution services offered outside of Canada by persons under 18 years of age; the transportation of people to brothels outside of Canada for the purpose of having sexual relations with persons under 18 years of age; certain acts committed outside of Canada with a view to procuring the services of persons under 18 years of age. It is my dearest wish that all members of this House will support this bill.

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### EXCISE TAX ACT

On the Order: Private Members' Business

Second reading and reference of the Standing Committee on Finance of Bill C-222, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act (extremity pumps).

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties. I think you would find unanimous consent that Bill C-222, standing on the Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Nepean, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act (extremity pumps), be withdrawn and the order for second reading discharged.

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

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### PETITIONS

LACHINE CANAL CLEAN UP

**Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition signed by 4,600 members of my riding who are petitioning the government to

*Routine Proceedings*

proceed immediately with the clean up of the Lachine Canal. This canal is so contaminated that if a child falls in, we have to decontaminate him or her for fear of infection.

Once the canal is cleaned up, we could use it and the surrounding area for recreational purposes. Many jobs would be created both during and after the process. I would like to add that I fully support this petition.

(1510)

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT SPENDING

**Mr. Jag Bhaduria (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville, Ind. Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting a petition signed by petitioners in the Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville area.

These petitioners call on Parliament to reduce the deficit by cutting wastage and reducing the overall expenses of every government department by at least 5 per cent.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present a petition signed by the people from the city of Fredericton, New Brunswick.

The petition states: "Whereas human life at the pre-born stage is not protected in Canadian society, the petitioners pray and request 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".

## HEALTH

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present a petition signed by constituents of mine as well as from people residing in North Battleford, Aberdeen, Melville, Ituna, Herschel and other places in Saskatchewan.

This petition pertains to repealing Bill C-91, which has doubled the price of prescription drugs for Canadians and has put in jeopardy the drug plans of many governments in Canada.

This petition asks the government, which in opposition supported repealing Bill C-91, to keep its promise and to repeal Bill C-91.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, again pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my honour to present a petition on behalf of now close to 27,000 residents of the Kamloops area who point out that they believe many violent offenders and sex offenders are being paroled prematurely and are being released without proper treatment and rehabilitation. They believe that those convicted of these types of offences

should remain incarcerated until they have successfully undergone treatment and can demonstrate unequivocally that they have been completely rehabilitated.

Therefore, they are asking the House of Commons and the Government of Canada to change the Criminal Code to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that these changes take place.

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present a petition signed by well over 600 constituents in my riding of Stormont—Dundas. The petitioners ask the government to enact legislation to review the Supreme Court ruling rendered September 30, 1994, and enact legislation, which I am pleased to say we have, to redress the repercussions of this ruling.

The petition pertains to the drunken defence ruling made by the Supreme Court.

## SAME SEX RELATIONSHIPS

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.):** I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by well over 70 residents of Stormont—Dundas who call upon the government not to enact legislation to amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.):** Finally, Mr. Speaker, some 400 petitioners ask the government to review and revise our laws concerning young offenders by empowering the courts to prosecute and punish the young law-breakers. The petitioners also ask that officials be allowed to release the names of young offenders and lower the age limit to allow prosecution to meet the severity of the crime.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 155 and 156.

[*Text*]

Question No. 155—**Mr. Althouse:**

For each of the last 20 years, what proportion of gross domestic product has Canada spent on: unemployment insurance programs; old age pensions; Canada pension plan; civil service pensions (including military, RCMP and parliamentary service); family allowance and/or child tax credits; health care; protection of property (police, military and prisons) and interest on debt payments?

*Routine Proceedings*

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** The question concerns the relationship over the last twenty years of the size of selected federal government expenditure programs to the size of the overall Canadian economy, as measured by Statistics Canada's gross domestic product (GDP) estimate. The following table presents Statistics Canada estimates of

GDP, values for the requested federal government expenditure programs and those values expressed in a ratio to GDP for the period 1975 to 1994. The table also includes notes briefly explaining the sources and certain aspects of the estimates which might influence their interpretation.

(millions of dollars)	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Gross Domestic Product	171,540	197,924	217,879	241,604	276,096	309,891	355,994	374,442	405,717	444,735
Federal Government Expenditures:										
1. Unemployment Insurance Benefits	3,155	3,332	3,904	4,507	4,030	4,332	4,757	8,454	10,062	9,859
% of GDP	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.3	2.3	2.5	2.2
2. Old Age Pension Benefits	3,753	4,305	4,692	5,238	6,085	7,020	8,213	9,304	10,137	10,999
% of GDP	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5
3. Canada Pension Plan Benefits	527	775	997	1,246	1,535	1,903	2,321	2,873	3,485	4,045
% of GDP	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9
4. Civil Service Pension Benefits	390	508	604	741	924	1,096	1,243	1,447	1,602	1,769
% of GDP	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4
5. Family Allowance/Child Tax Benefit	1,961	1,942	2,084	2,224	1,696	1,812	1,958	2,204	2,303	2,393
% of GDP	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5
6. "Health Care"	2,781	3,305	3,129	3,849	4,202	4,391	4,741	4,620	6,197	7,060
% of GDP	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.6
7. "Protection of Persons & Property"	3,397	4,136	4,720	5,265	5,642	6,372	7,495	8,645	9,866	10,854
% of GDP	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.4
8. Interest on the Public Debt	3,705	4,519	5,101	6,410	8,080	9,897	13,739	16,675	17,412	20,897
% of GDP	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.7
(millions of dollars)	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Gross Domestic Product	477,988	505,666	551,597	605,906	650,748	669,467	674,766	688,391	711,658	748,606
Federal Government Expenditures:										
1. Unemployment Insurance Benefits	10,118	10,394	10,369	10,781	11,445	13,119	17,323	18,648	17,592	15,012
% of GDP	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.0
2. Old Age Pension Benefits	12,150	13,148	14,006	14,801	15,718	16,705	17,955	18,776	19,479	20,176
% of GDP	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7

1. All series on benefits are taken from the income and expenditure accounts. Figures do not include administrative costs or any in-kind transfers.

2. "Health Care" and "Protection of Persons & Property" are functional expenditure categories from the financial management system. Figures include all expenditures in the form of transfers to persons, governments, businesses as well as direct expenditures on goods and services.

3. "Interest on the public debt" is from the income and expenditure accounts.

GST — Goods and Services Tax

(millions of dollars)	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

*Routine Proceedings*

3. Canada Pension Plan Benefits	4,676	5,349	6,948	8,095	9,137	10,199	11,298	12,886	14,197	15,249
% of GDP	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.0
4. Civil Service Pension Benefits	1,961	2,168	2,400	2,626	2,845	3,000	3,453	3,724	3,923	4,108
% of GDP	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5
5. Family Allowance/Child Tax Benefit	2,492	2,524	2,552	2,595	2,634	2,711	2,824	2,870	5,302	5,296
% of GDP	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.7
6. "Health Care"	7,134	7,465	7,462	7,685	7,780	7,354	8,048	9,771	8,331	8,098
% of GDP	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.1
7. "Protection of Persons & Property"	11,876	11,986	12,962	13,440	14,441	15,175	14,995	15,368	15,822	15,368
% of GDP	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1
8. Interest on the Public Debt	24,620	26,107	27,801	31,688	37,357	41,808	41,496	38,807	38,338	39,279
% of GDP	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.7	6.2	6.1	5.6	5.4	5.2

1. All series on benefits are taken from the income and expenditure accounts. Figures do not include administrative costs or any in-kind transfers.

2. "Health Care" and "Protection of Persons & Property" are functional expenditure categories from the financial management system. Figures include all expenditures in the form of transfers to persons, governments, businesses as well as direct expenditures on goods and services.

3. "Interest on the public debt" is from the income and expenditure accounts.

**Question No. 156—Mr. Althouse:**

For each of the last 20 years, what proportion of gross domestic product has Canada received in tax revenue from: individual income taxes; corporate income taxes; manufacturers' sales taxes; goods and services tax; payments for services rendered by federal agencies; contributions to Canada pension plan and contributions to civil service pension schemes (military, RCMP and parliamentary)?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** The question concerns the relationship over the last twenty years of the

size of selected federal government revenues to the size of the overall Canadian economy, as measured by Statistics Canada's gross domestic product (GDP) estimate. The following table presents Statistics Canada estimates of GDP, values for the requested federal government revenues and those values expressed in a ratio to GDP for the period 1975 to 1994. The table also includes notes briefly explaining the sources and certain aspects of the estimates which might influence their interpretation.

(millions of dollars)	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Gross Domestic Product	171,540	197,924	217,879	241,604	276,096	309,891	355,994	374,442	405,717	444,735
Federal Government Revenues:										
1. Personal Income Taxes	12,278	14,477	14,283	13,689	16,321	19,131	22,976	25,746	26,809	28,189
% of GDP	7.2	7.3	6.6	5.7	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.9	6.6	6.3
2. Corporate Income Tax — collections	5,224	5,483	5,251	5,174	6,219	7,865	9,134	8,525	9,152	10,573
% of GDP	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.4
3. Manufacturers' Sales Tax	2,971	3,911	4,284	4,766	4,592	5,174	6,200	5,846	6,411	7,353
% of GDP	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7

1. All series are from the income and expenditure accounts with the exception of "Sales of Goods & Services", taken from the input/output Accounts. "Sales of Goods & Services" does not include sales by crown corporations with the exception of Atomic Energy of Canada and Cape Breton Development, which are classified as general government.

2. "Goods and Services Tax accrual basis" line #4, is taken from income and expenditure accounts. The figures are shown gross of the goods and services tax credit for lower income Canadians: of 1991 = \$2,367 million; 1992 = \$2,557 million; 1993 = \$2,655 million; 1994 = \$2,833 million; and of the goods and services tax transitional credit, to assist businesses to convert to the GST, estimated as 1991 = \$900 million.

GST — Goods and Services Tax

(millions of dollars)	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

*Routine Proceedings*

4. Goods and Services Tax – accrual basis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of GDP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Sales of Goods and Services	538	647	735	957	1,180	1,288	1,440	1,841	1,805	2,257
% of GDP	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
6. Canada Pension Plan Contribution	1,426	1,630	1,829	2,022	2,318	2,604	3,008	3,665	3,474	3,902
% of GDP	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.9
7. Public Service Pension Plan Contributions	995	1,077	1,186	1,187	1,117	1,199	1,521	1,602	1,653	1,739
% of GDP	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
<b>(millions of dollars)</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>1988</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>
Gross Domestic Product	477,988	505,666	551,597	605,906	650,748	669,467	674,766	688,391	711,658	748,606
Federal Government Revenues:										
1. Personal Income Taxes	32,141	37,503	41,741	46,160	50,642	58,057	58,441	59,398	58,731	58,862
% of GDP	6.7	7.4	7.6	7.6	7.8	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.3	7.9
2. Corporate Income Tax – collections	12,130	10,608	10,882	10,095	13,061	12,747	10,159	8,334	8,672	12,096
% of GDP	2.5	2.1	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.6
3. Manufacturers' Sales Tax	9,015	11,841	12,726	14,329	16,253	14,030	0	0	0	0
% of GDP	1.9	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Goods & Services Tax – accrual basis	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,544	18,466	18,887	19,966
% of GDP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7
5. Sales of Goods and Services	2,516	2,660	2,984	3,143	3,356	3,681	3,945	not available. . .		
% of GDP	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Canada Pension Plan Contributions	4,346	4,721	5,393	6,023	6,694	7,782	8,396	9,025	9,517	9,969
% of GDP	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
7. Public Service Pension Plan Contributions	1,803	1,869	1,940	1,948	2,045	2,199	2,832	2,678	2,575	2,595
% of GDP	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3

1. All series are from the income and expenditure accounts with the exception of "Sales of Goods & Services", taken from the input/output Accounts. "Sales of Goods & Services" does not include sales by crown corporations with the exception of Atomic Energy of Canada and Cape Breton Development, which are classified as general government.

2. "Goods and Services Tax accrual basis" line #4, is taken from income and expenditure accounts. The figures are shown gross of the goods and services tax credit for lower income Canadians: of 1991 = \$2,367 million; 1992 = \$2,557 million; 1993 = \$2,655 million; 1994 = \$2,833 million; and of the goods and services tax transitional credit, to assist businesses to convert to the GST, estimated as 1991 = \$900 million.

GST — Goods and Services Tax

[Translation]

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[English]

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 39, I placed question No. 91 on the Order Paper on October 4, 1994. That was 186 days ago.

*Government Orders*

Last week, on the same point of order, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the House leader said that: "The Minister of Supply and Services has been working diligently", and that he would be in a position to answer my question soon.

It is my understanding that on all Order Paper questions the government does try to meet the 45-day period. One hundred and eighty-six days is an unacceptable length of time to respond to my question.

Would the hon. member please define what he means by "soon" and advise me as to when I will receive an answer to the question I asked six months ago?

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to assist the hon. member in carrying out her duties.

The minister, as I indicated, has been working diligently on this question. I understand that the answer is being sent to the office that reports to the House through me this afternoon. I hope to be in a position to provide the hon. member with an answer tomorrow.

(1515)

If not, obviously it will be after the break. I hope it is tomorrow. I am doing my very best to see that is what happens.

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**FIREARMS ACT**

BILL C-68—MOTION FOR TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.)** moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, not more than one further sitting day be allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the bill; and

That, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Business on the allotted day of the second reading consideration of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this Order and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

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

(Division No. 188)

**YEAS**

## Members

Alcock  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Barnes  
Bellemare  
Bhaduria  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Brushett  
Bélair  
Calder  
Cannis  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Cohen  
Culbert  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Easter  
English  
Finestone  
Flis  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Harvard  
Hopkins  
Irwin  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)  
MacDonald  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Malhi  
Marchi  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McCormick  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
Mifflin  
Minna  
Murphy  
Nunziata  
Ouellet  
Paradis  
Payne  
Peters  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Regan  
Rideout

Allmand  
Arseneault  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Bélanger  
Campbell  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Crawford  
DeVillers  
Discepola  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Godfrey  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Hickey  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
MacAulay  
MacLaren  
Maheu  
Manley  
Marleau  
Massé  
McKinnon  
McTeague  
Milliken  
Mitchell  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Pagtakhan  
Patri  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Richardson  
Ringuette—Maltais

*Government Orders*

Robichaud  
Rock  
Serré  
Skoke  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Verran  
Wappel  
Wood  
Zed—133

Robillard  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Steckle  
Szabo  
Terrana  
Tobin  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Whelan  
Young

(1525)

[English]

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

\* \* \*

**FIREARMS ACT**

The House resumed from March 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**The Speaker:** When Bill C-68 was last before the House, the hon. member for Medicine Hat had seven minutes remaining for debate.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I cannot give the speech I wanted to give today because the government has just invoked a form of closure, something that its members spoke out against very strongly in the last Parliament. I am going to speak out against that very thing right now.

(1530)

Canadians feel very strongly about the whole issue of gun control. In particular, many people across the country are opposed to the whole idea of registration.

In my judgment, this is an extremely cynical and political move. Just before a break when MPs are going back to their ridings to consult with their constituents, the government invokes a form of closure. This prevents Canadians from having the full input and type of discussion they should have on an issue which is so important to them. The government is playing politics with this issue and I want to speak about that in a larger context right now.

As I mentioned, people feel very strongly about this issue. The country in many respects is split along rural and urban lines. I can see this whole issue being extremely divisive down the road if it is not handled properly.

That is why Reform has offered a very good reasoned amendment to split the bill in two. It would give people a chance to vote on the proposals that would bring in tougher sentences for crimes committed with the illegal use of firearms. That is something many Canadians agree with.

Where people differ from the government is on the whole idea of registration. If the government was going to be absolutely fair about this, it would recognize that there are two separate issues here and Canadians should have a right to vote on them separately.

I want to talk for a moment about the whole process leading up to where we are today. As a starting point, before the gov-

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott  
Asselin  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Bouchard  
Bridgman  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Canuel  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond—Guiral  
Debien  
Dubé  
Duncan  
Fillion  
Frazer  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Godin  
Grubel  
Guimond  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Jennings  
Lalonde  
Langlois  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Lefebvre  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Nunez  
Penson  
Pomerleau  
Riis  
Rocheleau  
Schmidt  
Solomon  
St-Laurent  
Strahl  
Thompson  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Wayne  
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy  
Bachand  
Benoit  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cummins  
Daviault  
de Savoye  
Dumas  
Epp  
Forseth  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gilmour  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Guay  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Jacob  
Johnston  
Landry  
Laurin  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Loubier  
Marchand  
Mayfield  
Mercier  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ménard  
Paré  
Picard (Drummond)  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Sauvageau  
Solberg  
Speaker  
Stinson  
Taylor  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
White (Fraser Valley West)  
Williams—100

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Deshaies  
Gaffney  
Harper (Churchill)

Duceppe  
Grose  
Plamondon

*Government Orders*

ernment brings forward a piece of legislation which is so controversial and about which people care very deeply, I believe it is reasonable that the onus be put on the government to explain where the evidence is that points to registration being an effective way to curb crime.

We have asked many questions in this House on that issue. We have asked the justice minister on several occasions for the evidence. All he could do, as people would say when talking in a logic class, was make an appeal to authority, a false argument, that the police chiefs say it is a good thing to do, but there is no evidence. We have made that point over and over again. That is a very cynical move.

It is also very cynical how the whole consultation process was carried out. The minister did have some meetings with some groups over the course of the summer, which is great. However, when these meetings occur certainly there has to be some room for compromise. We cannot go in there with the attitude that we are not going to bend at all.

It got worse than that. After a while the meetings were by invitation. That is very cynical. People wanted to have a say but the minister said: "No, some people cannot come into these meetings because we want to make sure that things go our way". After that there is this omnibus legislation where the government tries to sell the good with the bad. Again, that is very cynical and very political and we absolutely disagree with that.

The final straw is time allocation right before a break. In this place, of all places, we should be talking about very important issues and MPs should be free to go back and talk about these things before they are set in stone. Unfortunately, members have been denied that opportunity because the government has invoked a form of closure.

We have spoken out time and time again on this issue. We have asked the government to produce the evidence that this will have an effect on crime. We have said that if it could produce the evidence it would have our support. However, the government cannot so we will not support it. That concludes my remarks.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to support this bill today.

This bill represents the culmination of one of the points in the red book. I want to quote from the red book in this connection: "In order to combat crime, a Liberal government will work in a broad range of areas. To strengthen gun control, a Liberal government will, among other measures, counter the illegal importation of banned and restricted firearms into Canada and prohibit anyone convicted of an indictable drug related offence,

stalking offence or any violent crime from owning or possessing a gun". That promise was included in the red book. That promise is being kept by this legislation today.

(1535)

It is that legislation the Reform Party is trying to destroy with this phoney amendment which it put before the House today. Reform members have run across the country misleading Canadians, telling Canadians that the amendment splits the bill. That assertion is totally and completely false.

The hon. member for Beaver River has been away. However, she will have heard these false statements which are being made by her colleagues as to the effect of this amendment across the country. I know if she gets to speak later this afternoon, she will want to dissociate herself from those comments.

With respect to the bill, first I would like to deal with the allegations made by the hon. member for Medicine Hat about the use of time allocation in the debate this afternoon.

We have asked repeatedly for assistance in dealing with the bill. We have offered to sit late in the evenings in order to accommodate members who wish to participate in the debate. Those offers were declined, politely but emphatically, by the members of the Reform Party. So we need not concern ourselves about their genuine desire to debate the bill.

They are shedding crocodile tears this afternoon, alleging that they are having their debate cut off, but let me review the record. The bill was debated in the House on February 16 and February 27, March 13, March 27 and March 28 for a total debating time according to the official record of 17 hours and 46 minutes. Eighty-four persons participated in the debate before today. I am number 85.

**An hon. member:** That shows how much interest there is in it.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member says that shows how much interest there is in it. It shows that a filibuster has been mounted by the Reform Party.

If we look at the number of speakers, 35 Liberals, 12 Bloc members, 34 Reformers, two New Democrats and one Progressive Conservative have participated in the debate so far. In other words, the Reformers have had almost every member speak, while on the Liberal side, despite the significant differences of view on this side, only 35 have managed to participate in the debate. This is nothing but a filibuster. The Reform Party is engaging in filibuster tactics and the government is taking a very sensible approach in bringing the debate to an end. The government is putting the Reform Party out of its misery.

*Government Orders*

So much for the argument about unfairness. The Reform Party has been offered an extra opportunity to debate this bill and it has consistently turned it down. The reason is that it wants the government to use closure. The Reform Party wants the government to bring an end to the debate so that it can get off the hook with respect to its rather ridiculous opposition to the bill.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat and dozens of other members from that party in particular have gone after the bill saying that there is no evidence that the proposals which the government has put forward will do anything to stop crime. I have some evidence and I would like to quote the evidence for hon. members, particularly those in the Reform Party and some doubting Thomases elsewhere in the House.

The proposal that the Minister of Justice has so courageously put forward, in spite of consistent and persistent opposition from Reformers and other people in the country, is based in part on our promise in the red book. It is supported very amply by the Canadian Police Association, whose members, after all, are experts in law enforcement. These are the people who enforce the Criminal Code across our country, yet members of the Reform Party trumpet themselves as experts on law enforcement. Most of them do not know a fig about law enforcement. They do not know anything about the subject, yet they rant and rave in the House all day that they want evidence.

I invite them to listen to the evidence of the president of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. This gentleman, Mr. Vincent MacDonald, made certain statements after his association at its annual conference last August called for the following: stiffer penalties for firearms misuse; a ban on military assault rifles and replica firearms; registration of all firearms; controls on the sale of ammunition; and full cost recovery. Those were the five items called for by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police at its convention in August 1994. These are the principal frontline law enforcers in Canada and that is what they called for.

The hon. members in the Reform Party ignore these suggestions and all of them are found in the bill of the Minister of Justice which is before the House today. If they supported law enforcement in Canada, they would be supporting this bill. They are frauds in that connection.

The president of the association said: "We must emphasize that while it is, perhaps, controversial, we view registration of all firearms as pivotal to the entire package, critical to controlling the illegal gun trade, to supporting preventative action and to enforcing the law". There is evidence that this will work.

(1540)

On February 24, 1995 Chief MacDonald said: "Registration of firearms will help control smuggling, gun theft and the misuse of legal firearms in a number of important ways". This is

from an expert in the law enforcement field. Surely, members of the Reform Party would bow to the ability and competence of the president of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and the collective wisdom of that body all of whom support this bill and believe that this bill is the right way to go.

I want to quote another statement from Chief MacDonald. He said: "As the U.S. example has shown all too well, arming for self-protection does not work but in fact escalates violence. For this reason, we believe Canada has a historic opportunity to chart a course that is different from the U.S. This legislation not only goes a long way to address current problems, but is an investment in our future". That is what the chief said; I submit that he was right.

If that is not enough to convince members of this House that this is the right way to go, one has only to look at the polls that have been conducted on this subject. I turn to the Environics poll of October 1994. Ninety per cent of Canadians supported a law requiring all firearms to be registered. In Quebec the figure was 95 per cent; Ontario, 92 per cent; British Columbia, 88 per cent; Alberta, 83 per cent.

Members of the Reform Party are forever boasting that they represent the wishes of their constituents. That is a false assertion. These members have no more interest in the wishes of their constituents than the man in the moon has.

The Reform member for Edmonton stood in this House and admitted that his own constituents in his own poll were 69 per cent in favour of the government bill. Yet he said: "I do not care what they say, I could not care less what they say. I am voting against it because, by George, I know better". Every member of the Reform Party is spouting the same stuff and nonsense. They may not use the same words. They cloak themselves in righteousness and say: "Oh, no. We are opposing this for good reason". But they know that their constituents support this bill. They know they would support it in overwhelming numbers.

If Reform members were doing what they say they always do, supporting and representing their constituents' interests, they would stand up and vote for this bill in droves. They would all show up. They would not pull that six and seven out of a total of 50 in the House which they pulled a weekend ago. They would all be here voting for this bill. Instead, all we hear is their ranting and raving and complaining about this government action on the bill and the very sensible proposals the Minister of Justice has put forward in this case.

I recognize there are deeply held views on this bill which represent significant differences of opinion on this subject. I can only say that the government has acted in the very best interests of Canadians in bringing this bill forward. It has brought forward a bill that is supported by the vast majority of the population in every region of the country. It has brought forward a bill that has been called for by the law enforcement experts, who more than any other in Canada know what is required to

*Government Orders*

deal with smuggling and illegal arms dealings and all manner of problems with guns.

This is a sensible bill. I realize there are going to be some changes made in committee. The minister has already acknowledged that he is willing to agree to certain changes to the bill in committee which will improve the bill.

The hon. member yaks about confiscation. He knows that when talking about confiscation he is only trying to stir up support for his party. He knows that at gun rallies he has been out selling Reform memberships in an effort to boost the sagging fortunes of the Reform Party. It is a shocking way to carry on.

The hon. member for Beaver River has missed some of the antics which have taken place in this House. I am sorry she did. She would have been ashamed of the conduct of most of her colleagues had she been here to watch the debate. I am glad she is back and I hope she will talk some sense to her colleagues because honestly, they need a good deal of it.

The fact is this is a good bill. It has garnered widespread support in the country. The Minister of Justice has proven time and again that he is willing to talk and be reasonable and flexible in respect of this bill. No minister has spent more time travelling the country seeking the views of Canadians than has the Minister of Justice. He has brought forward a bill—

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** He is not listening.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member says he is not listening. He is not listening to them, that is for sure, because they do not represent anybody. They represent a small minority of people.

(1545)

The vast majority of people support what the minister is doing. If the members of the Reform Party would look at the polls that their own member conducted and look at the national polls that have been conducted on this scheme, they would agree with everything I am saying, because they know I am right.

As I said, the Minister of Justice has indicated his willingness to make changes in this legislation. He has indicated that in committee he will listen to reasoned arguments. The committee is set up and ready to deal with this matter. It is prepared to hear a large number of witnesses. Indeed, the budget for the committee for the hearing of a substantial number of witnesses has already gone forward and is being considered by the budget subcommittee of the liaison committee.

I think this bill will be dealt with fairly. The owners of guns who have not yet had an opportunity to make their views known to the minister and to the Canadian public will have that opportunity before the committee.

**Mr. Taylor:** Every one of them?

**Mr. Milliken:** There will be ample opportunity there. There will be another debate in this House on third reading.

Of course, now we have the NDP getting into the act. This is the party that for decades has supported gun control and now all their members but one have shifted gears and gone backwards. They have all decided that this bill is not really what they wanted, even though it was in their party platform. They used to say they were bound by party conventions. Now they say they are not bound by party conventions; they are not bound by the obligations laid down at party conventions that have been set on their caucus.

Only the member for Beaver River will remember this. We used to listen in this House to the pontificating from the NDP about how they were so democratic; they did everything their party dictated. Now, today, we see them abandoning party principles; they have gone out the window. I do not think the NDP knows what a party principle is any more.

It is a most shameful abnegation of its responsibility to its members, because the members of the NDP in my constituency are strongly supporting the Minister of Justice in this gun control bill. They think their members of Parliament have gone wingy. I think they may be right. Things have really gone wrong over there. Only the member for Burnaby—Kingsway seems to have kept his head straight on his shoulders.

The hon. members of the Reform Party, who are supposed to represent their constituents, should be with the NDP on this one. It is unbelievable. I cannot understand how it is that two supposedly responsible political parties in this country could take such an irresponsible attitude in respect of such a significant matter of public debate.

We have had ample opportunity for debate on this subject for the last year. It has been debated in Parliament longer than any other bill in this Parliament already. The time for decision—

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** It has only been here for two months.

**Mr. Milliken:** We have been here for well over a year. The hon. member for Calgary West is saying it has only been a few months. He knows perfectly well that is not true.

We have been sitting here since February 1994. That is well over a year. That is a good long time.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** When did you table the bill?

**Mr. Milliken:** January.

The hon. member has had ample opportunity to discuss this matter. They have had opposition days when they could raise this issue if they wanted to; yet we have not seen it then.

We have offered to sit at night. The hon. member does not want to do that either. Why? Because he wants to have days and days of filibuster and hold this bill up until next year or the year after.

The government is decisive. The government made promises in the red book. The government made promises to the people of Canada when it introduced this bill. The government knows how to govern. It will show leadership to Canadians and it will proceed with this bill. It will do a great job in enacting legislation that will help reduce crime in Canada and help to solve the problems confronting this country in a way that is meaningful and sensible, instead of the ranting, pillaging and raving the Reform Party is engaging in.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the debate on the government's gun control legislation, in particular to support the Reform amendment that the bill be split into two parts, each to be voted on separately.

In doing so I wish to vehemently protest the restrictions the government has placed on this debate in order to rush the bill through Parliament. It strikes me as supremely ironic that a government that seems incapable of imposing any kind of discipline on the criminal elements in society has no hesitancy about imposing a strict discipline on its own caucus and on the debates of this House.

For more than five years Reformers have been criss-crossing this country asking the question, what do Canadians want and, in particular, what kind of country do Canadians want for themselves and for their children as we approach the 21st century. One of the most frequent answers we get to that question is that Canadians want safe streets, safe homes and safe communities.

(1550)

This was expressed to me very eloquently several years ago at a meeting in Toronto when in response to my questions, what do Canadians want, a man in the audience got up and said the following. He said: "Do you know what I want? I want my wife to be able to leave this hotel at 10 p.m. and go to our car in the parkade a block away without running the risk of being mugged, robbed or assaulted. I want the state to discharge the most elemental of its responsibilities, namely, its responsibility to protect the life and property of its citizens. I want to live in a country where the rights and security of law-abiding citizens

and innocent victims of crime take precedence in criminal law and the Constitution over the rights and security of criminals."

There are not many MPs in this House who would disagree that increasing public safety must be a priority of this Parliament. The disagreements among us arise over what is the best way to achieve that result.

With respect to Bill C-68 and the motion to split it, the key question is this. What role does gun control have to play in making Canada a safer place? Two different answers to this question are being given in the 35th Parliament: the Reform position and the Liberal position. Canadians must decide which position maximizes public safety.

The Reform position, which has been stated eloquently by my colleagues, is that gun control will only contribute to public safety if its primary focus is on the criminal use of firearms. The diversion of police attention and financial resources into excessive regulation of the non-criminal use of firearms will not enhance public safety. Canadian voters are telling Reformers and pollsters that their number one priority for justice is strong action directed toward persons who commit violent criminal acts. Based on this position, Reform MPs have taken the lead in proposing measures to tighten up the regulation of the criminal use of firearms.

These measures include the following: implement a zero tolerance policy for criminal offences involving firearms; ensure that charges are laid in all firearms crimes and that plea bargains are not permitted; impose mandatory one-year minimum jail sentences for using any weapon in the commission of a violent crime; provide for progressively more severe penalties for repeat violent and firearms offenders; ensure that all sentences for violent crime and firearms convictions are served consecutively; provide for lifetime prohibitions from ownership of firearms for all persons convicted of violent crimes; impose the same penalty for the use of a replica firearm as for using a real gun in a violent offence; create a new offence of theft of a firearm sentence three to fourteen years; impose sentences of three to fourteen years for unlawful importation or illegal sale of a firearm for a criminal use; deem the seller of a firearm to a criminal as having aided in any future crime committed; and transfer young offenders to adult court for using firearms in the commission of an offence.

In short, the Reform Party is opposed to gun controls that are not cost effective in reducing violent crime, improving public safety and saving lives, and would repeal any gun control provisions that are not cost effective in reducing violent crime, improving public safety and saving lives.

The position that the Liberal government has taken on gun control is utterly predictable and typical of Liberals. If one comes to a hard choice between two options, in this case focusing scarce resources on regulating the criminal or

*Government Orders*

non-criminal use of firearms, the Liberals invariably say: "Do both, even if doing one hurts the other". They are following the advice of that great American philosopher Yogi Berra, who said: "If you come to a fork in the road, take it".

So the justice minister has brought forward this Bill C-68—C stands for compromise—20 per cent of it, under pressure from Reformers, contains partial measures for tightening up the criminal use of firearms, but 80 per cent of it focuses on increased regulation of the non-criminal use of firearms for hunting, recreational and collection purposes, including the establishment of a universal, national firearms registry reputed to cost anywhere from \$85 million to \$500 million. One reason for this wild variance in the cost estimates is because the Liberal government underestimates the number of firearms in Canada.

(1555)

In 1976 a Department of Justice document estimated the number of firearms in Canada at 10 million, with about a quarter of a million guns being added to the stock each year. Using this estimate there should now be over 15 million firearms in Canada, but the justice minister says there are now only 6 million or 7 million guns in Canada.

Bill C-68 cannot be effectively evaluated or costed out unless and until the justice minister can explain where the other 8 million or 9 million guns went.

Reformers oppose the major portion of this bill for three reasons. First, the registry will not be universal. The criminals in whose hands firearms are a huge threat to public safety will unfortunately decline to register. The minister cannot understand why not. He will send polite letters to the Mafia and ads will be placed in the smuggler and gun runners digests, saying "Please, fill out these forms in triplicate in either official language and take them to the police". In the end the registry will omit the one group in whose hands firearms are most dangerous.

Second, the cost of implementing this bill will be far greater than what the minister says. Liberal cabinet ministers are notoriously inept at estimating cost. That is why the federal debt is almost \$550 billion and the government will spend \$35 billion more this year than it takes in.

The Reform caucus has developed a table of multipliers to help determine the real cost of any new proposal put forward by a Liberal cabinet minister. The more soft-headed the minister, the higher the multiplier.

The Minister of Human Resources Development, for example, is a 10. If he says something might cost \$100 million, we multiply it by 10 because the real cost will be closer to \$1 billion. The justice minister is not far behind. He is a 7. When he says his registry will cost \$85 million, we multiply it by 7 and the true cost will be over \$500 million, which is \$500 million that we do not have.

The third and most important reason for opposing Bill C-68 as it is now is that the proposed national registry of firearms for hunting, recreational and collection purposes will not improve public safety. The present handgun registry, which has been in place for 60 years, has not improved public safety. The Washington, D.C. handgun ban and registry has not prevented murder and rape in that city from going out of sight. The police in both New Zealand and Australia have recommended abandoning their costly and ineffective gun registries for precisely this reason.

Despite repeated invitations to do so, the minister has put forward no evidence that his proposed registry will improve public safety, nor has he even proposed public safety measuring sticks against which the performance of the registry can be measured.

In conclusion, if what Canadians want are safer streets, safer homes and safer communities, if public safety is really our aim, then Bill C-68 should be split, as the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville has proposed. The ineffective national registration part should be defeated. The sections tightening up the criminal use of firearms should be strengthened and passed forthwith. This is the course of action that will truly make Canada a safer place to live.

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on second reading of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. In particular, I welcome the opportunity to speak to some of the points raised a moment ago by the leader of the third party. I will come to that in a moment.

This is an extremely important discussion, and strong feelings are being expressed by all sides in the House and by many Canadians.

Approval of second reading will in fact send this bill to committee for discussion and amendment, and then the bill will come back to the House for a final decision and we will all know what the facts are surrounding the bill.

What happens at committee will be extremely important in relation to concerns that Canadians are raising and the concerns that I have expressed with regard to this bill.

(1600)

Constituents have raised their concerns with me with respect to their views on Bill C-68 and I have expressed them to members of my party. They also point out that they support certain measures in the bill to control crime, promote public health and safety and to impose stiff mandatory minimum jail sentences for a range of gun offences. There is strong support for that among my constituents.

My constituents also agree that the government should enact measures to strengthen border controls and amend the Criminal Code to address the problems of smuggling and the illegal

*Government Orders*

importation of firearms. Let me relate two of the four principles of the Firearms Act they strongly support.

I will come to splitting the bill in a moment. The splitting of the bill that the Reform Party talks about is nothing but misleading the public on the real intent of their amendment. The leader of the Reform Party stood up a moment ago and talked about moving toward safety measures. He had some good suggestions, I will admit, but the real intent of the amendment put forward by the Reform Party is not to split the bill but to destroy it. The good suggestions that the Reform Party leader talked about will not be put in the bill because the bill would be gone if we went ahead with the amendment.

Let me come back for a moment to the principles that have strong support in this bill. The criminal misuse of firearms will be dealt with through amendments to offence and sentencing provisions of the Criminal Code, including mandatory four-year minimum sentences for 10 specific violent offences committed while in the possession of a firearm. That is a good point.

The 10 offences are attempted murder, manslaughter, criminal negligence causing death, robbery, kidnapping, hostage taking, sexual assault with a weapon, aggravated sexual assault, extortion and the discharging of a firearm with intent to cause harm. Upon conviction, the offender will receive a lifetime prohibition against possession of a restricted or a prohibited firearm.

The second major important principle that there is strong agreement on is smuggling and illegal importation. Smuggling and illegal importations will be dealt with through legislative amendments and the development of programs for controlling the import-export and domestic transit of firearms, including border registration and new Criminal Code offences for illegally importing and trafficking in firearms. Those are good principles and I and many others in the House support them.

I will admit other aspects of the bill are much more controversial. They relate to the impact on legitimate gun owners, hunters, collectors and sports people using firearms. I have previously presented a petition on behalf of my constituents opposing the bill as currently drafted.

Let me go back to the points I raised then. The petition called on Parliament to "desist from passing additional restrictive legislation with respect to firearms or ammunition and to direct its attention to the apprehension and adequate punishment of those who criminally misuse firearms or other deadly weapons".

My constituents feel very strongly that the bill would not accomplish what the minister intended as currently drafted. They are concerned that law-abiding Canadians are already overburdened by unnecessary and ineffective gun legislation. They believe that the new proposals as currently drafted with the

introduction of mandatory gun registration would punish the wrong people. Many of my constituents and other Islanders have concerns with this legislation.

I tabled that position and raised those concerns. Now I want to see that my constituents have the opportunity to go before a committee in the proper forum to express those concerns themselves or through their national organizations. I do not want it to be the same as what we have been seeing in the past where the Reform Party is using misleading amendments and holding meetings across the country for political reasons.

(1605)

The party talks about crime. Every day its members stand in the House and say they are concerned about crime. The effect of their amendment would, in fact, destroy the opportunity of the bill going to committee and seeing that crime is controlled, including the misuse of firearms.

This is how misunderstood the Reform Party amendment is. Some of my constituents have suggested to me that I should support splitting the bill, believing that the Reform Party amendment will do that. It will not.

I listened closely to the leader of the third party. In his speech he went through a litany of suggestions to improve public safety. The amendment destroys that opportunity. I would suggest that the leader of the Reform Party re-read the amendment. Allow me to take a moment to emphasize to the leader of the third party what the amendment states: "this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-68". That would have the effect of destroying the bill. They know it. They are misleading the Canadian public. For the party that talks about crime control, it would have the opposite effect.

In conclusion, I want to see changes to the bill. Those changes can be made in committee. I suggest that the process is not all that it could have been; however, we have a bill before us that must be improved.

In discussions I have had with fellow MPs and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, I feel I have been given assurance that the bill will be decriminalized with respect to legitimate gun owners, collectors, sports people and hunters, at least on their first offence. With that assurance, I am willing to support the bill going to committee to be improved so that it meets the needs of all Canadians.

I am really disgusted that the Reform Party has tried to turn this, by its amendment, into a political game. However I guess that is life in the world of politics. Reformers are misleading Canadians as to where they really want to go.

By this bill going to committee it will give Canadians the chance to voice their concerns in a public forum, before a legitimate committee, so that the bill can be improved to meet the needs of all Canadians.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be recognized but not very happy to be speaking at second reading stage of Bill C-68, the federal government's ill-conceived firearms control legislation.

I am especially not happy to be here speaking today now that the government has invoked closure on the bill. It has cut off debate in the House so the parliamentarians who have been talking to their constituents about the bill will not now have a chance to share all they have heard in their constituencies with other members of Parliament and, more important, with the Minister of Justice and his cabinet colleagues. Shutting off debate on the bill at this point is quite a shameful act. First, the government restricted access to the bill and now it is restricting debate.

I have listened carefully to much of the debate since the legislation was introduced. As emotional as it has been at times, there has been much said that is worthy of note. I hope the minister has been listening with a mind which will accept change. Unfortunately I find that the minister, like many Canadians, simply accepts the idea of firearms control as an end in itself.

(1610)

The legislation addresses firearms control. Therefore the minister seems to be saying, for that reason alone it is worthy of support. It does not matter if this is a good bill, a bad bill or an inadequate bill. It should be worthy of support simply because it deals with gun control. We are all supposed to stand up and support it because of the premise. Whether it addresses all the problems facing Canadians and their personal insecurities does not seem to be relevant in the debate.

I believe these matters are relevant and I want to look at some of them today. I have heard many stories told in this Chamber over the past weeks, personal stories and quoted newspaper accounts of stories affecting people in various communities throughout North America. Each of these stories is told to gain support for the legislation. The stories are about individual tragedies of friends, relatives or people whose names appear in the paper because of some firearms accident or wilful event.

If one listens closely and reads between the lines, these stories are telling us that if we want to prevent the personal tragedies outlined, we must get rid of firearms and not register them.

The people who raised those stories in Parliament and the minister know that getting rid of firearms is not an option in the legislation before us today. For all intents and purposes the illustrative stories that have been brought to the debate, as important as they are to the individuals affected, are diverting attention from the real debate in front of us. The tragedies that they represent—and tragedies they are—can occur just as easily with a registered firearm as an unregistered one.

There is not enough time for me today, in 10 minutes, to outline everything that the legislation does. I will support the amendment before us which splits the bill into two parts because a good argument can be made for debating the two issues separately. My complaint with the legislation is the registration and the way in which it is being presented to the Canadian public by the government.

The universal registration of firearms is being presented for something that it is not. Persons with legitimate and legal uses for their firearms are being asked to pay for this misadvised purpose.

The government is telling Canadians that if all firearms are registered they can feel safer and have more security in their homes. They can feel safer and more secure on the streets. This is simply not true. Peddling false hope while doing absolutely nothing else to alleviate the fears of the Canadian public or to attack the root causes of crime and violence in our society is practically dishonest.

As members know, I believe in gun safety. Just because I do not support the legislation of the Minister of Justice, I have been criticized for not supporting firearm safety. Members will remember that this was one of the reasons why I supported the previous government's legislation on firearms. I supported that legislation against the wishes of many of my vocal constituents because it dealt with firearm safety. Today many of those who criticized me in the past have agreed that the safety course being offered is a good one, that the safe storage, handling and transportation regulations contained in that legislation were reasonable.

Bill C-68, the registration provisions in the legislation in front of us today do nothing to enhance or improve on the existing safety provisions already in place. The new legislation should not be promoted as if it does. Also, we must reduce the amount of violent death and injury. We as a nation must confront this issue from all sides, including its social and economic roots.

Bill C-68 and its registration provisions by themselves will do nothing to reduce violent injury, death or suicide for that matter. If as a nation we are serious about suicide, spousal violence or criminal street violence we have to do much more than talk about creating a registry.

We have to do all that we can to reduce suicides and homicides but as everyone in this Chamber knows, these suicides and homicides will occur with registered legal firearms as well unless other social and economic issues are dealt with.

(1615)

Members of the Chamber will recall, because it was released a few weeks ago, that the royal commission on aboriginal peoples released a report on suicide among aboriginal people, parti-

cularly among aboriginal youth. To date the federal government has done virtually nothing to respond to the recommendations in this important and crucial report. The report indicated this issue has been before the government for more than 10 years.

If the federal government were truly interested in dealing with the issue of youth suicide it would respond in the affirmative to the recommendation of the royal commission report immediately.

It is a bit surprising the government says firearms registration is critical to the reduction of suicide and violence and yet at the same time is proposing a delay in the full registration process until the year 2003. Surely if the government were serious about this false contention and about the issue, if registration were actually important to the reduction of suicide and violence, would it not make compulsory registration immediate?

Why wait eight years if this is so important? The answer is simple. There is no evidence to support the government's claims. Registration is not important to the reduction of suicide and violence, and the government knows it.

I also support the police dealing with real criminals in our society. I have no trouble accepting the argument that those who commit crimes against the rest of society must be sought out, convicted and punished. However, I must remind the House and the minister that every police officer from northwest Saskatchewan I have spoken to and all the police officers I deal with on a regular basis in my own constituency tell me registration is not the answer for them.

When they are called to a domestic dispute or a location where they are uncertain what they might find when they arrive, they already assume every home they visit has a firearm. They already take no chances when they visit a scene. The bill gives them no additional security in this regard.

The police tell me that anyone who will shoot them is as likely to use an illegal weapon as a registered firearm. The police in northwest Saskatchewan tell me they need more time in the field, better support services and more sustained opportunity to work on preventative community strategies. There is a need to work on programs that will help them prevent violence rather than programs that respond only once violence has been committed. The bill and government comments to that effect offer no hope that this is being contemplated by the government.

If I had more time today I would happily put more concerns on the record. Fortunately a few members in the House have already begun to do so. Rather, I stress I remain critical of this legislation. I am critical because the Liberals have set out an agenda that they say will deal with safety and security and they are asking the residents of my constituency who happen to own

### *Government Orders*

legal and useful firearms to pay for them through the registration system.

The government is doing this without offering any evidence that any part of its plan will work any better than existing rules which have not yet been fully evaluated. I find this wrong and to a certain extent shameful politics.

I have already demonstrated that I do support firearms control measures that have a real and meaningful impact on our nation and its citizens. As I said earlier, while there is a role for legitimate critique of Bill C-68 and the critique of the false hope the Liberals are setting up with its passage, I trust the nation, the House and especially the minister will not only allow room for that critique to be articulated but also will take it to heart.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the bill today. It is very significant that we are in the House talking about this subject at a time which I see as one of the last few periods when we can make this kind of significant change to our gun control laws.

We are looking at the type of society in which we want to live.

(1620)

The Minister of Justice has brought forward legislation on young offenders and sentencing. He has made a commitment to make changes to the dangerous offender laws and we have before us today the bill on gun control.

I do not want to criticize because I am a very big supporter and fan of our neighbours to the south. However, we have seen a situation there in which citizens who want to change the law cannot. We have seen a situation in which the number of deaths by firearms has escalated to totally catastrophic levels.

In 1992 in the United States, 35,000 people died as a result of firearms; 150,000 people wounded by firearms in the same year. That is alarming. Those who were wounded might have been killed at that time if infrared spotting devices were available. They are now available in the United States, giving greater accuracy in dark areas, at night and to those who really do not have proficiency in the use of firearms to have good aim.

We have been told the United States is different. We have been told this because of the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States. We have been told there is a constitutional right to bear arms in the United States. That is not correct in the sense the National Rifle Association in the United States would have us believe.

The right to bear arms as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States applies to the militias and the constabularies of the states to be able to arm themselves to defend against a national army. That is the basis as interpreted by the Supreme

*Government Orders*

Court of the United States of the right to bear arms. It is not for citizens of the United States to have unlimited permission and lawfully be able to have arms.

I want to give one example of how that applies with the case of one small community in Illinois, Morton Grove, in the early 1980s, I think in 1982. It decided it wanted to do something about the proliferation of firearms. It decided to ban firearms. There was a municipal bylaw which banned firearms in that community.

The National Rifle Association became very alarmed at this and a great deal of lobbying ensued. As a result, the state of Illinois passed a law that stated municipal laws could not be more prohibitive with respect to firearms than state laws. That destroyed any opportunity for any further municipality in the state of Illinois to do what Morton Grove did.

There are other states with the same law. It was never challenged. The right of the community of Morton Grove to do that was not challenged on the basis of the second amendment. It was the lobbying by the National Rifle Association to make sure state governments moved in to prohibit that sort of thing happening anywhere else in that state and to its determination, any other state in the union.

The National Rifle Association is quite a prominent lobbying group in Washington. It employs approximately 50 people, has an annual budget of approximately \$100 million and in the Congressional elections in 1992 spent \$1.7 million on candidates favourable to its position.

There is no way the Americans will be able to strengthen their gun control laws significantly in light of that kind of lobbying and force opposed to them.

(1625)

We just have to look at the Brady bill. Mr. Brady was shot at the same time as President Reagan, a very valued and admired public servant in the United States on the staff of the President of the United States. He was impaired for life. He and his wife worked tirelessly to bring forward a bill for stronger gun control. The bill he wanted was one stronger than the one eventually passed, but it was only through the force of personality and the type of people Brady and his wife were that they were able to get that bill at all.

Congress in the United States now wants to roll back some of the advantages and some of the things obtained in the Brady bill. I credit President Clinton when he says that under no circumstances would he allow that to happen and he would veto any such measures. That is not democracy. That is not allowing the people of the United States to choose.

We in Canada do not have that kind of force opposed to the free will and to the ability of Canadians to make their decision.

It is getting more difficult. The structured opposition is becoming stronger. If Canadians want stronger gun control it has to be now.

We want Canadians to decide. We want to have the bill go to committee. We want to have an intense study of the bill in committee. We are prepared to listen to witnesses, to members of Parliament and to make some changes to the bill.

The Minister of Justice said he wants to have the areas of black powder shooting, certified competitions and antiques looked at and perhaps defined a little more clearly; perhaps changes made in these areas. He has also given an assurance to the Canadian Police Association with respect to penalties and the criminalization of non-registration. He wants that looked at. Those are very significant directions. I presume he will be giving further instructions to the committee when he appears.

He has also stated that when he appears before the committee he will give the breakdown and the background information on why he has stated the registration system will cost approximately \$85 million. For those who are saying it will be \$500 million, I am sure they will want to hear the minister's information. That is fair.

The previous speaker from the New Democratic Party said it has not worked before so why are we trying again. We are trying again because it has not worked before. We are trying to put in a registration system that can work. It is not because it is a registration system. The registration system will work because of advances in technology, a registration that will be—

**Miss Grey:** The criminals can break in.

**Mr. MacLellan:** No, they cannot break in. That is nonsense. That is pure fabrication, absolute rubbish.

The possession licences and the firearms registration certificates will be cards similar to credit cards with magnetic tape which will have the information and when it is run through a machine similar to a machine that checks a Visa card, the firearm will automatically be registered. It could be registered in a place of purchase similar to Canadian Tire. It will feed into the main computer system at which there will be fire doors to prohibit the information coming back out.

It will be a safe system. That is one of the reasons we want to wait until January 1998 to start registration. We want to have the people of Canada realize this is a safe system, a beneficial system and it will not cost what they have been told it will cost them.

**An hon. member:** Will it fight crime?

(1630)

**Mr. MacLellan:** It is going to fight crime too.

Unfortunately, I only have ten minutes. If the hon. member comes to the committee and listens, he will hear that, if he has

*Government Orders*

not understood it already. This is going to be a cost factor where those who register, starting in January of 1996, will not pay anything for their possession certificate initially and the cost will increase in a moderate fashion throughout the five-year period. When the five-year renewal period comes around, there will be a cost of approximately \$60 per person for the renewal.

The registration cost will not be \$100 per firearm, as has been stated by many members in the House. It will be \$10 per firearm, and for that \$10 the person will be able to register 10 firearms. That is a significant difference from what we have been told by members opposite.

I also want to say that this bill will fight crime. If members opposite do not know that now, they should make a point of looking at the statistics to realize that.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I can just imagine all the criminals in Canada waiting to run down to the nearest registration office to say, "I own this gun. Put my name on that list, by golly, because I want to get on that computer." They just cannot wait for that.

Unfortunately, this is a tragic thought, but I can also imagine how much better future victims of firearms crimes are going to feel when an offence is committed against them with a registered firearm. I say that facetiously, but still very seriously.

The motion put forward by my hon. colleague from Yorkton—Melville will split Bill C-68 into two portions. I believe it is imperative to be able to discuss separately, in a substantial fashion, the so-called merits of universal registration, as the Liberals would like to have Canadians believe that there actually is some merit to it, and also to discuss the improvements to the Criminal Code that would deal with people who commit firearms offences. It is important that this bill be split. Canadian people must have a chance to have input on both sides of the bill. To create a bill that deals with these two issues in one simply leaves the Canadian people and this House with no opportunity to stop the bad side of the bill and, at the same time, vote for some of the good points.

I believe there are members in the Liberal Party who would, if given the opportunity, instantly vote against universal registration and at the same time instantly support stricter penalties and tougher laws for people who commit firearms offences. We enthusiastically implore the Liberal Party to support the splitting of Bill C-68.

I believe members should be concerned when changes to the Criminal Code are tied to other measures that seek to impose on the right of law-abiding Canadians to own and enjoy property. This imposition is exactly what Bill C-68, when taken in its entirety, seeks to accomplish: to impose red tape, more regulation and more penalties on law-abiding firearms owners in this

country. At the same time, the bill does little to impose stricter penalties, harsher penalties, rightful penalties on the people who commit firearms offences. We should be looking at deterring firearms crime while not imposing on the rights of law-abiding firearms owners.

(1635)

The motion of the member for Yorkton—Melville to split the bill is in accordance with a policy that the Canadian people want. If this bill was split, this party can support enthusiastically the part that deals with imposing stricter penalties on firearms offences, while at the same time enthusiastically opposing it, along with a lot of Liberal backbenchers who would love to do it. Unfortunately, because of party discipline in the Liberal party, they are not going to be able to oppose the registration.

The Minister of Justice, the Liberal members, with all their rhetoric and all their talk about this new bill, Bill C-68, have offered not one shred of substantive proof that universal registration will prevent firearms crime in Canada. Not one single shred have any of these Liberal members offered of proof that firearms registration is going to cut crime in this country.

The onus is on the Minister of Justice and this government to demonstrate clearly to law-abiding citizens affected by these new registration laws that they will indeed produce a desirable effect. That is what good legislation should be all about. This bill cannot demonstrate that in any way; therefore, it cannot be considered good legislation.

The onus was placed on the Minister of Justice to clearly demonstrate how registration is going to cut crime. He has not done it. The minister continues to state that registration will improve public safety. Again, he has not presented one single shred of evidence that it is going to do exactly that.

He says the association of police chiefs support him. I may get a few of these chiefs mad at me, but I would like to remind this House that the association of police chiefs has received about \$150,000 in grants for their organization from this government. One can conjure up all sorts of thoughts of why there is this great support for Bill C-68 and the Minister of Justice.

However, the facts simply do not support his claim. In New Zealand the practice of registration was discontinued. They tried it. In 1983 their police force discovered—I have to assume that the New Zealand police are a fairly intelligent lot—that a gun registry did nothing to combat crime. In Canada police officers in Saskatchewan—I have to believe that police officers in Saskatchewan are as intelligent as police officers in any other part of Canada—

**Mr. Taylor:** Maybe more so.

**Mr. Harris:** Maybe more so, yes.

*Government Orders*

The police officers in Saskatchewan have demonstrated that they have absolutely no faith in Bill C-68 and its ability to affect crime rates.

As time goes on we will see the police forces in some of the other provinces come forward with the same conclusion.

We have had a handgun registry in this country for about 60 years. It was revamped in 1977 by Bill C-51, which was introduced again by a Liberal government to, as they say—and this is wonderful—enhance public safety. This sort of sounds familiar. We have heard this same phrase from this government and the Minister of Justice himself over the last several weeks. It is to “enhance public safety”. Since 1977, studies by Sproule and Kennett, Robert Mundt, and Mauser and Holmes all showed that the changes enacted in 1977 had no effect on firearms homicide rates in Canada.

That is what we call substantive evidence, not the rhetoric and the words that the Liberals use with nothing to back them up—statistics.

(1640)

It is very clear that while Bill C-68 does contain some measures to deal more harshly with criminals and people who commit firearms offences, which we can support, we would have liked to have seen the government and the minister introduce a whole lot stiffer penalties than what they have done. While it contains some legislation that is good and that we can support, I challenge the part that deals with firearms registration.

I have been on talk show after talk show with anti-gun advocates. When I gave them the specific opportunity to bring forward substantive evidence that gun registration would cut crime, not one single time were they able to give a substantive piece of evidence. The most common answer was: “Well, we register cars; what is wrong with registering guns?” That is the standard answer from these people and this government here.

Let us go with that. Mr. Speaker, you tell me and any member over here whether the registration of automobiles cuts down on stolen cars, on traffic accidents or on the carnage that is on our highway. How does car registration cut down on people who steal cars and commit crimes with cars? Not one single bit.

I ask this government and any member over there to show me clearly, please, how they substantiate their claim that universal registration is going to in fact cut crime. I give that challenge to them and so do millions of firearms owners in this country who can see no justification for universal firearms registration.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Dear colleagues, it is my duty to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the

time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Brant—justice; the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake—the environment.

[*English*]

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the second reading debate on Bill C-68 today.

I have a distinct advantage over many of the members of this House because I am a member of the justice committee. As a member of the justice committee, when this bill is referred to the justice committee I will have many days and hours, many opportunities, to ask witnesses very pointed questions. I will have an opportunity not only to examine witnesses but to cross-examine witnesses and inquire about certain facts that my friends in the Reform Party, for example, have suggested are not facts and to ask certain questions that they want to ask.

My intervention today will not be to answer or attempt to answer the questions that my friends in the Reform Party have brought up, generally speaking. My purpose in standing today and speaking is to examine and to try to help Canadians understand precisely what it is that is going to happen today. What I object to, quite frankly, is the misinformation that my friends in the Reform Party are attempting to spread across Canada with respect to what would happen if we were to support their motion today.

What I want to talk about is the actual legalities of what would occur if one were to support the Reform Party motion, and then let us let Canadians decide what the Reform Party has been saying and let us let them decide whether it is in fact what would occur.

We are being asked to consider the government’s motion. It is a very simple motion. We may not agree with the bill or the principles, but the motion is very simple. It states “that the bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs”. The government is simply saying, all right, let us refer this to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs so that they can hear witnesses and hear all of these people who wish to either support or object to the bill.

My friends in the Reform Party have put forward a very specific amendment. They are trying to tell people that their amendment splits the bill. That is not the case. The motion is very specific. All words after the word “that” are to be removed. Remember that the original motion says that the bill be read a second time and referred to committee. Reform members want that passage to be removed. What do they want to substitute it with? Do they want to substitute a motion that says that the bill be split into two separate sections? No. This is what they want to do:

That this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, because the principle of establishing a system for licensing and registration of all firearms and the principle of creating a variety of offences are two unrelated issues that should be addressed separately.

(1645)

Maybe they should be addressed separately, but if this motion were passed it would not allow the House to address those two questions separately. If we passed this motion, we would not be dealing with Bill C-68, period. The House would not read Bill C-68 a second time. The House would not refer Bill C-68 to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Consequently, there would be no Bill C-68 and therefore, there would be nothing to split and nothing to discuss.

In my respectful view, it is improper for members of the Reform Party to suggest that their motion would split this bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. Their motion would have the effect of killing this bill, not splitting it. So let us talk facts.

Members of the Reform Party have made a point of saying that they are talking straight to the people. Then be straight with the people. If they are going to bring a motion that says to kill Bill C-68, then tell people that is the kind of motion they are bringing forward, not that it is a motion to split the bill. That is utter parliamentary nonsense.

Anyone who votes in favour of the amendment thinking that the bill will be split is sadly misinformed. The actual effect of voting for the amendment will be to kill Bill C-68.

If we were to kill Bill C-68 the justice committee would have absolutely no opportunity whatsoever to consider the merits of the bill. It would have no opportunity whatsoever to consider any amendments that could be put forward. It would have no opportunity whatsoever to try to excise some portions of the bill.

Let us be honest with Canadians. If members do not like the bill, then say so. If you do not like the bill, tell Canadians that the amendment would throw the bill out. Do not tell Canadians the bill would be split because that is not the fact.

**Miss Grey:** Is that the end?

**Mr. Wappel:** No, that is not the end.

Let us talk about what will happen if common sense prevails and we send this bill to committee. The bill is not perfect. Nothing that is written in this House is perfect. There are problems with the bill. The Minister of Justice acknowledged in a press release that he would like the committee to consider at least three amendments.

One deals with relics and whether they can be passed on from generation to generation. The second one is how we deal with prohibited classes of weapons that are used for competition. That is a legitimate thing. We can deal with prohibited weapons that might be used for competition. We can put an amendment to

### *Government Orders*

the bill that would permit such a use. There is nothing wrong or impossible about that. The minister has also asked us to look at black powder historical re-enactments.

There are a couple of problems I would like to look at before I have an opportunity to put forward my amendments. I acknowledge that I have an opportunity which is not available to most members. I am a member of the justice committee and I can put forward all kinds of amendments at committee. Then I can put forward more amendments in the House at report stage. I really have two cracks at it, unlike most members, and I acknowledge that.

One problem I have with the bill as it currently stands is the possibility of confiscation without compensation. This is anathema, unliberal. We have to deal with it. We have to look at what the bill actually says and make some hard decisions. In my view, there should be compensation for property that is legally acquired and is subsequently confiscated for the greater public good, if that is what this House decides. We do it with real estate. There is no reason that we cannot do it in this situation.

I would like to hear some evidence on that. I would like to hear the pros and cons. I would like to hear all those people who wish to come to the justice committee to tell us what is wrong or right with it.

(1650)

I have some problem with the mandatory sentencing. Let us pick a section arbitrarily. Let us pick proposed section 244, which is found in clause 138 of the bill which reads in part:

244. Every person who, with intent

- (a) to wound, maim or disfigure any person,
- (b) to endanger the life of any person, or
- (c) to prevent the arrest or detention of any person,

discharges a firearm at any person—is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of four years.

What does that mean from a legal point of view? Does that mean if they wound somebody, they will get a sentence for the wounding, then an additional four year consecutive sentence? Or does it mean that if they wound someone and they are found to have wounded someone under that section they will get a sentence of a minimum of four years? There is a huge difference. We have to hear from the justice department officials and other people in the legal field as to exactly what that means.

The perception may be among some in the community that a mandatory four year sentence means four years on top of any sentence for the crime. Others might think it is four years in total. That is called the totality principle. These are legitimate concerns and questions.

There is another legitimate concern. That is the one expressed by members of the Reform Party as to the actual purposes registration would serve. Would registration serve the purpose

*Government Orders*

of reducing firearm related crimes? How can we know unless we hear from the experts?

We can sit in committee and listen to people on both sides, the Ontario Handgun Association, the National Rifle Association or the firearms people. We can listen to the Canadian chiefs of police. Our friends from the Reform Party can ask them about the grants that have been going on for one or two decades. Never mind their innuendoes about the chiefs of police. They are not appointed by the federal government but by their own municipalities. These innuendoes are insulting to the chiefs of police.

In any event, these questions can be put directly. We can ask if there is any correlation between registration and the curtailment of handgun or firearm related crimes. If not, then it may be necessary to consider other reasons that we might want the registration circumstances.

It is inconceivable to me that a reasonable person would not want this matter studied in depth at the justice committee. All groups and people across Canada who want to provide input on this legislation would have the opportunity to do so. For the Reform Party to say anything but the fact that its motion would kill this bill is utter nonsense.

In conclusion, I want to say something to the people of my own riding of Scarborough West. I have discussed this issue with them on numerous occasions. I have put out a householder which contains a survey. It will be in their mailboxes within two weeks. I ask for their direct input and answers to the questions I have asked on gun control.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this debate as well. I am glad to be back in the House. I am particularly pleased to be able to address a subject I have heard about only in the last 24 hours. This is pretty handy.

It has to do with a debate that went on years ago. It seems like 40 years, but it was really only four, in 1991. My colleague from Burnaby—Kingsway had said something about the member for Beaver River supporting universal firearm registration. I thought: “This certainly is news to me. I have never spoken in favour of that. Boy, I had better check this out”.

I had to chuckle when I saw it in a copy of *Hansard*, November 6, 1991. My friend from Kingston and the Islands brought it to my attention this afternoon—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I wonder if the hon. parliamentary secretary would refrain from heckling while the member is giving her remarks.

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that from the Speaker and from the member for Kingston and the Islands.

It said that I was in favour of gun registration. Let me get one thing straight. I would like to quote from *Hansard*, November 6, 1991, page 4687. I had already given my entire speech and was on questions and comments. Remember that I was sitting way back there all by myself and put up with any amount of heckling from members.

(1655)

The parliamentary secretary, a dino-Tory, said to me, could I please make some comments on this, that and the next thing. I said to him at page 4687:

I would draw the member's attention to the Canadian Police Association and some of the recommendations they brought forward. They said that “over 90 per cent of our respondents believe that guns of all kinds should be registered”.

The Canadian Police Association said that 90 per cent of its respondents believed that all guns should be registered. I then said right after that that I agreed with that and I think every Canadian would agree with that. If those are its numbers, that is the survey it did among its members, how can I disagree with that? I am not going to dispute those numbers. If I were in favour of universal gun registration, and here comes the English teacher, I would have said I agree with them. I would agree with them if I were in favour of gun registration. It makes sense.

Looking at this yesterday I thought that if this was such a loud situation that I was in favour of gun registration, why in heaven's name did I not hear about it on November 7, 1991 from such groups in my constituency as the wonderful people who belong to Lac La Biche Shooting Association, responsible firearms owners, and Grand Centre's Cold Lake District Sportsman Fish and Game Association? Do you think that if I had supported gun registration these people would have even let me off the aeroplane to come back home? This is bunk.

If the member for Burnaby—Kingsway is so concerned about the fact that I support universal gun registration, he should have found it in my speech and in my thesis. He did not find it there; he did not find it now. He is in big trouble with his own small, minute caucus here.

If we are going to talk about flip-flops, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about when you and I listened in the last Parliament to Ian Waddell, Margaret Mitchell, and I could list all 43 of them. I am sure I can remember who they were. Audrey as well. They were going on and on talking about how terrible this was. All of a sudden in 1995 it is just amazing how things change. The NDP caucus is not going to be supporting this legislation. I have to admire them for that. The member for Burnaby—Kingsway is not going to be able to. If he can justify that back home that is fine. Things were different in 1991 of course. I did not agree with universal gun registration then, nor do I now.

*Government Orders*

Let us look at the Canadian Police Association's latest viewpoint on gun registration: "The Canadian Police Association recognizes the clear value of information availability to police officers, which registration of all firearms provides, and supports a full firearms registration system, but cannot support the registration system articulated in Bill C-68 unless there is a guarantee from the federal government that any implementation or administration costs for such a system will not come from existing operational police budgets". I agree with that too.

I do not agree with gun registration, but I have to agree with what the Canadian Police Association says. Whether the police will be able to enforce it on the frontlines or whether that money will actually have to come from some of the operating budgets, if there are fewer policemen in our cities, in our small towns and on our country highways when people are hauling around firearms committing crimes with them, that is where the money should go.

The proposed national firearms registration system will contain data for six million to 20 million guns, which is a lot of guns, and three million to seven million gun owners. We just heard our friend from the maritimes, the parliamentary secretary for justice, saying that we are going to get something like a Visa card and we will just run it through the magnetic strip.

Has anyone here ever had their Visa card stolen? Is it going to be guaranteed that that is safe, that they are not going to be able to break on to the Internet and have absolute access and a shop at home catalogue? Can we have any guarantee that someone is not going to be able to get into the Internet? He promised us it would be safer than safe.

When we talk safe, I want to talk about the fact that someone who is a victim of a crime with a firearm does not give two hoots about whether that gun was registered or not and whether somebody in a criminal gang in downtown cities anywhere across this country is going to be able to break into that system. We hear about it all the time. Why should the gun registration be any safer than anything else?

It is frightening to me that they would be able to know who has guns, where they are, how many they have and have absolute access to them. Those people are not going to register their firearms. We have to be absolutely dreaming if we think such a thing is going to happen.

(1700)

Do you think that someone coming across the border is going to give up a gun? Who is going to seize these guns?

**An hon. member:** The police.

**Miss Grey:** The police are going to seize the guns. This thing is going full circle because the Canadian Police Association just said in its most recent document: "Who is going to do the seizing? Who is going to do the policing?" How much time are the police going to have for that? How much time does any policeman in any constituency have for more bookwork and paperwork? They should be out in their cruisers stopping crime.

A universal registration system will be a very large undertaking with huge costs. People joked earlier when my leader was speaking about us not having any idea of what the costs are. We would like to know, or at least have an idea of what the costs are. The Minister of Justice may talk about costs but we have absolutely no proof of that.

The finance minister in his budget, somewhat recently, gave us an idea of what to expect for deficits. We are going to be spending \$9 billion on interest payments for every dollar that is cut. It goes on and on. One hundred billion dollars will be added to the deficit. Give us an idea of the costs, it is a lot of money.

Canadian taxpayers are going to be paying for this. We hear the government saying that it will be user pay, not just taxpayers' money. What is user pay? It is nothing more than me taking \$10 out of my pocket to pay for registering my .22. It is nothing more than giving my money to the government or to someone to register my gun. It is user pay. Is it still costing me money? Yes, of course it is. I would sooner pay that \$10 to a health care system that is going to be more efficient than knowing that someone is just paying to have his gun registered.

The recreational firearms communities of two provincial governments have huge doubts about the legislation and the minister knows it. I participated in the rally in September and I was proud of all the responsible firearms owners. Nobody acted crazy or irresponsible that day.

I must say I admire the minister for going out and facing them. The people in my constituency said they thought that was pretty brave. There was no one to be ashamed of there. It is not the responsible firearms owners who we should be attacking in this legislation. It is the criminal misuse of firearms and a registration system will do nothing to eliminate or even alleviate crime.

This new scheme will represent a massive attack by the state and its police on property rights and the privacy of millions of law-abiding citizens. I frankly do not think I need to say anything more about this. I never did support universal gun registration regardless of what my friend from Burnaby says. I do not agree with the police association's estimate. I agree with the fact that they say those are their numbers, but I do not agree with them. There would not be people in my constituency, and many policemen as well, who could support that.

*Government Orders*

Crime is what we should be attacking here, not registration. Registration is not the answer. Therefore, let us split this bill in two and make sure that we deal with crime. As the bill is now responsible firearms owners are going to be labelled and become criminals.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak on the motion. I have been spending the last few days listening to the debate on it.

I must say that some good ideas came from across the floor. Some good ideas also came from this side of the House of changes we could make to really reflect the concerns of some of my constituents.

Over the past few months I have been talking to a number of my constituents who have been hearing a lot of misinformation concerning this bill. It has been very difficult to really debate the bill in an open and meaningful way. I end up spending half of my time trying to explain to constituents parts of the bill that they believe are there but actually are not. I find that a very difficult way to deal with the legislation.

I have a number of concerns with the legislation but before I get into that I want to talk about those areas which I think everyone in the House supports. When Bill C-17 came into the House under the former Conservative government I could not support and voted against the sections on the increased criminal sanctions for the illegal use of firearms. One of the reasons I voted against the bill was that I did not believe it dealt with the criminal use of guns. My constituents did not feel these issues were properly dealt with.

(1705)

I brought those points forward and I want to thank the minister for at least listening to Canadians who felt there was not enough being done to sanction people who use guns in the commission of crimes. I appreciate that he and the Prime Minister are taking our ideas and moving forward with them.

As members know, the average sanction across the board is about 16 months. The minister has increased it to four years. I would rather have seen it go higher but I see that as a positive step and a good way forward.

I also agree with what the minister is doing with the whole question of smuggling. I have talked with the Minister of National Revenue and he has indicated to me that he, along with the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice, have a task force together. They are going to focus on smuggling.

This will not work unless smugglers are stopped at the border. There is one major place at the border where the majority of these guns are coming across. I call on the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General to deal with that situation and to get the guns off the street. I also agree with the seizure of the assets

of those people who smuggle. If assets are seized and smuggling is stopped it will go a long way in dealing with some of the problems.

I have not heard anybody on the other side thank the minister for dealing with the whole situation of young offenders with regard to handguns. I see that as a positive step forward and something we could support.

I want to get into those areas that I feel are not very well represented. Specifically, there is the whole area of registration. It is probably the area that concerns most of my constituents. When I was putting forward proposals on that, I always said that registration would have to be proven to me to be effective, efficient and affordable. When I look at some of the proposals put forward by the minister, I am concerned whether they actually meet that criteria.

I hope the members of the committee on justice will tear the bill apart, get the minister before them and get the proof whether these sorts of criteria are met. I see that as an important role of the committee and I hope it will take that challenge on.

I also wanted to split the bill. A lot of members wanted to split the bill but I have to say to my colleagues across the way that their motion does not split the bill.

**Miss Grey:** Make a motion.

**Mr. Speller:** I will make a motion. I wonder if I can have unanimous consent to move this motion. I move:

That section 80 on page 36 through to section 112 on page 51 could be removed from this bill and brought back as another bill under the name of the Canadian firearms registration system.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the member have unanimous consent to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. The member has the floor on debate.

**Mr. Stinson:** A Liberal said no.

**Mr. Speller:** Mr. Speaker, a number of members on all sides of the House would support a motion like that. I hope that maybe we can work as this bill goes through its other stages to convince the minister to do something like that.

**Miss Grey:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Speller:** Mr. Speaker, I notice that you gave our hon. colleague a going over for heckling before.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member has a good point. As the member for Beaver River will agree, I asked the member not to heckle her. I wonder if members on the Reform side would not heckle the member.

(1710)

**Mr. Speller:** Mr. Speaker, I return to the Criminal Code provisions and registration. A number of members have raised concerns about people who do not properly register their guns and therefore get a criminal record. I hope the committee will look at the issue. I know the minister has indicated to the Canadian Police Association that he would be willing to look at it. I know that members of the Liberal caucus will be working with the minister over the next little while to make sure that is a fact.

I would like to see a sunset clause on registration. We have found that there are difficulties with the handgun registration system. Frankly, I am not sure how this one is going to work. For instance if it is not working in 10 years, let's hoist it and get rid of it. If the minister can prove it is working, then leave it alone. However, something like a sunset clause may not be a bad idea.

Handguns are prohibited, however certain handguns are used now in gun clubs. I know the minister has indicated his willingness to work with national associations concerning handguns they say they should be able to use. I also hope that the minister and perhaps the committee will listen to other clubs whose members use handguns, but which may not always follow national association criteria.

I also have a real concern with how this bill deals with regulations and how it will look at an area that is not normally considered, that of long arms. An example is the Ruger Mini-14. I know it is not considered in this bill. However, there will be a provision created under which the minister can deal with the Ruger Mini-14 and prohibit it from being used.

In my area a number of farmers use it to shoot coyotes. It is the gun of preference to get rid of the coyotes. A number of people will be concerned with that area. Should these guns still be used to hunt or at gun clubs? I hope the minister will allow us time to deal with that issue.

I have listened to members of the Reform Party over the last while talking about the bill and how their constituents are against it. As members of Parliament we must deal with that. It is the Reform Party that says it has to represent the wishes of its constituents. I agree with that. That is why I talk with my constituents and try to get to as many areas as I can.

All members have to look at the results of national polls. I refer to a poll that was done by the minister of justice of Alberta. I want to quote from that poll. Obviously, everyone knows that the polls taken showed that Albertans were against this. It did not show that in the rural areas, which is of a concern to me because a lot of areas of Alberta are somewhat like southwestern Ontario. We have a lot in common.

If we look at the question: "Do you strongly agree or strongly disagree with registration of rifles?" The numbers were 50 per cent said they agreed and 48 per cent somewhat agreed or disagreed.

*Government Orders*

However, in some rural centres the numbers were: strongly agree, 58 per cent; strongly disagree, 43 per cent. It clearly shows that even in rural Alberta they support the minister in the registration of long arms.

As members of Parliament we not only have to consider our constituents but we also must take into account the importance of the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to the order made earlier today, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The first vote is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen.*

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

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

(*Division No. 189*)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Crawford	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazier
Gilmour	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Murphy	Penson
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Schmidt
Serré	Solberg
Solomon	Speaker
Steckle	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—55	

## Government Orders

## NAYS

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Crête
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Guimond	Harvard
Hickey	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint—Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murray	Ménard
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Proud	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Simmons
Skoke	St—Laurent
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin

Torsney  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Volpe  
Whelan  
Zed—173

Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Verran  
Wappel  
Young

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Copps
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Gaffney
Grose	Harper (Churchill)
Plamondon	Sauvageau

(1745)

[English]

**The Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost. The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

(Division No. 190)

## YEAS

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Campbell	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Clancy
Cohen	Crête
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana

Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guay
Guimond	Harper (Calgary West)
Harvard	Hickey
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Proud
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Young
Zed—173	

## NAYS

### Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Crawford	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gilmour	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jennings	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)

## Government Orders

Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Schmidt
Serré	Solberg
Solomon	Speaker
Steckle	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	Wayne
White (Fraser Valley West)	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—53	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Copps
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Gaffney
Grose	Harper (Churchill)
Plamondon	Sauvageau

(1755)

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the standing committee on justice and legal affairs.

My colleagues, your Speaker finds himself in somewhat of a quandary. I have been approached by hon. members of Parliament who wish to be recorded as abstaining from the votes.

I have two choices. I can have them stand, put it on the record and declare them out of order or I can simply ask those who want to abstain from the vote to rise and I can declare them all out of order at the same time.

I surely do not want to make light of this. Because we do not have a mechanism for abstention I would ask the committee on voting procedures to take this into account at some future time in its deliberations.

**Mr. Iftody:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I stood in my seat and that I would support neither the motion to kill the bill nor the bill in its present form. I would like a clarification of that from the Chair.

**Mrs. Ur:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it recorded that I was present during the vote but abstained.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, in this House, traditions have a significance that cannot be overlooked. I think we have an obligation to conform to what is customary in this respect.

It is assumed that if a member is present, he will make his opinion known as his constituents have asked him to do, whether he is for or against a bill. To abstain is not an option, as we see it, and we therefore object.

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

**The Speaker:** I want to thank the hon. member for Roberval for his opinion. He is right. The reason I rose was to explain my dilemma. It was simply for your information. I thank all members for their attention.

*Private Members' Business*

[English]

It being six o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

**MULTICULTURALISM**

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should transfer the responsibility for cultural preservation to individuals by discontinuing federal multiculturalism programs, relinquishing control of multiculturalism thereby allowing multiculturalism to flourish by giving individuals the freedom to pursue their own cultural ideals.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move this motion this today. Canadians from all across this country have become involved in a debate that explores the merits of the federal government's policy on multiculturalism. The issue has its defenders and its detractors. But most significantly, people no longer are blindly accepting the status quo that multiculturalism funding should be beyond reproach or even be beyond questioning.

The position of the Reform Party is given expression in my motion as just read. By relinquishing control at the federal level for funding multicultural projects, we will also be giving to individuals the chance to choose for themselves what cultural endeavours they wish to support.

As a government we have diminishing resources and as individual taxpayers we too have less and less disposable income. It is in light of this that we as legislators should be making efforts to maximize the freedom of individuals to distribute their disposable income where they choose.

In contemporary Canada does it not seem a little arrogant when the government decides which programs, which groups and which individuals should be funded? Are these decisions not better left in the hands of Canadians and not government? Why is it that this Liberal government avoids all the difficult decisions that concern Canadians the most?

I have sponsored two motions, both of which have been deemed to be non-votable. Last June I sponsored a motion for debate that related to the CBC. I recommended that the CBC be partially privatized. In that debate I suggested that we make some substantial changes to the CBC and that would include funding reductions.

I received a very poor reception from the other side of the House. In fact there was laughter and derision as I recall. However, here we are in budget 1995 and surprise, surprise, some of my recommendations have been acknowledged, particularly the recommendations for reduced funding and potential restructuring.

Another Reform proposition which the Liberals have recently borrowed was the recommendation to amalgamate all of the women's organizations into Status of Women Canada. I have suggested that further to that we dismantle the organization altogether.

Further to the debate on this motion, let me share with the House some sentiments from an average Canadian. I recently spoke to a group in Kingston, Ontario about my vision for Canada. A woman who heard me that day sent me some of her thoughts which echo mine. I would like to share them with the House today. She wrote on something she called "Acceptable Behaviour in a Global Village". She wrote:

The world of human beings has grown smaller and populations all over the world have become so mixed that we have to learn to get along peacefully with each other. The global village is no longer somewhere else. It is here and all of us are mixed in with it. It does not matter whether someone of a different race or nation lives next door or down the street or in a different part of town or halfway around the world, we have to learn to live peacefully with all of those peoples whose racial or national origins are different from our own. To do otherwise is to bring about an end to our world. The intolerance, conflicts, fighting and wars between peoples will bring an end to our civilization and the earth as a planet much quicker than any pollution or natural disaster.

All peoples have some members who are great people, who have accomplished things which are beneficial for all humankind. All peoples have some members who are difficult people who make life miserable for those around them. No one is perfect. Most people of all races are a mixture of good and bad. It is necessary to recognize the best and the positive in others regardless of what they look like, what language they speak or where they come from. The positive values of honesty, integrity, the ability to do the job required of them, the ability to care for family and other people and the ability to live peacefully together with others; all provide the basis for a good and worthwhile society.

Every race and nation of people has those individuals whose performance is excellent in all of those values. Every race and nation has many who fail to uphold those positive values. We need to change our attitudes to become more objective and non-judgmental. We need to become more accepting of all people.

(1805)

The woman concludes her letter with the thought that:

This is not an easy thing to do but if enough of us who feel this necessity start to put these attitudes into our own lives and encourage others to also do so, we will have a better world.

These are the sentiments of an ordinary Canadian. The writer has no Ph.D. in peace issues. She has no certificates proclaiming her to be an expert on eliminating racial discrimination. But she clearly is an expert on old-fashioned Canadian common sense. If we could only bottle these common sense attitudes and ship them throughout Canada and around the world what a better place this would be.

I was mentioning earlier that the issue of multiculturalism is of high profile in the media of late. I was reading a recent edition of *India Abroad* in which Professor Milton Israel wrote about the issue of identity as it pertains to multiculturalism. He wrote:

For some the emphasis on ethnicity facilitates division; for others, it provides a means to cope and a possibility of unity on better terms. Still others insist that national boundaries and the limited and distinctive identities they produce are eroding and the future lies with the "transnationals", people who are at home in more than one society. The loss of old home through migration or the substantial immigration of others is not to be lamented but a new kind of cosmopolitan nationalism is to be embraced.

I share this view. We do not need a special dispensation from the government to foster this belief. Members of ethnic communities also espouse these views. I experienced this when I spoke to the Human Rights and Race Relations Centre in Toronto, a privately funded organization that works to end discrimination in Canada. I went there on March 21 which was a day that acknowledged a race-free society. In fact it was called "the day to eliminate racism in the world".

I was so impressed that day with the individuals I met. They were all volunteers, leaders from the ethnic communities in Toronto. They had strived free of federal government funding to bring together other community leaders to discuss the issue of racial discrimination in the hope that it could be eliminated in this century.

There was a wonderful letter in the conference package that had been written by the hon. Paul Martin. He said he wished to acknowledge the work and contribution of the Human Rights and Race Relations Centre toward ending racial discrimination in this country. He acknowledged the dedication and commitment demonstrated by the staff and the volunteers—indeed all of them in this centre are volunteers—and that their efforts had been exemplary. He said that they all deserved to be commended for their efforts.

This is an excellent example of a group of Canadians who are working together without government funding to support and to further the process to eliminate discrimination.

**The Speaker:** I wonder, only because I take a special interest in what the hon. member is saying, would she clarify if that was the hon. Paul Martin Sr. or Jr.?

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, this was from the hon. Paul Martin, Jr. It was a letter he had written dated March 13, 1995. It was to help give support to this group in Toronto. I wanted to share that with the House because he had written such a wonderful letter to them.

The Reform Party opposes the current concept of multiculturalism and hyphenated Canadianism pursued by the Government of Canada. We would end funding of the multiculturalism

### *Private Members' Business*

program and support the abolition of the department and the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism.

If the Minister of Finance sincerely wants ideas on how to cut the deficit he will get rid of this aspect of special interest funding. He would immediately save the taxpayers of Canada some \$38.8 million a year. This also sends a powerful message to all concerned that beliefs in self-reliance, the indomitable spirit of the self in search of autonomy and independence is encouraged and championed in Canada.

(1810)

Multiculturalism was introduced in the House of Commons on October 8, 1971. In the 23 years that have followed, it has been politically incorrect for anyone to criticize it. I will repeat that. It has been politically incorrect for anyone to criticize it, especially in the House of Commons. I do not know the number of times I have had to bear the label of being bigoted because I speak from a different point of view. I have no patience for that any longer when all I want to do is bring reasoned and rational debate to this issue.

In fact, members of Parliament from the Tories, the Grits and the NDP have all used the multiculturalism policy in a way that I believe is insincere, superficial and shallow in order to garner political support from ethnic communities.

We all want the right to retain our roots, but what we have is Trudeau's enforced multicultural scam and the costs have been excessive. Ethnic group is pitted against ethnic group and the country is fragmented into a thousand consciousnesses. Trudeau's ideas about multiculturalism continue to contribute as a primary factor in the erosion of federalism and Canada's unity. Catering to special interest groups a la Trudeau and company smashes the spine of federalism. This destructive outcome is almost inevitable so long as we officially encourage large groups to remain apart from the mainstream.

The multiculturalism policy of Canada was designed to "recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage". It is intended to "promote full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins" in all aspects of Canadian life, including "equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity". The language of the policy is fairly innocuous and well meaning, but in practice it endorses special interest groups' agendas at the expense of the taxpayer.

Canadians remain unsure of what multiculturalism is, what it is trying to do and why and what it can accomplish in a free and democratic society such as ours. Multiculturalism can encompass folk songs, dance, food, festivals, arts and crafts, museums, heritage languages, ethnic studies, ethnic presses, race relations, culture sharing and human rights. Much of the opposition

*Private Members' Business*

to multiculturalism results from the indiscriminate application of the term to a wide range of situations, practices, expectations and goals as well as its institutionalization as state policy, an expensive one at that.

Public support for multiculturalism has been difficult to ascertain. In the early 1970s when the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism recommended the government introduce some ethnocultural policy, public support for multiculturalism was at around 76 per cent.

An Angus Reid poll in 1991 showed that figure has not changed much. It remains at 78 per cent. But what can we make of this level of support? Little to nothing, I suggest. At the same time that poll was being done, the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future reported some uneasiness about the Canadian public's attitude toward multiculturalism policies. It stated:

Overwhelmingly, participants told us that reminding us of our different origins is less useful in binding a unified country than emphasizing the things we have in common. While Canadians accept and value Canada's cultural diversity, they do not value many of the activities of the multicultural program of the federal government. These are seen as expensive and divisive in that they remind Canadians of their different origins rather than their shared symbols, society and future.

Further to this, a Decima survey was commissioned by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews and was carried out in October 1993. The survey found that three out of four Canadians expressed a preference for an American style melting pot approach to immigration over the multicultural mosaic that has been officially promoted in Canada since the 1970s.

(1815)

The survey also disclosed that Canadians generally are increasingly intolerant of interest group demands and that there is a relatively strong view that particularly ethnic, racial or religious minorities must make more efforts to adapt to Canada rather than insisting upon a maintenance of difference, especially at federal expense. Roughly similar proportions of visible minorities expressed the same sentiments.

This poll would suggest that it is the prevalent opinion amongst the groups targeted to receive multiculturalism grants that such grants are divisive. These are not my words; they come from others.

As I mentioned, criticism of the status quo has been increasing from the policy's supposed beneficiaries. For example, a fellow by the name of Jimmy who emigrated from Vietnam in 1980 and is now a technician at a photo processing lab commented: "The government spends too much money on something that's not necessary. Canada has freedom and work for

anyone who wants it, and that is all newcomers need". In Richmond, a magazine editor by the name of Anthony agreed that government-sanctioned segregation is no good for Canada.

What seems to be clear is that there is an erosion of support for multiculturalism by the citizens of Canada. This erosion of support for the multicultural approach, particularly given that minorities themselves concur, does nothing to promote harmony and unity in Canada because it does not recognize that all Canadians are equal.

Our vision of Canada should be committed to the goal of social and personal well-being that values individuality while emphasizing themes like family and community assumption of responsibility, problem-solving and communicating these value-sets as a means to better group life. However, at no time should the rights of a group supersede the rights of individuals, unless the group happens to consist of a majority within Canada.

I have tried to show why the federal government's interpretations of multicultural support must come to an end. We can no longer spend money we do not have on financing such a notion. The Angus Reid study from 1991 clearly shows that not only has the multicultural program failed, but Canadians oppose it. One of the main reasons that Canadians oppose this policy is that it is divisive.

I would like to refer to Arthur Slessinger, Jr. Mr. Slessinger is not a conservative thinker whom I trot out to support my position. He is a well-known liberal, an American Democrat. He is the quintessential Liberal's liberal. Slessinger believes that by its very nature multiculturalism is dangerously divisive. It encourages government to segregate citizens along racial, ethnic and linguistic fault-lines. Then it compels them to dole out rights and money according to the labels people wear. Far better to focus on unifying forces, he advises, emphasising the characteristics, desires and beliefs that citizens hold in common. Otherwise, tribal hostilities will drive them apart.

Preservation of diverse cultural heritages can be left to individuals, families and private self-financing organizations.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge that my own personal circumstances are those that encompass a multicultural family. I have a daughter who has dual citizenship with Australia and Canada. I have another daughter who is married to a young man from Mexico; his name is Fernando Rodríguez. I have European roots myself, Croatian and Norwegian. My husband also has a European background. Our family is multicultural. It reflects very much the diversity and richness of those various cultures.

I speak as a Reformer in this House. I believe there is no place in our society for the federal government to continue to fund multiculturalism. However, I do believe that there is a price to be paid for forging a new nationality out of diverse elements. Simply put, there is a fair degree of tolerance and goodwill all around. I have learned that through my personal experience.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take part in this debate and to set the record straight and tell things the way they are. In Canada, multiculturalism is not an ideal; it is a reality.

(1820)

[*English*]

Some people prefer to call this reality diversity or pluralism, or refer to the programs, policies and issues as intercultural, cross-cultural or ethnocultural. They can play the semantic game if they wish, but a rose by any other name is still a rose.

The hon. member who proposed this debate just said that we should never support group rights unless they are a majority. From my perspective and where I grew up, democracies are judged by how they treat their minorities.

Multiculturalism is not just a matter of the right of choice, which we all enjoy in our democracy in the maintaining of one's cultural roots. It is about respecting the right and ensuring it for all Canadians, whatever their race, religion, language or country of origin. It is about fostering a climate of mutual respect in a country where everyone is equal, where everyone has rights and, yes, responsibilities too. It is about equality. As our Prime Minister has said: "Equality is not about special interests or special rights. It is about social and economic justice."

[*Translation*]

Canada has a rich democratic tradition. The principles of justice, personal freedom, mutual respect, open mindedness, freedom, integration and the shared notions of justice have guided and shaped our social structures, our laws, our institutions and our way of life.

[*English*]

These are basic community and fundamental Canadian values. I would remind my hon. colleague—

[*Translation*]

—that the Prime Minister of Canada has often said our country's unity depends on its diversity, which is also our strength. It is in fact the essence of Canada.

[*English*]

I would say that we know that peace, prosperity and social harmony do not come from wishful thinking or letting the

### *Private Members' Business*

marketplace dictate or letting personal feelings prevail. They are partners in that undertaking, perhaps. They can only come about, in my perspective and in the perspective of this party, from good public policy, collaboration with the private sector, commitment and determination, and community goodwill.

[*Translation*]

The aim of the federal multicultural programs is to promote understanding among the various cultural communities. Who would quarrel with this objective? These programs are intended to help newcomers integrate into the country, to eliminate the obstacles to participation by all Canadians and to break down borders and put a stop to racial discrimination.

[*English*]

From a business and trade perspective, we find these policies have great economic benefits. The more we know about global markets, the more we can use the cultural and linguistic knowledge of Canadians in competing in those very markets where we now do global business and the more we will all benefit.

These are some of the things that multiculturalism is all about. It is far more than a case of enhancing and preserving culture. The hon. member surely realizes that we do not live in a perfect society.

There is discrimination, and although we may be number one on the UN list, we have not reached nirvana or utopia, to my knowledge, as yet. There are still talented people out there, citizens denied full access to the economic mainstream. There are still people out there sitting on the margins who have a vital contribution to make but are not able to make it because of discrimination, because of lack of understanding.

[*Translation*]

Linguistic, racial and religious tensions lead to misunderstanding. We sometimes take advantage of the public good. We often want to do things our way and we find it hard to put ourselves in others' shoes.

[*English*]

Good public policy and programs help all of us to stand tall and walk in confidence and pride as if we were in the other person's shoes.

(1825)

I believe that Canada's multicultural policies and programs have helped ensure peace and stability over our great land. Certainly the rest of the world seems to think so.

By weaving together all the diverse cultures that people our land, we have created a magnificent Canadian tapestry, reflecting our Canadian culture, which is more than the sum of all its dynamic parts. At a cost that is not extraordinary, less than \$1 per Canadian per year, this policy works at breaking down barriers and promoting institutional advances, thus providing individuals, as the member puts it, the freedom to pursue their

*Private Members' Business*

own cultural ideals in a society that can accommodate differences, build bridges, and profit from its pluralism.

Multiculturalism is not about living separately side by side; it is about living together. It is not about building walls; it is about tearing them down. It is about inclusion, not exclusion. It is about the fact that we are all Canadians. It is about respecting each other.

This government demonstrates leadership by tapping into the current and potential benefits of diversity. The multicultural program and policy, as I have said before, are good government policies. Its practices have evolved and are complemented by partnerships with individuals, corporations, organizations and other levels of government, whom I thank, as well as those individuals who serve them in a voluntary capacity.

Just for the member's information, we do not do song and dance or festivals, as she points out.

I am happy to share with the hon. member the initiatives we have taken with the Canadian Advertising Council and its study called "Colour Your Money", which shows that with sensitivity, good hiring practices and with the kind of publicity one would like to put out in our advertising milieu, diversity can be a very profitable business because one feels at home and welcome in the environment. I would be more than happy to share the successful partnerships we have had with the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Conference Board of Canada, the Asia-Pacific Foundation, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, Cineplex-Odeon, and many others too numerous to name.

We look to the future by working together with Canada's youth, with teachers, school boards and school trustees, by assisting in the development of films and books and then making them available to the children in our schools and in our public libraries. We build an environment that helps shape their lives. By encouraging understanding and co-operation among our youth, we help shape the future of Canada, a future of mutual respect, understanding and co-operation.

I would advise the hon. member—she spoke on the day to eliminate racism—to look at that group. It is a fine group that we help fund. We are very pleased with the work that many of these groups do, both in their voluntary and professional roles.

[*Translation*]

We must affirm and reaffirm the Canadian values expressed in our constitution and in the charter of rights and freedoms—the freedoms we take for granted—the right and the duty of each Canadian to protect and promote this exceptional democracy and to participate in it fully and equally.

[*English*]

Recently the Governor General said during his moving swearing-in speech: "I believe we still learn as much from our differences as from our similarities. When we only talk among ourselves, all we get back are echoes. We only grow if we take the time to quietly and carefully listen to each other."

[*Translation*]

He added that, in Canada, we recognize one fact in life. People here are true to their origins, and they bring their origins here with them. An infinite variety of traditions and cultures make up Canada's unique mosaic, providing a fine example for the world.

[*English*]

I would say to my hon. colleague, who has put what I consider to be an unenlightened approach before this House, that there are no hyphenated Canadians and there is no segregation in our policy. If someone chooses to segregate or hyphenate themselves, they have the freedom and the right to do so. It is too bad they feel they must separate themselves from the glorious undertakings that we have as a country and a nation that is the envy of the world in this regard.

(1830)

I would say to her in my closing remarks that the bottom line to my hon. colleague is that national values can cut across racial, religious and cultural lines in Canada, allowing multiculturalism to flourish in the best interests of all of us. It would ensure "old-fashioned Canadian common sense" to be the inheritance of all of our children's tomorrows.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak as the official opposition critic for multiculturalism, and I want to thank the hon. member for Calgary Southeast for giving me this opportunity to repeat the position of the Bloc quebécois on the federal government's multiculturalism policy. We believe there are several reasons why this policy should be abolished.

To put this debate into perspective, it would be useful to consider the official definition of this multiculturalism policy as read in a news bulletin from the Library of Parliament. We read that the term multiculturalism in Canada evokes the presence and survival of various racial and ethnic minorities that identify themselves as being different and wish to stay that way.

We should now look at the sequence of events that led up to the adoption of the policy on multiculturalism. It is 1971, under the Trudeau government, and the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism has just been published. Always according to the library's news bulletin, the fourth volume of the report dealt with the contribution of ethnic groups

to the enrichment of Canadian culture and recommended the integration (and not assimilation) into Canadian society of non-founding ethnic groups, recognizing their rights and privileges as citizens and making them equal participants in Canada's institutions.

We should also remember that a new political party was founded in Quebec with the sovereignty of Quebec as its stated objective, and that in the election held the previous year, it obtained 22 per cent of the popular vote.

How ironic. Feeling the pressure from this new expression of Quebec's desire for independence, coming as it did shortly after the October crisis, the Trudeau team, including the present Prime Minister, decided to make some adjustments to the report's recommendation. As a result, the concept of integration that would recognize the rights of members of ethnic groups and their equal participation in society was abandoned in favour of the concept of promoting cultural differences. In so doing, the whole dialectic of two founding peoples with their own language and culture was submerged and diluted in this ocean of other languages and cultures.

It was a fine sleight of hand, and most Canadians did not notice, except, of course, Quebecers. Through then Premier Robert Bourassa, Quebecers resolutely dissociated themselves from this concept.

In an open letter to Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Bourassa first reminded his federal counterpart that his proposal was a betrayal of the work done by the commission, whose focus had been bilingualism and biculturalism, and thus the equal status of the two peoples. He regretted Mr. Trudeau's decision to dissociate culture and language. He went on to reject out of hand a policy whose objective would be to promote languages other than French in Quebec. Finally, he reminded the federal leader that in this case, the jurisdictions were purely provincial.

Quebec never changed its position, although leaders and political options changed regularly over the years. In fact, Quebec developed its own policy for integrating cultural communities, a policy similar to the one proposed by the Laurendeau-Dunton Royal Commission.

In Quebec, the emphasis is on integration. Not assimilation but integration. The official definition of integration is as follows: integration is long term multi-dimensional process of adaptation, distinct from assimilation. In this process, the knowledge and use of the common language of Quebec society is a fundamental driving force. The process is consolidated in a society, where participation by all Quebecers is guaranteed and where immigrants and members of cultural communities find their place and are recognized as full members of the communal, social and political life of a pluralistic francophone society.

(1835)

This policy has received unanimous approval in Quebec; it is never an issue, unlike the Canadian policy.

### *Private Members' Business*

We cannot help but notice that multiculturalism enjoys anything but unanimous approval. The Decima and Gallup polls published in 1993 showed that 75 per cent of Canadians rejected the policy of multiculturalism and favoured a style of integration similar to Quebec's.

Given the government's investment in multiculturalism, it is a sad thing to see it fail. For the year 1993-94 alone, the government invested \$38,846 million. The program has existed for 20 years. How many billions of dollars have been invested to date in a flawed policy which the country does not want?

The policy is not working and even its target public, members of ethnic communities, are criticizing it. I cite as an example the overwhelming support for Neil Bissoondath's first book. His supporters were unanimous in saying that the government should only concern itself with helping immigrants to integrate into our society and fighting racism—end of story. He noted that the federal government's policy tended to create ethnic ghettos, which in no way foster integration and full participation in political, economic and social life.

We also cannot leave unmentioned the absurdities made possible by the multiculturalism policy. Barely six months ago, a consultation paper from the Minister of Justice proposed that culture or religion be permitted as a defence against criminal charges. Because of the ensuing uproar, the minister had to recant and withdraw the proposal. That is one example of how far some people will go to promote different cultures.

In closing, I would like to stress that a sovereign Quebec would continue to favour integration and respect. The current Minister of International Affairs, Cultural Communities and Immigration, Bernard Landry, confirmed that position just a month ago.

Please allow me to quote him: "Quebec will not use the public purse to subsidize cultural differences. Our government is against multiculturalism. Although the Quebec government acknowledges the fact that Quebec is multi-ethnic, it favours a policy of cultural convergence in one common culture, fortified by foreign sources". That sums up well Quebec's position on multiculturalism and deals with the issue effectively.

[English]

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to address this House regarding Bill M-364, a motion advocating the transfer of responsibility for cultural preservation to individuals by discontinuing federal multicultural programs, proposed by the hon. member for Calgary Southeast. Today I would like to take the opportunity to address some of the arguments utilized by opponents of Canada's multicultural program.

Unfortunately, over the past few years the spread of misinformation regarding our federal multicultural policy has been prevalent. The popular misconception of multiculturalism is of

*Private Members' Business*

a government-funded program that pays people to, first, keep their native cultures and languages, and, second, that serves to divide the country. These myths have, to an extent, been further propagated following the release of Mr. Neil Bissoondath's recent book, entitled "Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism". Although I certainly welcome this interesting publication as a means of stimulating debate in this area, I must also state my reservation about the unsubstantiated assertions made therein.

Mr. Bissoondath has misread the effects of multiculturalism by insinuating that money spent on multicultural events will reinforce stereotypes and lead to a break-up of the country socially.

I find perplexing the assumption that, for example, the display of a community's traditional dance could lead to divisiveness and negative stereotyping. This conclusion clearly is not credible. We know that multiculturalism does not promote or reinforce negative stereotypes.

(1840)

In reference to the dance, I and my family, as individuals and collectively, felt that we must preserve certain customs, traditions and beliefs. Based on those needs, because of our ethnic background, we preserved what we wanted, what we felt was honourable and desirable to preserve and pass on from generation to generation. One of those activities was Ukrainian dance. Everyone in my family learned how to do the Kolemkyka, the Hopokola, and other dances, which we all immensely enjoyed, not only with our members of the family but with other people in the community.

In these dances, there were not only those who were of Ukrainian ethnic background but of a multitude of ethnic backgrounds. That was the composition of the community in which I was raised. We all lived in perfect harmony with each other. No one decided that there should be a barrier between the Italians, the Germans, the Japanese, the Ukrainians or the Slovaks. We all had basically the same needs.

Moreover, Mr. Bissoondath draws a link between multiculturalism and the marginalization of immigrants. He relates the story of Canadian sprinter Ben Johnson, who, in a 24-hour period, was transformed in media sports from "the Canadian who had won Olympic gold through effort to the Jamaican immigrant who had lost it through use of drugs". It was from the positive to the negative, from the Canadian to the Jamaican immigrant. In my mind it is very clear that this type of media report is a result of ignorance and unconscious prejudice. It is certainly not a result of multiculturalism's assumed marginalizing effects.

The reality is that multiculturalism brings strength to this country. It is, however, a human characteristic to react in a

reflex-like and emotional manner when confronted with unsubstantiated stories about certain communities. We should not allow rumours and hearsay to determine our policies. Unfounded stories are not based upon educated opinion and most certainly are not based upon facts.

I expect that the Reform Party's position is the result of sloppy and inaccurate research because I certainly do not want to believe that they are intentionally misleading the Canadian public. Not for one moment do I believe that they would do such a thing.

However, Mr. Neil Bissoondath in his book, when referring to the Reform Party's opposition to multiculturalism, indicates:

my attitude is at best suspicious. Reform strikes me as a party that suffers from an astounding lack of social generosity and counts among its membership too many who are either racially minded or, to coin a phrase, knowledge-challenged.

Multiculturalism was officially introduced into Parliament on October 8, 1971. It was expected to be a vehicle through which we would achieve a cultural mosaic, as opposed to the U.S. melting pot. Today, 42 per cent of Canadians have origins that are other than British or French. While people with European origins still make up the largest number of Canadians, more and more immigrants are coming to Canada from Asia, Africa, the Middle East, the Caribbean, and Central and South America.

This is changing the face of the Canadian population. In the 1986 census, visible minorities accounted for 6.3 per cent of the Canadian population. By 1991 this figure was almost 10 per cent. The visible minority population of major cities is greater. For instance, in Toronto it is 26 per cent; Vancouver, 24 per cent; and in Montreal, 11 per cent.

Canada's multiculturalism policy is one expression of leadership. The multiculturalism policy is rooted in Canadian values. It is consistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which establishes the fundamental freedoms and democratic rights of all individual Canadians, irrespective of national or ethnic origin. It is also consistent with the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Official Languages Act and the Citizenship Act.

(1845)

Multiculturalism, as described under federal policy, is concerned with helping people become full participants in the life of Canada. It is certainly not concerned with the mandatory retention of culture and does not encourage cultural isolation, as some critics erroneously charge. There are the so-called ghettos of our communities where we may find, as we find in Thunder Bay, a large gathering of a certain group of people with a specific ethnic background. We find this happening because they choose to be neighbours. They choose based on their every day needs to be in constant contact with each other, to help each other, until they reach the point where they can communicate with anyone in their neighbourhood in the common language of

the area. In our case it could be English or, as in Quebec, it could be French.

In 1993–94, \$25.5 million was spent on the federal multicultural program, which is less than Brian Mulroney spent on his prime ministerial aircraft. The notion that \$25.5 million per year, which is less than a dollar per citizen, could ensure the isolation of Canadians into cultural–ethnic cliques is hardly believable. Moreover, one must keep in mind that an important component of the original policy was founded on the assumption that encouraging people to be confident in their own cultures would allow them to be accepting of the cultures of other groups. The official policy encourages Canadians of all ethnic origins to participate fully in the economic and social life of Canada, sharing their cultures and histories with each other.

It is unfortunate that members in the opposition benches are insinuating that multiculturalism and cultural diversity somehow preclude national unity and inhibit our ability to be part of the whole. This could not be further from the truth. Canadians of all origins do maintain a sense of their own cultural identity and at the same time adhere to the Canadian values of democracy and tolerance. There is no reason to believe that the two are mutually exclusive. That is a notion that has somehow been propagated by opponents of multiculturalism and it is extremely misleading and irresponsible. The proof for this is in the Canada of today. We are culturally diverse, and yet if we ask the majority of immigrants they will tell you that they are first and foremost Canadians.

I would like to conclude with a quote from a Toronto *Star* article dated June 21, 1991. It refers to the experience of an author. Her name is Myrna Kostash, grand–daughter of Ukrainian immigrants that settled in Alberta. She stated:

Multiculturalism policy and its institutions allowed me to take part in Canadian life. It allowed me to get out of the ghetto. During my own childhood, ethnic cultures were private, taking place in Ukrainian churches and in youth groups. I was aware that I was dropping out of my peer group in order to be Ukrainian. But with the advent of multiculturalism, I felt that when I spoke as a Canadian–Ukrainian writer, I was doing it within the mainstream institutions of Canadian literary life. I became a Canadian through this sense of entitlement. I didn't have to choose between public and private cells. Both came together through multiculturalism.

**Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House to speak in favour of my colleague's motion, private member's motion No. 364. The motion provides for the transfer of the control of multiculturalism away from the federal government to individuals. Essentially, the motion put forward by my colleague from Calgary Southeast calls for the withdrawal of federal funding to multicultural groups.

I concur with that objective. However, just because I think the state should not be funding various cultural groups does not mean that I dislike these groups. Just because I disagree with

### *Private Members' Business*

government imposed multicultural policies it should not be construed to suggest that I dislike other linguistic or ethnic groups. I am arguing against government policy, not against cultural groups.

(1850)

After all my roots are different from the roots of many other people. Together those generations of various ancestral heritage came to this country to settle and build what became by far the best country in the world. This country was opened up, settled and built without a multicultural policy. In fact I doubt if the term multiculturalism was even coined when my parents came to this country back in the twenties.

My roots are a mixture, a real hodge–podge so to speak. My linguistic heritage is Prussian German but my ancestral affiliation and connection include not only central European heritage but east European heritage, Slavic heritage, including Ukrainian, Polish and Russian. My parents understood and spoke these languages, plus what they called Yiddish. I am led to believe that Yiddish is a kind of Germanic way of speaking Hebrew. If that makes any linguistic sense I really do not know. In a land, in a country, that encompasses much of the earth's land mass with over 150 cultural groups, who am I to question what makes sense in that part of the world. Come to think of it, perhaps there are lessons to be learned given the turmoil that existed for centuries in tsarist imperial Russia, then in the former Soviet Union and presently in the newly created state of Russia.

My parents left their homelands, along with hundreds of thousands of other people from that area, having lived in those lands for almost 200 years. They left to escape the tyranny that was to enslave the people for over 70 years. They came to Canada, where everything was new and very unfamiliar. They had nothing when they came halfway around the world.

However they had freedom. They had liberty. They had liberty and freedom that the people back in the land from whence my parents came could not even imagine or dream about. My parents embraced their newly adopted country with energy and a zeal that was typical of newcomers during that time. Like those who came from places other than Britain, they soon learned English like everyone else. Some youngsters did not learn English until they started school.

For years, for generations, like thousands of families not only from eastern Europe but from all over the world they held on to some aspects of the culture that they had lived with before they came to this country.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to know something? These people all came usually with little or no money and they received not one thin dime from government. Not only did they not ask for money, they did not expect any government money. They came to this country for freedom and for the tremendous opportunities

*Private Members' Business*

that this great and beautiful land afforded them. They settled and built communities that helped to build this country.

I suggest to the multicultural minister that what transpired during those pioneering decades was real, genuine, unvarnished multiculturalism. All these people, these families from varied backgrounds, from different parts of the world worked together and co-operated to build churches, schools and communities. Together they worked to build the country.

That was multiculturalism at its finest with no government dollars. They were all proud of the fact that they had become and were Canadian.

Since government funding for all types of programs began, many communities have divided. Friction and animosity has developed. Dependency on the state, on government handouts has been created. Apparently the multicultural minister thinks so too because she has recently mused that Canada has no culture.

(1855)

I would suggest the minister leave the confines of Montreal and Ottawa and visit rural Canada, the west and Atlantic Canada. She might be pleasantly surprised, if she stays for awhile, of the flourishing culture that she might not only see but also feel. I suspect culture in this country would flourish even more and probably bring Canadians closer together from all parts of the country if the state would only get its nasty little nose out of culture, along with its close sister multiculturalism.

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know I have a very short time so I will try to be brief. It is very difficult to be brief.

Multiculturalism is about a participatory democracy. The members opposite have consistently used the myths out there in society to defend a position instead of using that which they know to be the truth and the facts from the department itself.

My colleague and I were talking about experiences when we were growing up, experiences that are still happening today, where the teachers would stream whole classrooms of kids into vocational schools because they were Italian, Portuguese, Ukrainian, Polish or what have you. That happened then and it is happening now in Toronto with the Portuguese kids. It is happening with the black children. It is happening everywhere.

Multiculturalism tries to break down those kinds of barriers so that those children have equal access by providing race relations programs and holding discussions in schools to understand the differences, that these children are not inferior in any way. We were not. My whole generation was streamed into vocational schools when we came to this country. Multicultural-

ism empowered my whole generation and a lot of other Canadians who were of different backgrounds and did not have the ability.

I will tell another story. Earlier today we were talking about Harbourfront. Not long ago, in the late 1980s, a group was putting on a poetry reading. They were choosing the names of poets who were published but not yet well known across Canada. One of the staffers who happened to be of Ukrainian background said: "Oh, there is a really good poet I know in Toronto who is published in his community but not across the country. His name is Pier Giorgio DeCicco". They said: "This is for Canadians, not for foreigners".

The multiculturalism policy is intended to create participatory democracy, to give access, to give equality, to allow Canada to evolve into a strong nation.

We talk about the fact that we are Canadians and we have all these common symbols but it is a bunch of garbage and words because it means bloody nothing when it comes down to the facts and the lives of every Canadian, when it comes to the systemic discrimination that exists in all institutions.

I spent 20 years of my life working in Toronto with multicultural and immigrant groups. Most of that time I spent fighting the invisible discrimination and systemic barriers in the school systems and in social services that people could not access because they were not of Anglo background. To this day in metropolitan Toronto, one still cannot access the majority of the dollars for social programs unless one is from the Anglo community.

This is about participatory democracy, rights, equality and being a Canadian. The members opposite should inform themselves before they speak about myths.

(1900)

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of things I would like to say. First, I have very much appreciated having the opportunity to debate this matter today with other members of the House. I note their passion and their sense of wanting to debate this further. To that end I would seek unanimous consent of the House that this become a votable item and move it to committee as quickly as possible for further discussion.

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

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

JUSTICE

**Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on a question I asked the Minister of Justice on February 15. It regards the disturbing trend whereby defence lawyers subpoena private and confidential files and records from counsellors at sexual assault centres, from psychiatrists, doctors and other personal counsellors for use in the defence of their clients.

I thank the minister for his attention to this issue and for his informed response. However, I would like to share with the House the angst and concern that exists among constituents in my riding when they think of these personal documents being brought into the courtroom.

I like to share with the House some words from a constituent who wrote to me: "For many of us, the only safe place to talk about our injuries is in therapy. Therapy is a place where victims can learn to re-establish their own self-worth without being abused again. The counsellor offers the support that is desperately needed in order to learn how to set safe boundaries, learn about self-worth, the right to privacy, that it is okay to say no, it is okay to validate our own needs, it is okay to be angry and how to express that anger in a safe and constructive manner.

"In therapy, we learn that we are not powerless to our perpetrators and that it was not okay to be violated in the manner in which we were. We are given a place to safely express our emotions and validate our own feelings, even if we are the only ones that do. For many of us this is the only safe support that we have.

"This is a very sad day because now the defence lawyers want to take away what little privacy we as victims have and violate us all over again. My therapy is very personal to me. I can talk about my pain and my goals, my hopes and my fears. I pay good money for the right for that support to allow me to create my own boundaries. I urge you as a representative of my government to stop this injustice".

Those words are poignant and they are instructive. They tell us that victims of violence do not want these very private and therapeutic conversations to be part of the courtroom proceedings.

In 1992 the House passed very good legislation with the rape shield law. We know recently that in Nova Scotia the law was challenged and fortunately, the Minister of Justice intervened and the integrity of that law was maintained. With this right to subpoena we see a back door approach to get confidential

### *Adjournment Debate*

information into the courtrooms where it should not be and where it creates difficulties for people like my constituent.

I know the minister is working very hard on this. I know he has intervened in the Supreme Court case that is reviewing the result of a B.C. appeal that would require strict controls over the use of this information in court. I thank the minister for that intervention. I hope the Supreme Court will judge in favour and allow the result of the appeal in the B.C. judgment to be available to all of us in Canada.

I ask the minister to continue his diligent review in this regard. I realize the issues are complex, but I ask him to find a balance between providing a fair trial for the accused and for the victim a right to privacy.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Brant has said, this is a troubling and complex issue which places in conflict two compelling sets of interests.

On the one hand, victims need to be able to seek counselling and medical assistance in confidence and with full respect for their privacy and personal integrity, both at the time of their counselling and later on in any court proceedings. On the other hand, people accused of serious offences need to be able to bring forth relevant evidence that may establish their innocence. Courts across the country are grappling in individual cases with the very difficult balance of victims' and accused persons' interests.

(1905)

The Supreme Court of Canada heard argument on this issue in the case of O'Connor v. the Queen on February 1. The federal government intervened in that case to urge the court to endorse a strengthened version of the guidelines developed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal. The Supreme Court has reserved its decision.

The O'Connor guidelines developed by the B.C. Court of Appeal are designed to prevent fishing expeditions into the complainant's past. They place the onus on the person seeking access to the records to establish that they are relevant. This is done through a two part procedure which may be done in camera with a ban on publication and at which the complainant and the holder of the records are not compellable witnesses.

At present and subject to the decision of the Supreme Court, the O'Connor procedure is binding only in British Columbia. At a January federal-provincial-territorial meeting of ministers responsible for justice, it was agreed to review the B.C. Court of Appeal guidelines with a view to having them adopted in each jurisdiction. This would govern the situation pending the decision of the Supreme Court in O'Connor and pending any new legislation in that area.

*Adjournment Debate*

It was further agreed that the issue requires urgent attention. Consequently, officials were directed to work on it and report to the deputy ministers at their next meeting in the spring.

The Department of Justice is consulting with interested groups and individuals to determine how personal records are in fact used, to fully explore all perspectives and concerns, and to develop ways of balancing the complainant's interests with those of the accused.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on March 29 I rose in the Chamber to put a question to the Minister of the Environment. At that time world leaders were just beginning talks in Berlin aimed at stabilizing levels of greenhouse gases now threatening earth's climate.

The talks are the result of the June 1992 meetings of 106 of the world's nations. Those talks were held in Rio de Janeiro with the purpose to sign the framework convention on climate change.

Since that meeting in Rio, more than 100 nations have ratified the Rio treaty. Now in Berlin the world's leaders are meeting to assess our progress since 1992 and consider proposals to strengthen the agreement.

Sadly, as important and indeed as critical as this is, there is not much to assess. Canada, like so many other countries that made commitments to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, has failed miserably to live up to those commitments. As we speak tonight, the Minister of the Environment is likely in Berlin. Just as likely, she is embarrassed by the position Canada is in with regard to the commitments we made in Rio.

When we look at what has happened since Rio, we do not have to look far to see that nearly nine billion more tonnes of carbon have accumulated in the atmosphere and the evidence of climate change is mounting. In fact, in response to the crisis the Minister of the Environment acknowledged the crisis and even went so far as to say that if Canada and the other nations which are emitting greenhouse gases do not do something about this, climate change and global warming will create a situation where floods will occur off the east coast of Canada and tiny but beautiful Prince Edward Island will be all but submerged.

It is hard for me to imagine that the Minister of the Environment knows about the possibility of this catastrophic event and she is not prepared to take immediate and dramatic steps to combat it. I hope we do not have to wait for the day when my good friends in Prince Edward Island are looking for new homes in Ontario or Saskatchewan before we begin to take this issue seriously.

Carbon emissions are increasing. This represents a trend that is moving dangerously in the wrong direction.

According to the latest *Worldwatch* magazine, in order to stop the accumulation of greenhouse gases and allow the earth to return to equilibrium over a period of centuries—yes, you heard me correctly, Mr. Speaker, I said centuries—scientists say that carbon emissions will have to be reduced to the rate at which the oceans can absorb them, or 60 to 80 per cent below today's rate.

Yet on the current path, emissions are projected to increase by 60 per cent within the next two decades. Obviously the earth's atmosphere will require sharp cuts in industrial country emissions and a rapid slowdown in emissions growth in developing countries. This means that all the nations of the world need to have action plans in place to guide the progress of this critical issue. No nation can afford to sit on the sidelines.

It is clear the world is facing an issue with uniquely large and irreversible consequences. The delegates in Berlin cannot afford to waste the opportunity to begin turning the ship around. Given that, I ask the minister why Canada's wimpy actions on climate change are not as forceful as our resolve to preserve the fish stocks off the Atlantic coast.

I hope the government today is prepared to say we have to do better.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government in partnership with the provinces and territories has reached a national consensus on the directions Canada will take to address the challenge of climate change.

In a meeting in Toronto on February 20, energy and environment ministers from the federal, provincial and territorial governments agreed to Canada's national action program on climate change. The Deputy Prime Minister tabled the action plan today at the first conference of the parties to the framework convention on climate change in Berlin.

The action program sets out the strategic directions Canada will follow to meet its commitment to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000. The action program is based on the principle of sustainable development as advocated by the Brundtland commission, an approach in which environmental, social and economic policies are fully integrated.

Consequently, the action program provides the opportunity for each jurisdiction in Canada to undertake actions appropriate to their circumstances. The program is a living document. The federal, provincial and territorial governments are committed to reviewing the program regularly to ensure that Canada's stabilization commitment is met.

Toward that end all ministers committed to review progress by late 1990 and agreed to continue developing options to close the 13 per cent stabilization gap that currently exists. The release today of Quebec's action plan on climate change is a noteworthy example of the action being taken by other jurisdictions in Canada.

*Adjournment Debate*

The aim of this government as stated in the red book is to co-operatively work with provincial and urban governments to improve energy efficiency and increase the use of renewable energies.

Responding to the challenge of climate change represents a tremendous opportunity for Canadians to use their entrepreneurial spirit to forge ahead with creative and credible solutions, solutions that work for the environment and for our economy.

[*Translation*]

**The President:** Colleagues, pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.14 p.m.)

---

# CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### **William Shakespeare**

Mr. Richardson ..... 11521

### **Labour Relations**

Mr. St-Laurent ..... 11521

### **Health Care**

Mr. Morrison ..... 11521

### **Partridge Island**

Mrs. Wayne ..... 11521

### **Grand River Hospital**

Mr. Telegdi ..... 11522

### **Government Ministers**

Mrs. Chamberlain ..... 11522

### **International Haemophilia Day**

Mr. Discepola ..... 11522

### **Burundi**

Mr. Bergeron ..... 11522

### **Canadian Cancer Society**

Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..... 11523

### **Interest Rates**

Mr. Solomon ..... 11523

## **Canadian Citizenship**

Mrs. Ringuette–Maltais ..... 11523

## **Young Quebecers**

Mr. DeVillers ..... 11523

## **Bloc Quebecois**

Mr. Lavigne (Verdun—Saint–Paul) ..... 11524

## **Canadian Broadcasting Corporation**

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) ..... 11524

## **Post Polio Syndrome**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 11524

## **Bloc Quebecois**

Mr. Bertrand ..... 11524

## **Ford World Curling Championships**

Mr. McKinnon ..... 11524

## **Liberal Party**

Mr. Solberg ..... 11525

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **Fisheries**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11525

Mr. Tobin ..... 11525

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11525

Mr. Tobin ..... 11525

Mr. Bouchard ..... 11526

Mr. Tobin ..... 11526

## **Canada Social Transfer**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 11526

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) ..... 11526

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	11526
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	11526

### **Indian Affairs**

Mr. Manning .....	11526
Mr. Irwin .....	11526
Mr. Manning .....	11527
Mr. Irwin .....	11527
Mr. Manning .....	11527
Mr. Irwin .....	11527

### **Winnipeg Jets**

Mr. Marchand .....	11527
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	11527
Mr. Marchand .....	11528
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	11528

### **Indian Affairs**

Mr. Duncan .....	11528
Mr. Irwin .....	11528
Mr. Duncan .....	11528
Mr. Irwin .....	11528

### **CIDA**

Mr. Paré .....	11528
Mr. Ouellet .....	11528
Mr. Paré .....	11529
Mr. Ouellet .....	11529

### **Indian Affairs**

Mr. Thompson .....	11529
Mr. Irwin .....	11529
Mr. Thompson .....	11529
Mr. Irwin .....	11529

### **CIDA**

Mr. Bélisle .....	11529
Mr. Ouellet .....	11529

Mr. Bélisle .....	11529
Mr. Ouellet .....	11529

**Indian Affairs**

Mr. Gilmour .....	11530
Mr. Irwin .....	11530
Mr. Gilmour .....	11530
Mr. Irwin .....	11530

**Bovine Somatotropin**

Mr. O'Reilly .....	11530
Ms. Marleau .....	11530

**Government Contracts**

Mrs. Venne .....	11530
Mr. Rock .....	11530
Mrs. Venne .....	11531
Mr. Rock .....	11531

**Indian Affairs**

Mr. Stinson .....	11531
Mr. Irwin .....	11531
Mr. Stinson .....	11531

**Government Spending**

Ms. Minna .....	11531
Mr. Eggleton .....	11531

**Immigration**

Mr. Nunez .....	11532
Mr. Marchi .....	11532

**Forestry**

Mr. Abbott .....	11532
Mr. Irwin .....	11532

**Health**

Mr. Riis .....	11532
----------------	-------

Ms. Marleau ..... 11532

**Presence in Gallery**

The Speaker ..... 11532

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**National Defence**

Mr. Mifflin ..... 11533

**Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken ..... 11533

**Canada Elections Act**

Bill C-320. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 11533

Mrs. Terrana ..... 11533

**Criminal Code**

Bill C-321. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 11533

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 11533

**Excise Tax Act**

Bill C-222 ..... 11533

Mr. Milliken ..... 11533

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn) ..... 11533

**Petitions**

**Lachine Canal Clean Up**

Mr. Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul) ..... 11533

**Government Spending**

Mr. Bhaduria ..... 11534

**Rights of the Unborn**

Mrs. Wayne ..... 11534

**Health**

Mr. Solomon ..... 11534

**Criminal Code**

Mr. Riis ..... 11534

**Justice**

Mr. Kilger ..... 11534

**Same Sex Relationships**

Mr. Kilger ..... 11534

**Young Offenders**

Mr. Kilger ..... 11534

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 11534

**Motions for Papers**

Mr. Milliken ..... 11538

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Firearms Act**

**Bill C-68—Motion for Time Allocation**

Mr. Gagliano ..... 11538

Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 133; Nays, 100 ..... 11538

**Firearms Act**

Bill C-68. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment .. 11539

Mr. Solberg ..... 11539

Mr. Milliken ..... 11540

Mr. Manning ..... 11543

Mr. Easter ..... 11544

Mr. Taylor ..... 11546

Mr. MacLellan ..... 11547

Mr. Harris ..... 11549

Mr. Wappel ..... 11550

Miss Grey ..... 11552

Mr. Speller ..... 11554

Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 55; Nays, 173 .....	11555
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 173; Nays, 53 .....	11556

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **Multiculturalism**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	11558
Motion .....	11558
Mrs. Finestone .....	11561
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	11562
Mr. Dromisky .....	11563
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) .....	11565
Ms. Minna .....	11566

## **ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

### **Justice**

Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	11567
Mr. MacLellan .....	11567

### **The Environment**

Mr. Taylor .....	11568
Mr. MacLellan .....	11568

### **Appendix**