



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 239 • 1st SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, October 6, 1995**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

The House of Commons Debates and the Proceedings of Committee evidence are accessible on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 6, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

#### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT

The House resumed from October 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-64, an act respecting employment equity, be read the third time and passed.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one thing that makes me most proud about being a parliamentarian is the opportunity to be a part of the passage of legislation like Bill C-64.

When each one of us makes the decision to run for public office it is because we have certain agendas, certain policies we want to put forward. Seven years ago next week, when I was first nominated to run for public office, I had an agenda and I still do. That agenda has a great deal to do with human rights. It has a great deal to do with regional disparity. It has a great deal to do with feminism and it has a great deal to do with fairness. Bill C-64 is a piece of legislation that certainly fits into my agenda. It fits into one of the reasons that although I was born into the great Liberal Party I chose it again as a student in university and later when I decided to run.

There are frequently misunderstandings about the expression employment equity. For example, there are people who confuse employment equity and affirmative action. Employment equity and affirmative action, while complementary, are not the same.

I used an analogy when I spoke at report stage and I will do it again because it bears repeating. At report stage I talked about the fact that we could use a medical metaphor. Employment equity is preventive. It is a preventive measure. It ensures that we do the right thing from the beginning. Affirmative action is curative. I might add, for those people who through misunderstanding find affirmative action repugnant, that affirmative action is enshrined in the charter of rights and freedoms and as such is something Canadians have taken to most strongly, not

just Canadians of this political stripe but the majority of Canadians.

Affirmative action would not be necessary if employment equity were the rule rather than the exception.

• (1005)

A couple of phrases and a couple of taglines have arisen throughout the debate that need to be dealt with. The one I have to talk about is the usage of two words together in the English language whenever we talk about employment equity. Those two words are competent and woman. When I hear my colleagues say a competent woman should be allowed, another word I truly love, to advance as far as anyone else, I sit here in vacant and in pensive mood and wonder why we never use those words together about competent men.

Why are we always so afraid that some woman might slip through and might not be competent? With the greatest of respect—and I have already said on several occasions in this debate how fond of men I am in general—there are some incompetent men. We have seen them and they have not suffered in the employment equity wars as have perhaps legions of competent women.

The hissy fit I just had was a little patronizing. I did it deliberately. We can argue the merits of employment equity. Certainly these expressions irritate a number of women on this side of the House—and I look at my colleagues from Oakville—Milton, Windsor—St. Clair and Etobicoke—Lakeshore—as much as they irritate me. Perhaps it is not as much as they irritate me but they certainly are irritating. Perhaps I have become more irritable in these discussions. It may be because I have been having these discussions in the Chamber longer than my three aforementioned colleagues.

Whether we are patronizing, whether women or men are competent or incompetent, whether there is a feminist agenda, whether there is a Liberal agenda—and of course there is a Liberal agenda called the red book—it is important that the bill continues the legacy of fairness. It must continue the legacy of sound social policies which have made this country the envy of the world, which have made this country the country rated number one in the United Nations survey. Everybody here knows that in their hearts, in their minds and in all their lives. It has been a great blessing for all of us either to choose to come here or to have been born here.

*Government Orders*

We enjoy longer life expectancy, higher educational levels and a greater real income than anyone else in the world. This is an outstanding record of which anyone in Canada can and should be proud. However, it is based on a history of fair legislation, human rights legislation and employment equity legislation.

It began back in the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It followed through with Mackenzie King, to Louis St. Laurent, to Lester Pearson, to Pierre Trudeau and now to the current Prime Minister. It is a legacy we in the Liberal Party are justly proud of and it is one that we will continue to further.

It would be dangerous, however, to sit back, to rest on our laurels and say that because of this history Canada is somehow a perfect place. It is not a perfect place. It is not a perfect place if one belongs to a visible minority. It is not a perfect place if one is a woman. It is not a perfect place if one has a disability. It is not a perfect place if one falls under any of the prohibited headings in the charter of rights and freedoms. We know that discrimination is still a fact of life; every one of us knows it. The whole reason for discrimination is fear of the unknown, fear of people unlike us, fear that somehow people who are unlike us will take something away from us or away from our children. However there is a Canadian tradition that rises above fear.

• (1010)

We are only now emerging from one of the worst recessionary periods in our history. Most of us in the House of Commons belong to that amorphous mass known as the post-war baby boom. This recession was the first real attack on our very privileged lives. Many of us were lucky enough to weather it without huge injury but many of us were not.

I stood in the House on many occasions in opposition and talked about the cost in human terms of the recession. I talked about the rate of bankruptcies, the small business losses. I talked about the number of young people, both men and women, who were not getting jobs and did not have any hope.

We are recovering. We know it and we see it. It is not coming perhaps as fast as we would like but it is coming. Consequently, because Canada is coming back to its accustomed prosperity, the time has come for legislation like Bill C-64 to shore up our employment equity promises and to ensure that all Canadians have fair opportunity.

There are times when it is important to deal with questions of gender equality with a relatively light touch. Members of the female gender remind male colleagues that life is better from womb to tomb for the lords of creation.

I said in the House the other day that in spite of the fears of some of our colleagues in opposition, white males get 50 per cent of federal government jobs. They get 60 per cent of the jobs nationally in both the private and public sector combined. Even more overwhelming, white males get 90 per cent of the

promotions. With figures like that I believe it would be safe to say, and I do not think anyone would argue with me, probably the white male is not exactly an endangered species in the economic climate.

**An hon. member:** It is if we keep drinking the water.

**Ms. Clancy:** That may well be. I have spoken frequently to the hon. member for Edmonton Northwest about the amount of water he consumes in the House of Commons. I will not make any comments about the amount of air he deals with or the temperature.

However there are people in the country who suffer because the federal employment equity act does not have teeth until we pass this amendment. It cannot really be enforced. Bill C-64 brings in needed enforcement measures.

I talked about the fact that in opposition I was the vice-chair of the committee to review the employment equity legislation. We heard witnesses from all over the country. I remember in particular a group from the province of Saskatchewan that fell under federal jurisdiction and had taken to heart most seriously the whole question of employment equity.

• (1015)

These people very proudly showed us that their employee roster reflected the demographics where they lived and effectively the national demographics. There was probably a higher demographic percentage of aboriginal people because it was the province of Saskatchewan, but on a gender basis, disabled basis and so on, the demographics were extremely reflective of the society where they did their business. They also showed us the excellent quality of their labour relations and profit margins.

I do not understand what it is people fear from legislation that is clearly put on the books to ensure fairness for people who for generations, for thousands of years since the dawn of time have been systemically discriminated against because they are female, they are black, they are aboriginal, they are disabled, or for whatever reason under the blanket condemnation of discrimination enshrined in the charter of rights and freedoms. Why do people fear legislation that promotes fairness?

Why do people fear something which says if there are two equally qualified people and one of them comes from a disadvantaged group that it is time to give the benefit to the member of the disadvantaged group? Why is that a frightening thing? Is it because there is a lack of confidence in their own ability to succeed? Is it because there is that fear of the unknown which I spoke of earlier, the fear that someone with a different skin colour, or a female of the species, or someone who needs extra help because of a disability will surpass you and show you that in spite of the perceived disability or the perceived discrimination that person is possibly a finer or a more productive person than you are? That kind of response is unworthy of Canadians. It

is unworthy of a society that is held up as an example to the world.

All of us have unworthy thoughts. All of us have fears. We all have great trepidations about what the future will hold, not just for ourselves but for our children and for the generations to come. All of us here in the House have a particular responsibility which is to somehow get over those fears and to deal with those fears. We have to look at the larger picture of Canadian life and do our very best to legislate in a way that will benefit the largest number of Canadians.

I said at the beginning that all of us came here with an agenda, with things we wanted to see accomplished. I said that one of the things I wanted to see accomplished as a member of Parliament was a furtherance of human rights and fairness. Bill C-64 again is one of the reasons I am proud to be a member of Parliament. I support this bill and I will be delighted to see it pass.

[Translation]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the official opposition has given its support to this most praiseworthy bill. We have been listening to the comments of the third party since yesterday, and I do appreciate what the members across the floor have had to say, something the opposition can rarely state.

I would, however, like to ask the hon. member the following question. Eloquent words are good, very eloquent words even better, but better still are not words but concrete actions and accomplishments.

• (1020)

Let me give the example of the wage inequity that exists at this time for women in the federal public service. It has been evaluated at 72 per cent. How can that be remedied when Treasury Board has undertaken to cut 45,000 positions?

How will the legislation be implemented so that, in the public service for example, there can be a move beyond mere words to concrete actions toward restoring the balance?

[English]

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. However, he may be confusing his apples with his oranges.

The member first talked about the fact that 72 per cent of the Public Service of Canada is female. That is true, but in talking about the public service—and I do this in spite of my great respect and affection for the President of the Treasury Board—we still have a way to go in ensuring that women reach higher echelons in the public service. They must be able to break through glass ceilings. The federal government has a responsibility to be an example to the private sector.

### *Government Orders*

I believe that with the passage of Bill C-64 and the other projects and policies of the government we will see the federal government continuing its role as an example to the rest of the country. One of the ways it has to be an example to the rest of the country is to put its financial house in order.

I am not exactly sure where the hon. member's riding is in the province of Quebec but I can tell him that I represent the third largest public service town in Canada. The largest is of course Ottawa. The second largest is Montreal. Halifax is the third largest. I have shared with the hon. members for Dartmouth and Halifax West in excess of 30,000 employees of the federal government. With the greatest of respect to the hon. member, I do not need anyone to tell me about the problems and concerns of public servants.

With the downsizing which we all know has to be done the public servants in Halifax who are going are taking retirement packages and are finding that the federal government is dealing with them in a fair and open way. This project is moving along at an even faster rate than a number of people had thought. Thus far I have received little or no complaints from my constituents who, I can assure the hon. member, are extremely vociferous and quick to get in touch with me if there is something they are unhappy about or something they feel is not going their way.

If the hon. member is worried about public servants, perhaps he would like to come to Halifax. They would tell him that they are not quite so badly off as he might think.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the dissertation by the member opposite representing Halifax, the bastion of public service in Canada.

I remind the member opposite that Canada is not a perfect place for the people she listed in her dissertation, all of the groups that were designated. It is not a perfect place for men either. The world is not a perfect place.

In my experience the drive to perfection is better achieved through education rather than legislation. We cannot legislate tolerance; we can educate tolerance. We cannot legislate wisdom; we can educate wisdom. There are some things the government just plain cannot do. I leave this aside and recognize that this legislation will pass.

Why, if this legislation is so good and so necessary for the public at large, are there two sets of rules? Why do we ask Canadians to do one thing while we do another? Why do we ask Canadians to do with less when we are prepared to accept our pensions the way they are? If this legislation is so good, why does it not extend to the House of Commons?

*Government Orders*

• (1025)

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, there were several questions and I will be delighted to deal with each one.

First and foremost, I have to disagree with my hon. friend from Edmonton Southwest, one of my favourite members of the third party. On the question of education for tolerance as opposed to legislation, the point is that we have to do both. I think my hon. friend from Edmonton knows that.

Sometimes we do have to legislate. That is why we have human rights acts with which I am sure my hon. friend would not disagree. That is why western democracies have frequently had to drag portions of their populations kicking and screaming into the latter part of the 20th century. Sadly but truly, part of that is in the area of human rights law in all its ramifications. If we have to do that, we have to do that.

On the question of pensions, I do not think we are debating pensions, but yes, I opted into the pension. I am proud to do so and I will continue to be proud to do so because, in the words of that Clairol commercial, I am worth it.

With regard to the question of why the employment equity legislation does not relate to the House of Commons, there is an option for the House of Commons. I too agree with the hon. member but with legislation, one of the things I have learned in my seven years here is that sometimes we must crawl before we walk. This is a great step forward from the old act. The improvements and amendments will keep on coming in all areas of policy while the Liberal government, our Prime Minister and the cabinet make the policy for Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Lévis has already said, we support Bill C-64, on which I believe we have worked very hard in committee. We heard a number of witnesses and tried in good faith to improve the bill.

It is worthwhile keeping in mind, I think, that the bill before us on employment equity goes back as a concept to 1983 and the Abella commission. The Abella commission provided us with a very clear understanding of the fact that, while individual discrimination still exists, often in the form of prejudice or negative attitudes toward certain social phenomena within our society, a more systemic discrimination still exists as well, related to the system and to certain practices, rules and usages which are still sanctioned and upon which it is not easy, as an individual, to make any impact to bring about change.

What Bill C-64 asks of us is to ensure that the composition of the labour market reflects the composition of the Canadian

population. I do not see anything in such an objective that is unreasonable or beyond our grasp as a society.

When it comes to systemic discrimination, discrimination within the system, which is most certainly the hardest to get rid of, four categories of individuals have the most difficulty claiming their rightful place in the work force. First and foremost in the four groups listed in the bill are women, and we shall come back to this, since they make up more than half of the Canadian population and still lag considerably behind in the workforce, particularly where wage policies are concerned, as the member for Lévis mentioned.

• (1030)

The second group is visible minorities. They say we live in an increasingly cosmopolitan society. This implies there are more and more people who do not belong to the majority, who are not white, and these people also have specific problems such as getting promoted and getting a job with managerial responsibilities in the workplace.

And of course we have persons with disabilities. This has become a fact of life. Our society can expect to have an increasing number of people who are functionally challenged. There is certainly a connection with the increase in people's life expectancy, especially among women who seem to have a philosophy of life and a knack for taking care of themselves from which men would have a lot to learn.

The last group covered by this bill is aboriginal peoples. Aboriginal peoples represent approximately 4 per cent of the Canadian population but have managed to occupy only 1 per cent of the jobs available.

In federally-regulated companies with more than 100 employees and throughout the public service—more on that later—we are being asked to find ways to ensure better representation of these four groups in the labour market.

We asked ourselves two questions when considering this bill. First, whether other groups or individuals in our society suffered systemic discrimination.

It was pointed out that older workers may have been discriminated against, since it is not easy when you are laid off and lose your job, and you are 40, 50 or 55 years old, to find a job somewhere else. I think we can safely say there is some hidden discrimination against this group.

The question also arose whether in our society young people, the under thirties, also have that problem. We tried to get some statistics to have a better picture of the problems facing these people. We concluded on the basis of the information we had in committee that there was no specific indication that young people and older workers had suffered systemic discrimination during the past few years.

*Government Orders*

Under the employment equity bill, it is also possible to invoke the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The charter is a mixture of the best and the worst. The best being, of course, the will to ensure that every citizen, irrespective of his income, origins, or profession, has certain rights. I would say the worst part is the provision which attempts rather awkwardly, without reflecting much concern for the interests of Quebec, to support multiculturalism. But that is another issue. In any case, section 15(2) of the charter allows for specific measures aimed at the same designated groups we find in Bill C-64.

Why do I mention this? Because very often there is an assumption that employment equity legislation, and this includes federal as well as provincial legislation, may not be compatible with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Upon closer scrutiny that is clearly not the case, and as I said before, section 15(2) of the charter allows for measures to deal specifically with designated groups.

The overall picture, before we get into the details, is the following. There seems to be a pretty standard profile of economic discrimination on the labour market against women, persons with disabilities, aboriginal peoples and visible minorities, and the situation is not improving. I would say there are four characteristics that are a constant in access to employment for the four designated groups.

• (1035)

Generally speaking, the unemployment rate is higher for women, aboriginal peoples, members of visible minorities and persons with disabilities. The level of unemployment of people in these groups is often higher than the national average, despite the fact that we have had employment equity legislation since 1986. This is the first characteristic of a general economic profile.

Also, generally speaking, we can say that these people are in poorer paying jobs, that is, again as compared with the national average.

When we look at the employment profile and the type of jobs these people hold, we realize that they often occupy lower level positions, not executive or management ones. For certain groups, and I am thinking particularly of women and aboriginal peoples—I was very surprised to learn—the lower level positions are often clerical jobs, junior positions. Here again, nothing has changed since 1986.

The final characteristic of this general profile is that the people in the four designated groups are employed in jobs with low growth potential. This means that, in the course of the changes the job market will undergo in the next few years, these are the jobs that will be threatened, because of their low level of specialization.

I think it important to keep this profile in mind, because, once we realize the situation, it is impossible to rise, like some of our Reform colleagues have done, and state that everyone is equal in the labour market. It is not true that everyone is equal, and it is not true that everyone has an equal opportunity to occupy the same jobs.

But that does not mean that progress has not been made. I think we would be misinformed as parliamentarians if we did not acknowledge what has been achieved since 1986.

I would like to outline for you the percentage of jobs held by each of the designated groups in relation to the jobs held by the population as a whole.

Let us take members of visible minorities, for example. We are told that, as of the last census, they represented 9.4 per cent of the population. In 1987, one year after the Employment Equity Act came into effect, they occupied 5 per cent of the jobs in the labour market. Between 1987 and 1993, with the legislation still in effect, progress was made, because members of visible minorities now represented 8.9 per cent of the labour force.

Obviously, 8.9 per cent is lower than the absolute proportion of the population they represent, which is 9.4 per cent.

Women, of whom the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration spoke so eloquently, represent 52 per cent of the population of Canada. As we know, this is a widespread phenomenon, there is no hiding it. Just think, in 1987, they occupied 40 per cent of the jobs available on the labour market in Canada. By 1993, things had improved and women held 45 per cent of available jobs.

Nevertheless, when we analyze the figures a bit,—and this is where we realize it—we see the need for employment equity legislation. I wonder, in the case of the pages, whether we have achieved a balance between men and women. I would guess from what I have seen that, in this session, the women outnumber the men. But we will get hold of the statistics on this.

The aboriginal peoples represent 4 per cent of the Canadian population. In this case, things are really dramatic. In the case of the aboriginal peoples and persons with disabilities, progress has been particularly pitiful and there is the greatest cause for concern for us as lawmakers.

The aboriginal peoples represent 4 per cent of the Canadian population. In 1987—hold on tight, Mr. Speaker, you are in for a shock—they held .66 per cent, that is, not even 1 per cent, of jobs on the labour market. In 1993, they occupied 1.4 per cent of the jobs.

• (1040)

This is a recovery. There is a pressing need to change course. Handicapped people, who represent 15 per cent of the Canadian population, held 1.59 per cent of jobs in the work place in 1987

*Government Orders*

and 2.56 per cent in 1993. Even today in 1995, we see discrimination, a gap, an imbalance between the relative size of some designated categories and their participation in the labour market. This is what Bill C-64 is designed to correct, and I do not understand how a member of Parliament, a representative of the people cannot subscribe to these principles.

One thing surprised me throughout our numerous committee hearings. Of course, I do not deny that there is a cost and some paperwork attached to employment equity, but I was pleasantly surprised to note that what employers came to tell us is that an employment equity strategy is now part of a sound staff management policy.

Removing employment barriers against certain people is in everyone's interest. In a context where businesses are asked to be good corporate citizens, to maintain close links with their communities, striking just the right balance between a business and its environment is in everyone's interest. This is a provision of Bill C-64 on employment equity.

The law is no longer perceived strictly as an anti-discrimination device as it was in its first few years. It is seen as an important component of sound management and enforcement of a human resources management policy.

When we stop to think about it, there is a cost attached to delaying employment equity. If it is true that handicapped people, people with functional limitations who can hold a job are denied this opportunity, if it is true that these people represent 15 per cent of the Canadian population and that 60 to 80 per cent of them are unemployed, we must realize that there is a cost attached to this because the productivity they could contribute to Canadian society is lost to us as a society.

Provisions like this one in the employment equity bill are to be commended.

What pleased committee members the most—and this was also one of the recommendations adopted by the previous committee in the previous Parliament during the five year review—is that the Employment Equity Act will now apply to the public service of Canada as a whole.

The act previously applied to perhaps 5 per cent of employees working for some 300 employers. This act will now apply to twice as many workers, since the entire public service of Canada, which employs close to 300,000 people, will now be subject to it.

Of course—and we agree with this—, provision has been made for some organizations that will now be subject to Treasury Board regulations because of certain strategic imperatives concerning them. These organizations include the Communications Security Establishment, the RCMP, the Canadian Forces and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

All committee members expressed the wish to be subject to the Employment Equity Act once the amendments have been made.

I heard on several occasions a fallacious, hypocritical, deceitful and dishonest argument from our Reform colleagues, who told us that employment equity meant hiring incompetent people.

• (1045)

That is the basic argument that was used throughout our deliberations by our colleagues from the Reform Party, who do not support Bill C-64. This argument does not stand up to analysis, however, because the legislator provides in the bill, more exactly in clause 56, that this is not employment equity.

It provides for three things. Employers to whom the legislation will apply, because they have 100 employees or more, are told that employment equity does not entail opening new jobs. We can appreciate that, in the current economic conditions, not all industrial sectors are experiencing growth.

In fact, you must admit that the government's financial plan is rather shabby, despicable and mediocre. One cannot ask that new jobs be created for the sake of implementing an employment equity policy. Employment equity does not mean creating new jobs, no more than it means setting quotas. There is no mention of this in the bill and I think it is ill-advised to say otherwise.

How will all this work in everyday life? What employers are asked to do is to prepare an annual employment equity plan and file it by June 30 with the human resources directorate. This plan must contain three things, more or less. It will have to set out how the workforce composition will be assessed. Having assessed the composition of the workforce within his business, where underrepresentation has been identified, the employer will be required to set out what measures he intends to take in order to remedy the situation both qualitatively and quantitatively.

That is a major change introduced by the bill. Not only is the employer required to assess quantitatively the composition of his workforce, but he can also provide qualitative information, which was not the case previously.

We are dissatisfied with certain aspects regarding the employment equity plan. Personally, I would have liked this plan to be prepared and implemented jointly by union and management, as a requirement. We have presented amendments to make this a joint responsibility, a mandatory and binding responsibility, because we do not think that employment equity is possible unless it is something that all parties want and agree to.

Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated and I think that the government made a major mistake there because there was a

*Government Orders*

consensus among the interested parties about this provision. In addition, we would have liked that a copy of the employment equity plan be distributed to each employee and the contents of the plan to be posted in common display areas, as provided for in the Canada Labour Code for instance, where the employer is required to post his policy regarding sexual harassment.

We believe that the bill would have been greatly improved as a result, had the government bowed to the opposition's arguments. Unfortunately, this has not been the case and we were told, quite wrongly I would say, that the employment equity plan would contain strategic information, information which, by virtue of its highly confidential nature, could put the businesses' competitive position at risk. To this, the unions and our party naturally replied: "But if all employers are subject to the same requirements and all of them have the same plan and are willing to make it available within the organization, it is hard to believe that some of them could be penalized, since this standardized policy would be implemented across the board".

To conclude, let me say that it is with great pleasure that we support a bill which, without being perfect, is a major step forward as far as employment equity is concerned.

• (1050)

[*English*]

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the hon. member for Hochelaga for the last couple of years and I know him to be a very earnest, honest, hard working and credible person. I know that when he speaks about this employment equity legislation he is speaking from the heart, that he really does think this will improve society in Canada and prevent discrimination.

I want to ask the hon. member what he thinks will happen as a direct result of this legislation when people who are just as qualified, not more or not less qualified, are denied a job or advancement because of the colour of their skin, because of their race, because of their gender. Does the hon. member feel this will contribute to hard feelings, contribute to discrimination and plant seeds of dissension that would not otherwise be in our society?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ménard:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his good words. I think exactly the same of him. It was a pleasure to work with him, because he seems to represent the progressive wing of his caucus. That wing is not as large as it should be, but that issue will not be solved at this level.

I want to give him an example. It goes without saying that if we agree with employment equity, we support the objective of making more room for designated groups. Let me give a concrete example which is related to my personal life.

I have a twin brother who suffers from cerebral palsy, and I am convinced that he wants to earn a living, just like I do. He is as intelligent, hard working and willing as I am. Had it not been for the fact that a number of organizations have specific policies urging employers to hire persons with disabilities, my brother would probably never have found work. We have to recognize that it is not a natural tendency for an employer to hire handicapped people. Nor is it a natural tendency to hire members of a visible minority group. Employers are still very reluctant to hire women who might give birth in the near future.

When my twin brother was hired, had he been chosen instead of an able-bodied person, that person might have resented the fact and that would have been understandable. However, we must go beyond such considerations, which means that, in a number of cases, preferential treatment should be given to the four designated groups mentioned in the legislation. I agree with that principle.

The minor distinction which I would make is that, in order to achieve genuine and real employment equity, it is necessary that when people apply for a job, their application be reviewed based on their ability to do that job. When my disabled brother was hired, he had the basic skills required to perform the duties involved.

The bill includes a very explicit provision which provides that an employer is not required to hire unqualified persons. It can be assumed that, given personnel management policies, employers conducting interviews to recruit staff will reject applicants who are not deemed qualified. However, when a number of people have equal skills, including persons with disabilities, then a collective effort should be made to help these persons get the job.

[*English*]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member if this employment equity legislation will address an issue of discrimination by using discrimination itself.

• (1055)

Although the legislation as he interprets it may not be doing that, we do have a situation in which those who are not covered by employment equity legislation are being told not to even bother applying for some of these positions that are open because they happen to fall outside of the categories of this protection.

How fair is it to not even be considered for a job? I am referring to the RCMP as a prime example. I have had a number of young men complain because they have been turned away at the door from even applying because they do not fit into this little category. How fair is it to those individuals to be denied

*S. O. 31*

even the opportunity of applying to see if they are equally capable of doing the job?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ménard:** Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, I will admit that some people are being frustrated. Let me say this to her.

It seems to me that it would be a great deal easier as parliamentarians to reach a consensus on the justification for an employment equity act if we were in a context of job creation. Surely, we must hope that there are enough jobs to go around. The misfortune at this time, the reason there has been the heavy backlash on employment equity, is that there are too few jobs available and that the jobs available are not accessible to everyone.

I agree with the hon. member on this. Where our opinions diverge is that over here in my seat for Hochelaga—Maison-neuve I feel that a full employment policy is not possible in a country that stretches across a whole continent, as Canada does. Those countries that have adopted successful employment policies—because trade is a worldwide affair, but unemployment is not, and I would be delighted if we could have the 5 or 6 per cent unemployment they have in Austria and other countries—are small countries with populations of seven, eight or ten million and countries with great cohesiveness. And Quebec possesses those characteristics.

**The Speaker:** It being 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), we will now proceed to statements by members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### COMMUNITY ACADEMIC SERVICES PROGRAM

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to a program in my riding called the Community Academic Services Program, CASP. It is a community program dedicated to upgrading adults in English and math up to the grade nine level by setting up classrooms in community facilities such as church basements, Lion's clubs and schools. It is province-wide and has been very successful in helping people gain new skills.

CASP was recently awarded the UNESCO international award for literacy at the Beijing world conference on women. The importance of literacy cannot be overstated. It is an essential tool in increasing employment opportunities and improving the quality of life for people across the country.

I congratulate Maryanne Bourgeois and her staff from Literacy New Brunswick in particular for their hard work and dedication. As a member of the Fredericton Community Literacy Committee and as someone who has been involved with CASP

from the beginning, I am encouraged to see the program is getting international recognition.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### AIDS

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maison-neuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this National AIDS awareness week has given us members the opportunity to reflect on this significant problem for society, as between 42,000 and 45,000 Canadians and Quebecers are now infected with HIV.

It is our duty to step up our efforts to eradicate HIV transmission and to ensure that infected individuals receive the support they require. The battle against AIDS, however, also includes a battle against homophobia, and that is precisely the theme of the 1995 awareness campaign.

Putting an end to homophobia requires a positive atmosphere, an atmosphere of solidarity toward those who are seropositive, and a positive representation of homosexuality. My closing wish is that all members of this House will contribute to overcoming homophobia and thus to winning the battle against AIDS.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### THANKSGIVING

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on this Thanksgiving weekend Reformers would like to thank a few Liberal members who have really stood out in this session.

First, we would like to thank all of those unknown backbenchers for filibustering the government's own pre-referendum stay asleep "snooze bar" legislation.

Second, we would like to thank the Minister of Finance for his Walter Mitty, feel good, two-year revolving target approach to fiscal forecasting which if nothing else will make weather forecasters look good.

Third, we would like to thank the Deputy Prime Minister for helping us put together a working definition of the term racist. Thanks to her we now know that a racist is an individual who is winning an argument against a Liberal.

Finally, thanks go to the minister of HRD whose job creation initiatives have ensured that thousands of young Canadians will utter the words "do you want fries with that" upon graduation from university.

We would like to thank the Minister of Justice for his unwanted gun control bill, the treasury board minister for his expensive infrastructure program, and a special thanks to the Minister of Health for her great impersonation of the hon. member for Macleod.

### ARCTIC WILDLIFE REFUGE

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the members of Vuntut Gwich'in first nation and various wildlife and environmental groups will soon begin a cross-country tour of the United States to gather support for the declaration of the Arctic national wildlife refuge as a United States national monument and for the protection of the area from exploitation.

The wildlife refuge is a primary calving ground of the Porcupine caribou herd which migrates across the Yukon-Alaska border. This herd is unique and constitutes an irreplaceable national treasure while providing subsistence for First Nations people.

The Prime Minister and the American president have said they support the protection of the herd. In recent statements the president has said he supports the establishment of a national monument. However the U.S. Congress wants to open the area to oil and gas development.

I urge the Prime Minister to intervene personally by lending his public support for the national monument declaration and by reaffirming Canada's commitment to protect the herd.

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL IMMUNIZATION MONTH

**Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I gave a flu shot to Bob Marks, director of the Canadian Lung Association. With that one shot Bob got protection for the whole winter. However Bob alone does not benefit from that shot; all of society does.

Over 2,000 Canadians a year die from pneumonia and influenza. The number of work days lost due to flu and the cost to business and the health care system are exorbitant. Yet only 33 per cent of at risk Canadians take advantage of this protection.

During October, National Immunization Month, we are changing that. We are asking Canadians to do themselves a favour by getting a flu shot.

Polio used to paralyse our children. Not any more. Diphtheria and whooping cough caused death among our young. Not any more. National immunization programs put an end to those days. Now we are on guard against influenza. In every province thousands of at risk seniors, the chronically ill, children and HIV positive patients can get free flu shots because it is good preventive medicine.

As a physician I ask every member of the House to recognize National Immunization Month by getting a flu shot. I will give it to them personally. Let us all say no to the flu.

**The Speaker:** I am all for that and I will be happy to meet with you right after question period.

*S. O. 31*

### HIV-AIDS

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I wear this red ribbon in remembrance of those who have died of AIDS and for the approximately 16,000 Canadians who have been diagnosed with the HIV-AIDS virus.

The AIDS virus has most seriously affected the homosexual community. However the virus does not discriminate on the basis of gender or sexual orientation as many women and children have died of the virus in addition to the thousands of men.

While our views may vary one thing is very clear. Those who suffer from AIDS are human beings. They deserve our support and compassion.

I applaud Canadian researchers for their relentless search for a cure. While progress is being made every effort must be made through education and lifestyle change to stop the deadly transmission of the disease.

As we take time this week to support AIDS awareness and education programs, I encourage every member of the House to inform themselves about the disease so as to eradicate prejudice and homophobia and treat those suffering with AIDS with the dignity and compassion they so rightly deserve.

\* \* \*

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I commend the auditor general on his study on environmental management systems and its recent release. The co-operative effort of the many government departments involved in the project should be acknowledged. It is a good example of the wide range of initiatives in which all parts of the government are sharing information and best practices to green government operations in as rapid and cost effective a manner as possible.

The Government of Canada, through its greening government operations initiative, has established guidelines for all federal departments to follow in order to integrate environmental considerations in their operations.

• (1105)

The auditor general has provided us with a useful study. Implementing an environmental management system is a vital first step to improving environmental performance in key areas such as procurement, fleet and facilities management, and land use.

This is only one step the government is taking to meet its commitment to Canadians to make sustainable development a reality.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

### AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, according to the secret document prepared for Operation Unity by Industry Canada, in the event of Quebec sovereignty, because the aerospace industry worldwide maintains close relations with their respective governments, if the governments of Quebec and Canada can maintain co-operative relations in this sector, the aerospace industry will not be affected. The document also indicates that partnership is more the rule than the exception in this industry, throughout the world generally. It seems clear that, in the country's national interest, Canada will try to negotiate a partnership with Quebec in the aerospace sector.

The blackmail, intimidation and threat of reprisals have to stop. It is time Quebecers were told the truth, and the truth is that a partnership is not only possible but desirable for both Canada and Quebec. Canada will negotiate a partnership agreement with Quebec not out of charity for its former province, but because it is in the national interest to do so.

\* \* \*

[English]

### GOVERNMENT GRANTS

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, once again I stand in the House to tell Canadians about the wasteful practices of the Liberal government.

In particular I list some of the outrageous grants being handed out by the Minister of Health. A group known as Positive Straight Men received \$10,000; the prisoners with HIV-AIDS support action network, \$63,000; the Committee on Seniors and Sexuality, \$117,000; and let us not forget that pauper of the financial industry, the Royal Bank of Canada that received \$55,000.

The only thing that Canadians are asking is that their tax dollars be spent responsibly. This is a minute part of the \$10 billion of grants and contributions in 1994-95, much of which has been poured down the proverbial drain.

\* \* \*

### WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS

**Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1995, the office of The Women Entrepreneurs of Saskatchewan was officially opened in Saskatoon to serve businesswomen in rural and urban communities across the province.

Women entrepreneurs enjoy an enviable success rate in business. In spite of this they have historically faced obstacles which often prevented them from getting started in the first

place such as banks demanding a husband's signature on a loan, high interest rates or excessive collateral. We must factor in as well fear of the unknown and isolation resulting from lack of business networks.

The women entrepreneurs office, funded by western economic diversification, will go a long way to breaking down the barriers by providing loans at market interest rates, advisory services, mentoring and seminars related to entrepreneurship and business skills.

Congratulations to Jeanne Martinson, Pamela Warden, Marie Jensen, Donna Dixson-Bernard and Ann Chatfield, the board of directors, for making this dream a reality. Finally, well done, Andrea Scott.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FRANCO-ONTARIAN FLAG

**Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite my Liberal, Bloc and Reform colleagues and all the other members present today to join with me in congratulating Franco-Ontarians on the 20th anniversary of their flag.

On September 25, I had the honour of participating in a ceremony at the University of Sudbury, in my riding, to honour the Franco-Ontarian flag and to celebrate the contribution made by Franco-Ontarians to Canada and to our shared heritage.

Since September 25, 1975, the date of its birth, the Franco-Ontarian flag has become an important symbol of our accomplishments, our culture and our language. Today, Franco-Ontarians continue to grow and develop within a strong and united Canada.

Franco-Ontarians, all proud Canadians, first and foremost, owe a large debt to their predecessors, to those who created the flag and to the University of Sudbury.

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL DEBT

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the PQ premier once again raised the spectre that an independent Quebec might not assume its fair share of the Canadian debt.

In a speech delivered in Matane yesterday evening, the separatist leader said: "But if you do not want to sit down and negotiate, stay away from the table but don't expect to see any cheques".

Once again, the separatist leader used that threat to make people believe that he will be able to force Canada to negotiate a partnership agreement if Quebec separates.

• (1110)

Quebecers are reasonable and responsible people. They know that a partnership project based on threats and blackmail will not work, and this is another reason why they will vote no on October 30.

\* \* \*

#### CANADA–QUEBEC ECONOMIC UNION

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis–Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Châteauguay was absolutely right when he said that Canada would negotiate a partnership agreement with Quebec. Indeed, even Industry Canada recognizes, in a secret document prepared for Operation Unity, that: “Should Quebec separate, and should there be a breakdown in the co–operation between federal research institutions based in Quebec and those located in the rest of Canada, the scientific and technological efforts of the two states would suffer a real prejudice”.

If there is a partnership, there would be no such breakdown. Forget the gloomy speeches; it is obvious that the interests of Canada and Quebec call for a partnership treaty. This is particularly true for the space industry, as well as the science and technology sector.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment forgets that she is not the only minister of the environment in the country. There are 12 others and they make up the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, a forum for co–operation and joint action.

The federal minister thinks that environmental policy revolves around her. In contrast, the CCME is committed to developing the environmental management framework agreement which would reduce duplication and overlap.

Is the minister in support? Not a chance. Now harmonization has been put on hold.

The environment minister has pushed the provinces around too much. She has also cancelled any provincial negotiations on financial support to Habitat Canada which the provinces said they would assume by increasing waterfowl hunting fees.

The minister does not care for a program that would save the government money; she is only scared of devolving her assumed power.

Are her feelings hurt? Co–operation is a two–way street. It is time the minister got off her pedestal and listened to what the provinces have to say. She may even learn something about political sustainable development.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

#### QUEBEC ECONOMY

**Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette–Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, Quebecers are not going to be represented at an important economic and trade meeting with Chinese officials because the PQ premier decided not to attend that event. Just like he did when Team Canada conducted its very important and successful Asian tour, the PQ leader prefers to stick to his separatist creed, rather than co–operate with our partners from the business world, to promote economic recovery and job creation.

Quebecers are primarily concerned with economic issues and job creation. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be a priority for the PQ premier. On October 30, Quebecers will say no to the separatist project, a project which does nothing to promote economic recovery and create jobs for them.

\* \* \*

#### REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at a meeting with UQUAM students in management studies, the PQ finance and revenue minister said: “It seems that business people are not overly grateful when it is the Parti Québécois which does something”. Are we to understand from the minister’s comments that he is trying to enlist business people in the Yes camp?

The PQ minister must stop using provincial subsidies and other benefits to force Quebec businesses to support the Yes side. Earlier this week, his colleague, the Bloc Québécois leader, said that enlisting business people was undemocratic and unacceptable.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### LAND MINES

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, land mines and anti–personnel devices are a humanitarian disaster. There are over 100 million of them seeded in over 60 countries of the world. From Mozambique to Chechnya, from Cambodia to Angola they lie silently in wait for their next victim.

They cost between \$30 and \$70 to make and are made by such countries as the United States, Italy and even Canada. Most are designed to maim and not kill, and some are even designed to look like toys so that children will pick them up and get their arms blown off. This is a perverted logic if ever there was one.

The majority of the victims are innocent women and children.

*Oral Questions*

• (1115)

In developing countries wracked by civil war, it costs between \$300 and \$700 to remove them. Last year we removed 85,000 but seeded two million at the same time.

I put a private members' bill forward on September 21 asking the House to ban land mines and anti-personnel devices. I hope for the sake of the most impoverished people in the world the House joins hands to do just that.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]**SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the past few days it has become increasingly clear that this government is trying to hide the devastating impact that a number of reforms planned by Ottawa will have, especially in the case of social programs.

The government keeps postponing the release of the details of these reforms until after the referendum. Furthermore, the last budget announced cuts totalling seven billion dollars in transfers to the provinces for the financing of social programs.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that cuts in payments to the provinces for social programs, irrespective of the criteria the federal government will use, will cause a major shortfall in funding for spending on health care, post-secondary education and social assistance in Quebec, a shortfall that, depending on the criteria applied, is estimated at between \$1.9 and \$2.5 billion over the next two years, and this is only in Quebec?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member for Roberval says, we are not hiding a thing. We announced our schedule for transfers to the provinces at the beginning of our mandate. We gave them three years. We told them from the outset: we will continue to increase a little bit next year, and that was 1994, and then in 1995 we will go on increasing, and the cuts will come in 1996 and 1997.

However, next year the subsidies we pay will still be higher than they were at the time we formed the government. The Minister of Finance explained to the provinces that he would give them time to adjust and that he would even continue to increase payments during the first two years. However, they were told to expect adjustments.

The provinces were aware of this and initiated their own cuts. For instance, last year in December, Quebec's health minister announced cuts totalling \$500 million. We still gave slightly more than the previous year, but he made cuts. Obviously, everyone has to make adjustments. Provincial governments across Canada are making adjustments. The Government of Quebec has started to do so as well, and it will have to make more adjustments after the referendum.

We told all provincial governments ahead of time what to expect. I think this is all very fair and very open and shows a government that has absolutely nothing to hide before, during or even after the referendum.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is the future we want to talk about. The Prime Minister seems to appreciate talking about that.

We know that in the future, the federal government is planning cuts in unemployment insurance and old age pensions. We found that out last week here in the House, but the bad news will not come until after the referendum.

Would the Prime Minister agree that by attacking the most vulnerable members of our society with cuts in his own programs that are targeted to the needy, he is hitting them twice with cuts in payments to Quebec that will total between \$1.9 and \$2.5 billion in two years' time, which will force the Quebec government to add to the cuts made by the federal government? Does he not realize he is hitting the neediest in our society from both sides?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the unemployment insurance program was explained in the budget, and we are preparing legislation that will be tabled very shortly.

Just this morning I received a call from a provincial premier who wanted to see me to discuss the legislation, and who begged me not to go ahead immediately because he had a number of representations to make.

• (1120)

I told him: "Fine. As soon as I have time, we will have a meeting, and we will table the bill as soon as possible, because we want people to have time to discuss it".

The hon. member referred to senior citizens. I made it clear here in the House that we have no intention of affecting senior citizens. I made that quite clear. But I also said that we will have to make sure we can still pay the old age pensions of the people who will retire in 2005 and 2010. Good government means planning for the future. And people who are retired now do not have to worry.

We want to be able to pay old age pensions in 2005, 2010 and 2015 because many of us will still be here, although there may not be that many on the other side, and we have to consider the future. As far as pensioners are concerned, they do not have to worry, I made that clear, and old age pensioners will not be affected, not in November and not in the finance minister's next budget.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister admit that at the rate the federal government says it will cut transfers to the provinces, in other words, money used by the provinces for social programs and education, at the rate the federal government plans to cut these expenditures, according to our most accurate estimates—although the criteria have not yet been released, but we tried a series of criteria that seemed likely—we can say that in four years time, if Quebecers say no in the referendum and decide to stay in the federal system, in four years time the federal government will no longer pay a cent in transfer payments for social programs, education and social assistance, and on top of that, under the tax points system, Quebecers would again have to send part of the province's tax revenues to Ottawa to help fund social programs in the other provinces?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, under the present system, there is a decline in the amounts to be spent on transfers to the provinces.

That being said, one of the reasons we decided to proceed with these reforms, and this was explained by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health, and I said it myself here in this House, was to reverse this trend while maintaining a certain level of money in these transfers. In other words, we intend to freeze these amounts to stop this decline, for reasons we discussed with the provinces, in other words, the federal government firmly intends to remain involved in improving social programs in Canada.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the documents attached to the last federal budget mention that transfers to the provinces will be cut by \$2.5 billion in 1996–97 and \$4.5 billion in 1997–98. In 1997–98, if the federal government distributes the Canada social transfer on the basis of population, as suggested on page 40 of the federal budget speech, Quebec alone will absorb over 40 per cent of the \$4.5 billion in cuts.

Does the Prime Minister not agree that, on the eve of the referendum, he has a duty to stop hiding his intentions from Quebecers by disclosing publicly how the federal government intends to distribute among the provinces the \$4.5 billion in cuts planned for 1997–98, so that Quebecers will know the real impact of federal policies?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development and I intend to sit down with provincial

officials to determine how the country and the provinces can restructure their finances.

That said, the hon. member has just quoted figures that have been used by other separatists. As I said before in this House, they are basing their arguments on something that is quite preposterous.

• (1125)

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this is a revelation. I did not know that the Minister of Finance was a separatist, as these are his figures.

Does the Prime Minister confirm that, whatever the distribution criteria adopted, in 1997–98 alone, Quebec will be deprived of between \$1.2 billion and \$1.9 billion for the funding of its social programs? The PQ government was not the only one to predict these cuts. His friends in the Liberal Party in Quebec, including his colleague, the current Minister of Labour, said the same thing when they were in power.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the hon. member's analysis is quite preposterous. It is quite clear that no decision has been made on distribution. Second, I think that the hon. member should also consider equalization, which is a very important factor.

The hon. member seems unwilling to talk about it, but let me tell you that, in 1996–97 for example, equalization payments to Quebec will amount to \$4 billion or 42 per cent of federal equalization payments to the provinces.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. The government's record on Somalia is not terribly open, but openly terrible.

This week we have seen evidence that national defence headquarters altered documents. The punishment, it gets to investigate itself. We have evidence that Lieutenant-Colonel Kenward destroyed evidence and obstructed justice. The punishment, he got promoted. We have evidence that Colonel Labbé uttered unlawful commands. His punishment, he has been put in charge of the army staff college to teach leadership.

The minister must have had files on these events. Why did he wait so long before he acted?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had a distinguished career in the Canadian forces before he entered politics. I am quite surprised and disappointed that he would ask that sort of a question. He talks about openness. The government has no axe to grind. We want the commission into the deployment of the Canadian forces in Somalia to get to the bottom of whatever happened. He

*Oral Questions*

talks about being terribly open. If he wants to know what I mean by terribly open I can tell him. It means transparent, unfettered and above board.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has gone kicking and screaming into the Somalia commission. We in the Reform Party are the ones who demanded a commission of inquiry.

The Somalia commission, which the minister called only after pressure from this party, is headed by top-notch people and will come to its conclusions in due course. There is a complete abdication of leadership within the Department of National Defence. The Prime Minister's expression of confidence in the minister and the chief of defence staff cannot change that fact.

Officers are named in police reports. They are implicated in criminal activities, falsifying documents and offering incentives to subordinates to commit murder. Does the minister consider these to be examples of good leadership?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised, disappointed and somewhat disillusioned not only by the tenor of the question but by some of the implications of the question.

The members of the third party talk about calling for this inquiry. I happen to have personal knowledge and I will inform the House of it. Other members will remember when we were in opposition—I want the hon. member to check the records—I asked for this inquiry in April 1993.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it took two years for the government to act. Originally it wanted an internal investigation. It was only under our pressure that the government opened up the investigation.

The Prime Minister said that these troubles occurred under the previous government. Yet after two years nothing has been done to fix the problems. If the minister knew previously of the evidence that has been revealed this week, he has complicity in covering it up. If he did not know, he is guilty of contempt in the highest order. The minister's management of national defence over the—

• (1130)

**The Speaker:** In our questions we are making giant leaps. I would ask the hon. member to please put his question.

**Mr. Hart:** My question: The minister's management of national defence over the past two years has only compounded—

**An hon. member:** Order.

**The Speaker:** Please, my colleague, the question now.

**Mr. Hart:** Will the minister resign?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a little problem today. From watching the hon. member I realize not many of them will be re-elected when they act like that.

The member talks like that about the Canadian Armed Forces which have been an honour to all Canadians. Those Canadians have been doing a great job in Yugoslavia for the past three and one-half years, yet a former member of the armed forces is using those kinds of words about his colleagues who were with him in the army, who have always been a great part of the Canadian strength. We have the best soldiers in the world.

Not long ago I was talking with the President of Croatia and the President and Prime Minister of Bosnia. They told me the best soldiers in the former Yugoslavia were the Canadian soldiers.

When I see a former soldier acting like the hon. member, I know those members will not be back in great numbers after the next election.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TRANSFER PAYMENTS**

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

The federal government reallocates to the Quebec government, in the form of transfer payments, a portion of the taxes collected from Quebecers. As a result of the numerous cuts made by the federal government, the amounts handed back to Quebec are constantly being reduced, and transfer payments have become an unstable and inadequate source of funds for Quebec.

Does the Minister of Finance confirm that, since 1980, the proportion of Quebec's revenues coming from federal transfer payments, including equalization, has dropped by 28 per cent and that the situation will get progressively worse as a result of the last federal budget given that, by 1997-98, transfer payments from Ottawa will account for only 12.7 per cent of Quebec's revenues?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again—and this is unfortunate—separatists do not have a firm grasp of figures.

At present, while receiving approximately \$29 billion from Quebec, we give that province approximately \$41 billion, which means a net gain of \$11 billion for Quebec. What we must ask ourselves is this: Should Quebec ever achieve independence, what will the separatist movement do to bridge that gap?

*Oral Questions*

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that I will have to put my question in writing because I was unable to get an answer.

Since it is becoming increasingly obvious that, within four years, Quebec will no longer receive any money from Ottawa for social program funding—I repeat, social program funding—how can the minister justify his plans to set up new structures and implement new manpower training initiatives that will increase duplication, when these structures and initiatives are to be funded from surpluses in the UI fund, to which Ottawa will no longer contribute as much as a penny?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat the same thing. The government, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Health and myself have all stated in this House that one of the goals of the current reform is to reverse the trend, stop our reserves from shrinking and maintain a level that will allow us to set the amount to be transferred to the provinces, including Quebec.

\* \* \*

• (1135)

[English]

#### CANADA PENSION PLAN

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development on behalf of all Canadians.

A new poll shows that only 19 per cent of Canadians under age 50 expect to get anything out of the Canada pension plan when they retire. Their confidence in the plan has gone down since the Liberals replaced the Tories in 1993.

Does the government have any plans at all to correct the Canada pension plan problem? What will it do to assure Canadian workers and employers that the money they are contributing to this plan is not just going down the tubes?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a curious question about money in the Canada pension plan going down the tube. The money goes to provide for retirement security for senior citizens. It goes to provide for a basic income benefit for disabled Canadians. It goes to provide a basic benefit for widows and their children.

The Reform Party's proposals as it puts them forward would mean a substantial reduction for disabled Canadians, a substantial reduction for widows, and a substantial reduction for 1.8 million pensioners. How can the hon. member stand up and tell us to do something to protect the system when his own party is proposing a way of slashing the program?

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the difference between the Liberals and the Reformers is that we would have a plan that would be actuarially sound. This one has never been sound. The Liberals were informed of that when they first brought in this plan. They fired the adviser who gave them that advice 30 years ago.

I ask again: What will the government do specifically to make the Canada pension plan actuarially and mathematically sound and sustainable? That is what Canadians demand.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, we announced in the last budget that we would be presenting a paper containing a series of proposals as to how we can deal with the sustainability of the Canada pension plan. The Minister of Finance will be meeting with his counterparts later this year to talk about this. As the hon. member should know, this is not just a federal government plan but one we share with the provinces. It is a joint plan and therefore we have to make those kinds of arrangements.

Let me give the member one very quick example of the kind of measures we are taking. On July 1, I announced a series of changes to the Canada pension plan that will allow those with disabilities to go back to work so that they can have a bigger incentive to be employed and not simply draw the benefit. It once again goes to the very heart and soul of what we are trying to do in our reform which is to provide for economic security by giving people a good chance at a job.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. Despite a slight dip in unemployment after ten months of zero net employment growth in Canada, we find that the unemployment rate among those under the age of 25 has again increased. Even those who manage to find work are often in an extremely precarious positions. In fact, this is the lowest level of youth activity in the labour market in 20 years.

What concrete actions does the government plan to take to help young people, since the youth unemployment rate has again risen in September, from 15.7 per cent to 16.4 per cent?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the hon. member raised that question. It does give me the opportunity to tell members of the House in case they have not heard that this morning the unemployment rate fell to 9.2 per cent which is the

*Oral Questions*

lowest rate since 1990. The hon. member will be particularly interested to know that in the last two months in the province of Quebec 16,000 new jobs have been created which is the highest job growth in any region of Canada.

[Translation]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is not answering my questions. I was asking about youth employment. Does the minister acknowledge that the youth employment situation has deteriorated since the Liberals came to office, with 27,000 fewer jobs for young people since November 1993. Is he prepared to acknowledge this?

• (1140)

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's figures are not correct. The unemployment rate has gone down for young people but not sufficiently so. Looking at the figures, one of the reasons is that still far too many young people are dropping out of school far too early and therefore do not have the required skills to get a job.

That is the reason the government introduced the youth internship program. It is a partnership with the private sector to create opportunities enabling young people to move from school to work with a full transition in a partnership way. This year over 24,000 young people will be enrolled in that program.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the average Canadian cannot afford to travel in expensive limousines and yet the Department of Citizenship and Immigration gave over \$20,000 to a Toronto limousine service to ferry immigrants around town.

My question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is why?

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration promotes open government and release of information to the greatest extent possible. I am certain the information the member has come up with probably came to him through this or other measures.

We are glad to promote open government and I am happy he has this information. I will pass it on to the minister to give the member a fuller answer at a later time.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thought my question was why we are ferrying immigrants around town in limousines, not about open government.

To continue in the same vein, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration spent \$200,000 at Big Bill's Furniture and Mattress Warehouse in Kitchener. It gave \$152,000 to Zellers to buy furniture for some immigrants. Again I ask the parliamentary secretary why?

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

With regard to taxi services which he clearly wants to call limousines, a car is a car. On the other hand if he wants to look at settlement services and what we do for immigrants coming to Canada, it is a program of which we are very proud. It is a program we are determined to preserve because on this side of the House we believe in the importance of immigrants in that they help build this country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS**

**Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux—Montagnes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. While the federal government has cut CN's debt by \$900 million in order to make it more attractive to investors, CN has signed a \$300 million contract with GM to purchase new Ontario-built locomotives.

How can the minister justify the decision to renew CN's locomotive fleet at the taxpayers' expense, when this ought to have been left for the new shareholders to pay for after privatization?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is no doubt aware that locomotives are not kept on a lot somewhere like cars are at a Ford or GM dealership. Let me assure the hon. member that the locomotives in question will be delivered to CN long after privatization.

**Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux—Montagnes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I take it that the minister prefers this huge order from Ontario to be made by a crown corporation. How can the minister allow CN to add \$300 million to its debt load by purchasing new locomotives at our expense when he has just injected close to one billion dollars of Canadians' tax money to reduce that same debt and to make CN more attractive to investors?

[English]

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. member does not understand.

The restructuring of the debt for Canadian National has to do with the IPO that will be made available to the investment community in November of this year.

*Oral Questions*

• (1145)

As to the order for locomotives for CN's operations in the years to come, those locomotives have not been built yet. They have not been paid for yet. They will not be delivered nor will they become a liability for CN until a number of years down the road.

As to how CN is to run its operations, obviously it needs new rolling stock. Locomotives built in London, Ontario are sold not only to CN but to CP and all around the world. Only last week we had representatives in from the Congo looking to purchase locomotives from the GM shops in London because they are the best in the world.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Many Canadians are worried about the economy stagnating in recent months. We have even heard some members of the official opposition talking about no net job creation since January.

Would the minister once again set the record straight on Canada's employment situation?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that the job market is going through some very major changes. That is one reason it is so important we modernize our structures to enable Canadians to make the adjustments, to get new employment tools to respond and particularly to provide new choices.

Within those very positive figures we had this morning of the unemployment rate coming down, 70,000 of the jobs created were manufacturing jobs. They are well paying, full time jobs.

This shows that the fear of the jobless recovery is not quite accurate. The reality of the Canadian economy, through the kind of stimulus that has been provided by the Minister of Finance in his budgets and in other areas, is that manufacturing and exports are leading job recovery in this country. That is why we have to continue to provide that enormous support and confidence. That is the most important key to creating jobs.

\* \* \*

**DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier in question period I think that most Canadians would

have been appalled to see the Prime Minister defending some of the things going on at DND by wrapping himself in the name of the peacekeepers and the job they are doing, putting their lives in danger, trying to defend the country.

Does the Prime Minister really think that when we read about the stonewalling of police investigations, about the cover-up of criminal activity, and about the falsifying of documents this in any way does any service to the men on the ground who are defending Canada and trying to keep peace in foreign countries?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have said to the House many times that we initiated the public inquiry into the matter. Now I see the Reform Party is taking credit for that.

I was in opposition when the parliamentary secretary was on his feet asking for an inquiry. We are having a public inquiry and all the documents are available.

Of course there are problems in the army. In any department there are problems. We are working to solve them. We will accept the recommendations if they are valid and we will change what has to be changed.

To try to create the impression that we have a terrible army in Canada when it is lauded by everybody around the world I think is going the wrong way.

The young member has a lot of personal ambition. He should tell his colleagues to slow down, because there will not be much of a Reform Party very soon.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, all Canadians know it is not the army that is terrible, it is the Minister of National Defence's running of that portfolio.

We have been pursuing this inquiry. The opposition Liberals, as he knows, called for this two years ago. We had to call for it for nearly two years before we got it.

The Minister of National Defence has been sitting on this material, which has been under his nose for two years. Was there complicity in this? Did he know this was happening, or was he simply incompetent and did not provide this material in the first two years of this administration?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence got up many times in the House and explained that under the laws of this land when there were cases in front of the military courts we could not proceed with an inquiry because it could have invalidated trials that were going on. It is the way we operate. There were some charges against some military people and we could not have a public inquiry on the same element of proof because it would have been used by the different lawyers or the prosecution to destroy the case.

*Oral Questions*

• (1150)

We have to respect the law of the land. After the judgments were rendered we had a public inquiry. We could not have both together. With time, when he gains experience, he will know the law of the land a bit better and perhaps one day he will be ready to take over what will be left, if anything, of the Reform Party.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In Quebec, there are 25 federal research facilities employing 3,000 workers, which represents 13.4 per cent of the jobs in federal facilities of this type in Canada, whereas, in Ontario, the Chalk River nuclear research centre alone employs 2,227 people. Overall, federal centres employ 11,000 researchers and technicians in Ontario.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that the federal government has consistently penalized Quebec in the area of research and development, undermining its scientific and economic development? Would he also explain why, under such conditions, he is cutting funding for research in the DIPP program, which is crucial to the aerospace industry located primarily in Quebec.

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as regards the DIPP, the hon. member should be aware that, in recent years, nearly 50 per cent of funding has gone to Quebec, to business in Quebec.

We have to be realistic when we talk about the DIPP, because we have long known the size of the defence industry in Quebec. When the transition was made with the DIPP funds, almost 50 per cent of these funds were, in fact, paid to businesses in Quebec.

As far as research and development is concerned, we acknowledge that the proportion spent in Quebec is approximately 25 per cent, which is still very close to the proportion of the population.

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in Quebec we receive only 17 per cent of funds intended for research and development. According to the Minister of Finance, the figure is 13 per cent.

How does the Prime Minister justify this imbalance between Quebec and Ontario in the distribution of federal research facilities, whereas Hull, Gatineau and Aylmer are within the National Capital Region and could have received a greater proportion of these facilities?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has repeatedly explained, there are a whole lot of people in the

greater metropolitan area of Ottawa–Hull working at research and development centres. Let us leave this aside.

The hon. member should note that, even though the Bloc Québécois and the Government of Quebec claim 17 per cent of federal funding for research and development goes to Quebec, we contend and are prepared to show proof that approximately 25 per cent of the Government of Canada's funding for research and development goes to Quebec.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in November the Alberta government will ask grain farmers whether they are in favour of having the freedom to sell their wheat and barley to any buyer, including the Canadian Wheat Board, into domestic and export markets, yes or no?

In response, the federal minister of agriculture states the Alberta plebiscite will not be the last word on this issue. When will the minister of agriculture give farmers the last word on this issue and have a plebiscite across the whole Canadian Wheat Board area to settle this issue?

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister of agriculture has made it very clear for a number of months that farmers will be involved in the future of the Canadian Wheat Board in Canada.

To emphasize that, he has recently put in place a very expert panel to go right across western Canada to talk to farmers, chat with farmers, and consult with farmers in all of the industry about their views on the future of the Canadian Wheat Board.

We will continue to deal with everyone and consult with everyone in the industry in order to talk about and deal with the future of that great wheat board.

• (1155)

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, panels, studies, commissions and reports, and it has been two years and nothing has been done.

Alberta farmers are being asked for their opinion on the issue because the Alberta government believes that farmers have the right to make this decision. Who will have the last word on whether farmers should have the freedom to sell their wheat and barley into all markets? Will it be the farmers or will it be this father knows best minister of agriculture?

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that farmers will be consulted. I also remind the hon. member of the disappointment of all of us when the third party in Parliament recommends to farmers to break Canadian law and supports them in this.

We will follow the tradition of our party and consult. However, with regard to the wheat board, the Reform Party thinks it knows best and is requesting and supporting farmers to go against the rules and laws of the land with reference to the wheat board.

\* \* \*

### MINING

**Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Although I recognize that there has been a substantial increase in exploration expenditures in the mining industry in the last few years, there are still some serious impediments to investment. What does the government intend to do to help Canada's investment climate in mining?

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. First, it gives me an opportunity to express our condolences to the families and friends of those nine people who lost their lives in the helicopter crash in Kyrgyzstan. Our thoughts and prayers are with them at this very difficult time.

Second, it gives me an opportunity to give some good news to the House. We are having excellent results as far as mining is concerned in Canada, with exploration expenditure up 32 per cent in 1994 and it looks like it will go to \$675 million this year. Twenty mines are opening and only two closing permanently, and there are 2,000 to 3,000 new employees in the mining industry.

This is all due to the excellent financial position the Minister of Finance has set out for the country, the Whitehorse mining initiative, and the efforts of the government to build a more innovative society and remove the overlap and duplication in our regulatory regimes. Science and technology is leading the way in this industry.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the inception of the Canadian nuclear program, the federal government has spent over \$12 billion on nuclear research and development, mostly in favour of the Ontario nuclear industry, of course. Through its subsidies worth \$175 million a year, the federal government has created an industry that now employs, directly or indirectly, 60,000 people in Ontario.

My question is for the Prime Minister. How does the Prime Minister explain the fact that the federal government has

### Oral Questions

provided such large subsidies for electricity generation in Ontario, when Quebec has never received anything from the federal government to generate its own electricity?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the development of a nuclear industry in Ontario came about because that province had fewer hydroelectric resources than Quebec. Canada's development is based on potential, resources and population. I am sure that some provinces did not receive anything for nuclear energy development because they do not have the necessary resources.

Quebec received federal assistance. Hydro-Quebec has nuclear facilities in Gentilly. Quebec got its share, but the fact is that it did not need as much nuclear energy as Ontario. That is the way it is in Canada. This is a diversified country. Although we are trying to distribute everything among the various parts of Canada, some things cannot be distributed solely on the basis of population, as I was saying the other day. We are not about to start digging rivers in Saskatchewan so we can give that province its share of the national ports budget.

\* \* \*

[English]

### BLOOD SUPPLY

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health on behalf of all Canadians.

The Krever commission is investigating the state of our national blood supply. Recent reports have revealed deep organizational breakdowns within the system.

Canadians want action now. Their health continues to be threatened by leaks in the blood supply system. Last week here in Ottawa about 1,800 units had to be recalled because of a breakdown in that system after it was learned that some units had not been tested for hepatitis B.

• (1200)

Now Canadians are outraged to hear through the Krever inquiry that a U.S. drug company was allowed to distribute AIDS tainted blood products in Canada that affected six British Columbians including five children.

Could the minister tell the House and Canadians what plans if any she has to reform the system and implement the commission's recommendations in order to restore confidence in our national blood supply system?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that we have not waited for the Krever commission to begin to do some work within the blood supply system. We are nevertheless funding the Krever inquiry.

Since I have been Minister of Health we have doubled our resources in the Bureau of Biologics. We have increased the

*Routine Proceedings*

inspections of blood collection centres; we now inspect them once a year. We have made it possible for the results of these inspections to be made public. We have set up an advisory committee on blood issues so we can keep ourselves informed.

We continue to do everything possible to monitor all new technologies that are emerging in order that we can have them in Canada and that we can have the best and the safest blood supply system in the world.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Victor Chernomyrdin, Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

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

**The Speaker:** I also wish to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of a delegation from the People's Republic of China led by Liu Fusheng, Chairman of the standing committee of the People's Congress of Hunan Province.

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

\* \* \*

**POINT OF ORDER**

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary to the minister of agriculture in his response to my question earlier stated that Reform MPs were counselling farmers to break the law regarding some of the oppressive actions of the Canadian Wheat Board. That is totally untrue.

Reform MPs have never counselled farmers to break the law and I think it is important I set the record straight on that.

**The Speaker:** May I once again caution members on the use of language which seems to be getting more and more aggressive as we go along.

It is true that in the House of Commons we are used to strong language, but at times we get carried away with ourselves, one side saying one thing about the other and the other side retaliating by saying that someone else breaks the law.

We are entitled here to free speech, of course, but sometimes when it comes close to transgressing our parliamentary rules I will intervene. I would once again ask all hon. members to be very prudent in the language they use as it is offensive not only to individuals but it could be offensive to the House.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

• (1205)

*[English]***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 two petitions.

\* \* \*

**LOWER CHURCHILL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the 1994 annual report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## FINANCE

**Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Finance concerning Bill C-90, the Excise Tax Act and Excise Act.

*[Translation]*

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the 89th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which deals with the list of associate committee members.

With leave of the House, I intend to move for concurrence in this 89th report later this day.

\* \* \*

*[English]***LAW COMMISSION OF CANADA ACT**

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-106, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada.

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

*Government Orders***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 89th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## BOVINE GROWTH HORMONE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present three petitions.

In the first petition the petitioners are asking that Parliament take steps to keep BGH out of Canada by legislating a moratorium or stoppage on BGH use and sale until the year 2000 and by examining the outstanding health and economic questions through an independent and transparent review.

## VIOLENT OFFENDERS

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners pray and request that Parliament rescind mandatory release legislation where violent offenders are involved; that Parliament ensure all information on violent offenders, including prior offences and refusal to enroll in treatment programs, is provided to those making decisions on release or parole; and that Parliament ensure all violent offenders will be separated from society until it can be proven that they will not reoffend.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the petitioners are requesting that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way and upholds the Supreme Court of Canada decision on September 30, 1993 to disallow assisted suicide or euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I present a petition which calls on Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

I am pleased to present the petition on behalf of these constituents.

• (1210)

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-64, an act respecting employment equity, be read the third time and passed.

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in my comments today on Bill C-64 I want to focus on one important point. This employment equity legislation is a Canadian answer to a Canadian reality.

[Translation]

That Canadian reality is that persons in designated groups are not doing as well as they should in our labour force, given their qualifications.

That Canadian reality is that many instances of systemic discrimination can still be found.

[English]

I refer to a study released only last week by Simon Fraser University which states very clearly that male immigrants who are members of a visible minority earn 15 per cent less than white males born in Canada with the same education, in the same industry and in the same city.

We have heard a lot of debate on Bill C-64 that seems to deny that there is a problem, that action is necessary and that leadership by the Government of Canada is necessary. While it is a lot less nasty, to quote the same study, white immigrants still earn 2 per cent less than native born Canadians.

The figures become quite substantial. Let me quote: "Mean earnings of immigrant male members of visible minorities were down 22.6 per cent from those of Canadian born white males".

We could talk about each of the designated groups and make it clear that in the private and public sectors being well qualified is not enough if a person happens to be a member of a visible

*Government Orders*

minority, a woman, an aboriginal or a person with a disability. Those things work against them. They seem to cloud perception of their ability to do the job and to take on more senior responsibilities. It happens throughout every sector of the economy.

Let me come back to the Canadian reality. The Canadian reality is that our citizens want and deserve a country that breaks down these barriers to success. Two years ago that is what our country offered to Canadians and ever since we have been living up to our commitment.

Let me go back to the red book. It offered a vision of Canada with the economic strength it deserves and the social strength that draws us together as a community. At the beginning of the red book, the man whom Canadians chose as their Prime Minister and whom they continue to support wrote:

The result is a Liberal plan for Canada firmly anchored in the principle that governing is about people, and that government must be judged by its effectiveness in promoting human dignity, justice, fairness, and opportunity. This is our approach, and this election is about presenting that choice to Canadians.

Our platform was based on jobs and growth that would enrich everyone. We understood that people have expectations for their society, not just for their own wallets. That was why one of our commitments was a stronger employment equity act. We were determined that the federal government should do what it could to ensure that Canadians have a fair opportunity to get ahead in life. It draws on the willingness of employers to take a hard look at old practices and to move to a workplace that welcomes the talents of all our citizens.

• (1215)

Quite simply, this bill is about identifying and knocking over barriers that keep some people on the outside looking in or on the bottom looking up. It rests in the best tradition of opening the doors to full participation in Canadian society for all our citizens with all their diversity.

That puts the members of the Reform Party in a bit of a bind as they debate Bill C-64.

[*Translation*]

They know that incompetent members of designated groups will not take over the workplace. They know that no arbitrary quotas will be imposed. They know that this bill takes into account the concerns voiced by small business. And they know that the bill is fair and reasonable.

[*English*]

They are reduced to appealing to the worst in people instead of to the best. They are reduced to philosophical musings that are irrelevant to the case before the House and worst case, individual stories pulled from the murky depths of the American right wing. They cannot even get the name of this process right in their efforts to score political points. They seem to believe

that if they use the term affirmative action they can polarize the debate.

One of the most destructive things that can be done in a society or in a Parliament is to polarize the debate, to pit one group against another, rather than to build ties and mutual respect among us.

If they want to talk about the American system, let us look at the record there and then let us compare it to what the government wants to do in this bill so that Canadians, despite the Reform Party members, will know the difference between the American system and ours.

Some 30 years ago the United States began to come to grips with the impact of centuries of racial discrimination. By 1970 Richard Nixon brought in the first affirmative action policies for the U.S. government. Let me remind my hon. friends that Richard Nixon would never be called a bleeding heart, but he did what he knew was right at the time and what his society needed. Other governments, public and private institutions took similar steps.

[*Translation*]

As the *New York Times* noted recently, this process has yielded results. "In the past 20 years, it said, a substantial number of black families have been able to climb the social and professional ladder. While positive action is not the only reason for this, it certainly played a major role".

[*English*]

Has the American process been perfect? Has it been what we want to model ourselves on? Absolutely not. In some cases arbitrary approaches were imposed. There were decisions that struck those of us at a distance as odd and unfair. In response that American system too has evolved but they too know there is still much to do.

Ask anyone who watched the public reaction to the Simpson trial and to the ultimate verdict. Race is still an issue in American life. The right wing there and their junior auxiliary in the Reform Party here cannot wish it away.

I believe that Canada begins from a better starting point than the United States. We do not have a clean history when it comes to racism and discrimination but we do not have the same burden of history that the Americans do.

Nonetheless there are barriers still to the full participation of members of designated groups in the economy and therefore to their full participation in society. Creating opportunity through ensuring fairness is the point of Bill C-64. We have chosen a Canadian approach. We have been guided by what works.

I had to go back to the dictionary. After listening to the debate for several days, I was starting to question whether I really understood what the word equity means. This is the Employment Equity Act, not the employment special preference act, as the Reform would have us believe, not the employment discrim-

ination act, as Reform would have us believe. It is the Employment Equity Act.

• (1220)

Let me quote from the dictionary: equity; fairness. If one goes to the second definition, it says the application of the principles of justice. Equity; justice. Those are Canadian words. Those are words that Canadians have taken to their hearts and have identified now for decades as a fundamental of what this country is all about.

Let me go to the word equality: the state of being equal. It is not one better than the other, but equal. That too is a term that our society and our country has stood for not only at home but around this globe.

Our approach in the bill is founded on a human resources planning approach to workplace issues. It is founded on creating a climate that encourages diversity through real action, not empty rhetoric. It is founded on a compliance process that has been based on those best Canadian values of negotiation and co-operation.

It is founded on giving employers the tools, the information and the incentive to recognize the ability in everybody who comes forward and applies for employment, in everybody who is in their employ and is looking for opportunities to advance and to improve.

My colleagues on this side of the House have talked about how this system will work. We do not have to rely on speculation. This is not new legislation. With some minor changes in applying it to the public service, it is the same employment equity legislation that has been in place in Canada since 1987.

My colleagues have talked about employers who see the value in this legislation to do the right thing. These employers have spoken of the flexibility and realism that is the foundation of our approach.

I sat through weeks of hearings of the human rights committee where numerous employers' organizations came before us in support of the legislation. They were not in support of every detail of it. They asked for some changes and most have been made. Not every equity group approved of every detail in the legislation. They asked for some changes and some of those have been made.

In true Canadian spirit, we are trying to achieve a progressive goal for all Canadians, a goal that is good for our economy, good for our society and good for individuals within our Canadian society.

We have not, as always, done what everybody would have liked but we have reached the best accommodation possible of the many different interests involved.

### *Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

We have taken a made in Canada approach to employment equity. Admittedly, there are problems, but we can find effective, sensible and user friendly ways of dealing with these problems. This means no quotas, no reverse discrimination and no arbitrary preferential treatment. This means creating a fair and rational workplace for all.

[*English*]

I ask the hon. members opposite to quit falling back on the tired slogans of American politics, to quit pretending that the Canadian way is the American way. It is not. Look to this country. Look to our reality. Look to a better future and more opportunity for all Canadians, not just the select few. Look to a solution that makes sense. That solution, I believe, is found in Bill C-64 and the continuation of employment equity in Canada.

• (1225)

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the member who just made her presentation spent some time talking about discrimination in Canada, saying that members of the Reform Party deny that there is discrimination. I do not think one Reform member of Parliament could be found who would deny that there is discrimination and that it is not a problem. I do not deny it and I do not think any of my colleagues would deny it.

If discrimination finds its way into the workplace, as members of the Reform Party have said, it should be dealt with in a tough manner. We do not tolerate it and we must not tolerate it.

The member also gave statistics to show that legislation is needed. I present a few statistics and ask the member to respond to them. These are from the 1994 employment equity report. The report said that 570,000 people are currently regulated by the present Employment Equity Act. The member spoke about this not being new legislation, that there is an Employment Equity Act in place. Of this number 45.6 per cent are women. In the Canadian workforce about 45.9 per cent are female. The difference between those in the employment equity program and those outside is .3 per cent.

In total, women occupy 47 per cent of government jobs, while 47.3 per cent are available for work. Again, a .3 per cent difference. The civilian staff of the RCMP is 82.6 per cent female; Citizenship Canada, 74 per cent female; Transport Canada, 75 per cent male. What are we going to do in these departments? Are we going to make sure we get the right quotas, get rid of women in one department and get rid of men in the other? What are we going to do?

The overall statistics in government and outside government show the employment equity program has very little effect.

*Government Orders*

Before the member responds to these statistics, the polls consistently show that Canadians are against employment equity. Approximately 70 per cent to 80 per cent of Canadians are against employment equity programs, such as this Liberal program.

I want to ask the hon. member how the Liberals can totally disregard the will of a large majority of Canadians and ignore these polls on the issue when they are so willing to accept the results of their own polls on other issues?

**Ms. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that the Reform Party obviously needs to educate itself. The member for Vegreville just said "if discrimination finds its way into the workplace". It is impossible to look at any statistics from the workplace and not accept that discrimination finds its way into the workplace.

I will quote some additional statistics from a recent report by Simon Fraser University. Canadian born Greek males earned 16.2 per cent less than Canadian born males of British background. Even those earnings paled beside the ones for black and Filipino immigrant males who posted earnings that were respectively 21 per cent and 20.2 per cent lower than those for Canadian men of British background. Double jeopardy operates for women. Visible minority immigrant females earned 7.2 per cent less than white Canadian females. I therefore ask the hon. member to please take the if out of his statements about discrimination in the workplace.

• (1230)

Employment equity is not about being able to get a job; it is about having an equal opportunity to get as good a job if the person is as good. It is true that over 80 per cent of employees in the clerical category in the Government of Canada are women. Those happen to be the lowest paid jobs. That may be why there is such a high representation of women. Employment equity is about giving all groups the opportunity to earn the same as anybody of similar competence. Within that group of clerks the top levels are more likely to be occupied by men. Even within that group of clerks women are not allowed to progress.

The member referred to the fact that equity has been achieved. It has not. Notwithstanding the qualifications, we must look at the quality and the rate of pay, rather than simply being able to access the lowest paid jobs.

I sat through a couple of months of committee hearings on this bill. There was only one poll which came forward which said that Canadians were not in favour of equality in employment and it was a flawed poll. If the Reform Party had more polls with more validity to bring forward at any time during those hearings, it had every opportunity to do so, but it did not.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this country is managed by statistics. The hon. member pulled out statistic after statistic about who is where in our society. I wish government members would go to their ridings and talk to

the people one at a time. Maybe then they would understand more about what is going on in the country.

I am very happy to speak to Bill C-64, the legislation of a Liberal perfect world. It was interesting to hear the debate over the last two days, but it is somewhat disheartening. Let me go back to an issue which is somewhat related to this. Let us look at what the Liberals know about the workplace.

Today in Halifax we learned of how the minister of patronage in Atlantic Canada is meddling in the job market. Surprise, surprise. Once again the friends of the minister have mismanaged millions of taxpayers' dollars at Cornwallis Park Development Agency in what has been called potentially the biggest boondoggle in the last two decades.

Jobs, jobs, jobs. What does it mean to the Liberal minister for Atlantic Canada, the minister of public works? Once again we see that the minister of public works has his own version of job equity. A person has to belong to one of two categories in this country: either donate to the Liberals or become friends with one. That is the only way to have an equal shot at a job in Atlantic Canada.

I do not think the government has any idea of what job equity is. Who a person knows and whom they donate to are what really count.

The seeds of dissension are here among our young. They are not there for lack of a job equity bill; they are there because many of them see themselves as not being able to get jobs because of quotas. Government will deny the use of the word quota. I will explain exactly where I get this terminology: right out of the bill.

• (1235)

This is social engineering at its worst. Ontario has just elected to do away with it. We are not talking about America, as one of our Liberal colleagues over there said. This is Ontario. Apparently there is a mismatch now. The Ontario government says it will do away with it while the Liberal government in Ottawa is about to impose it on the rest of Canada.

It is also interesting that the last speaker from the Liberal Party said that we in the Reform Party talk about affirmative action which is all wrong. However, the Liberal member for Halifax in a partial quote said this morning, "affirmative action would not be necessary if employment equity were in existence" or something to that effect.

**Mr. Forseth:** What is the difference?

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** That is exactly what she was talking about and the other one said: "You are talking about it over here".

What is the answer? The answer is: "We will fix it. We will fix it for everybody in Canada. We Liberals have the answer". Let me show what their answer is. Goals versus quotas, are they the same thing? Under the Employment Equity Act, section 6, an employer is not required "to hire or promote unqualified

persons” which is good, nor “to create new positions in its workforce”, which is very good.

Also under the Employment Equity Act, section 33, the Canadian Human Rights Commission cannot impose a quota on the employer where quota is defined as “a requirement to hire or promote a fixed and arbitrary number of persons during a given period”. This is very good. People say: “That makes a bit of sense to us. We could probably buy into this legislation”.

What is not talked about by the Liberals is section 10. In circumstances where under-representation of designated groups has been identified the employer is required to prepare a plan in which short term numerical goals for hiring and promotion of the designated groups are established. We will be getting employers to look at short term numerical goals, but these are not quotas. Also longer term goals for increasing the representation of persons in designated groups are also established.

If in the opinion of a Canadian Human Rights Commission investigator—there is an investigator; hire him like the ethics counsellor who is not used either—an employer has not made all reasonable efforts to implement the employment equity plan, including the goals, the employer may, if negotiations fail, ultimately be subject to an action by an employment equity review tribunal for contempt of process similar in nature to contempt of court leading to imprisonment until the directive is complied with. This is from sections 25 and 31, mark it down.

An employer, believe it or not, can also be fined up to \$50,000 by the responsible minister, who is yet to be determined, for failure to file an employment equity report, for failure to include required information in the employment equity report, or for providing false or misleading information in the employment equity report. This is from section 36, write it down.

Tell me the Liberal government does not have quotas. Tell me this is all voluntary, completely voluntary. Then tell me what it means to have an investigator on staff checking them out.

• (1240)

Tell me what it means to force organizations to have short term numerical goals for hiring and promotion of designated groups and long term goals. If they tell the investigator they cannot make it or they cannot do this or that, then they negotiate. If that does not work, there will be a tribunal. If that does not work, they will be put behind bars.

Listen up. What is the government doing? This is not a fun exercise we are going through to get votes and spend money. What this government is legislating here is serious. It has nothing to do with racism but has everything to do with rights and privileges in this country.

### *Government Orders*

Who will the government fine up to \$50,000? Why will it fine someone up to \$50,000?

What will the government do when it has a quota in a town where perhaps there are not the right number of people? Will it get its investigator to find somebody to take to a tribunal? What if someone is found who is absolutely not suitable for the job? Will that person be placed in the job anyway? That is a great way to get Canada competitive in the global market. The brilliance of social engineering.

Let us look at a couple of application forms. One of these forms was given to me by a backbench Liberal who is not very happy with what is going on here. Among the things asked on this application form is to self-identify. Look in the mirror or perhaps determine what kind of person you really are. Let us self-identify: cultural, racial or linguistic minority person. Explain that and define it. Lesbian, gay man or bisexual. What the heck does that have to do with employment? That is where social engineering hit. That is just one application.

Here is the government’s application. The longest thing on the application is the group with which one has to self-identify: Black, Chinese, Filipino, South Asian, Indonesian, Pakistani, Japanese, Korean, Southeast Asian, Burmese, Cambodian, Laotian, Thai, Vietnamese, visible minority west Asian, North African, visible minority Latin American, Oceanic, Polynesian, Micronesian, Melanesian. What is the government doing to this country?

These are application forms. The government is intent on social engineering quota systems. If something is found wrong then it will get its investigator out. He will chase it down, much like the investigator it has under the Official Languages Act. He makes his report.

**Mr. McClelland:** That might answer the census question.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Perhaps.

This is the politically correct Liberal government days in our Canadian society. Government members will impose on the rest of us those things we do not necessarily want. Do they really think in a community like mine that many visible minorities do not get jobs? In fact they are the majority of employees in many businesses in my community. Do they think other people say that is not fair? We have to try to employ everyone in society regardless of race, colour, creed, religion or sex.

• (1245)

We cannot engineer society through legislation, but the Liberals will do it because they have a majority government. The mess will be there, which they will leave behind when they are turfed out of office.

*Government Orders*

Let us talk about SMIP. Probably not one of them knows what SMIP is. Do they know? What is SMIP? They have no idea what SMIP is. That is special measures initiatives program, a new program just introduced by the Liberal government. What is it all about?

It retains the successful elements of previous special measures programs. It has new initiatives to support the development and retention of designated group members. There is a recruitment component in SMIP that is similar to old programs but is directed at other groups such as aboriginals, visible minorities and so on.

What does SMIP do? It spends money. It spends \$768,000 on aboriginals; \$508,000 on all employees; \$992,000 on all employment equity groups; \$838,000 on more than one but not all employment equity groups; \$382,000 on women; and \$225,000 on visible minority groups. The list goes on and on.

There is not a person in the House today on that side who even knows what SMIP does. A lot of it buys votes; it enables the government under yet another program to go around the country handing out money.

The Liberal government is involved in quotas. I have explained how and why. If someone would like to stand on the other side and explain what I said, if I were wrong about my discussion on goals and quotas, I would love to hear it. Am I wrong about sections 25 and 31? Am I wrong about section 36? If I am, let us talk about it.

How is it right to ensure fairness in an employment system while at the same time telling some people they need not apply because they do not fit into a category? The government will say that is not really so and they will get another portion of the workplace.

Young people are saying to politicians all the time, not just Reformers but Liberals as well, that they cannot get in there, that they need not apply, that they need not submit an application form to the RCMP. I have had them in my office and I asked why not. They say that they do not fit, that they are excluded from the category. How does it make it right on the one hand to exclude people and on the other hand say it is fair and equitable?

• (1250)

**An hon. member:** That is baloney.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** One member says that is baloney.

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

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** It is absolutely accurate. I need not say much more about it. It is extremely frustrating to listen to Liberals on the other side giving their version of the Liberal world out there without a reality check with the rest of the country.

When they refer to “those bad Reformers” it must be a racial thing with them. If they took a good look at who we are and what we represent in our communities—people of all races, colours, creeds, religion and sex—they would be a little disappointed in themselves. They should look in the mirror and wonder what they said in the House of Commons about Reformers. That is probably the lowest we can get in debates like this one. It is fine if they wish to use it but they will not get it from over here.

If the goal system is not a system of quotas, exactly what is it? What is it when we need an investigator to ensure these things are being done? What is it when people can be fined and become a criminal for not living up to a quota established by government? What is that?

It is a frustrating exercise to try to get the debate on a level that the government will understand. Its members are intent on pushing this through. They are intent on having it their way. They are intent on giving average Canadians what they think is best for them even if average Canadians do not think it is.

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

The Reform Party was born of a sense of feeling excluded from the power and the decisions made in the country. If I am wrong in that regard I would certainly want it pointed out. However, it is my understanding that essentially the Reform Party was born of the notion that the west was feeling left out and did not feel it was part of it.

That sentiment should cause the member to understand exactly the principles behind the bill. The desire to allow all people to feel a part of the system of government and so on is very important. Members representing that party opposite should be the first people to understand that notion, given where they were born.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, the member's first presumption is inaccurate. Not only the west wants in. He has it all wrong. The east wants in. Central Canada wants in. The difficulty is that people across the nation are alienated by the traditional tactics of that party.

It was not just politics, for instance, that had us opt out of the MP pension plan. That traditional party at the trough will take the money and run, which alienates people across the country. It has alienated us here. The traditional approach to the Senate of that party and the other party that is gone is wrong. It has alienated most people in the country yet the Prime Minister continually appoints Liberals to the other place.

• (1255)

It is not some Reformer coming out of Abbotsford, Langley or Aldergrove, British Columbia, saying that he is angry. We do a fair bit of travelling ourselves and we hear it across the country.

*Government Orders*

That presumption the member just made will sink the Liberal ship. It truly will because they are basing the dissatisfaction of people on something they feel is western alienation and that is wrong.

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I attentively listened to the hon. member's speech. I was somewhat puzzled by some of the conclusions he drew from the bill we are debating.

I should like to ask a question of the hon. member. Does he believe aboriginal Canadians, women and visible minorities choose to work in low paying jobs, choose alienation from the Canadian economic system and choose their lifestyle?

We have lived for decades without employment equity and thanks to employment equity we are now seeing progress. We are seeing, for example, that women's salaries have gone up. Not enough. They are still not equal to men's salaries. The gender gap still exists.

Since the hon. member seems to have all the answers, I will go back to the original question. Does he think that women choose to be ghettoized in certain sectors? Do visible minorities choose low incomes because they like low income jobs? Or, is it because there are systemic barriers in society that do not allow these individuals to achieve their full potential?

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, no one in this country or any other country chooses to make less money than anyone else. Males do not choose that. Females do not choose that.

Everybody in this country has an equal opportunity. It is not necessary to legislate it. It is not necessary to imprison people or to fine people that do not abide by the rules.

It is a lot like any other distribution within society. I stand beside the member from Coquitlam who is female. I do not think she makes less than I do. I do not think she has any particular advantage over me or I have any particular advantage over her. She got where she is today the same way I did; she worked hard for it.

The presumption being made is that any inequity in the country can be legislated. They cannot legislate morality, although I am sure they will try hard enough. They cannot engineer a society. Have they not stopped to think about what has happened in Ontario and why? Is it just because the Ontario government is Conservative and they are not? Is that the reason they put it away?

**Ms. Catterall:** Yes, exactly.

**Mr. Stinson:** How many female leaders have they ever had and in how many years?

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** It is interesting to note the number of female leaders the Prime Minister's Liberals have had.

**Mr. Stinson:** Yes, and after how many years?

• (1300)

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a government of double standards. A few minutes ago I described what happened with the minister of public works in Atlantic Canada. Talk about double standards. Hiring friends. Does this guy look at employment equity? Only if you know a Liberal and donate to the party. That is employment equity to those people over there.

**An hon. member:** Most people call it patronage.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** This is a party of double standards. Fortunately for Canada we only get their double standards once every few elections and then we throw them out.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the member. He accuses others of having double standards. Yet he is against equity, the purpose of which is to ensure as much as possible that the double standards that exist are rectified.

The member is beginning to understand a little. In another 120 years, to use an expression he used, his party should have it down pat.

The member said in previous remarks as well that he and his colleagues have travelled around the country and know very well what is going on. Is he aware of an article in today's *Cornwall Standard Freeholder* in which the Grand Chief of the Akwasasne community in my riding talked about the extensive travel of the member across the way: "Three Reform Party MPs who toured Akwasasne Wednesday to check out smugglers alley should be arrested for trespassing, says the furious Grand Chief Russell Roundpoint". He identifies the members for Calgary Northeast, Wild Rose and Fraser Valley West.

I wonder if the member is familiar with that and what some people think of his travel plans. Does he not think that when he does those kinds of activities he just bragged about that the least he could do is have the courtesy of informing the local elected officials, and I am thinking here of the Grand Chief of Akwasasne?

There is a perception of insulting the community by the failure of members to do so, and showing disrespect for the minority and also to stereotyping them as all being part of an illegal activity. If he does not want to give that perception, will he at least tell us now that the failure on his part and that of his colleagues to show that kind of respect was wrong and will he apologize to my constituents who live in Akwasasne?

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, if this member were doing his job we would not have to travel to his riding.

*Government Orders*

If that member realizes what is going on down there and the problems they are having and the people we talked about, he would not be in the House whining about it.

He is trying to do exactly what is going on in the House. He is trying to turn a situation where we were looking at some real problems of crime in his riding into a racial issue. That is what is wrong.

We have been talking to the solicitor general about the crime problem in this area and we have been getting very poor answers. There has been no recognition from the government, no real action to curb it. We have been down in the member's riding because we were asked to go. If he does not like the way we travel, that is really just too bad.

I belong to a party that goes out and talks to the people rather than these pompous Liberals who complain that Reformers are in their ridings dealing with issues. They turn a crime issue into a racial issue. That is exactly what is wrong. He has a crime issue in his riding.

• (1305)

They do not have the courage to deal with the crime because they are so sensitive about something they call a racial issue.

**Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

[*Translation*]

I am pleased to discuss this bill, which seeks to make the workplace fairer for all Canadians, particularly those who have traditionally been disadvantaged.

This is also an opportunity to reply to some very severe criticism made by Reform Party members in terms of this bill's probable impact on the Canadian business world.

[*English*]

I wish they would stay with us long enough to hear some of these responses so they do not come back uneducated. They asked a lot of questions. They want responses. I am going to reply to some of their concerns and it would be great if they were here to hear them.

[*Translation*]

This criticism has dire consequences, because it seeks to undermine the efforts made to ensure fair treatment of Canadian workers.

[*English*]

**Mr. McClelland:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note that it is customary and appropriate that we do not make reference to the absence or the attendance of other hon. members.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for raising the point. His interpretation is correct. If that

assessment is correct I would ask the hon. member for St. Paul's to deal with it. We should all be mindful, as the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest has raised the issue, that we are not at any time to make reference to the absence of members from the Chamber.

**Mr. Campbell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to speak to this bill and to have the attention of all members of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

So, I want to take a few minutes to discuss the provisions of this bill and explain how they will not only benefit disadvantaged people in the workplace, but also employers.

This legislation reflects two basic values which Canadians really care about: fairness and equality. It also takes into account the need to promote business development, in order to create jobs and opportunities which will ensure a good future for all Canadians, whoever they are and whatever their situations.

[*English*]

This bill seeks to achieve a critical balance between competitiveness and compassion which is so vital for assuring opportunities for Canadians.

While we in government are seeking to enhance fairness and opportunities for Canadians, some opposition members either do not see the need for such measures or feel that no improvements are required to existing legislation. In my opinion they simply do not get it.

They have never had the experience. They do not understand what it is to apply for a job, to have all of the qualifications and to somehow suspect that their colour, their gender, their disability or their orientation precludes them from a fair chance at that job.

I do not necessarily ascribe malevolence to interviewers or people who do the hiring. It is human nature. We have all felt it ourselves. When we face candidates before us we tend to like those who are just like us better than we like everybody else. We feel more comfortable. We feel more at home. We can see ourselves working with them.

We have only to look at the membership of the third party to see that they have the same problem and perhaps need a plan to deal with it within their own ranks.

An interesting study was done recently with respect to hiring. Employers were asked to consider applicants on the basis of their applications only. There were no personal interviews. It was interesting to see employers hire people without regard to colour, gender or disability and only find out later their colour, gender or disability and then say: "I do not care. I will make whatever arrangements are necessary. Whether it is a ramp for a wheelchair, or whatever it is, I want that candidate".

When faced with a person in front of them, by human nature or otherwise, the tendency is, after years and years of good intentions, for employers not to move fast enough. They need some assistance in seeing a way through to doing what they know is in the interests of their businesses which is to have a diversified workforce.

• (1310)

Much progress has been made under current employment legislation and the current act but much more remains to be done. Women are still concentrated in lower paid clerical, sales and service jobs. Maybe that is the place where some hon. members want to see them stay but that is not where this member or this party wishes to them stay.

In the case of aboriginal people, the percentage in the workforce under the act currently is 1.4 per cent compared to 3 per cent in the Canadian population. It is roughly the case with respect to persons with disabilities. They are roughly 6.5 per cent of the overall population but a far lower percentage in the workforce. That is wrong. It denies Canadian businesses the work and dedication of devoted and capable people who can be accommodated and should be received and welcomed as should people who are otherwise among the designated groups.

However, those people still find themselves on the bottom rung of the economic and social ladder. It is not just their problem, which is what I suspect hon. members from the third party think. It is a problem for all of us since restricting the participation of such individuals in the economic life of our country damages the competitiveness of Canadian businesses. Businesses themselves understand that. They endorse many of these proposals. They have been doing a number of things on their own. They have been working with us to develop programs to give effect to the guiding principles encompassed in this legislation. It is good for business and it is good for Canada.

Those businesses realize that recruiting, promoting and retaining people who are representative of the Canadian population helps them provide better and more responsive service since diverse experience and perspectives are a bonus not a burden.

It is useful to note that many business representatives, not usually identified as left wing radicals, appeared before the standing committee in support of the bill. They told us the bill would help them develop a more diverse workforce and give them a competitive edge over less diversified competitors. Diversification in business just is not about one's product line. It is about one's employees as well.

Contrary to the accusations of some members, this bill is not some piece of wild-eyed radicalism, totally divorced from the realities of economic life and experience. Rather, it is a moderate document which seeks to promote equal opportunity in the

### *Government Orders*

workplace without imposing an onerous regulatory environment on business which we recognize is already hard pressed in an increasingly global, competitive marketplace.

For instance, while the act seeks to encourage employers to address under-representation by members of designated groups, it does not require them to hire unqualified people, to create new positions, to create undue hardship or to contradict the merit principle. What we are anxious to see is people hired on their merits regardless of their gender, their colour and other characteristics which have gotten in the way of people with equal merit getting an equal opportunity.

The impact of the bill will be limited since it will only involve those public and private sector organizations and enterprises covered by the Canada Labour Code, about 10 per cent of the workforce. It does not impose quotas or some draconian regime directed from Ottawa as some have suggested. Rather it seeks to help organizations and enterprises develop their own targets for themselves which will allow them to develop a more representative workforce.

To do this, the act will rely on self-identification by employees rather than forcing people to be singled out. There is every indication that such a system should be successful since employees have shown themselves increasingly willing to identify themselves for the purpose of this since the first act was passed in 1986.

In addition, enforcement of the act will not be a reign of terror as conjured up by members of the third party. There is no intention of hounding companies which, not yet fully in compliance with the targets they set, are sincerely trying to reach their goals. Our approach in such situations will be of helping, not harassing. We hope to encourage co-management of this program within enterprises. This means getting workers and management to work together in partnership to ensure the success of the program. While management will bear responsibility since it has the ultimate say in how it manages its affairs, there will be considerable opportunity for both sides to work together on the setting of targets, timetables and implementation strategies.

• (1315)

Success in the area of labour-management co-operation could well prove so rewarding that both parties might then decide to extend this collaboration to other areas of common concern, which would in turn benefit the enterprise as a whole.

Canadians are justly proud of the progress they have made in ensuring fairness and equal opportunity. While the Employment Equity Act of 1986 has led to a number of successes, much remains to be done. We in this party will not cease in our efforts to improve upon what we have done in the past. History does not stop. We gain new experiences every day and we see ways in

*Government Orders*

which we can implement our policies more effectively as time goes on.

We realize though that progress must not hinder the success of Canadian business, which is so vital for creating jobs and opportunities Canadians need. This act seeks to provide this vital balance and contains provisions that will benefit not only employees, particularly those traditionally disadvantaged, but employers as well. As such, it represents a win-win situation where everyone gains.

For this reason I will be supporting this legislation before the House and would encourage all members to do so.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before giving the floor to the hon. member for Lévis, I simply wish to remind the House that the period for questions and comments lasts five minutes.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, first, I want to say that the official opposition supports the legislation, even though we feel it does not go far enough—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Dubé:** —in spite of the protests made by the third party. At the same time, a member of that party alluded earlier to the government's double standards. In a sense I agree with him, but obviously not for the same reasons.

There are the following points. First, the government introduces legislation like this one, which is in general very praiseworthy and, at the same time, it passes other legislation, including one piece of legislation last year, suspending job security in the public service for three years. Administratively, they will cut 45,000 jobs over this period, and yet, when it comes to employment equity for women, for example, in the public service, it seems to me that a government should first set the example itself, before it asks business to do something.

It should be beyond reproach in this regard. In fact, we can see, and all the statistics indicate, that no progress has been made in the federal public service; nothing has changed. Pay equity is in the order of 72 per cent. Even for jobs requiring the same qualifications, women were paid less than men. Women are in lower paying jobs, because these jobs are lower down the ladder.

With the cuts and the legislation ending job security, there was the phenomenon of voluntary departures, buy-outs. In cutting other positions, a discretionary formula was used, and guess by whom, by the managers of the various government services. The vast majority of the positions involved are held by men, very few by women.

Can we call this a fair practice? This is what I mean when I talk about a double standard, it may be alright for the third party

to support it. It is all very well to make speeches in the House, to pass fine laws, but I know, coming from Quebec, that some people expected a lot from the Official Languages Act, for example, in promoting employment equity for francophones, those from Quebec, and even those from outside Quebec, and still nothing has happened.

Last year, a minister was obliged to issue directives to enforce a 20-year old law, and nothing has improved.

We will support this bill, but I have a question for the hon. member. In his opinion, since he is closer to the minister, are there any indications of a reversal of the double standard trend, that is, the trend of passing fine laws, but changing nothing? On the contrary, revisionist measures have been taken leading to regression and a return to the past by, for example, suspending job security in the public service.

What is preventing the government from passing antiscab legislation?

• (1320)

So, this is my question to the hon. member, who seems to have progressive ideas. I want him to reassure me as to the value of what he is saying, in terms of its impact on the government and on cabinet.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I remind the hon. member for St. Paul's that while he indicated to the Chair he would be splitting his time, if he wants to give his colleague the opportunity to conclude her intervention before the end of government orders his response should be brief.

**Mr. Campbell:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I do want to allow my colleague that opportunity.

I thank the hon. member for his intervention and for reminding the House that the official opposition does support the bill. We appreciate that support. Obviously they recognize, as we do, that there are improvements that can be made in the way in which we do business in this country.

He raises some good points to the effect that the public service should be mindful of the laudable merits of this statute as it begins to apply to them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for his co-operation and I regret the period of question or comment is terminated.

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join with my colleagues on this side of the House in support of this important piece of legislation, which many disadvantaged Canadians have long dreamed of.

Yes, I use the word “dream”. I am proud to be a member of a team that dares to dream, one that has such faith in our capacity as individuals and our capacity as a nation.

In the Liberal Party the vision was set out in what we called “Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada”. In that document the government reinforced and spoke about the social fabric of the country. We promised to strengthen our employment equity legislation to ensure that we meet a very simple but profound commitment. That commitment springs from the belief that everyone in Canada is entitled to equality.

I remind members that the red book speaks of a future where all Canadians, regardless of gender, race, or physical and intellectual attributes, enjoy a standard of living and quality of life equal to those of other Canadians. With this legislation we are moving forward and ensuring that that future will become a reality.

I want to talk about Bill C-64 in terms of the strength we hope this will build in our society, in our communities, and among us. It is capitalizing on the diversity. It is about creating jobs and growth. It is about removing barriers to full employment. The modifications of the act are designed to streamline and strengthen its existing provisions to ensure that the philosophy behind employment equity becomes the everyday practice in the federally regulated workplace.

This constructive piece of legislation builds on the significant progress we have achieved since the Employment Equity Act was introduced in 1986. I remind the House that Canadian banks, airlines, broadcasters, some of the largest and most visible companies in the country, have been implementing employment equity programs for a decade. They have recognized that without such plans their businesses would become less and less representative of the clients they serve, a point which must not be lost on us as government.

As a result of the federal policy and the dedication of business to implement it, the numbers of designated groups have risen, without backlash but with plenty of benefits to our society. Bill C-64 is a continuation of our efforts to create real equality of opportunity in the federally regulated workplace. It goes further than our existing legislation by expanding the act's coverage and clarifying what employment equity will and will not do.

This legislation will help explode the many myths we hear coming from across the way in this House. These folks have circulated many of those myths: employment equity challenges workplace norms that reinforce existing patterns of power. This can be threatening to people who are satisfied with the status quo. They do not understand the need to accommodate differences because they are satisfied with the way things are.

• (1325)

The so-called playing field is already tipped in favour of those for whom it was constructed, so it is not surprising that

### *Government Orders*

there are attempts to find reasons to justify resistance to more inclusive employment policies and practices.

We have heard the myths coming from the other side of the House. We want to affirm that employment equity, with its emphasis on fairness toward all Canadians, shatters all those unfounded assumptions.

The legislation requires only that employers consider all qualified candidates, I underline qualified, when seeking new employees or choosing among workers for promotions. The act does not allow quotas, and it certainly has no mandatory preferences when employers choose new workers or consider their existing employees for promotions. Somehow those two concepts, the qualified candidates and no mandatory preferences, seem to be lost on the opposition.

This bill is not about preferential treatment; it is about equal treatment. If it is given a chance to work, everybody will benefit. The legislation is meant as an unobtrusive human resource management tool that would educate and assist employers as they create more equitable workforces. Would that we could do this in the House.

The whole point of this bill is to enhance this country's economic performance through the removal of barriers that prevent members of the designated groups from contributing to the workplace. It is as much about economics as it is about justice. Clearly it is about both. We want to achieve a better balance, one that assures fairness and dignity for disadvantaged Canadians and works to our country's social and economic advantage.

We are not interested in compiling statistics. The act is not about counting numbers or instituting reams of new regulations. We are talking about Canadian people, work ready individuals anxious to demonstrate their abilities in a fair and welcoming environment, who must be given that choice.

We need to rethink how we relate to one another as groups of people. That is exactly what our improved employment equity legislation asks us to do.

Bill C-64 asks Canadians to open their hearts and open their minds to the many advantages of workplace diversity. It asks that we put into practice the democratic principles we profess to believe in: fairness, access and equity for all, regardless of gender, race, disability, orientation. It insists that we live up to our moral and legal obligations by upholding the rights and freedoms enshrined in our Constitution.

Clearly employment equity is not an impediment to business or an infringement on anyone's rights. It is a catalyst for improvement to the workplace and progress in our country. It is the foundation of Canada's future. More than just the stuff dreams are made of, this legislation can dramatically impact the standard of living and quality of life of disadvantaged Canadians, the millions of women, visible minorities, persons living

*Private Members' Business*

with disabilities, aboriginal people, et cetera, who are an important part of our great nation.

I remind my hon. colleagues that these people are counting on us to do the right thing. They are counting on us to endorse this crucial legislation. There can be no debate. Bill C-64 is the right thing for Canada. It is the right thing for us to do. It is the right thing for us to do right now.

Let us get on with the job. Maybe the myth carriers and those who would stand in this House and continue to have those myths circulate will begin to understand that Canadians are counting on us to ensure that fairness and equity exist in this country.

Let us get on with the job. Let us support this legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I see members seeking the floor on questions and comments. I remind colleagues it is 1.30 p.m. I can only proceed by unanimous consent.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-242, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act (improvement to public safety), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this private member's bill reach the floor of the House of Commons. As members know it is not an item of private members' business which will be voted on. We all know and believe, because we have to, that our private members' business arrangements sometimes shine a light, point the way and give direction in the field of statutory and policy reform. If it does not happen here it is not going to happen anywhere.

My bill—perhaps I should not call it my bill because a lot of people, events and persons contributed to the bill—reflects six or seven years of experience in this House as a member of Parliament, regionally and nationally and more particularly the seven years I spent on the House of Commons justice committee. Some of the things in the bill actually evolve directly from that experience on the justice committee.

To be sure there continue to be flaws in Canada's criminal justice system. We all recognize that. The challenge is to find solutions and make corrections.

I am not one of those who would say that the whole system is in disrepute. I have a great deal of respect for the Canadian criminal justice system, notwithstanding some of the flaws that it has. Let us be honest, there is not a criminal justice system in the world which will not over time develop flaws and show need for change.

In the past year and one-half the government that I sit with proudly has made a number of changes in the criminal justice area. I will mention the Young Offenders Act, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, the new sentencing act, amendments to the Criminal Code to deal with DNA testing and other areas and last but not least the institution of a new national crime prevention council.

The council recognizes that we have a long way to go, maybe forever. The business of reducing the potential for crime will go on forever. The business of addressing society's needs in a way that will reduce the propensity of our citizens to resort to crime will always be there and will go on.

Last night, by coincidence I guess, I had the opportunity of watching on one of our Canadian networks an interview with the French and Mahaffy families following the conviction of the accused Paul Bernardo for the murder and other crimes in relation to their daughters. Thanks to television and to those families, we were able to enter into the homes of these two Canadian families. I could not help but sense that the families were hoping for a reconciliation with Canadians to meet the challenges in their personal lives. I cannot imagine that had anything to do with why they agreed to do the interview.

• (1335)

I want to thank them for doing the interview and I hope that Canadians have been made aware of several things. It shows how vulnerable we all are in terms of public safety. We share our vulnerability to a psychopath or any criminal intimately with every one of our fellow citizens.

Last night's interview permitted Canadians to understand how important this area of law and policy is to all of us. I hope those families will forgive me for even attempting to suggest what they wanted to convey. I believe one area where we still have some reform ahead of us is the criminal justice area. I hope they would agree.

There are still reforms that we must address. The bill before us today is a short list. It is not comprehensive. It contains six areas of reform. I am going to walk through it now. I believe it is fair to say that not every element of the six areas will have universal support. That is rarely the case when one tries to make a change in the criminal justice system. However, I would like to

think that there is a sizeable consensus that this list is just part of the reforms still out there for us to accomplish.

The first item is the denial of statutory release for serious, repeat offenders. A serious repeat offender in this case is a person who while on any form of early release, has been convicted of an offence for which that person has been sentenced to five years or more. The subsequent second offence which would result in the denial of early release is certainly a serious offence. It would have drawn a sentence of five years or more.

I am not being particularly aggressive in this. In April 1993 the standing committee on justice reported through its 14th report and recommended that the sentence for the subsequent offence be set at two years. It is the same recommendation of denial of parole and early release but the threshold was two years. In my bill I have selected five years.

I hope I will not be accused by anyone of wimping out. The Liberal Party of Canada in May and August of the same year adopted the report of the justice committee as part of its criminal justice policy package. The House of Commons justice committee unanimously endorsed the provision and referred it to the House. The Liberal Party of Canada adopted the entire justice committee report. At the moment that recommended reform has not yet been adopted.

• (1340)

One of the most glaring examples of why reform is necessary is the case of the conviction of Albert Foulston in Edmonton for the murder of a police officer in 1990. This person has had 48 separate convictions so it is fair to call him a convict. This convict was in prison serving a sentence of approximately 10 years. I do not know whether anybody really knew exactly how the 10 years was composed because the sentencing mathematics contained in the Criminal Code and in the CCRA are very complex. In any event, he was released.

On several occasions while he was on early release he committed other offences. I will not go through the list. It is part of the public record elsewhere. While on early release for the umpteenth time he participated in the killing of an Edmonton police officer for which he was fairly promptly sentenced to 20 years.

The sentence calculation resulted in his total sentence looking like 30 years because it was consecutive. However, because of the way we calculate sentences, he was eligible for parole one year and five months after he was convicted of the murder. With his life sentence he was eligible for parole one year and five months after he was convicted of murder. That is absurd. The absurdity has been recorded in public journals.

One is moved to say that the system is obviously in some disarray. I will leave that as an example of why the existing provision must be changed.

### *Private Members' Business*

My bill says that if a person is on early release and is convicted of a crime and sentenced to two years or more that person loses the right to early release.

I accept that there must be at the end of the consecutive sentences a period when the offender will be integrated. That has to be in the statutory release portion because I do not want that guy being released at the end of 30 years and sitting on the Bay Street bus the next day beside my kids. I want a period of integration.

The bill would close a loophole which allows offenders to avoid serving time for new offences if those new offences occur while they are on early release or even while they are in prison. If a person is sentenced to seven years for a particularly bad crime and during the fifth year that person gets out, beats somebody up and steals his money, that would normally draw a sentence of a couple of years. The way the law is currently written it requires that person to start the two years back at the beginning of the seven year sentence.

I am not going to take time to read that section of the Criminal Code. It is a public statute and anybody can read it. They can read the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the appropriate section of the Criminal Code.

• (1345)

Basically the second offence is what I call a freebie. There is no sanction. You can steal a car, steal a purse, commit an assault, and provided of course that the sentence for the second offence does not exceed the length of the sentence you were first on, you do not have to serve any additional time. This needs to be corrected.

We tried in the House in the last Parliament, I know we tried in this one, and we are getting closer. We have made amendments, but officials seem to be reluctant to alter the system too much, because every time you change a sentence calculation it costs money, and they do not have the money in their budgets. They are very cautious about making changes to the way we sentence people and keep people in our correctional institutions. I accept that.

In any event, I am still on the case and many of our colleagues in this House are still on the case and we are slowly getting to those reforms.

The third area is the lowering of the age of criminal responsibility from age 12, where it is now, to age 10. That has been misinterpreted in a lot of quarters. People ask how you can throw the Criminal Code at a little 11-year old. That is not the objective, any more than it is the objective to throw the book at the 13-year old or the 14-year old. What we have done in this country is arrange for intervention into the life of a young offender when they are under 18 years of age. What this does is allows the appropriate intervention for a 10-year old or 11-year old. At present there is no intervention.

*Private Members' Business*

I remember in the last Parliament, the day before I introduced a similar provision in private members' business was the day of that unfortunate killing in Great Britain where the two 11-year old boys were involved. If that had happened here in Canada there would have been no intervention. In some provinces there would have been a social worker, but no Young Offenders Act. The social worker procedures vary from province to province. This would allow intervention at an early age, the same way we intervene for all young offenders.

The fourth area is a provision that deals with the community scourge of crack houses. Municipalities are crying out for some way to deal with this. I suggest the solution is to redefine what we call a disorderly house or a bawdy house in the Criminal Code and allow the same procedures that communities use to deal with bawdy houses and disorderly houses, where there are procedures to deal with what we call found-ins and procedures to deal with landlords. There is nothing else out there. It is a simple amendment, and many communities I know would want to take advantage of it to deal with crack houses.

Fifth is stiffer bail provisions for two categories of cases, where you have people out on bail or on peace bonds committing other offences. This proposal deals with being on bail or on a peace bond and committing an offence on the peace bond or committing another driving offence while on bail for a driving offence. There are very serious implications for the public to have a drunk out driving again when he or she is on bail on a driving offence. To reverse the onus in the bail does not mean they do not get bail; it means that it is up to them to show the judge why they should be released. The onus or the burden of proof changes in terms of entitlement to bail.

Last is a matter that has been discussed publicly. It would allow victims of sexual assault to have the blood of the accused tested only under a judge's order and in such a way that the evidence of the blood test would not be used against them in the trial. This provides something for the victim to make sure that he or she has not been infected with many of the sexually transmitted diseases that are out now. There are half a dozen of them. Some of them are lethal. We have to have some compassion for victims where you make a prima facie case in front of a judge and the judge says there will be a blood test. In this way the victim can be assured, as best we can using the medical testing we have, that he or she has not been infected with one of these STDs.

• (1350)

Those are the six parts. I have had a lot of help preparing this, first from my constituents, who have given me a lot of latitude here in Parliament to deal with a lot of issues. I hope the bill reflects their concerns. I received a lot of help from Canadians. I will mention some of the people with whom I have had contact over the last few years: Margot Blackburn, who has gone public, Priscilla de Villiers, who has gone public, Mrs. Mahaffy, the Rosenfeldts, and others. These people have all been direct or

indirect victims who want to see change. I have also spoken to public interest groups, Victims of Violence, CAVEAT, the Canadian Centre for Victims of Crime, financed by the Canadian Police Association.

I am grateful to my colleagues in this House for their continuing support. Sooner or later, I hope these initiatives will bear fruit.

[Translation]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to speak on private member's Bill C-242 tabled by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River. I shall be addressing in particular clauses 3 and 8 on lowering the minimum age of criminal responsibility.

Before I begin, I would like to stress that I find it a bit strange that we are today debating a private member's bill from a member of the government party. He himself began his speech by stating that he was on the House of Commons justice committee for six years, nearly two of those while his own party formed the government. I find it somewhat strange that he is proposing this again today. I wonder, is it because he has not managed to influence his own minister of justice? Yet, as a member of the justice committee he has studied these specific aspects.

I am a bit surprised therefore to see a former member of the justice committee proposing such a bill. Perhaps this means—and I think some of the hon. members opposite might have something to say on this—that the matter was looked at somewhere and the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River was no doubt told that his bill was not in line with the government's intentions.

I am therefore prepared to debate it, but it is my impression—not that I want to say we are wasting our time—but that the energy expended by the hon. member, his good intentions notwithstanding, could have been better expended if he had worked on the office of the Minister of Justice, particularly the minister himself. But, there you are.

The members of the opposition, who have no real power, can see that the backbenchers of the government party do not have much power or influence over their cabinet colleagues either.

As I have stated, my speech will be on clauses 3 and 8, because they are aimed at dropping the minimum age of criminal responsibility from 12 to 10 years.

I recall being present here in the House when the Young Offenders Act was being discussed. That debate succeeded in lowering the age by two years. At that rate, and considering the number of debates there have been over time—you may think I am laying it on a bit thick—but if we keep dropping the age down every two years, in ten years they will be saying that the Criminal Code applies to babies. This is not logical, but there you have it. In Canada, government members, with the backing of the third party, are going along with a trend that is really

reinforcing the ideas of the right, ideas that our young people really need measures to control them better.

I cannot get over this. Before coming out with such things, did anyone think about the message we are giving to our young people at the present time? Ten to twelve year olds are still just children, or adolescents at most.

The hon. member is suggesting a change in the definition of a child and an adolescent by lowering the age. At 10 they would be recognized as adolescents.

• (1355)

True, our children are bigger than they used to be because they are healthier and better fed. It was recently reported that their IQs might be 10 per cent higher as well, for a variety of reasons, than what they were 20 years ago. I am willing to agree that these conditions are improving, but I still feel ten years is too young.

I am sure that this has not succeeded in influencing the Minister of Justice and therefore is not likely to be implemented. I trust that this debate will not influence others. One never knows if, after Quebec becomes sovereign, another party, the Reform Party for instance, were to come to power in Canada, well then it would be—

**Mr. Gagnon:** It would be dreadful.

**Mr. Dubé:** Although I did not put words in the mouth of the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, for once I agree with him. It would be dreadful to see such measures made more stringent.

We in Quebec have a tradition. Although we apply the Canadian Criminal Code to those under the age of 18 years, there is a provision for rehabilitation. When a crime has been committed by a young person, it must be interpreted as a sign to the parents and to society that something must be done for this young person.

I recall the words of a member of this House, whom I shall not name as he is not present. You would have cautioned me, Mr. Speaker, that we must not speak of the absent, but once warned, twice shy.

Who among us can boast that we did nothing bad as children. It is true that there are some extremely isolated cases, for instance the two young boys aged between 10 and 12 who committed a murder in England. This is unacceptable, but these are isolated cases. Let us have a look at the statistics.

What is the real state of affairs? According to statistics issued by the Conseil permanent de la jeunesse du Québec, in 1992–1993, 35 per cent of violent crimes in Canada were committed by individuals aged 25 to 34. On the other hand, the

### *Private Members' Business*

12 to 17 year old group was responsible for less than 15 per cent of these crimes. I repeat, less than 15 per cent.

Excluding the elderly, the very old—I am sorry to say the very old, but I will soon be joining them, since in 12 years I will be 60—statistics issued by Statistics Canada show that young people are less violent than any other age group in terms of serious violent crimes. Let us keep this in mind.

I do not want to impute motives to the member, but he is jumping on the bandwagon in favour of harsher measures to better control our young people. Was increased funding for prevention and better education ever considered? Were increased resources in these areas ever considered?

I did not see anything to that effect coming from this government. Unfortunately, some provincial governments want to cut this sort of services. A case in point is what is going on in Ontario. I have not closely checked it out but I understand that Alberta has made drastic cuts in these areas. This is a dangerous trend.

We all have kids and we know how firm we have to be with them. We cannot be naive. We have to be firm with them, and, as adults, give them good advice. We must not always think in terms of punishment. We must give ourselves better means to help those who tell us that society leaves to be desired, that they have problems and need our help. I think we should debate those things.

One last point. Time flies and I have only one minute left.

I have kids living at home and friends in the same situation and I am always amazed to see how easy it is for them to view violent movies. Why can we not take adequate measures in that area?

• (1400)

I cannot give you specific statistics today, but I am sure that the many murders and attempts at violent acts that a young person can see depicted on film in one evening have a negative influence on our youth.

Why are we not conducting serious studies to limit the influence of such programs on our youth? I would be an interesting approach. We could at least try.

After all, we did bring these kids into the world. There is a song which says: "We gave them birth, maybe we could listen to them". So maybe we could listen to what they have to say and try to find out why these violent individuals act the way they do, even though they are only a minority.

We must, as a community, be it Quebec or Canada, take the necessary steps to help these young people. If I am still here later on—which is doubtful, but if not here perhaps elsewhere—

*Private Members' Business*

someday I will suggest ways to help young people avoid the negative influence of such television programming.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House to speak on Bill C-242. It is a very rare occasion to see anything concrete coming from the government side of the House that makes any sense and actually deals with the real issues. I guess it is because it is coming from the back benches and not from the government that I can appreciate we are dealing with the real issues here.

Having had the opportunity to sit on the Standing Committee of Justice and Legal Affairs with the member for Scarborough—Rouge River, I can appreciate his approach to legislative changes. During his tenure on the committee the member for Scarborough—Rouge River has been able to identify problems with the current laws, propose legislative changes before the committee and try to promote them. Unfortunately he has had very little support from members of his own caucus.

He is attempting with Bill C-242 to deal with the real issues, the real concerns, and to suggest legislative changes. There is nothing earth shattering about the changes he is recommending. Serious repeat offenders should be denied statutory release. Loopholes should be removed from the calculation of parole eligibility which allow repeat offenders not to serve their full new sentences. Victims of sexual assaults should be allowed to request that their assailants provide blood samples to check for infectious diseases. Bail procedures should be toughened up. Crack houses should be outlawed and the age of criminal responsibility for young offenders should be reduced from 12 to 10 years old.

The member for Scarborough—Rouge River has identified a number of flaws in the justice system and has offered workable solutions to these flaws. Either that, or I would suggest he has been reading the Reform Party's policy book again. Bill C-242 reads like it came directly out of the criminal justice reform section of our policy book. In either event the Reform Party certainly supports each and every one of the amendments in Bill C-242.

It is a shame that these issues will only receive one hour of debate this afternoon and then will die. All these amendments have the support of the Reform Party. I am certain they also have the support of an overwhelming majority of Canadians. Canadians are demanding justice reform. There are just too many cases where the law is not protecting the average citizen.

Canada's justice system needs to adopt one underlying principle: when the rights of a convicted offender are in conflict with the rights of the victim or the rights of society as a whole, the rights of the victim or of society shall take precedence every

time. A prime example of the need for this principle is contained in clause 7 of Bill C-242.

The need for legislation sprung out of a case in Quebec a few years ago when a mother was sexually assaulted by an inmate on parole. The inmate had previously been incarcerated in an institution with a very high number of AIDS cases. Since her assailant had been an intravenous drug user the victim was naturally concerned that her assailant may also have carried HIV. When her assailant refused to voluntarily give a blood sample the victim went to court to have one given. Her request was rejected because conducting a blood test against the offender's will was deemed to be a violation of his rights under the charter.

• (1405)

This is a prime example of what is wrong with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This offender who committed a serious crime of sexual assault should have lost some of his rights. One of the rights he should have lost was the right to refuse to take a blood test.

On the day of the sexual assault the victim's life was irrevocably changed. Sexual assault leaves emotional scars that never leave the victim. One additional burden should not have been her daily concern about whether or not she had been infected by HIV or any other sexually transmitted disease.

Clause 7 would have addressed that issue. Unfortunately Clause 7 like the rest of Bill C-242 will never be enacted.

In the last days of June we finally got the government to move on the question of taking DNA samples. Why could blood samples not be given the same consideration where there is justifiable cause?

Another aspect of Bill C-242 I should like to address is the amendments the member for Scarborough—Rouge River wishes to make to the Young Offenders Act. He felt it was necessary to lower the minimum age from 12 years to 10 years. The member for Scarborough—Rouge River cites the example of the murder case in Great Britain where two 10-year old boys murdered a 3-year-old. The member correctly pointed out that had the offence occurred in Canada the police would have had little recourse but to simply accompany the boys back to their parents, and that would have been the end of it.

It is interesting this example was used because I have used it myself on many occasions. I have been criticized because such a horrendous event has not occurred in Canada and therefore it is inappropriate to use it.

Then I switched to my Mikey Smith story. Mikey Smith is an 11-year old boy from Surrey who has for the past couple of years been one of the most active car thieves in the lower mainland area. While I am not sure what his current total is, it is probably well over 100 cars. Mikey Smith publicly admitted that he

would continue to steal cars until he was 12 years old because there was nothing anybody could do about it.

Mikey's mother asked that he be charged before he either killed himself or somebody else, before he reached a point where he could not turn his life around. The Surrey RCMP would have been more than happy to have accommodated the mother but the law did not allow it. The Surrey crown counsel would have loved to have been able to have accommodated Mikey's mother, but as the Young Offenders Act currently stands there was nothing they could do.

I questioned the Minister of Justice about it in the House and in committee. He expressed concern about the issue. He basically said that while they can do something about it they are not prepared to do so.

In the meantime one of my constituents was going home one afternoon, going through an intersection on a green light, and was sideswiped by a car stolen and driven by Mikey Smith. Fortunately no one was seriously injured, but it is incomprehensible that this kind of situation can continue to be allowed and that Mikey Smith should be allowed to continue the mayhem.

One response I received from the federal government was that it was a case in which the provincial social services should have intervened. Just for the government's information, they did. They sent Mikey on a wilderness program so that he could develop a better attitude. The program helped so much that on the day Mikey returned to Surrey he stole a car to celebrate his return.

Unfortunately Mikey is not the only youngster under 12 to be engaged in crime. Youth gangs are recruiting 10-year olds and 11-year olds to carry out some of their crimes because they know that they cannot be charged. Still there is no hint from the government that it will support this kind of change. In fact when the Reform Party put forward a votable motion last year not one Liberal voted in favour of it.

In conclusion, Bill C-242 is a good example of how some Liberal backbenchers have proposed good legislation but how the government is not prepared to let the legislation be enacted. It is apparent to me that the only way these criminal justice reforms will ever be enacted is if there is a more Reform minded government in place. I assure the member for Scarborough—Rouge River that such a government would be much more sympathetic to supporting these initiatives.

• (1410)

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to listen to the debate.

### *Private Members' Business*

I have looked at some aspects of the bill and think it would make good law. However when I hear the position of the Reform Party then I think I must be wrong.

I have studied the proposals that have been put forward. Some I agree with and some I do not. When trying to come up with criminal law we must always look for a balance. The protection of society is always a primary concern. That has to be balanced with the rights of the accused. In recent years the interests of the victim have also come to the fore.

I believe that the bill put forward by the member for Scarborough—Rouge River tries to strike that balance, particularly in the area of someone who continues with the commission of crimes while he or she is out on early release. The proposal for change so that the person will no longer be eligible for statutory release is a good one.

The threshold for statutory release is also good because it is not at the two-year level but at the five-year level, which indicates that a rather severe crime has been committed. Therefore, more sanctions for the protection of society require that we have this type of an amendment. The example used by the member for Scarborough—Rouge River of a person who commits a murder and would only have to serve roughly a year and half before being eligible for parole is something that needs to be amended. I support those two aspects of the proposed changes in Bill C-242.

I share the concerns of members from the Bloc about changing the age for people who have committed a crime. It seems to me that lowering the age is really not the proper direction to proceed. Perhaps what we have to do is what has been done in some jurisdictions, which is introduce more flexibility. Rather than trying to come up with age limits, we should allow the court in specific circumstances to determine whether the child has the capability of understanding the crime he or she has committed and whether the process would be better served either inside or outside the criminal justice system, rather than come up with some magic line drawn in the sand.

In that sense I cannot support the part of the bill calling for change to a 10-year age limit, although it is very convenient when we hear the stories put forward by the Reform Party for Mikey Smith or the stories that come forward from the situation in Great Britain. Most often we hear of the extremes but we have to come up with laws that deal with the norms. Therefore, I see no real benefit in that aspect of the proposed bill.

There is some benefit in looking at stiffer bail procedures, crack houses and those types of things to see whether we can grapple with those issues and come up with a system that works.

*Private Members' Business*

On the face of it these seem to be good. It is too bad the bill will not get the opportunity for committee study and input. Maybe there are other approaches, other ways to fine tune the bill. However, to me it looks very positive.

I talked earlier about balancing one aspect against another. I can think of nothing worse than a person who has been the victim of a sexual assault being doubly victimized by not knowing what possible diseases may have been transmitted as a result of that sexual assault. When I try to balance the rights of the individual who committed the crime and the rights of the victim, from my own point of view I come down on the side of the person who has been victimized. If a blood test would give any comfort to that person after enduring that situation, then I think society would require that we do something.

• (1415)

In that sense this bill proposes a methodology which would allow the court to review the circumstances to decide whether or not an order should be granted. Therefore the rights of the individuals in that balancing act we have to go through are protected to a degree, but the rights of the victim are also protected.

In conclusion and as a general comment, the main thrust of the bill deals with the issues of the people who commit a crime once they are out on statutory release, the eligibility for bail and the calculation of sentences. Those issues are well aimed. We need some changes in the law in that area.

I do not support the member in his position with respect to the change of age. The member for Scarborough—Rouge River and I have discussed this issue over some period of time.

I do support the general direction. I would be interested in hearing from experts but I think the bill requires the right balance between the accused and the victim in dealing with blood tests. It is unfortunate this bill is not going before committee where we would have the input of others as to how we can make our criminal justice system better.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill C-242, an Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, the Criminal Code, and the Young Offenders Act. I know that the hon. member from Scarborough—Rouge River has invested a great deal of time and energy in bringing this piece of legislation before the House.

The thrust of the hon. member's proposals is to deal more stringently with repeat offenders, particularly those who commit crimes while on day parole, full parole or statutory release.

In particular, these proposals address anomalies in the current legislation which have been of concern to various interest groups, particularly the police and justice system officials.

Under that legislation, many offenders who commit multiple crimes or who re-offend during their sentence may remain eligible for release and may even avoid custody altogether.

On June 21, 1994, the Solicitor General introduced Bill C-45, an Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and related statutes.

The bill received third reading and is now before the Senate.

The amendments contained in Bill C-45 will ensure that offenders who get new sentences will feel the effect of those sentences. This will help restore confidence in the sentence calculation process in the following way.

Under the government's proposals, any offender who receives a new custodial sentence while on conditional release would be automatically returned to custody.

In the case of a consecutive sentence, the offender would have to serve the parole ineligibility portion of the new sentence before becoming eligible again for parole.

This means a third of the new sentence, or one-half of the sentence in cases where the court has made an order that this would have to be served. The net effect is proportionate to the new sentence and respects the decision of the court to serve an additional period of time in custody.

[*English*]

These proposals were developed on the basis of extensive consultations with a broad range of groups and individuals including judges, lawyers, police, provincial corrections and justice officials, as well as representatives of various voluntary service organizations.

Last March the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs conducted a review of Bill C-45. During that process, the committee heard from over 60 witnesses who represented 32 different organizations, including victims groups, police organizations, professional groups, women's groups, aboriginal organizations, as well as a range of organizations from the voluntary sector.

• (1420)

During its clause by clause review, the committee debated a number of motions to amend the sentence calculation provisions of Bill C-45 and endorsed them in their entirety. These provisions were also recently passed by the House of Commons.

[*Translation*]

While I believe that the hon. member's bill is well-intentioned, I am also concerned that it falls short of the impact intended by Bill C-45 for the following reasons. First, the changes proposed in Bill C-242 do not take into account the

inter-relation of the various sentence calculation provisions in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

By changing two aspects of the law, we will create an imbalance with other aspects of the legislation. This would necessitate significant re-drafting of the law as it now stands. Bill C-242 also deals with the complex issue of sentence calculation in a limited manner. Implicit in these proposals is the assumption that an offender under sentence will receive only one new sentence.

In such cases, sentence calculation is simple and straightforward. The offender would lose any eligibilities for conditional release on the original sentence, and would have to wait out the parole ineligibility period of the new sentence before becoming eligible again for conditional release.

But how would a sentence be calculated if the offender receives four or five new sentences of varying durations, some consecutive and some concurrent, at different points in the original sentence? The bill fails to address this complex and very realistic matter.

The law must be equipped to deal with multiple sentences and all possible combinations of sentences in an equitable manner consistent with the court's intent. And while this government supports the principle that repeat criminal behaviour should be dealt with more stringently, particularly when it occurs during conditional release, I also believe that the courts can take this into consideration when imposing a new sentence.

Bill C-45 will address the shortcomings of the current sentence calculation provisions I mentioned earlier. In doing so, the bill does not lose sight of the purpose of statutory release which is to provide offenders released from prison with a gradual controlled transition period back to the community to assist them with their reintegration and minimize public safety risk.

I would like to assure the members of this House that where any offender is at high risk of committing a violent or serious drug offence before sentence expiry, the National Parole Board has the authority to detain the offender until warrant expiry. All the measures I have mentioned aim to ensure that offenders are not arbitrarily held in prison longer than necessary, and that due consideration is given to their individual cases and level of risk to the community.

We must take heed that discretion is fundamental for ensuring that all cases are dealt with fairly. I believe that an individualized approach based on risk assessment is preferable to blanket removal of statutory release for a category of offenders.

[English]

During witness hearings on Bills C-45 and C-41 regarding sentencing reforms, it was frequently heard that imprisonment should be used as a last resort for the most serious offences. Many witnesses who appeared before the justice and legal

### *Private Members' Business*

affairs committee also stressed the merit of providing offenders with gradual, structured release programs combined with ongoing treatment and support to ensure long term community protection. It is well known that simply locking them up for longer periods of time will not achieve the goal shared by all Canadians for improved public safety.

• (1425)

[Translation]

The proposals set out in Bill C-45 are a thoughtful reflection of the collaboration with many groups and individuals, including members of the opposition.

I look forward to seeing effective and balanced reform—such as that presented by the government in Bill C-45—move forward, and anticipate that Parliament will deal fairly in addressing the anomalies which the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has brought to our attention.

[English]

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favour of Bill C-242, the public safety improvement act, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Scarborough—Rouge River. Before I address the specifics of the bill I believe it is important for members to understand the history of our colleague's complex initiative.

As many members know, since his election to Parliament in 1988, the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has been a strong advocate for criminal justice reform. He first introduced this bill in the late stages of the last Parliament. At that time the bill received a great deal of attention for three main reasons.

First it was and still is a thoughtful, well drafted and complex piece of legislation which attempts to fill numerous cracks in the criminal justice system. Second, national police and victims groups rallied around the bill because it addressed many of their concerns. Third and perhaps most significant of all, the bill was co-sponsored by the former member for Red Deer who at the time was a government member who shared his opposition colleague's concerns for the issues which the bill aimed to address. Today, more than two years later, we are still debating those same issues in the House.

As previous speakers have noted, this is an omnibus bill which deals with six key areas of the criminal justice system. They include statutory release, sentencing, young offenders, crack and bawdy houses, bail provisions and the rights of victims. To a degree some of us are asking why the government has not already addressed these issues. To a degree it has.

We have had the DNA legislation, amendments to the Young Offenders Act, a new child registry for sex offenders, tougher immigration and deportation provisions, and the list goes on and on. The government has done a good job. We have done a lot

*Private Members' Business*

more to improve public safety than any government before us and that is not just Liberal rhetoric.

The deputy bureau chief for the *Sun* news recently reported: "This Liberal government has actually done more to toughen up the system in two years than the previous Tory government did in nine". Although we have accomplished a great deal, there is still more to be done and this bill addresses some of those problems.

The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has proposed that an offender who commits a crime while on early release and who is sentenced for five or more years for that crime would no longer be eligible for statutory release. That proposal makes a lot of sense. The purpose of statutory release and for that matter all forms of early release is to prepare the offender for his or her ultimate reintegration into society. If an offender commits a crime during the trial freedom period, they obviously do not appreciate their freedom and therefore should not be trusted again.

In 1988 had Joseph Fredericks, a convicted pedophile with a long criminal record, not been entitled to statutory release, or mandatory supervision as it was known then, Christopher Stephenson, an innocent 11-year old Brampton boy, might not have been brutally murdered. It is for this reason that serious consideration should be given to this proposal by my colleague from Scarborough.

The issue of an offender committing a crime while on early release for a previous crime brings us to another section of the bill which deals with an area referred to as corrections math. Currently, if an offender commits a new crime while still serving a sentence for a previous crime, the new sentence begins

on the start date of the original sentence. I am certain that anyone listening to this is confused, as I was when I first learned about sentence calculation many years ago when I was in Millbrook on the other side of the table doing parole hearings.

It still makes me angry. An offender serving a sentence of seven years for armed robbery commits another crime while on early release in year five of his or her sentence. Although the offender is sentenced to an additional three years in prison for the crime that was committed while on early release, they will not serve additional time in jail because the new sentence will be merged with the original one. Basically they are allowed to commit a free crime.

It is 2.30 on Friday afternoon and everyone wants to leave. It is the end of the time. I am sorry I was not able to finish my speech, but I want to tell members that I support Bill C-242 and the amendments to it. I hope the justice minister is listening.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for Victoria—Haliburton for his co-operation.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96, the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

Before adjourning, I wish all of you and yours a very happy Thanksgiving.

[*Translation*]

I would like to wish you all a wonderful Thanksgiving Day.

It being 2.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday, October 16 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28 and 24.

(The House adjourned at 2.31 p.m.)

# CONTENTS

Friday, October 6, 1995

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Employment Equity Act

Bill C-64. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	15329
Ms. Clancy .....	15329
Mr. Dubé .....	15331
Mr. McClelland .....	15331
Mr. Ménard .....	15332
Mr. McClelland .....	15335
Ms. Meredith .....	15335

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Community Academic Services Program

Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	15336
--	-------

### AIDS

Mr. Ménard .....	15336
------------------	-------

### Thanksgiving

Mr. Silye .....	15336
-----------------	-------

### Arctic Wildlife Refuge

Ms. McLaughlin .....	15337
----------------------	-------

### National Immunization Month

Ms. Fry .....	15337
---------------	-------

### HIV-AIDS

Mrs. Brushett .....	15337
---------------------	-------

### The Environment

Ms. Bethel .....	15337
------------------	-------

### Aerospace Industry

Mr. Godin .....	15338
-----------------	-------

### Government Grants

Mr. Williams .....	15338
--------------------	-------

### Women Entrepreneurs

Mrs. Sheridan .....	15338
---------------------	-------

### Franco-Ontarian Flag

Mr. Bonin .....	15338
-----------------	-------

### National Debt

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	15338
---	-------

### Canada-Quebec Economic Union

Mr. Paré .....	15339
----------------	-------

### The Environment

Mr. Forseth .....	15339
-------------------	-------

### Quebec Economy

Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais .....	15339
------------------------------	-------

### Referendum Campaign

Mr. Bélanger .....	15339
--------------------	-------

### Land Mines

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	15339
---	-------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Social Program Reform

Mr. Gauthier .....	15340
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15340
Mr. Gauthier .....	15340
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15340
Mr. Gauthier .....	15341
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15341
Mr. Duceppe .....	15341
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15341
Mr. Duceppe .....	15341
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15341

### Department of National Defence

Mr. Hart .....	15341
Mr. Mifflin .....	15341
Mr. Hart .....	15342
Mr. Mifflin .....	15342
Mr. Hart .....	15342
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15342

### Transfer Payments

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	15342
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15342
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	15343
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	15343

### Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Epp .....	15343
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15343
Mr. Epp .....	15343
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15343

### Youth Unemployment

Mr. Dubé .....	15343
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15343
Mr. Dubé .....	15344
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15344

### Immigration

Mr. Williams .....	15344
Ms. Clancy .....	15344
Mr. Williams .....	15344
Ms. Clancy .....	15344

### Canadian National Railways

Mr. Mercier .....	15344
Mr. Young .....	15344
Mr. Mercier .....	15344
Mr. Young .....	15344

### Employment

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) .....	15345
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	15345

### Department of National Defence

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	15345
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15345
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	15345
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15345

### Research and Development

Mrs. Guay .....	15346
-----------------	-------

Mr. Young .....	15346
Mrs. Guay .....	15346
Mr. Young .....	15346

**Canadian Wheat Board**

Mr. Benoit .....	15346
Mr. Vanclief .....	15346
Mr. Benoit .....	15346
Mr. Vanclief .....	15346

**Mining**

Mr. Serré .....	15347
Mr. Rideout .....	15347

**Nuclear Industry**

Mr. Pomerleau .....	15347
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	15347

**Blood supply**

Mrs. Hayes .....	15347
Ms. Marleau .....	15347

**Presence in Gallery**

The Speaker .....	15348
-------------------	-------

**Point of Order**

<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Benoit .....	15348
The Speaker .....	15348

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken .....	15348
--------------------	-------

**Lower Churchill Development Corporation**

Mr. Rideout .....	15348
-------------------	-------

**Committees of the House**

**Finance**

Mr. Campbell .....	15348
--------------------	-------

**Procedure and House Affairs**

Mr. Milliken .....	15348
--------------------	-------

**Law Commission of Canada Act**

Bill C-106. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	15348
Mr. Rock .....	15348

**Committees of the House**

**Procedure and House Affairs**

Motion for concurrence in 89th report .....	15349
Mr. Milliken .....	15349
(Motion agreed to.) .....	15349

**Petitions**

**Bovine Growth Hormone**

Ms. Meredith .....	15349
--------------------	-------

**Violent Offenders**

Ms. Meredith .....	15349
--------------------	-------

**Criminal Code**

Ms. Meredith .....	15349
--------------------	-------

**Human Rights**

Mr. Campbell .....	15349
--------------------	-------

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken .....	15349
--------------------	-------

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Employment Equity Act**

Bill C-64. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	15349
Ms. Catterall .....	15349
Mr. Benoit .....	15351
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	15352
Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	15354
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	15355
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	15355
Mr. Boudria .....	15355
Mr. Campbell .....	15356
Mr. Dubé .....	15358
Ms. Augustine .....	15358

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Corrections and Conditional Release Act**

Bill C-242. Motion for second reading .....	15360
Mr. Lee .....	15360
Mr. Dubé .....	15362
Ms. Meredith .....	15364
Mr. Rideout .....	15365
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	15366
Mr. O'Reilly .....	15367



*En cas de non – livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*  
Groupe Communication Canada — Édition  
45 boulevard Sacré – Coeur,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Canada Communication Group — Publishing  
45 Sacré – Coeur Boulevard,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes par l'Imprimeur de la Reine pour le Canada.**

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada.**

---

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir la version anglaise de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,  
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada,  
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**