



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 022 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: As is our custom, we will now sing O Canada, which will be led by the hon. member for Oxford.

[*Editor's Note: Whereupon members sang the national anthem.*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

NEUTRINO OBSERVATORY

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House to a unique Canadian scientific initiative in my riding of Nickel Belt which will soon help unlock the secrets of our universe.

Sixty-four hundred feet underground in Inco's Creighton mine in the town of Walden, the finishing touches are being added to a neutrino observatory. Underground and shielded from cosmic rays, the observatory will study neutrinos, small particles emitted from the centre of the sun. The results could very well change our understanding of the universe and the very foundations of physics.

The observatory represents an international consortium made of Canadian governments, the U.S., the United Kingdom, universities and Inco Limited. It is a model of how governments and the private sector can partner to achieve great things. It is also a partnership led by Canadians.

I wish to extend my congratulations to all the contributors and in particular to Inco for showing us once again that mining in Canada is on the cutting edge—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Wetaskiwin.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, take back the street rallies are becoming all too common in cities and towns

across Canada. From the east coast to the west coast, Canadians are calling on the government to get tough with convicted criminals.

The years of lenient sentences, pampered prisoners and lax parole laws that favour offenders' rights over victims must end. Too many innocent lives have been snuffed out because this Liberal government is stuck in neutral.

Respondents to my recent householder demanded a return to law and order. Canadians want a say on capital punishment through a binding referendum. People want justice put back in the justice system.

Canadians are sending a wake-up call to the Minister of Justice. If he does not respond quickly, the voters will ensure that he and his colleagues are on this side of the House after the next election and will be watching a Reform government implement the changes that they were afraid to make.

* * *

CANADA HEALTH AND SOCIAL TRANSFER

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Canada health and social transfer will be implemented gutting national standards in the Canada assistance plan and slashing billions of dollars from health care, post-secondary education and social assistance and services.

This week Jean Swanson, president of the National Anti-Poverty Organization and Guy Caron, chairperson of the Canadian Federation of Students, have launched in Ottawa a National Fast for Fairness co-ordinated by the Action Canada Network.

Their fast, joined and supported by people across Canada, including churches, universities, food banks and union locals, draws attention to the CHST and the devastating impact it will have on people's lives, our economy and our vision of Canada.

New Democrats join our voices in calling for national programs with national standards and adequate funding and in supporting the alternative federal budget.

Finally, we pay tribute to Jean Swanson and Guy Caron for their personal leadership on this profoundly important issue.

*S. O. 31***NISGA'A LAND CLAIMS**

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to President Gosnell and the Nisga'a people on the signing of the agreement in principle this past Friday. Our colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, is also to be congratulated for his important role in seeing this historic moment to fruition.

Those who know the history of this agreement know that it is long overdue. The Nisga'a have been turned away too many times by too many governments for too many years.

The signing marks the end of 20 years of negotiations, two decades at the negotiating table watching federal and provincial governments come and go. For the Nisga'a this has been going on a lot longer than 20 years. The Nisga'a people have been working at this for over 100 years, quietly, patiently, with dignity and persistence.

The time is long overdue. Our government has a chance to change history and we will do so.

* * *

[Translation]

PONTIAC REGIONAL COUNTY MUNICIPALITY

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last month, Pontiac made headlines across the country. The mayors of the Pontiac regional county municipality had decided to consider a motion proclaiming the territorial integrity of the Pontiac RCM, should the yes side win the next referendum.

In the end, on February 16, the Pontiac RCM mayors signed a joint statement asking: "That the Prime Minister of Canada, provincial and territorial premiers spare no effort to reach a compromise eliminating the option that would result in altered territorial borders".

The next day, a local paper ran an article under the headline "Sixteen Pontiac Mayors in Favour of Secession". This catchy title in no way reflected the content of the Pontiac mayors' final statement, and I question the real purpose of such statements.

* * *

[English]

WORLD FIGURE SKATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. John Loney (Edmonton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to express my sincere appreciation to the city of Edmonton for the marvellous work it did in hosting the World Figure Skating Championships. Thanks to the tremendous spirit of so many hardworking volunteers who organized this event, Edmonton was a showcase to the world.

• (1405)

All programs were sold out and the economic impact to the city of Edmonton was over \$40 million. The figure skating championships had a huge television audience with over one billion people from around the world watching the event.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate Shae-Lynn Bourne and Victor Kraatz for a fantastic performance which won a bronze medal for Canada.

Once again I would like to thank the city of Edmonton for its outstanding work in hosting the 1996 World Figure Skating Championships.

* * *

[Translation]

MASCOUCHE BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year the Mascouche board of trade is celebrating its 20th anniversary.

The Mascouche board of trade has managed to stay the course and reach full maturity. Through hard work, efforts, motivation, and perseverance, its members, headed by Richard Boies, have shown their ability to help businesses.

Success in business requires a great deal of consultation and flexibility on the part of individuals, who must join forces to succeed. In these difficult economic times, we must recognize the need to work together and merge our energies to reach our goals.

I would like to congratulate all the members of the Mascouche board of trade who, I trust, will know how to be as successful and committed as during the past 20 years.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a preliminary agreement has been signed transferring a B.C. highway to the Nisga'a people.

Given the number of conflicts that have arisen in both British Columbia and Quebec these past few years around road access, signing this agreement with the Nisga'as sets a precedent that will be a source of conflict and will cause more roadblocks to be erected.

Thus far, the Bloc Québécois has been supportive of the agreement with the Nisga'a. However, if a similar agreement were negotiated in Quebec, they would have a problem with that and would probably not go along with it. Why does the Minister of Indian Affairs support this irresponsible precedent and how can the Bloc be in favour?

The Bloc has supported every major government initiative regarding aboriginal people outside Quebec. Interestingly enough,

the Bloc supports the minister on agreements concerning other provinces, when it would object to similar agreements being signed in Quebec.

* * *

[English]

VALLEY REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Valley Regional Hospital in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants is leading the way in health care reform in Nova Scotia.

The Valley Regional Hospital will be the first in the province to come under the jurisdiction of one of our four new regional health boards. These boards were established as part of last year's provincial health reforms.

Since its inception in 1904, the Valley Regional Hospital has had a distinguished history. This new designation does not represent the end of an era but is one more example of how the hospital has always responded positively to change.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the tremendous contribution of retiring director Peter Mosher, to Betty Mattson, the hospital's new acting general manager, the staff and many volunteers for their efforts to lead Nova Scotia's health care system into the future.

* * *

[Translation]

GREEK PEOPLE

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 25, Greece celebrated 175 years of independence. It was on March 25, 1821 that the Greek people started their struggle to regain their independence after 500 years of Turkish domination. Their sense of identity as a people enabled them to set off on this difficult journey that required tenacity, courage and above all solidarity.

The people of Greece—birthplace of western civilisation, especially in the fields of arts and science—were oppressed by the Ottoman Empire for hundreds of years without ever losing sight of their quest for independence.

Today, we salute the Greek people, who, through their determination, succeeded in regaining their freedom and their place in the world community. We share with Quebecers and Canadians of Greek origin the well-deserved pride of Greece for achieving its freedom and sovereignty.

S. O. 31

[English]

ALBERTA PREMIER

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premier of Alberta mistakenly subscribes to the notion that meetings of provincial premiers are the best means of defining change to our Confederation.

The premier of Alberta calls the premier of Quebec a great Canadian. Why? Because he needs his support to grant federal powers and erode national standards. He does this without consultation, without the consent of any Albertan but himself and perhaps his cabinet.

● (1410)

What about the great Canadians who live and work in Alberta, those who have positive and constructive suggestions for the renewal of our Confederation? Does he value what they think? Does he even ask what they think?

The most powerful message that I have heard from Albertans is that there is a need to be inclusive, to fully involve the people of Alberta. It is their collective wisdom that will build bridges of accommodation and understanding between people, provinces and regions.

Our Edmonton East Unity Roundtables included 300 people. A constituent of mine summed up the sentiments beautifully when he said—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vaudreuil.

* * *

[Translation]

MONTREAL BOTANICAL GARDEN

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Montreal Botanical Garden recently inaugurated its new facilities, built at a cost of \$22.3 million.

The work done includes the renovation of the administrative buildings, the construction of a new complex for visitors, and the refitting of the laboratories. The new additions and the modernized existing facilities will definitely increase the potential of the botanical garden and the interest that it generates among tourists, in Quebec and abroad.

Last year, the garden welcomed over one million visitors and the economic spinoffs greatly helped Montreal's economy. The Canadian government invested \$5.7 million in this partnership initiative with the Quebec government, the City of Montreal and the Université de Montréal.

This shows once again that such partnerships between the governments of Canada and Quebec are the best way to ensure the economic recovery of the Montreal region.

*Oral Questions***MONTREAL REGION ECONOMY**

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the economy of the Montreal region is currently undergoing a major crisis. The unemployment rate is alarming, 48,000 jobs were lost between the months of November and January, and the unemployment insurance reform is forcing more and more people to turn to on social assistance.

What is the federal government doing to correct this unacceptable situation? Nothing. The mayor of Montreal, Mr. Bourque, came to Ottawa to ask for federal assistance. He went home empty handed. Minister Stéphane Dion wants to divide Montreal into small blocks, while the Minister of Human Resources Development calls the unemployed lazy people and agitators.

Montrealers are still waiting for the jobs promised by the Liberal Party during the election campaign. So far, they only got cuts in social programs, in the UI program and in the transfer payments to the provinces. The Liberal government's performance regarding Montreal is a real shame.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again the justice minister fiddles while victims of crime burn. And the smouldering anger felt by victims' families is spreading like wildfire across other groups concerned about justice.

When will the justice minister wake up to the overwhelming demands to repeal section 745? Even when the public protest spreads to the grassroots of his own party, he insists on talking about weak-kneed amendments.

Yesterday the Canadian Police Association smoked him out on his use of convoluted logic to defend his foot dragging. The CPA also joined Reform in demanding a complete repeal of section 745. Amendments will not do.

This government likes to talk about the will of the majority, but this minister is stubborn as a rock, even when in the minority in public opinion, among victims groups, with police, even in the House of Commons.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNET

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry announced yesterday that our government was about to invest, in partnership with the private sector,

some \$15 million in order to connect all Canadian schools to the Internet.

This official announcement merely fulfils the commitments we clearly outlined in the throne speech and the last budget. By the end of 1997, this federal government project will allow students from across the country to communicate with one another and give them access to the vast pool of information known as the Internet.

The implementation of SchoolNet in all Canadian schools will be done as indicated in the budget speech, in co-operation with provincial and territorial governments. Through this announcement, our government confirms its intention to give Canada an information infrastructure that will enable it to assume real leadership at the global level.

* * *

• (1415)

[English]

THE BLUENOSE

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 75th anniversary of the launching of the *Bluenose* which has come to be recognized as Nova Scotia's sailing ambassador.

The *Bluenose*, launched in Lunenburg in my riding of South Shore 75 years ago, is a continuing portrait of the heritage and industry in my riding. The lumber mills, blacksmiths, shipwrights, sailors, fishermen and all those who either helped to build her decks or worked upon them are the very roots of our heritage and our communities.

The *Bluenose* is not only a legend on the South Shore, she is known the world over as one of the greatest sailing ships of all time. The historic importance of the *Bluenose* as a fishing and cargo carrying schooner as well as her prowess as a racing vessel have marked her place. She continues to be celebrated on something each of us carries with us every day, the dime.

It is important that we recognize Canada's seafaring history and make it a part of our national identity. Nova Scotians will salute this vital part of our heritage this year by celebrating the Year of the Wooden Boat. We must hold on to the memory of this great national icon for generations of Canadians to come.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

FEES FOR MARINE SERVICES

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the years the federal government has made a number of decisions that have had a negative impact on the economic

Oral Questions

development of Quebec. I would remind you, if I may, of the Borden line, which in the early 1960s literally killed the petrochemical industry in east Montreal, and the more recent decision to build Mirabel airport, which did considerable harm to Montreal's air traffic and is currently causing problems the federal government is washing its hands of. Now, once again, the federal government is getting ready to impose a unilateral decision with the potential of disastrous consequences for all of the ports along the St. Lawrence.

My question for the Prime Minister is as follows: Are the federal government's proposals to first of all divide Canada into two main maritime regions, east and west, and then to subdivide the east into three parts—the Atlantic ports, the St. Lawrence ports and the Great Lakes ports—not likely to isolate the St. Lawrence ports and to place them in a delicate situation with respect to the new fee structure the government wishes to implement?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as minister, I have not yet reached a decision concerning the organization of Canada's ports, whether in Quebec or in the other provinces.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

By isolating the St. Lawrence region, if the minister were to decide to do so, does he not acknowledge that the St. Lawrence ports are at risk of being extremely ill served by the new fee schedule he is planning to implement, particularly the charges for icebreaking and dredging?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet reached a decision. If I do make such a decision, I can assure the hon. member that we have no intention whatsoever of isolating the ports in the province of Quebec, or the province itself, as they themselves wish to.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the Minister of Transport is more reasonable than his fisheries colleague, who has been the one responding in this matter until now.

I will ask the Minister of Transport to give us some hope for the future by bringing his fisheries colleague around to see reason and ensuring that no decision is made on charges for navigational aids, icebreaking and dredging operations.

Can he commit to no decision being made by the government until the period of consultation is completely over and the report tabled, so that an informed decision can be made, rather than a half-informed one, as his colleague in fisheries wishes to do?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always ready to listen to representations by the hon. member, and I am always ready to consult my colleagues here.

But the hope for the future of Quebec's ports, for the province of Quebec and for Canada, lies in the results we obtained in the byelections, which indicate that we are now well placed to keep Quebec's ports properly integrated within the Canadian system.

• (1420)

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, some Wednesday afternoons things get a bit topsy turvey. I understood from the Minister of Transport's second response that he would not be making a hasty decision. I am sorry to say that he will not be making one, since the coast guard now comes under the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

My question is therefore to the new Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. He can take note of what his cabinet colleague just said. Consultations are currently under way on the subject of the fees the coast guard will charge for marine services. I would remind the minister that these consultations are to conclude in the middle of the month of April. The deputy minister in question, the commissioner for the coast guard, announced last week that the minister would reach a decision within two weeks, even before the end of the consultations.

Here is my question, since those opposite seem to be in a hurry today. Is the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, who is responsible for the coast guard, prepared to put off his decision to impose charges for navigational aid services until April 19 at the earliest, so the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans can complete its work?

[English]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well what is happening here. His question is one of total rhetoric. He serves on the committee, he sits on the committee, but for the benefit of the House here is what is happening.

The commissioner of the coast guard along with others has had many consultations, three months of consultations. We are now before the committee. The fisheries committee will hear witnesses and further consultation until I believe the second week in April. No decisions have been made and consultations will continue to take place.

If the hon. member is concerned about decision making, no decision has been made. It will not be made while the committee is doing the study and it will not be made until completion of the committee's work.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think we can assume the minister has said he has yet made a decision and will let the committee complete its work.

Since the minister is prepared to put off his decision until we have finished our work, is he, while we are on a roll, prepared to take into account the recommendations to be made by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans and especially requests coming from people in the industry, from the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, because, until now, the coast guard commissioner has had four bosses, none of whom has taken the time to listen to the industry? So I ask him to wait.

[English]

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that the commissioner of the coast guard has been more than patient in hearing the consultations and the intonations of all interested parties in all ports in Canada from one coast to the other.

In the navy we had a thing called obey the last order, but consultation does not mean that you obey the last order, that you listen to the last person. The consultation will take into consideration all the points that have been made from January until whenever the committee is finished its work.

In addition to the hearings of the committee there will be a staff of the commissioner of the coast guard attending these committee hearings. When the committee is finished its work we will not start from scratch all over again because we will take into consideration the ongoing consultations so that a decision can be made in time to collect these fees for the whole year.

* * *

GOVERNMENT BUDGETS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this fiscal year eight provincial governments are expected to balance their budgets or post surpluses. This means they will be in a position to offer tax relief to consumers and businesses and therefore stimulate real job creation for the unemployed. The only government left dragging its feet on budget balancing and tax relief is the senior government in Canada, the federal government.

If eight provinces can balance their budgets and even the separatist premier of Quebec can commit to deficit elimination, why can the federal government not do likewise?

● (1425)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the House, we have a plan that is working very well.

Interest rates are down by 3 points since last year. This morning I was reading in a newspaper that all the agencies evaluating the rating of Canada in terms of quality investments said it is now one of the best places in the world to invest. It is working very well.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): The federal government has a plan, Mr. Speaker, but it happens to be the slowest plan in the country for reducing the federal deficit.

Why should the national government, the one that is supposed to provide leadership, be the last to commit itself to balancing its budget? It ought to be the first.

If the Prime Minister simply cannot put together a balanced budget plan, would he be willing to hold a Canadian economic summit, like the one in Quebec, and allow business, labour and provincial leaders to put together a balanced budget plan for him?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have a plan that is working very well. When we look at the OECD nations and at the group of seven, it is Canada that has the best performance at this time because of our steady decline in the deficit in relation to GDP. When we became the government it was 6.2 per cent; it went down to 5 per cent; it went down to 4 per cent; it went down to 3 per cent; and it is going to 2 per cent.

As everybody knows, if we move too fast we could create all sorts of problems, including a recession. When that happens less revenue comes in and the deficit increases.

To be balanced, like the Liberal Party tends to be, not to the extreme right, not to the extreme left, that is the way Canadians do things, and it is working very well.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister compares his government's financial performance to that of the OECD countries. He ought to compare it to the provinces in Canada. Eight provincial governments are on a faster track for deficit elimination and tax relief than the federal government.

On this countdown we are hearing, from a \$40 billion deficit, to \$30 billion, to \$20 billion, to \$10 billion, the other side that is never spoken of is the federal debt's going from \$450 billion to \$500 billion, from \$550 billion to \$600 billion.

I will ask one more time. What is wrong with the decision making and financial planning apparatus of the federal government that it cannot produce a budget balancing plan when eight other governments in Canada can?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we came to be the government only two years ago. If we had been the government before that we would not have the situation we have today.

Oral Questions

I suggest the leader of the third party take 24 hours, sit down and read what I said to him in my first two answers and he will understand.

* * *

[Translation]

STATISTICS CANADA

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

Yesterday the Minister of Industry attempted to play down Liberal patronage in Statistics Canada recruitment. Yet, patronage has reached such a point that Statistics Canada management found it necessary on March 25 to issue a memo, of which I have a copy, recommending that its commissioners act with intelligence and discretion in order to avoid, and I quote: “—having people in high places halt the process again”.

I call upon the minister to inform this House. Who are the people in high places who halted the process? Are they from his department or his office, because quite obviously they are not from Statistics Canada?

• (1430)

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we went through this fairly painfully and slowly yesterday. I will try not to take too much time today.

I would remind the hon. member that we did—

Mr. Young: Could you draw pictures, John, for him?

Mr. Manley: —in the past employ a political reference system in naming census commissioners in this case.

It has come to my attention that of the names that were referred from the province of Quebec the most successful patronage boss of them all, I am afraid to say, was the independent member for Beauce who had 19 per cent of his recommendations accepted. The Bloc had 18 per cent and my colleagues in the Liberal Party had 17 per cent.

He perhaps ought to ask his colleague, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who somehow managed to get 61 per cent of his accepted.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a painful answer. Can the minister explain to us why the census

commissioners had to have their priority lists referred through a member of his office, in this instance Franco Iacomo?

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I explained yesterday, there are priority lists for the recruitment of census representatives. Priority is given to the names referred through my office. If hon. members wish to ensure their names are referred they need only call my office.

However, they cannot both rely on a system of political referrals and then suggest it should not occur. The hon. member making that suggestion reminds me of the veterinarian who set up shop with a taxidermist under the sign: “Either Way You Get the Dog Back”.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand the CSIS employee suspected of being a Russian mole is no longer an employee of the service.

Can the minister explain why this individual was released only two months ago and not five years ago when the internal investigation was done?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, can the hon. member explain why in the House and outside the House she alleged that this individual was now an employee of CSIS? Perhaps the hon. member better withdraw her allegations and go back to the drawing board.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister stated that although a CSIS employee had committed numerous breaches of the service’s security policy he was confident in how CSIS had handled the issue.

Yet in 1988 when Kwan Lihuen, a CSIS translator in Vancouver, was found to have had unreported contact with targets of the service he was immediately suspended and then fired when his security clearance was pulled. Even when SIRC and the federal court ruled that Kwan’s clearance should be reinstated, CSIS refused to rehire him.

Can the minister explain why CSIS was so rigid in that case and so lax in this one?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the hon. member’s question, but I

Oral Questions

will be happy to seek further information about the case she mentioned even though I think the record is clear I was not the minister in 1988.

* * *

• (1435)

[Translation]

STATISTICS CANADA

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

A memo from Statistics Canada dated December 5 said, with regard to priority lists, and I quote: "A candidate who scored 60 per cent in the written exam and 56 per cent in the oral exam has priority of employment over a person from another source who scored, for example, 80 per cent and 75 per cent in the same exams".

Does the minister not find unacceptable the fact that some people who get better scores in the exams are not hired only because their name is not on the priority list?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have had the same experience. These people were chosen to fill the positions of census commissioner. There was no priority list.

In fact, that is why a priority list was established for the positions of census representatives.

[English]

The choice was made on the basis of a written test followed by an oral examination. Many people in all parts of Canada and from all parties passed the written test but did not pass the oral examination. That gave rise to the numbers I quoted earlier which, if anything, indicate this test was very stringent.

By far the bulk of the people retained to perform the work on the census will have come from no political list at all. About two-thirds will come from sources other than political referrals.

[Translation]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the minister has misunderstood what I said. It is not those who have the highest scores who are hired, but those who have lower scores. That is what the memo says.

The memo says that those who score 60 per cent and 56 per cent in the exams will be hired, but those who score 80 per cent and 75 per cent will not necessarily be offered a job. The department does not want to hire them. The memo says that those who score 60 per

cent and 56 per cent will be hired and that those who score 80 per cent and 75 per cent will not be hired. That is what the memo says.

Can the minister explain to us why his department writes these kinds of memos and will not hire the most competent candidates?

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member seems very confused by the process.

If the hon. member were saying we were hiring people who did not pass the test because of their political affiliation, I would agree with her that we would then have a problem. However, the reality is that nobody is being hired unless they prove their qualifications.

There is no priority list, save for the census representatives. We have asked that priority be given to the names referred from my office provided they pass the required test.

I am advised that the hon. member for Saint-Hubert has sent us names, and those names will be on the priority list. If she wishes us to remove them from the priority list we will endeavour to do so.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Patricia Grace Ducharme of Campbell River, British Columbia is dead today because police were not allowed to warn her that she was living with an extremely dangerous suspect in a murder case.

A police staff sergeant told the Vancouver *Sun* he was unable to warn her of the imminent danger because of the freedom of information and privacy acts.

Will the solicitor general please tell the Canadian people and the House if he feels this outdated, ridiculous law is still an effective means of looking out for the interests of the public?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will have to get more information about this and get back to my hon. friend.

What I would like to know is whether the acts the hon. member is referring to are federal law or provincial law. He has raised some very serious matters which deserve to be treated seriously and the first thing for me to do is to be sure of exactly what the facts are.

• (1440)

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the answer does not surprise me. It is about victims' rights and we do not hear much about that from the other side.

Let me quote Chris Simmonds of CAVEAT, British Columbia: "The problem really isn't with the RCMP, it rests with the politicians in Ottawa. There should be a law on the books so that when police feel someone is dangerous they have the right to warn them. An officer could have taken her aside and warned her. At least she would have known who she was dealing with".

Does the solicitor general agree there is a need for such a law, yes or no?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very concerned about victims' rights. It is for that reason that this party brought in the gun control law that was opposed by the Reform Party.

I want to ask my hon. friend, is it not true that CAVEAT called for support of the gun control legislation while it was opposed by the Reform Party, yes or no?

* * *

[Translation]

BROADCASTING AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. In its final report, the information highway advisory committee recommends the review of foreign ownership policies for broadcasting and telecommunications companies in order to promote investments and competition in Canada.

Can the Minister of Industry assure the House that he intends to recommend to cabinet that foreign ownership of parent telecommunications corporations go from 33.33 per cent to 49 per cent?

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that Canada, together with other parties to the Uruguay round, is now engaged in negotiations in Geneva on the issue of trade in telecommunication services.

We have an offer on the table at the present time in Geneva which would bind our current law that permits 20 per cent foreign ownership directly and 33-1/3 per cent indirectly. Combined this comes to about 46 per cent. We are not at the present time proposing a change in that bargaining position.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, can the minister tell the House that he

will follow up on the recommendation made by the information highway advisory committee to ensure that these two industries, telecommunications and broadcasting, are subject to the same foreign ownership rules?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since we are not about to recommend changes at this point, I would remind the House that the same rules do apply for broadcasting and telecommunications.

Mr. Gauthier: No, no.

Mr. Manley: It is the same thing. We are not proposing changes.

* * *

[English]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Last December the minister participated in a sacred assembly where he was asked to establish a national aboriginal day that would formally recognize aboriginal people and their contributions to society. I would like to ask the minister why he is considering such a day and if he will act on it.

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a national aboriginal recognition day was passed by the assembly in Quebec in 1990. It has been requested by the Assembly of First Nations and by spiritual leaders. It has been pushed by private members of the NDP, by our member from Red Sucker and two weeks ago by the executive committee of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities.

These people are looking for a day of recognition, a day celebrating the aboriginal ties to the land. The challenge to the government is whether it is prepared to do it from sea to sea to sea. I am pleased to advise the House and members that the caucus, the cabinet and the government have reflected on this.

The Prime Minister will be proclaiming very shortly that there will be a national aboriginal day. It will be at the summer solstice, June 21 of each and every year. It will be a celebration of the spiritual ties of the aboriginal people, a recognition of them as our neighbours. Hopefully it will lead to a better future for all of us in Canada.

Oral Questions

• (1445)

NISGA'A LAND CLAIMS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in this Parliament the Bloc Québécois has supported every major government aboriginal initiative outside Quebec.

If the Nisga'a deal was in Quebec rather than in British Columbia, the Bloc would not support it because of the precedent established by the transfer of ownership of public roads to the Nisga'a. The memories of disputes over ownership of roads at Oka, the Mercier bridge and Akwesasne are too fresh.

Why is the minister promoting a deal in British Columbia that he would not dare promote in Quebec?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise is patently wrong but a comparison of what the Bloc and Reform do is interesting. The party to my far right, Reform, has opposed the Yukon legislation, the Nisga'a legislation, the Davis package, the Arctic exiles package, the B.C. treaty process.

The Reform Party has voted against every piece of aboriginal legislation brought to the House except the Norman Wells legislation that benefited an oil company. If Reform members want to compare themselves to Bloc members, if the Bloc supported one piece of legislation, Reformers would be at least tied with the Bloc. If the Bloc supported two pieces, it would be 100 per cent better than the Reform.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we do comprehensive analyses more than the minister. We supported the Split Lake agreement. We supported the Pictou landing agreement.

The Nisga'a deal sets a precedent for future land claims across Canada. It gives the Nisga'a constitutional protection for preferential tax treatment forever. This ends the possibility of an equal taxation system for all Canadians.

Why has the minister broken his promise to deal with native taxation on a national basis?

Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the Reform proves to all members that it does not know what it is talking about. If it does know what it is talking about, it is giving the wrong information to the House.

The Nisga'a deal proclaims that in the 12 years, after we help them, the Nisga'a will be paying taxes like every other Canadian. They are under the Criminal Code. They will be under the charter of rights.

This party purports to have some spiritualism. Let me read something:

The mainline churches support these negotiation processes in principle because we have been trying for over 30 years to face our own role in this sad history—We either get on with it as immigrant people, or face our First Nation neighbours in the streets and at the barricades—John Siebert, program officer, human rights and aboriginal justice, United Church of Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC CITY BRIDGE

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Yesterday, the coalition to save the Quebec City bridge sent all members of the House of Commons pieces of the bridge as well as a photograph showing how dilapidated it is. According to a study done for CN, restoration work must be undertaken as soon as possible to prevent irreversible damage. The Quebec government and CN recently said they wanted to do their part in saving this heritage property, a world-famous masterpiece of civil engineering.

Does the minister admit that the federal government is the only stakeholder that still refuses, unlike CN and the Quebec government, to do its part in restoring the Quebec City bridge?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is fully aware of how important the Quebec City bridge is. The hon. member should know that the Quebec City bridge was transferred to CN in 1993, which means that the federal government no longer has any economic or financial interest in it.

CN wants to continue maintaining the bridge and will do so, but it also wants to come to an agreement with the Quebec government regarding the repairs to be done within a few years.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Transport will finally understand how important this issue is when the bridge starts crumbling into pieces tomorrow.

After recognizing the Quebec City bridge as a national historic site, will the Minister of Canadian Heritage or the Minister of Transport admit that, unless the government makes an immediate commitment, this recognition remains an empty shell while the Quebec City bridge continues to deteriorate?

• (1450)

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a \$700,000 consultant study was done by the firm Modjesky and Masters which was one of the firms that was consulted when the original bridge was built many years ago. The

study confirmed that the bridge can be maintained and will be as long as maintenance is constant. CN plans to spend approximately \$1.5 million to \$2 million this summer in repairs to the bridge.

CN is prepared to enter into an agreement with the province of Quebec for a more complete restoration of the bridge in the years ahead. All it is waiting for is a decision by the Quebec department of transport which has the responsibility for this bridge.

May I repeat to the hon. member that this bridge was not built by Canadian National. It was built by the Intercolonial Railway Company. This was a company picked up by CN as it acquired certain bankrupt companies. The federal government had responsibility for it for many years, but as of 1993 its financial responsibility for this bridge ceased.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the finance minister ran for the Liberal leadership, he stated that harmonizing the GST with provincial sales taxes would make it almost impossible to get rid of the GST down the road. Now he is pushing extremely hard to harmonize the GST with the provinces.

Does the minister now believe that the GST should become a permanent fixture in the Canadian taxation system?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no. There were a number of times in opposition and previous times in my life when I certainly criticized the GST. In fact, I would criticize the GST today. There are a number of major problems with it. In fact, that is why we want to bring in a replacement tax, precisely to deal with those problems.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister made a very trenchant observation when he was in opposition, that if the GST did become harmonized it could be there forever.

My question is for the finance minister. Does he believe that harmonizing the GST would make it virtually impossible to get rid of it?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first we are talking about a replacement tax that would make it better for consumers and better for small business.

Second, as with any tax, a subsequent government or this government is capable of dealing with it. There is nothing in any single tax that would so bind a government, either federal or provincial, that it could not deal with it and not deal with its own revenues.

The government is going to do what it said in the red book. It is going to do what was promised on page 22. That is what was

promised Canadians. The tax system will be dealt with in a way that will allow Canadian companies to create jobs, allow them to be competitive and allow consumers to have a lower rate. In fact, we are going to do a great deal to make this economy better and better and better.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Most often when we talk about the Atlantic fishery we hear only of the downturn of the cod fishery. However, the shell fishery in my riding and across the Atlantic provinces is doing extremely well and is a mainstay of the economy of the fishery at this time.

Will the minister tell the House of the growth and the success of this bright sector?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do thank that the hon. member for her question. The Atlantic shellfish fishery is a very vibrant part of the Atlantic fishery and of the Atlantic economy as a whole.

In recent years prices have increased substantially and the landings have been up. The indications are that prices were pretty stable last year. Early indications are that they will be stable over this season as well.

• (1455)

In addition, the landings are not expected to fluctuate over the period of time that we are looking at. For the Nova Scotia economy, the shellfish landings represent 40 per cent of the quantity of fish and 80 per cent of the total fisheries landing.

This resource is so important that efforts will be taken to make sure that strict conservation measures are applied and the quotas will be given in a fair and reasonable manner.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last year, more than 25 per cent of the contributions paid by employers and employees into the UI fund, or \$5 billion out of \$18 billion, were used for purposes other than providing assistance to the unemployed. The Minister of Finance will divert another \$5 billion this year, and more than \$5 billion next year to reduce his deficit at the expense of the unemployed.

Why does the minister persist in calling UI premiums money that no longer goes back to the unemployed and which, in fact, constitutes a hidden tax?

Oral Questions

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we came to power, the UI fund was running a deficit in excess of \$6 billion. By the end of 1995, this deficit had turned into a surplus of approximately \$735 million. It certainly is not more than \$1 billion today. We have made it very clear that we wanted to build a cushion to protect the workers in times of economic decline.

The hon. member talks about diverting funds and that sort of thing. Look, we do not even have a \$1 billion surplus to spend on Canadian workers.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, why is it then that, last week, senior officials at the Treasury Board and the assistant auditor general confirmed our fear, a fear we have had for the past six months, of seeing employer and employee contributions used to replenish the federal government's consolidated revenue fund like any other tax or revenue collected by the federal government. Someone somewhere is not telling the whole truth.

In this context, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance the following question: Could he confirm that his government's refusal to transfer any active employment measure to the Government of Quebec may have been motivated not only by his own centralizing designs and those of the Minister of Human Resources Development, but also by the fact that this would create a shortfall of a few hundred million dollars in the federal government's annual budgetary revenue, letting its real deficit show a bit more?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat once again that UI premiums have been used to absorb the deficit, which amounted to about \$6 billion. Today, the surplus does not exceed \$1 billion.

It is obvious that the funds were not used for any purpose other than to make up the deficit we had inherited.

Now, the deficit, I mean the hon. member—

Some hon. members: Ha!

Mr. Martin (LaSalle-Émard): There is no difference.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle-Émard): No, no, I meant to say the hon. member. It was a slip of the tongue, Mr. Speaker; I take it back.

This is a matter of accounting. In 1986, the auditor general insisted that the UI fund was part of the federal government's consolidated account. It is purely a matter of accounting. We are only following the auditor general's instructions. If the auditor general is prepared to instruct us otherwise, we are prepared to sit down with him. But this is all a matter of accounting. This is unfamiliar ground for an economist.

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the information commissioner has found that officers in national defence headquarters altered and destroyed documents relating to the Somalia affair to prevent them becoming public.

He stressed that this deception was deliberate and the result of clear and direct orders. How can the House, the commissioners on the Somalia inquiry, or the Canadian public believe anything this minister or his department says when his officials are proven guilty of this kind of cover up?

• (1500)

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that it was the deputy minister of defence who drew this matter to the attention of the information commissioner immediately upon learning of the irregularities.

We welcome the report of the information commissioner. Indeed, his findings and the facts in his report are consistent with those that have been revealed in the military police investigations.

All of the matters addressed by Mr. Grace in his letter to the deputy minister have either been addressed or are being addressed.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the department was dragged kicking and screaming into the arena to declare this information.

The information commissioner advises in his report that he gave the Minister of National Defence the names of those "who gave clear and direct orders to destroy all original versions" and the names of those "vigilant, courageous and honourable employees of national defence, both military and civilian, who delayed in obeying".

What has the minister done to punish those who gave the orders? What has he done to ensure the protection of those who did the right thing?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the kicking and screaming, I would like to quote from a letter written by Mr. Grace to the deputy minister: "There is a silver lining to the cloud which these cases represent for national defence. The wrongdoing which occurred was first brought to my attention by the deputy minister of defence". In other words, it was brought to the attention of the commissioner by the department itself. There was no kicking, screaming or dragging.

Routine Proceedings

Obviously this is a disconcerting series of events and all of those matters will be addressed.

What the hon. member has also failed to reveal in the House is that his party, together with members of the national media, maligned the present chief of defence staff. Mr. Grace in his letter has since said that the chief of defence staff, General Boyle, has had nothing whatsoever to do with any of the wrongdoings.

I expect apologies from the Reform Party and the national media with respect to the actions taken against the chief of defence staff.

* * *

PACIFIC SALMON TREATY

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. It concerns the very serious Pacific salmon treaty impasse. Salmon is of vital importance to the B.C. economy.

Will the minister make public the report of the mediator that was rejected by Alaska and the United States? Will he push for binding arbitration of this dispute? Should this fail, will the minister stand up for Canada and take tough measures from rigorous customs inspections of U.S. vessels up to a transit fee as suggested by Premier Glen Clark? Will he stand up for Canada?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question does represent the sensitivity of this issue with fishermen in British Columbia. I am very sensitive to that. I have been there twice and have spoken with them and I will be going out again soon.

The hon. member is aware that as we speak, the Minister of Foreign Affairs is in the United States. He will be discussing both with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State, Mr. Christopher, exactly the points the member is making.

I want to reassure the hon. member and those fishermen on the west coast of British Columbia who are so concerned that we will do whatever is considered necessary to ensure that the principle of equity, which is their concern with salmon, is achieved. The best arrangement possible will be made for this year through the Pacific Salmon Commission and in future years as a result of tough negotiations with our neighbours as necessary.

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER**HOSTAGE TAKING OF CANADIAN CITIZENS**

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that when we came here this afternoon, 56 Canadian citizens on board an aircraft in Egypt had

been kidnapped and flown to Libya. I am pleased to announce that they have now been freed and that all are safe and sound.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages the government's response to two petitions which were presented during the first session.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration and the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Persons with Disabilities and associate memberships of some committees. If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in this 11th report later this day.

* * *

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-246, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sexual exploitation of children outside Canada).

She said: Madam Speaker, this bill seeks to amend the Criminal Code concerning child sexual exploitation abroad. Right now, Canada cannot prosecute an individual who is a Canadian resident. This bill would make it possible to prosecute anyone who commits such a crime abroad. It seeks to prohibit the sexual abuse of minor children abroad. It also seeks to introduce the principle of extraterritoriality, which would allow Canada to prosecute a person. The bill would also make it an offence for a person to be involved in the transportation of individuals going on a trip abroad for sexual purposes.

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

Routine Proceedings

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-247, an act to amend the Criminal Code (trespass).

He said: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce this bill. I have received numerous complaints that persons are trespassing on property causing a public disturbance and destroying a sense of community and liveability for children, yet are unable to be removed permanently. For example, we know that malls are a popular place for youth to hang out. If the security of the mall is forced to remove a problem person, that person can re-enter the mall within minutes. The only way the person can be charged is if they resist. Therefore if the person never resists, the act could continue over and over.

There is a serious technical gap in the law which has been identified by the New Westminster city police in my riding as they have a storefront office in a local mall.

To come to the aid of the community which is being subjected to this loophole in the law, I am proposing an amendment to section 41 of the Criminal Code, making it a summary conviction for a person who has already been lawfully removed from real property or a dwelling house not to be able to lawfully return for 24 hours.

• (1510)

The Criminal Code is full of gaps like this one and while this bill may only fill one of the holes, it is certainly a good start. Our laws need to support the law-abiding citizen rather than provide a legal invitation for repeated mischief without ensuing consequences.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-248, an act to amend the Criminal Code (prostitution).

He said: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce this bill in the House.

In my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby prostitution is a problem. Constituents are very concerned. They feel the only action taken so far was to move the prostitutes from one side of the railway track to the other, and I say that in a literal sense.

My community asked me to represent it and to take real action from the federal standpoint. My constituents want amendments made to the Criminal Code in order to make penalties tougher and control easier.

Currently in section 213 of the Criminal Code public communication to obtain sexual services only carries a penalty of summary conviction.

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

* * *

NUCLEAR LIABILITY ACT

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-249, an act to amend the Nuclear Liability Act.

He said: Madam Speaker, under the Nuclear Liability Act a private nuclear facility is now required to carry \$75 million in insurance to cover damage from facility breakdowns and other accidents. This bill would increase that amount to \$500 million and could oblige the crown to pay damages above that level.

We must remember that the damages from the Three Mile Island nuclear breakdown a few years ago amounted to \$3 billion and damages from Chernobyl amounted to \$14 billion.

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

* * *

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-250, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act and the Canada Elections Act.

He said: Madam Speaker, currently under the Parliament of Canada Act and the Canada Elections Act the Prime Minister has complete latitude in determining when general elections and byelections will be held. This is unacceptable to Canadians who want a little more certainty as to when they will go to the ballot box.

This bill would not contravene the Constitution Act of Canada, but would make changes to existing legislation so there would be fixed elections. General elections would generally be held every four years and byelections could only be held in the fall or the spring of the year, thus bringing certainty to a very uncertain era.

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the House gives it consent, I move:

That the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs which was presented to the House earlier this day be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is there unanimous consent to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

• (1515)

[Translation]

PETITIONS

EMPLOYMENT CENTRES

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, today I am presenting a petition originally signed by 6,300 people in the riding of Shefford, which I represent in this House. This petition represents over 10 per cent of the adult population and the names were collected in five days. It asks that Granby's Canada employment centre, with all the existing services, be maintained.

The Granby CEC is an economic development tool essential to the Granby area. I would like to thank all those who helped collect the signatures, especially the Granby Chamber of Commerce, which organized and piloted the petition.

The petitioners call on Parliament and the Minister of Human Resources Development to re-evaluate their decision, in order to maintain the existing services at the Granby CEC.

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions under Standing Order 36. The first is from Red Deer, Alberta. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families that decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and aged.

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the second petition is from Strathroy, Ontario. The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability and specifically that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of all alcoholic beverages.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre. The first group of petitioners request that the Government of Canada not amend the human rights act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners fear that such an inclusion could lead to homosexuals' receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

CONSENT

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the second petition concerns the age of consent laws. The petitioners ask that Parliament set the age of consent at 18 to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse.

* * *

[Translation]

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Madam Speaker, these petitioners make the following comments. They note that tobacco and its products are related to a number of illnesses, such as cancer, heart disease, strokes, emphysema, and chronic bronchitis.

They further note that they contain 4,000 chemical products that cause problems, 43 that cause cancer, and that perhaps 38,000 premature deaths can be attributed to cigarettes and the other products every year. They want it to be identified as a dangerous product.

[English]

TAXATION

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present today. The first, with 325 signatures, is from my constituents echoing their frustration over another example of high taxation caused by government over-spending or the potential of that.

They draw to the attention of the House that they oppose any increase now or in the future in the federal excise tax on gasoline.

JUSTICE

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the second petition is from Sun Hope in memory of André Castet. This is a petition to ask that the rights and protection of victims take precedence over the rights of criminals and that substantive change happen to the Young Offenders Act over and above the ineffective changes of Bill C-37.

The third petition, again from my constituents, calls on the House to recognize that dangerous sex offenders and pedophiles

Government Orders

should be locked up for life, violent offenders should serve their full sentences, that we should have a control registry of names and addresses and that we should keep offenders incarcerated if they are a risk to society.

Among other things the petitioners from my constituency ask for these changes.

• (1520)

TAXATION

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from a group of taxpayers who I know will be pleased that the finance minister obviously heard their message and did not increase tax on gasoline in this year's budget.

I am sure they would want the message presented to Parliament for consideration for next year's budget.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the second petition I have is from several hundred residents of this region urging Parliament to follow through on the commitment of the government to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation.

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to present a petition signed by numerous constituents of my riding.

The petitioners ask that the House not amend the Constitution, as requested by the Government of Newfoundland, and refer the problem of schools back to the Government of Newfoundland.

One of the instigators of the petition, Al Selinger, also states in an accompanying letter that such an amendment would abrogate the rights of a minority.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

LAW COMMISSION OF CANADA ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-9, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (for the Minister of Justice, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Goodale (for the Minister of Justice, Lib.) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in support of Bill C-9, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada.

I would first like to thank the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for their work in reviewing and amending the bill in the previous session. The amendments adopted by the committee, incorporated in Bill C-9, will contribute positively to the implementation of the legislation.

The passage of the legislation fulfils an important commitment made by the government in the red book that we would restore at the national level an independent capacity for law reform.

Bill C-9 will achieve that goal and it will do it in keeping with the government policy of ensuring that advisory organizations provide essential services that are cost effective and efficient. It is part of a broader effort to establish a more efficient and effective legal system.

We have made every attempt to reflect the results of our nationwide consultations in the legislation before members today. The legislation proposes a lean commission, flexible in form, multidisciplinary and inclusive in function with an emphasis on streamlining the legal system.

The preamble provides a guiding framework, a philosophy by which the new commission would be governed. This framework takes the form of specific principles identified in the consultations including openness, inclusiveness, responsiveness, a multidisciplinary approach, innovation and cost effectiveness. The law commission visualized in Bill C-9 will be different from that of the

former commission in its attention to the process of reform and the stakeholders involved.

• (1525)

The commission's mandate will be to study and to keep under systematic review in a manner that reflects the concepts and institutions of the common law and the civil law systems the law of Canada and its effect with a view to providing independent advice on improvements, modernization and reform that will ensure a just legal system that meets the changing needs of Canadian society and of individuals in that society.

In exercising its mandate the commission will provide advice on the development of new approaches to the law; measures to make the legal system more efficient, economical and accessible; partnerships and co-operative arrangements with other communities in Canada to stimulate critical debate; the elimination of obsolete laws and anomalies in the law.

An important consideration underlying this legislation is the particular balance struck between the independence of the commission and the need for accountability.

The commission will be an independent arm's length body reporting through the Minister of Justice to Parliament and will set its own agenda. This independence would be balanced by a requirement in the legislation ensuring that the minister be consulted before the agenda is set.

The legislation provides for a ministerial reference power but also requires that the minister consult with the commission before making such a reference.

The commission, through the minister, would table study reports, agendas and annual reports before Parliament. Similarly, the minister would be required to respond to any report received from the commission.

The commission will consist of five commissioners, a small permanent secretariat, a volunteer advisory council and volunteer subject panels. The president will be full time while the other four commissioners will serve part time. Instead of retaining a large in house staff to conduct studies, the commission will contract for research from outside sources or enter into joint arrangements with existing institutions and agencies.

To provide the commission with the capacity to examine the law of Canada in a manner that reflects the concepts and institutions of the two juridical systems in Canada, common law and civil law, an amendment was introduced by the committee to require that members of the commission be chosen, taking into specific consideration the need for commissioners as a group to have knowledge of the two legal systems.

Government Orders

As an indication of the desire for the new commission to conduct business in an open and inclusive fashion, the advisory council will be established in legislation to provide advice on the strategic direction of the commission and to review its performance.

To further ensure that the commission will be provided with advice reflecting the principles enunciated in the legislation's preamble, the committee proposed that the same factors be taken into consideration when appointing members to the advisory council, as in appointing the commissioners.

Therefore although membership is not limited to the legal community, members should be broadly representative of the socioeconomic and cultural diversity of Canada, represent various disciplines and reflect knowledge of common and civil law systems. I believe this amendment enhances the legislation and the ability of the commission to fulfil its mandate.

I mention the amendment made to the mandate of the advisory council, clause 19. Rather than operating at the request of the commission, the advisory council will have an obligation to advise the commission in matters related to its strategic direction, program of studies and performance.

In other matters related to the purpose of the commission the advisory council will have discretion in exercising its advisory function. This amendment, introduced in committee, is critical to ensuring a transparent and inclusive process intended to be open and responsive to Canadian society. I strongly support this amendment.

The existence of the advisory council and the ability to create subject panels will be a significant departure from the structure of the former Law Commission of Canada. It is through these bodies that consultations will be institutionalized.

• (1530)

In addition, the commission will be designated a departmental corporation to enable it to receive funds from outside sources, from private and voluntary sectors and to generate revenues through the sale of annual reports and other publications.

In conclusion, the commission envisioned by the legislation represents a number of significant differences from the former Law Reform Commission of Canada. Its broadened approach to the process of law reform is to be inclusive, multi-disciplinary and open to all sectors of Canadian society. There will be greater emphasis on the efficiency and economy of the legal system. It will have a leaner budget and a structure employing part time commissioners, a small secretariat and the use of outside researchers optimizing joint arrangements, collaboration and partnerships, notably with the academic community. It will have a more inclusive manner of operating, using an advisory council and subject panels. Innovative approaches, including new information technol-

Government Orders

ogies, will support a commission which will approach its task with more vigilant attention to cost.

The purpose of the bill is to bring a wide ranging, integrated approach to the improvement, modernization and the reform of the law of Canada. The law is the infrastructure of our social and economic life and in this context, law reform is an essential ingredient to nation building.

I am confident that the Law Commission of Canada as proposed in Bill C-9 will make an important contribution to this vital enterprise. I urge the House to pass this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, here we are at third reading of Bill C-9, which provides for the creation or rather the exhumation of the Law Commission of Canada. Whatever the case may be, the Minister of Justice today wants to revive this useless body, which cost taxpayers \$105 million over its 20 years of existence and which made few recommendations that Parliament actually used.

The Law Reform Commission was established in 1971 under the Law Reform Commission Act. Its role was to systematically study and review Canada's laws. It did three main types of research: substantive criminal law, criminal proceedings and administrative law.

In its last year of existence, the commission had a budget of \$5 million. In addition to the commissioners and employees, the commission hired a number of consultants on contract. More than 82 per cent of the commission's expenditures went to salaries and special professional services—primarily university researchers and lawyers hired as consultants for short periods. In this area, the accent is on research and not on practical management.

Unrealistic research programs and astronomical costs were the two main reasons the government of the day chose to abolish the commission.

When the commission was dismantled, the Department of Justice received interim credits so that the work that was furthest along could be completed, particularly the work in the multiculturalism and justice project, undertaken at the request of the minister.

In addition, in June 1993, Treasury Board gave final approval to the funding needed for the Department of Justice to set up and implement a long term law reform strategy. One of the aims of the program was to provide the department with the resources it needed to study more law reform issues internally, for example, by paying experts on a contract basis in the areas under study; to work

with other organizations such as the Quebec law reform institute and other major institutions in the field of justice.

The annual budget for projects in the law reform division ranges from \$500,000 to \$600,000. The studies funded by the division dealt not only with multiculturalism and justice but also with a whole range of problems related to law reform such as human rights, euthanasia, changes to the preliminary investigation procedure, jury selection and many others.

• (1535)

The division now includes three full time and one part time employees. The minister wants to set up a new commission when there is already a competent staff ready to respond to the government's requests.

The division is doing a very good job. The minister could very well entrust this law reform division with all the work needed to direct and reform Canadian law and to find innovative solutions to endemic problems. When I think about how this government is slashing the budgets of the NFB, Telefilm Canada and the CBC, I feel like hitting someone.

The Canadian government would rather waste \$3 million a year on a commission that will carry out consultations. The Minister of Justice finds it desirable to appoint 29 federalist friends to this commission. The minister of consultation may not like it, but Bloc members will not be fooled. Ironically, it is the law reform division that, in May 1994, distributed a consultation paper and questionnaire on the creation of a new law reform commission to 884 individuals and organizations.

Of the 884 questionnaires that were mailed out, 126 were returned to the department. These are the extensive consultations referred to in the bill's preamble. Former members and researchers of the old commission were undoubtedly consulted. However, it is not so clear that consultations were held outside that community. But the consultation paper and questionnaire were distributed to all senators and members of the House of Commons.

One thing is clear: the provinces as legal entities were overlooked. The desire to seek out people's views is expressed several times in Bill C-9 but nowhere in the text could I find some concern about consulting the provinces as major stakeholders in Canada's legal community. According to the constitutional distribution of legislative powers, the federal government must legislate in its areas of jurisdiction. By creating a new commission, the federal government may well overstep its jurisdiction.

What concerns me the most is that the new commission's mandate is, and I quote: "to study and keep under systematic review, in a manner that reflects the concepts and institutions of the common law and civil law systems, the law of Canada and its

effects with a view to providing independent advice on improvements, modernization and reform that—meets the changing needs of Canadian society and of individuals in that society”.

In light of this statement of principle, we must conclude once again that the federal government is seeking to centralize reforms and to standardize legislation across the country without taking regional disparities into consideration and above all without considering Quebec in its study and review of both legal systems in Canada. It is outrageous on the federal government's part to claim to be reforming and reviewing Quebec's civil law, since it has absolutely no jurisdiction.

The Minister of Justice should reread carefully section 92 of the 1982 Constitution Act. It is very upsetting to see him condone such inappropriate legislation. What are the real motives and goals of federal authorities concerning the new commission's role? Will the commission be yet another centralizing instrument? Is this not an indirect way of doing what is prohibited by the Constitution? The federal government's intentions are clear: It wants to standardize the law, whether civil or criminal, across the country.

The unavowed dream of federal authorities is to move into various areas of provincial law under the cover of direct consultations with the public, while ignoring the provinces. They want a single federal law from coast to coast.

• (1540)

This emphasis on the consultation by the commission can only be done at the expense of the research component, particularly if its budget is two million dollars less than that of the former commission, even with the use of new communication technologies. Indeed, these technologies involve costs which will probably be as high as the travel expenses incurred by the former commission, if not higher.

One has to wonder how an agency such as this one, with an annual budget of \$3 million, can truly conduct or commission research and develop various programs to that end, while also holding major public consultations.

Bill C-9 provides that the research and analysis responsibilities that are incumbent on a reform commission will be assumed primarily by various social bodies independent from the commission itself. This is how the federal government will ensure the financing of its initiative.

Indeed, the Minister of Justice seeks to have the provinces indirectly finance research activities relating to law reform by having such activities conducted by university research centres, and even the Institut québécois de réforme du droit.

Government Orders

Under cover of a partnership and a streamlining of resources, the federal government is once again showing us that we have to keep a close eye on it. The cost of the research conducted by the commission will be borne by the provinces.

The mandarins in Ottawa, led by the Minister of Justice, view the provinces, and Quebec in particular, as nothing more than pressure groups, on the same footing as a gun manufacturers association, a seniors club or a chamber of commerce.

The bottom line is that the field of action of the new commission will not be limited to federal law. On the contrary, it appears from the policy statement and the preamble that the federal government will not make any bones about stepping into the provinces' fields of jurisdiction. The consultation paper published May 16, 1994 was already ominous. It says, and I quote: “—the need for law reform stems from the inability of existing laws to deal effectively with problems, and the root causes of those problems often involve the complex interaction of social, economic, health, education, and other factors”.

What is the most worrying is that, with Bill C-9, Quebec loses its guarantee of representation on the commission. In effect, subsection 4(3) of the old Law Reform Commission Act guaranteed that two of the five commissioners came from Quebec. Not only is the federal government not consulting Quebec in the areas that concern it, but it is also excluding it outright by not having a representative from our province.

In addition to the absence on the commission of Civil Code experts from Quebec, the skills and abilities of the commissioners are extremely vague. I note in passing that the government has completely ignored the recommendation by the Canadian Bar Association that women be represented equally in the composition of the commission.

If we look at clause 7 of Bill C-106, before it went to committee, all we find is the following passage, and I quote:

7. As a group, the Commissioners should be broadly representative of the socio-economic and cultural diversity of Canada and represent various disciplines.

In committee, we attempted to reason with government members, but they turned a deaf ear. At the very most, and as often happens with this government, we are left with an empty shell, in the form of clause 7(3) as it now stands:

7.(3) As a group, the Commissioners should be broadly representative of the socio-economic and cultural diversity of Canada, represent various disciplines and reflect knowledge of the common law and civil law systems.

• (1545)

This means that, if the commissioners have a knowledge of the civil law, they do not have to come from Quebec. What explanation can there be for this lack of logic? What explanation can there be

Government Orders

for the only province in Canada with civil law and which comprises one quarter of the Canadian population not being represented on the commission?

The federal government's intention to shove Quebec aside is still more obvious in the English version of Bill C-9. It states, and I quote, that the commissioners "represent various disciplines and reflect knowledge of the Common law and Civil law systems". In the English version, then, they need only reflect a degree of knowledge of the Quebec system and can, just as easily as not, come from British Columbia or the Yukon. This is shameful.

Not only does the federal government wish to interfere with areas that are not within its jurisdiction, but it has the audacity to do so in a cavalier fashion. This is a situation in which incompetence comes very close to deception.

The composition of the Supreme Court ought to have been the exemplar followed. The Supreme Court Act calls for at least three of the nine judges to be from Quebec. It is totally logical for the highest court in Canada to reflect the two legal systems in the country. Why did the Minister of Justice not subscribe to the same logic?

A final consequence of the federal approach is that, by allowing the future commission to address provincial law, the provinces face the risk of bowing to pressure for uniformization. This will be even stronger, to the point of being unbearable, if the provinces do not have a hand in determining the composition of the commission and its mandate, and in approving that mandate. For this reason alone, Bill C-9 is unacceptable.

This is not all. Unlike the former Law Reform Commission Act, clause 4 of the bill accords less importance to the new commission's research role and focusses more on lucrative and other organizational and promotional activities. This contradiction is striking, to say the least.

These new requirements are indeed surprising and a long way from the role that should be played by a commission responsible for reforming the law and carrying out the mission set out in clause 3 of the bill. The reason is simple. The Minister of Justice wants to make his commission into a propaganda tool through a basic shift in its mandate.

Not only is he broadening the scope of the commission in order to encroach in areas of provincial jurisdiction, not only is he dropping Quebec's representation on this commission, but he has the gall to use his new commission as a marketing tool to promote federal interests.

How do you expect the Bloc to support such a bill? The minister wants us to believe that his commission will be independent. In clause 3, the bill clearly provides, and I quote, that:

The purpose of the Commission is to study—the concepts—of the common law and civil law systems—with a view to providing independent advice on improvements, modernization and reform—

This is bunk. The appointments of the five commissioners are clearly partisan. It reeks of payment for loyal services. The five commissioners will be appointed by the Prime Minister on the recommendation of the Department of Justice. The commissioners will also be appointed during pleasure. In other words, they will be relieved of their duties if they are unsuitable and fail to follow the party line and the legislative program of the government in power.

Following their appointment, the commissioners then appoint the members of the advisory council. There will be 24 of them. They too are appointed during pleasure. They are not paid for what they do, but do receive travel and living expenses. These 29 people will make up the Law Commission of Canada. With 29 partisan appointments, the Minister of Justice is creating his own fan club of intellectuals, who will philosophize over the ins and outs of the law.

They will be so far removed from reality, that the Minister of Justice will soon realize his error and put an end to this commission.

• (1550)

In a different but equally important connection, any reform agency has problems inherent to its nature and mandate. The former commission never overcame the intrinsic problem of time. The more complex and lengthy the bill, the longer its consideration takes and, consequently, the higher the chances that the sociopolitical context has changed drastically between the time when the commission started studying the bill and the time when it finished, which makes it more difficult to adopt reform proposals as submitted.

The former commission was severely criticized in this respect by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada in the House of Commons. In 1985, the auditor general's office conducted an in-depth audit of the operation and management of the former commission. In his report, the auditor did not mince his words about the project management approach of the commission.

One excerpt speaks volumes; it says, in essence, the following: "Since 1972, the commission has neither reviewed its initial research program nor submitted a further program, in spite of the fact that its work has changed considerably. There were also major delays in the implementation of its research program and major cost overruns compared to 1972 cost estimates. For example, not one of the completion deadlines were met, and in many cases, projects have yet to be completed 10 years after the original completion date".

In paragraph 10.30 of his report, the auditor general points out that the absence of written guidelines and procedures has caused deficiencies in the commission's contracting process. The report cites among other examples the fact that the basis for selecting

various consultants or researchers were not put in writing. The report concludes that, unless it goes to tender, the commission should justify its choices in writing to ensure that any given choice was reasonably motivated.

Bill C-9 does not act on the auditor general's recommendations. A follow-up audit conducted by his office in 1998 showed that, three years after it was initially recommended that it do so, the former commission still had not undertaken a comprehensive review of its program effectiveness.

If I interpret the commissioners' complaints correctly, the former commission was in greater need of direction and control than of an arm's length situation and mandates as broad as they are ill-defined. The justice department never assumed its responsibility as a regulatory body. The situation had been allowed to deteriorate to the point where the government did not have a choice any more. It had to get rid of the commission and integrate some of its resources into the Department of Justice, hence the establishment of the law reform division.

I would like to say that the justice minister cannot be serious when he describes the future commission as a streamlined law reform commission of Canada. If he was serious about streamlining, he would let it be. A streamlined commission already exists within his department.

The Minister of Justice did not learn from the mistakes of the former commission. He chose to ignore the report in which the auditor general severely criticized the former commission. It has not gotten through to him yet that there is already, within his own department, a division whose sole purpose is to reform Canadian law. By failing to learn from past mistakes, he runs the risk of making the same mistakes.

Moreover, and the minister will not be warned again, Quebec will not be fooled by this cheap trick aimed at invading its areas of jurisdiction, spending public money needlessly in the process. The Bloc Quebecois cannot condone this kind of manoeuvring.

• (1555)

[*English*]

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, for the information of Canadians watching this debate, we are debating Bill C-9, formerly introduced in the last sitting of the House as Bill C-106. Essentially it sets up a law reform commission. The purpose of the commission is to advise government on needed changes and modernizations to the existing laws of Canada.

We opposed this bill when it was introduced to the House at second reading and we oppose it now at third reading. I hesitate to

Government Orders

take the House's time by reiterating the same concerns and arguments that were made in the debate on October 19, but there are a couple of new developments which need to be discussed and which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. There have been a couple of amendments suggested to the bill and those should be dealt with.

The commission is being set up as a "departmental corporation". This is to be in aid of increasing or underlining the independence of the commission from government and also to allow it to generate revenues which is an acknowledgement of the concern that has been raised about the cost of this ever increasing circle of commissions and other groups which keep being created.

I would hesitate to predict what a departmental corporation could bring in or recover from the sale of its reports. I suggest it would certainly not be a very considerable amount. Even Parliament itself seems very uninterested in many of these reports. They gather dust on shelves. I would be extremely surprised if members of the public laid out cold hard cash just for the pleasure of reading them. I would also point out that the research work done to generate these reports in the first instance is funded solely from taxpayers' dollars. For taxpayers to have to pay additional money to look at the reports they paid to have generated in the first place does seem to be a bit much to ask of any member of the public.

The Reform Party suggested two amendments to this bill at committee stage. The first one was to correct what we felt was an unjustified inclusion in the bill of the words "after extensive consultation". We feel that the legislation which is put before Parliament should be defensible and should be accurate in the way it is framed. We really felt that extensive consultation was a misnomer for the process that had taken place in bringing back this idea of a law reform commission.

The consultation in fact consisted of 844 questionnaires of which only 126 were returned, a less than 15 per cent return rate. The 844 questionnaires went out to, among other people, every MP and every senator. About half of all these questionnaires went to members of Parliament who have to vote on whether or not this whole thing goes ahead. It seems redundant to preview the opinions of members of the Canadian Parliament and then call this consultation. When we use the word consultation the public thinks of it as we are consulting members of the public at large, or extensively some other interests besides the law makers and the decision makers in Parliament, but that was not the case.

We felt for the integrity of the legislation and the plain speaking that would be required of legislation that the reference to extensive consultation should be deleted. However, it is still in there. Canadians are being given to understand that there was extensive consultation and extensive discussion across the country about

Government Orders

bringing back the commission and it should be put on the record that this was definitely not the case.

• (1600)

The other amendment which we proposed would increase the role of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs in the appointment of the commissioners and the advisory body to the commission.

When I criticized the Minister of Justice for this at second reading he rose in the House and said that this body was going to be both independent and accountable. It would be independent of the minister and it would be accountable to the House through the minister. At that time I asked, and I still have not received a satisfactory answer to this difficulty, how a body could be independent of a minister when it is accountable to the House through that minister.

There are so many areas in the legislation where not only is the commission accountable through the minister, it is directly a creature of the minister. The minister, for example, appoints the five commissioners. How can a body which is appointed by a minister, through his recommendations to council, be even remotely considered to be independent of that minister?

The commission must consult with the minister before setting its agenda. The commission must carry out studies or prepare reports at the request of the minister. The response to the recommendations of the commission is at the minister's discretion. The minister could simply ignore or neglect to do anything about the recommendations of the commission.

There is so much leeway and control over the process by the minister that to say it is independent of him or her is simply incorrect. There is absolutely no basis on which to make that argument.

To say that the commission is accountable is again a notion which cannot be supported by the facts. For example, the commission will be given \$3 million a year on which to operate. However, it will be set up as a departmental corporation. Supposedly, it is like another crown corporation which is at arm's length from government, therefore, not only can government not tell it what to do unless it wants to do that, members of Parliament cannot obtain information from it through the Access to Information Act.

The departmental corporations are totally independent bodies. They are corporations in the private sector. As members of Parliament, even though these bodies are totally funded by taxpayers, we have no right to obtain information from them.

The grain commission is a good example of this. The commissioners on the grain commission set their own remuneration. They set their own terms of reference. They set their own pensions. The people served, the taxpayers of Canada, and even members of

Parliament, cannot obtain information from it because the commission is at arm's length and has such a level of independence that it is accountable to no one.

This commission has been set up in the same way and yet the minister tells us that it will be accountable. However, in the way it has been set up, the accountability is once again shielded behind all of these arm's length mechanisms. We are going to have the same situation as we have with the other bodies.

For example, ACOA was asked by the taxpayers how many jobs it had created with the millions and millions of dollars the taxpayers had given to it in order to create economic activity in Atlantic Canada. However, they cannot obtain an answer. ACOA is not required to give that information to the people who are giving it money.

To set up another body like this is a slap in the face to taxpayers. Members have to realize that taxpayers work very hard for the money they give to bureaucrats and politicians.

• (1605)

They should have some means of ascertaining that they are getting bang for their buck. However, we have no certainty of that in this legislation. Another \$3 million is floating around the countryside with the accountability mechanism very uncertain and loose. We should object to that very strongly.

For example, we have so many services which taxpayers desperately need in order to take advantage of economic opportunities, to get health services and the education of our young people and our workforce. The \$3 million is being cut from the kinds of services that Canadians are demanding. Here is money being used to set up a commission that Canadians are not demanding but which they pay members of Parliament to carry out.

The whole job of members of Parliament is to recommend and put forward legislative measures that are needed to deal with issues facing the country. The whole point of having members of Parliament is to update and modernize the laws so they meet the changing needs of Canadians.

Why on earth are millions of dollars being spent on members of Parliament who come with all different perspectives, meeting in committees, studying issues, travelling the country, debating in the House of Commons and analysing bills and then all of a sudden another \$3 million is being thrown into the hat to have another commission of buddies of the justice minister, whomever he decides to appoint, to do the very same work that members of Parliament are elected and paid to do?

In my speech on this matter on October 19, I made an offer to the justice minister. I said: "If you are really so desperately in need of a law commission, then we as Reform Party members in the House of Commons will gladly do that job for nothing. We will study these issues and give you recommendations. We will certainly be

truly independent. We will not cost you a nickel. We will do the kind of research and advising that you say you need”.

Many resources are open to members of Parliament and certainly to the justice minister. There are professors in universities in the area of law and law reform whose mandate is to do independent research. They would be delighted to share the fruits of their labours with lawmakers. However, all of a sudden even more researchers will be hired to do even more research when there is plenty being done.

This bill is not needed. It does not do the work that it is supposed to do. It sets up yet another bunch of appointed people to be used by the minister to validate what he wants to do anyway. This is a very bad piece of legislation, especially at a time when the country is going deeper into debt by millions of dollars every day.

I would urge the House to reject the setting up of yet another body and yet another commission, that we get on with the job of doing this work with the elected people who we are already paying and that we forget and scrap these kinds of measures. They are not needed and they will not do a better job for Canadians than is already being done.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in looking at this bill, I have been trying to figure out what it is that the Liberals are attempting to accomplish. The thesis of my speech today is Liberal patronage.

The question has to be asked: Where is the money coming from that will create the new agency whose work is already being done by the justice department? When the law reform commission was abolished some of the funding was redirected to the justice department. Is the \$3 million for this new commission coming from the justice department which is already doing that type of work? Will there be a cut in the department's budget to make way for the new commission?

• (1610)

It is rather instructive to look at what was said by the previous government when it cut the law commission. The Hon. Gilles Loiselle, President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State for Finance on April 30, 1992 said:

The Law Reform Commission was created in 1971. It has played a useful role in conducting an ongoing review of the statutes of Canada, in co-ordinating non-governmental research on legal issues, and in providing independent advice to the Minister of Justice.

The government has concluded, however, that these functions can be fulfilled without maintaining a separate organization. Responsibility for commissioning outside research will be assigned to the Department of Justice, with the minister and the department seeking the views of researchers and practitioners in universities and elsewhere. The Law Reform Commission will accordingly be wound up and any necessary continuing resources transferred to the Department of Justice.

Government Orders

The Liberals are trying to make work for their Liberal lawyer friends and are revisiting the Liberal law reform commission. Where did the \$3 million come from? Did it come from the resources that were returned to the justice department by the previous Conservative government or has the government just dug a little bit deeper into the trough so that it can reward its Liberal lawyer friends?

By eliminating the law reform commission in 1992 the government of the day was moving toward eliminating duplication. My Liberal friends of today do not necessarily understand the concept of eliminating duplication, particularly if they can be setting up more boards to employ more Liberals.

The government wants to bring the law commission back. Much of the work can be done by the justice department which has far greater resources. I refer to comments by Peter McCreath who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State (Finance and Privatization) on April 30, 1992. He said:

It is not as if the kind of work that has been done by the Law Reform Commission of Canada will cease if the law reform commission ceases to exist. It is very important that kind of research continues to take place—

Law reform is possible in Canada even without the Law Reform Commission.

In the name of logic, are the Liberals of today actually saying that the work previously being done by the law reform commission over the last four years has not been done? That is a little bit of a stretch in terms of credulity.

I am trying to drive home the reason why the Liberals of today are trying to bring this back for their Liberal lawyer friends. The members of this new commission will be order in council appointees. It may be another chance to let the few remaining Liberal supporters in this country who do not have government jobs get on the government payroll. In short, the commission has the opportunity to be a haven for political appointees.

I would like the member for Kingston and the Islands, who loves to kibitz on this, to directly refute that this commission will not be a place to put the wonderful Liberal lawyer friends of this government today. In fact that is the reason why this is being redone.

Mr. Milliken: I hope it is.

Mr. Morrison: But he is a lawyer.

Mr. Abbott: Is he a lawyer?

Mr. Morrison: Of course he is a lawyer.

Mr. Abbott: Is he a lawyer? We listen to him talk and talk and talk so he must be a lawyer.

Government Orders

We have seen the Minister of Justice begin politicizing our courts by several of his recent appointments of defeated Liberal candidates and Liberal riding presidents to the benches.

I am going to deal with the issue of patronage in detail at the conclusion of my speech but I am still working to develop this case. Actually I do not have to work to develop this case. It is so obvious.

The Minister of Justice will have to be consulted before the agenda of the commission is set. As was pointed out by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North, this is very clearly not an arm's length organization. Is it not really just Liberal logic to say that these people are independent—

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Is there such a thing?

Mr. Abbott: Is there such a thing as Liberal logic? Well, these things do happen.

The minister states that the commission will operate at arm's length. That is really magic because there is a little discrepancy here. He wants it to be independent, but he wants it to do what he wants it to do.

• (1615)

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Selfish.

Mr. Abbott: I do not know about selfish, but it certainly defies the whole idea of—

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Liberal logic.

Mr. Abbott: —Liberal logic. You got it.

The minister also gets a say in the appointment of council members. In short, it appears that the new law commission will be an extension of the minister's and the department's staff. If it is simply an extension of the minister's and department's staff, why are we setting it up? Why not just give the justice department another \$3 million and say to get on with the job? If that is what this whole process is all about, there certainly would have been a less expensive way than going through the whole business of coming up with this legislation. Why did he not ask for an extra \$3 million from the Minister of Finance?

It is interesting that the former member for Edmonton—Strathcona on November 25, 1992 in talking about the old Law Reform Commission said: "It costs \$4.9 million each year". I should point out that the Liberals always start low and aim high. They are only starting at \$3 million right now. Who is to know where the cost of this commission is going to go? I come back to the member's comments: "It costs \$4.9 million each year. It has five full time

commissioners and"—believe it or not—"a staff of 36. That is a lot of staff and a lot of commissioners, and it costs a lot of money. It is my belief that in Canada we have created too many commissions, too many boards and in a certain way we have devalued Parliament".

What is really scary is that the situation of creating too many commissions and getting things out of the control of parliamentarians was started by the Liberals and the Conservatives attempted to terminate it in their feeble little way. Now that the Liberals are back, guess what? We have the re-creation of yet another commission. Terrific.

"I would rather see", the member said, and this reflects the comments of the member for Calgary North, "work of this nature done by parliamentary committees—. I say to my colleagues in response, we have had an independent agency that has done a lot of good work but it is time we ourselves did this work and brought some prestige back to Parliament. Let us not devalue Parliament by giving its role to outsiders".

Reflecting on the most recent legislation by this Liberal government, it does devalue the whole role of Parliament and parliamentarians. It just treats this place like a rubber stamp. When the Liberals are not getting their own way they simply bring in the pile driver of closure to make sure that it gets through, as witness the reintroduction of this piece of legislation.

The member said: "We can do that independent work. There is also a fiscal argument here. It is an expenditure of \$5 million a year. We have had a deficit over the past years of roughly \$30 billion a year,"—and of course it has gone up since then—"now \$34.6 billion has to be borrowed. We have to borrow that money each year and then we have to borrow money to cover the interest on that money each year".

In parenthesis I point out to all the Liberals present that their government, in the life of this government, will increase the annual interest charge on the debt that they have accumulated by \$11 billion a year. It is an increase. That is only the difference between what the interest charge was when this government came in. When these people are kicked out of office in 1997, they will have added an annual interest charge of \$11 billion a year to service the debt, yet they are perfectly prepared to spend another \$3 million a year.

The member went on: "We have to borrow that money each year and then we have to borrow money to cover the interest on the money each year. It is a vicious cycle. The government has to take a hard look at where we spend our money. Some of this work will be contracted out but there will be a net saving".

The point of my speech today very simply is that this government did not learn anything. The Liberals were booted out for a nine year period when there were people here who tinkered around the edges. They really did not get anything done but at least they understood that we cannot spend money we do not have. Those

people on the other side of the House to this day still do not understand that basic concept.

There was an interesting article in the November 21, 1995 *Financial Post* in which Deborah McCorkell-Hoy, director of the law reform division of the Department of Justice had some really interesting comments. I quote from the article:

When the commission was set up, McCorkell-Hoy said, everyone agreed that it should be as independent as possible, but it "needs to be tied to the needs of Canadians".

To put that into effect, the bill creates a 25 member advisory council "to advise on the strategic direction of the commission and review its performance".

As well, specific reform projects will be monitored and advised by panels of expert specialists.

McCorkell-Hoy points out several areas that could attract business partners and funding:

Intellectual property and its relationship to new information technologies.

Biotechnology, a subject in which law reform "has tremendous implications for the economy of the country, and yet the law is unknown".

• (1620)

Well, of course, we are dealing with the Liberal government.

Federal financial regulatory mechanisms, especially in international commercial law.

Since the bill gives the commission a wide mandate to develop "new approaches to, and new concepts of, law", it's not inconceivable that other federal areas such as taxation, corporate law, labour law, unemployment insurance or immigration could be research targets.

Right there, in the words of this official from the justice department, we have a very clear and very specific indication that this bill is being set up to reward the government's Liberal lawyer friends. That is what it is all about. It is a make work project.

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Patronage.

Mr. Abbott: Well, was it not a minister who said that we should have more transparent patronage? Is that not what he said in the House the other day? Only the Liberals would say that.

The point I am trying to drive home and for the people of Canada to understand, is that when the Liberals run out of work they can give to their friends, they come up with some kind of a make work project like this one. What do we have in Canada as a result of the charter of rights and freedoms but a charter industry populated by high priced lawyers who go around trying to figure out how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. This is only in the wonderful world of the Liberals.

We have stated, since its inception, that the country needs less government, not more. Canada has no lack of agencies, boards or commissions. Creating another agency when the work proposed is

Government Orders

already being done makes absolutely no sense, which is the thesis of my speech.

It is not a matter of privatizing law reform. There is no mention of making cuts within the justice department when its work will be done by the commission. This is a make work project for the government's Liberal lawyer friends. That is it, plain and simple. This is a Liberal patronage bill.

Look at the fact that the Prime Minister is not satisfied to just appoint Liberal bagmen to the other place. People go there and travel at taxpayers' expense going around and collecting funds for the Liberal government for the upcoming election. He is not satisfied with that.

As a matter of fact, Senator Taylor, the most recent appointment to the other place, was very open, honest, candid and frank when he said: "This is a patronage appointment. I have been a Liberal all of my life and this is what I get for it". He got appointed to the other place so that he can travel around and pick up money for those people. It is absolutely shameful.

If we value the work of an independent commission, why is the justice minister so closely involved in the process? Because this is not an independent commission. That is why. This is a process of making work for Liberal lawyer friends.

The justice minister picks appointees, he has a say on the agenda and will have flexibility in response to the commission's recommendations. Even after these lawyers get paid all of this money, the justice minister will have flexibility. If we were to translate that, the justice minister can ignore the recommendations. These recommendations have the potential of being of absolutely no value except the value that has been siphoned out of the pockets of tax paying Canadians.

If we are truly interested in the modernization and reform of Canadian law, why would we not have a completely independent body without such a large role for the Minister of Justice?

I rest my case. The plain fact of the matter is that because of the very, very close tie-in, the connections, the absolute control by the minister of justice, this law does nothing except make work for Liberal lawyer friends.

• (1625)

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague on a very logical, well put together and erudite examination of Bill C-9.

There are huge problems today in the justice department and in the ability of our men and women in uniform who go out on the streets every day to defend the rights of innocent civilians. They put their lives on the line every day. If we speak to them we will

Government Orders

find they are incredibly dissatisfied with the justice department and the laws and regulations it has put forth over the last 20 years which have significantly hampered their honourable goals for Canadian society.

What constructive suggestions does the hon. member feel we could put forth, such as victims rights, repealing section 745 and such? I would like to hear his views on these very important issues.

Mr. Abbott: Madam Speaker, there are many issues the justice minister is absolutely ignoring and I might suggest at his peril and the peril of the Liberal Party. They are issues like section 745 which has the absolute backing of the majority of the members of this House and the majority of people in Canada. It also has the backing particularly of the victims of the people who are currently incarcerated who may become eligible under section 745. There are many, many bills like that.

It is so obvious and seems quite clear to me, to return to my original thesis, that this bill is simply a make work project. The justice minister is not listening. We could not only save the time of this House and the cost of putting this bill through, but we could also save the \$3 million a year that will be forked out to the Liberal lawyer friends.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I understand the member has a substantial interest in law and order issues. The speech he has just given indicates that this bill in particular is of great interest to him. Perhaps the member for Kootenay East could explain to the House and to his constituents why he never turned up in committee to discuss the bill.

Mr. Abbott: Madam Speaker, as you would be aware and I know the member is aware, a member of Parliament has many responsibilities be they in revenue, in heritage, whatever the case may be.

This issue is of tremendous importance to people in my constituency. As a matter of fact, I devoted my most recent householder entirely to the issue of crime and what the ordinary citizen could be doing about crime even under the meagre, pitiful laws the Liberals are presently toying with.

As we have been given the opportunity today, when I do have some time available to speak to this issue, I speak on behalf of the people of Kootenay East. They say to this government to get on with the job, change the justice system and do not tinker and play with it with these silly make work projects.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am so glad the hon. member for Kootenay East was able to clarify why at the beginning of speech he was asking all those questions about the bill. He wanted to know various details about the bill, why the minister was not doing this, why the minister was not doing that, why the bill did not do this, why the bill did not do

that. We all know why he does not know the answers. He did not attend the committee meetings.

I am astounded the hon. member would say in justification for his failure to show up to discuss the bill in committee that what he did was put out a householder to his constituents about law and order issues. Why did he not put out one on his attendance?

• (1630)

I suggest that had he put out one explaining where he was when he was not at the justice committee discussing what he says is a very important bill, perhaps his constituents would have understood a bit more about his views on justice matters.

Mr. Abbott: Madam Speaker, of course we are talking to the now defunct, failed, fired parliamentary secretary who used to spend all of his time in the House.

Maybe I could ask him the same question. Did he attend the justice committee? Did he attend the finance committee? Did he attend the heritage committee? Did he attend the natural resources committee? Did he attend the environment committee? What was he doing wasting his time here in the House, running around like he did before, making all sorts of these little yattering noises?

We all know very well that what really goes on is when a member of Parliament comes to Ottawa, unfortunately even if he is six foot five and 250 pounds, he cannot be dissected and sent to this committee, that committee and also be in the House to answer the inanities of the former parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Kootenay East managed to get through that particular matter without answering the question as to why he was not in committee. He has made comments about the member for Kingston and the Islands who was fulfilling his duties in the House, quite different from some of the members opposite. Again, he has not mentioned why he was not in committee.

I am sure he cannot make that comment about me in the justice committee because I was in that committee all the time, even on this bill. I never saw him once. Perhaps he can now take this opportunity to answer why he was not at any time at any of those committee meetings dealing with this bill.

Mr. Abbott: Madam Speaker, it is interesting that the member speaks about fulfilling his duties. I wonder if the member would care to stand up perhaps in the next segment in debate when he can answer the question of how he fulfilled his duty in that committee on Bill C-68 when the people in his constituency clearly and demonstrably gave him direction that he was to vote against Bill C-68.

Government Orders

I suggest the reason he did not fulfil his responsibility to his people in his constituency was that he knew if he kept quiet on Bill C-68 he just might have a chance of being appointed the chair of that committee.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Madam Speaker, today we are speaking about Bill C-9, an act to create the Law Commission of Canada.

This commission was set up to do some relatively general things. It was set up to study, analyse and give advice on measures to improve our justice system.

This is another sad day in Parliament. This is another example of what I call studyitis. When we have problems in this country do we address those problems? Do we bring forth constructive solutions to impact on those problems in an effective way? No. What do we do? We study them. We analyse them. Perhaps we give advice on them.

There have been thousands of studies on ways to improve justice in Canada. All we need to do is come together to look at those solutions, take the best solutions out of those suggestions and impart those to the Canadian justice system for all Canadians.

As we speak people are being raped, murdered, assaulted, robbed, all manner of terrible things are happening to them, and the justice department has been largely ineffective, particularly in the last 10 years, in dealing with these problems.

We have another Pavlovian response by the government to some very serious problems that exist in Canada today. It is not benign. It will cost taxpayers \$3 million to bring the commission together. Again we have to ask why. Why are we doing this when constructive solutions already exist?

• (1635)

I do not agree with the commission. I challenge the Minister of Justice and the solicitor general to work together with our party, which has put together many constructive improvements for the justice system, to enact those improvements. I send that challenge out to them and I hope they respond.

I would like to introduce constructive solutions on which we can work to improve the justice system.

First, we have a problem with the time it takes an individual who is arrested to be tried and convicted. Today we have a very onerous system. It takes a great deal of time before the person who is charged is brought to justice. One of the things we could do to expedite the time involved would be to eliminate preliminary hearings. They are expensive, time consuming and they delay justice. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Second, we could limit the number of appeals available to convicted persons. Appeals must happen. It is the only fair way to

have a balance and a check in the existing system. However, to allow individuals to continually appeal is wrong. It is a waste of taxpayer money.

Third, we could limit the number of adjournments which lawyers can introduce during the course of a trial. Currently lawyers can introduce umpteen adjournments. They cause an incredible backlog in the courts. There must be a fair number of adjournments to ensure that due process takes place. However, if we limit their number we could expedite the process while ensuring the accused receives a fair trial.

Fourth, the Minister of Justice could introduce a DNA data bank. This would enable police officers across Canada to take DNA samples from accused individuals and place them into the data bank. It would help police officers to speed up their analysis of criminals. If a person is innocent they have nothing to fear. Is this an abrogation of an individual's rights? Absolutely not. It is something we could introduce today for the collective good of all Canadians. A DNA data bank would expedite a person's guilt or innocence.

Fifth, it is very important that we repeal section 745. I have heard the intervention by the Minister of Justice. He said there are many exceptions to this rule. However, we have to understand that section 745 applies to individuals convicted of first degree murder. It is very difficult to convict a person of first degree murder. Those who are convicted are guilty of heinous crimes, including the murder of a police officer. The number of individuals convicted of these crimes and who were released after 15 years is shocking. It sends a very bad message to those contemplating vicious crimes.

Consider the juvenile system. Juvenile violent crime is on the increase. It is the fastest growing aspect of crime in the country. Something must be done about it. Unfortunately the solutions attempted by the government have been wholly inadequate. It is high time the government began to implement constructive solutions for youth. Youth crime is a tragedy.

• (1640)

What we should do is name youths convicted of a crime. This would show them they cannot hide behind anonymity when committing a heinous crime. We have to speed the process from apprehension to trial, as I mentioned before. We need to have constructive solutions to address the precursors to those children who lead a life of crime.

This comes down to some of the determinates of health which have not been widely looked at. Many of these juveniles go on to live a life of crime. I have worked in adult and juvenile jails both as a doctor and as a correctional officer. Many of these individuals have had tragic family histories. They live in a family milieu which breeds a psychology that can lead to conduct disorders and then to crime.

Government Orders

When we identify these family circumstances, we need to bring to bear the full resources we have to try to ameliorate these circumstances. Sometimes this cannot be done. Unfortunately the system we have today ensures that those children continue to remain in the tragic, harmful, often violent and always repressive situation. Sexual violence often exists within the family and if not that, physical violence and an enormous amount of neglect.

The mindset we have today within our social programs and the justice department is to keep these children basically where they are. This is a mistake. A child cannot change his or her pattern of behaviour if they are living under these very tragic family circumstances. It is imperative that these children be removed from the home for as long as it takes for the family situation to become sufficiently better so that the child's basic needs are met and their personal safety is ensured.

Work and skills training should be made obligatory not only for adults but for juveniles. This will be imperative if they are to become a functional member of society when released from jail.

Many individuals, particularly in adult institutions, have problems with substance abuse. Jails do try to some extent to address the problem but the way they do it is wholly inadequate. Conditional on their release, if substance abuse is identified as a contributing factor to their criminal behaviour, they should take part in effective substance abuse programs in the judicial system.

We must also look at the rights of the victims, something we have not heard much about in the House. This is absolutely imperative. We have to hold the rights of victims as the pre-eminent issue in justice. We must protect the rights of innocent civilians above those of criminals, period. That is the primary role of justice. Right now that is not what we are seeing.

My colleague earlier today in question period, when asking a question to the Minister of Justice, gave a profoundly tragic example of a woman who was murdered because she could not get the information needed from the judicial system that the individual she was with was violent and that her life was at risk. Who are we trying to protect, the criminals or the victim? We must protect the victim. I do not care about these spurious arguments put forth about protecting the human rights of an individual. The person whose human rights must be protected first and foremost is the victim. Therefore our party has put forth many constructive solutions, including making obligatory victim impact statements, appropriate restitution to the victim and counselling.

• (1645)

I will give a really sad example that happened in my constituency. A lady came to my office. Her 13-year old son, an invalid, was sexually abused by an older boy, a 17-year-old. When they went to

court and the older boy was convicted of sexually abusing the handicapped 13-year-old, the 17-year-old said he was a victim.

The 17-year-old got more counselling, money from this institution, from the justice department, than the victim, much more. That is not justice at all. Who are we trying to protect?

We need balance. The accused and the convicted must be treated too. To ignore them is to ignore society at our peril. We must also first and foremost be able to protect, treat and deal with the victims of some terrible crimes that exist in society.

We see little justice in the justice system. We see a crisis of conscience within those men and women who put their lives on the line every day to protect us.

I spoke with some members of a police force yesterday. They echo what is said by police officers in my riding, that the system we have today simply does not work. We cannot merely tinker around the edges. We have to impact some good, strong, effective solutions and we need to do it now. If we do not do it now, more innocent civilians will be unnecessarily hurt.

We can address the precursors to the individuals who commit these crimes. By doing that, we will be saving ourselves not only money but a lot of grief and individuals who need not be hurt in the future.

It is up to us in the House to look at these effective solutions today and enact them. It is not up to us to enact another bill, to develop another commission to do more studying, to give more advice, to do more analysis to enact solutions that are already on the books.

The solutions are there and I challenge the government once again to look at those solutions and bring them to the floor of the House. Let us have a vigorous debate and pick the best ones. There are many that were done by learned individuals.

I hope hon. members opposite will take it upon themselves to bring forth some effective solution for all Canadians to protect them and to prevent further crimes. It must be done today.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Before we proceed with questions and comments, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway, health.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I was really interested in the comments by my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. One of the thoughts that crossed my mind was a term I was trying to think of earlier in the most recent exchange. What we are looking for here is Liberal logic. Basically he has asked them to take a look at some very logical, rational ideas that would put the rights of the victim first.

Government Orders

Would he agree with me that the term Liberal logic is the ultimate oxymoron?

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for the question. It never ceases to amaze me why, with all the resources we have, with all the intelligent people who sit in the House today, we do not enact these solutions. The power to do this lies with the government. Liberal logic is indeed an oxymoron. Here the Liberals have the opportunity for a solution and they play politics with it and fritter it away. Why? The goal of the House is not to enact solutions, the goal is not to bring forth good solutions to the Canadian public. The goal is the maintenance of power. The problems of the country become secondary to effective solutions to address the problems of the country. The problems become secondary to the acquisition and maintenance of power. That is a huge disservice to the Canadian people.

• (1650)

If the Canadian public only knew what went on in the House and how we are living in a very pyramidal system where the important decisions of the country are made by approximately 12 elected officials and a number of non-elected and unaccountable officials, it would be shocked.

All is not lost, however. If the government would remove itself from its profound and primary desire to maintain power and looked beyond that to build a better House of Commons which gives the ability to individual members of Parliament, across party lines, to represent their constituents effectively and to put forth effective solutions, which gives the power to committees to bring forth solutions and legislative initiatives to the House, there would be a much more democratic situation in the country. By doing so we would build a stronger Canada.

Instead we have a situation in which the frontbenches and the whip structures cower members in the back to do exactly what their leader tells them to do.

That does their constituents a disservice because there are numerous good solutions that the backbenchers have which I have spoken to many times. There is no reason why those solutions cannot be brought forth for the public to digest, debate and for us to debate in the House.

If we accept the current so-called democratic situation we have here today, we should be ashamed of ourselves. The House is far from being a democracy.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[Translation]

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Pursuant to Standing Order 35(5)(a), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until 5.30 p.m. today, at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

[English]

AGREEMENT 20 ON INTERNAL TRADE IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

• (1655)

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): This is the ruling by the Speaker on Bill C-19, an act to implement the agreement on internal trade.

There are three motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-19.

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be grouped for debate but voted on separately.

[Translation]

Motion No. 3 will be debated and voted on separately.

I will now submit Motions Nos. 1 and 2 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-19, in Clause 9, be amended

(a) by replacing line 5, on page 3, with the following:

“nor in Council may, by order, subject to subsection (1), do any one or”; and

(b) by adding after line 13, on page 3, the following:

“(2) Any order made under subsection (1) is subject to the adoption by the House of Commons of a resolution explaining the measures contemplated by the order, which shall have been debated for two days before being put to a vote.”

Government Orders

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-19, in Clause 14, be amended

(a) by replacing line 6, on page 4, with the following:

“14. (1) The Governor in Council shall, by”; and

(b) by replacing line 10, on page 4, with the following:

“ing out the purposes of the Agreement only after scrutiny and approval by the appropriate committee of the House of Commons”.

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address the motion which I just moved, Motion No. 1. Even though you read it, I would like to read it again to make sure that people understand its meaning. The motion reads:

“(2) Any order made under subsection (1) is subject to the adoption by the House of Commons of a resolution explaining the measures contemplated by the order, which shall have been debated for two days before being put to a vote.”

As Quebecers, we supported the free trade agreement with the United States. We support, in principle, free competition. We worked very hard to give Quebec access to the vast U.S. market. We know that, at times, the Canadian market was harder for Quebecers to penetrate than the U.S. one. Deregulating internal trade seems like a good idea.

We must deregulate so as to not impede free competition or the movement of goods, services and people. During the last referendum campaign, we Quebec sovereignists spoke at length of an economic partnership with the rest of Canada. This measure is a step forward that will allow for the free competition and the partnership that we sought to have with the other Canadian provinces.

• (1700)

As I said a moment ago, we have always been very favourable to free trade and, I repeat, we would like to see a very open economic partnership among the provinces so that we can work much more freely with the other provinces in Canada and, naturally, at least have the possibility of conducting trade as easily between provinces as with the United States.

That is what we are proposing in this motion, and particularly with respect to disputes, the committee which will settle disputes between provinces. We have a committee that settles disputes between Canada and the United States, but the bill that deals with an internal trade agreement sets up a committee to settle disputes that will arise over time.

This is where we have a problem. The process is rather complex. We are told there will be a complaints secretariat; if a complaint cannot be settled internally by officers of the permanent secretariat, there will be three other possibilities. First of all, there is the possibility of consultation, at the request of the secretariat. We will also have an internal trade committee. This committee will be a

permanent one, with representatives from all the provinces, appointed by the provinces through a rather special procedure, with which we are also in agreement.

It will also be possible to form a special group, a sort of arbitrator for very serious conflicts between certain businesses that are not adhering to the rules of the agreement. If the working group decides on a course of action that is not sufficiently stringent or accepted, then the next step will be trade action taken by the government.

This is where we have a problem. Trade action can be implemented by order of the governor in council, in other words, by cabinet. That is why I am tabling this motion. We do not agree that the government should be allowed to decide by order to act, because I feel that the governor in council could decide, almost in secrecy, to act.

This is where the problem lies. There could be conflicts between economic sectors of activity or conflicts between certain businesses or ways of doing business. There will be some economic sectors in conflict with others, with the bulk of a given economic sector under the control of one or a few provinces, to the detriment of another.

This goes beyond trade and might affect the economy of a province, any province. That is why we in the Bloc Québécois propose in this motion that there be a debate of at least two days in the House of Commons before the order takes effect. We feel that this is very important because it could affect a province.

This is not only a matter of trade. In some cases it may lead to confrontation between certain provinces.

• (1705)

This is the reason we believe there must be more transparency and a public debate, before the government acts. I have referred to the entire process, an excellent one, for settling differences. It is very well organized, very safe and complex and will, I think, be able to play an effective role. But, if the process cannot work, I envisage serious repercussions which must be revealed publicly and debated publicly.

For this reason, I find this is a bit risky. Some provinces, in any case, might be affected on the economic level. This is why we feel there must be debate for two days before we go ahead with a ministerial order.

These are the main reasons. We in Quebec are also somewhat concerned to see the federal government taking this decision via an order. We see this as just one more power the federal government is giving itself. It is another example of the federal's centralization. Since this is an agreement between the provinces why, in the long run, is it the federal government which will settle the matter by an order. This strikes us as somewhat dangerous. The federal govern-

ment might favour one province over another because of the power it has given itself to settle certain problems relating to internal trade.

Overall, we are in favour of liberalizing trade between the provinces, but we strongly insist—and I address these words particularly to the government members who will be having to vote on this—that they support this motion, so that MPs from the party in power will have the opportunity to have their say. Perhaps the government members representing certain regions will express themselves freely, so that their region, or their province, will be protected in sectors which might affect another province.

For this reason, we deem it very important to debate the matter in a way that is both open and transparent. I hope the government members will take this motion under consideration.

[*English*]

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Motion No. 2 regarding changes to the bill that will implement the agreement on internal trade.

During my address today I will explain that without the inclusion of my amendment, Bill C-19 will not address the concerns of Canadian taxpayers who are tired of the onslaught of patronage appointments from this Liberal government.

I will explain how my amendment will improve this legislation to serve the best interests of Canadians by providing a transparent system of scrutinizing governor in council appointments as they pertain to the agreement on internal trade.

The amended clause would read as follows:

14(1) The Governor in Council shall, by order, appoint any person to fill any position that may be necessary or advisable, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, for carrying out the purposes of the agreement only after scrutiny and approval by the appropriate committee of the House of Commons.

Government ministers have made a practice of conducting the business of governor in council appointments in secret. The salaries which are bestowed on these appointees are paid for by the taxpayers. It is only right that these same taxpayers should have a say in how many appointments are made and how much the commissioners are paid.

• (1710)

This amendment establishes elected members of Parliament serving on committees as scrutineers to patronage appointments. It will ensure that Canadians, through their elected members of Parliament, play a role in governor in council appointments.

Government Orders

The process thus far has been anything but open. Even though the Liberals campaigned on integrity in government and pledged to award governor in council appointments based on merit, Liberal Party affiliation has been at least as important as merit. I would suggest that it has been far more important in many of the patronage appointments made by the government.

This amendment will help the Liberals to keep their election promise. After all, everyone needs a little help now and again.

The agreement on internal trade, which will be implemented by this legislation, was contrived from executive meetings involving cabinet officials of the 12 provinces and territories along with the federal government. These 13 government bodies are defined as parties to the agreement. Their objective is the removal of interprovincial trade barriers which cost Canadians between \$6 billion and \$10 billion a year. The objective is, indeed, admirable. The government is to be congratulated for taking the first step in freeing up trade within Canada. Unfortunately, it is only a very small first step.

The result of this process so far is a seriously flawed agreement which identifies the problems, yet does very little to solve them. The important thing to remember is that all provinces and territories signed the agreement showing an intent to remove trade barriers. The problem exists in the means available to remove those barriers.

The agreement on internal trade outlines a series of legitimate objections which allow exemptions to the agreement. These objections are based on public security and safety; public order; protection of human, animal or plant life and health; the protection of the environment; consumer protection; protection of the health, safety and well-being of workers; and affirmative action programs for disadvantaged groups. If it can be proven that any of these provisions will be infringed on by the removal of a barrier, they will be exempt from the agreement. By doing this a party can protect specific interests very easily.

The fact that all agreements are based on the unanimous support of all parties leaves the door open to protectionist practices. This is evident in the removal of a dispute settlement mechanism in the energy sector. Just last week the House debated the Churchill Falls power contract. The trade barrier created by the contract is costing Newfoundland and Labrador close to \$1 billion a year in lost energy revenue.

The very principle on which the agreement on internal trade is based is contravened by that contract. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador look to the new agreement on internal trade to right the wrong. Unfortunately, the process of deliberation between the provinces does not provide any real hope for the resolution of this problem as the agreement now stands.

Government Orders

The definition of a legitimate objective is extremely vague. It encompasses nearly every protectionist measure implemented by the provinces and ensures that barriers will continue to exist.

It is obvious from this language that disputes between parties will arise. It is imperative that a trade agreement contain a dispute settlement mechanism which is fair, effective and binding.

It remains to be seen whether the dispute settlement mechanism in the agreement will be effective. However it has met with considerable criticism from a wide range of groups, individuals and companies that have examined this agreement.

• (1715)

The process that individuals and governments have to go through to settle a dispute is lengthy, complicated and limits the access of individual businesses to the mechanism. The Minister of Industry and his provincial counterparts had the arduous task of striking an agreement which not only addressed the barriers to trade in Canada but was also agreeable to all parties on all issues. This was partially accomplished, although many of the sectors were not addressed effectively. That is the problem. Some were not addressed at all.

The committee of ministers set out objectives for designing the dispute resolution mechanism. This was to include: (a) disputes are to be directed by governments rather than private parties; (b) non-confrontation resolutions are to be used wherever possible; (c) no access to the courts will be granted in dispute settlements, no room for court interpretations; (d) restrict access to private parties in order to minimize the possibilities of frivolous claims being used as a means of harassing governments, resulting in financial burdens.

I want to repeat part of the last criteria set out by governments in this agreement: to restrict the access of private parties in order to minimize the possibility of frivolous claims being used as a means of harassing governments. This agreement is more concerned with protecting governments from harassment than it is with protecting individual Canadians and individual Canadian companies. That shows there is a real flaw in the thinking that has gone into the dispute settlement mechanism.

I question the rationale for restricting individuals access to dispute resolution mechanisms. As stated earlier, trade barriers cost Canadians money and jobs. Therefore Canadians need to be assured that their concerns on the existence of these barriers will be duly heard and acted on.

Access to dispute resolution mechanisms by individual Canadians ensures that the concerns of small businesses that rely heavily on internal trade will be dealt with. The purpose of this agreement is not to appease governments but rather to ensure

access to markets across Canada. That is the purpose of this agreement.

The agreement on internal trade includes a provision which allows individuals access to the dispute resolution mechanism. The following is a brief outline of that provision. As I go through it, members will acknowledge that the mechanism is much too complex, much too slow and has no teeth.

First, an individual company is to contact its party to the agreement. Its party is either a provincial or the federal government, depending on jurisdiction. If the government involved refuses to act on its behalf, the party that wants to use the mechanism can contact the internal trade secretariat and apply for individual to government consultation.

Before access is granted, an individual has to undergo a screening process which determines whether the individual's claim is frivolous or vexatious. If it is deemed to be frivolous or vexatious, then the claim is disqualified and the individual company is not allowed to go through the dispute settlement mechanism.

If the claim is deemed valid, then the dispute will be heard by a panel of experts. This is where my amendment comes in. Each province and the territories, along with the federal government, will appoint five panelists to a roster that will consist of 65 panelists.

The terms of reference of these experts, their pay and their accountability is not mentioned in either the agreement or in this bill. The agreement also calls for the appointment to the office of the secretariat of internal trade of screeners and others as needed by the governor in council. The bill asks Canadians to sign a blank cheque for an undetermined number of people, to be paid an undetermined amount of money, to do an undetermined job.

• (1720)

Canadians are tired of this kind of patronage appointment. They want accountability. In fact, when the Liberals were in opposition they too wanted accountability of order in council appointments. They suggested that there be established a non-partisan nomination and confirmation procedure for order in council appointments. Is it not interesting now that the Liberals are the government they forget what they wanted when they were in opposition?

My amendment will deal with this problem of openness in order in council appointments.

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the two motions on the floor I will deal first with the matter that was brought forward by the hon. member from the Bloc Party.

Government Orders

I would suggest this amendment is one that really reflects a continuing misunderstanding of how the dispute resolution procedures of the agreement are intended to operate.

The amendment is quite unnecessary because then the federal government would be tied to a procedure to which none of the other parties under the agreement are tied. There are 13 parties and the other 12 would not be tied to the procedure.

Further, Motion No. 1 is nothing but an attempt to restrict the scope of action that the government may legitimately expect to have to ensure that it is able to protect the national interest in the negotiated balance of benefits in the agreement on internal trade.

The proposed amendment by the hon. member for the Bloc is a cumbersome procedure. It is unnecessary and it is time consuming. It is unnecessary because the government in any retaliatory procedure under the act, the retaliatory measures first of all by the government must be fully consistent with the agreement on internal trade. Second, they are matters that are entirely within the government's constitutional jurisdiction.

Again I emphasize that the procedure being suggested is one that only the federal government would be required to follow. None of the other parties would have to follow it.

The amendment in effect would be an attempt to unilaterally amend the agreement that all parties have agreed to already. This cannot be done. The amendment is a disguised effort to delay or to impede the ability of the government to act in the national interest in areas that are clearly within its own jurisdiction. For these reasons I suggest that this amendment does not warrant the support of the House.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member from the Reform Party involves a much broader question. It that involves the question of approval of government appointments. This was dealt with in committee and has already been rejected.

The committee was not the place where this matter should have been dealt with. The motion should be dealt with in another committee if the Reform Party is intent on pursuing such a matter.

• (1725)

This amendment proposes a complex method of making appointments. It is obvious the Reform Party has one intention, to tie up the House continuously in matters like this so business cannot go ahead. That is all on which the Reform Party is intent. The amendment is an attempt to grandstand, it is not an attempt to try to see that the business of the House proceeds in an orderly manner.

I would suggest this is a matter that it is not appropriate to deal with at this time and it should be rejected.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Longueuil wish to speak to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Vegreville?

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I would like us to move on to Motion No. 3.

[*English*]

Mr. Benoit: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood that Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are grouped together and Motion No. 3 is to be debated separately. I would like to make a few comments on Motion No. 3 as presented by the Bloc.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member. Motion No. 3 is in the next group. We are dealing with the first two now.

[*Translation*]

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Government Orders

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 3 in Group No. 2 will be debated and voted on separately.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-19, in Clause 20, be amended

(a) by replacing line 1, on page 6, with the following:

“20. (1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act or any provision thereof, or”; and

(b) by adding after line 4, on page 6, the following:

“(2) Any order made this section respecting the coming into force of section 19 is subject to an obligation on the part of the federal government to commence negotiations and to enter into an agreement with the government of Quebec to eliminate inconsistencies between the provisions of the Internal Trade Agreement and Quebec’s laws and regulations respecting bulk trucking.”

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief so we can finish at 5.30 p.m. First of all, the reason we introduced this motion—

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it is 5.30 p.m.

* * *

[*English*]

LAW COMMISSION OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-9, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-9, an act respecting the Law Commission of Canada.

Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 31*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Calder
Catterall
Cohen
Collins

Alcock
Althouse
Arseneault
Assadourian
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Cannis
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Collenette
Comuzzi

Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Discepolo
Dupuy
English
Finestone
Fry
Gagliano
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
Miffiin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O’Reilly
Paradis
Patri
Peric
Peterson
Proud
Regan
Rideout
Robinson
Serré
Sheridan
Skoke
St. Denis
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Zed—133

Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Duhamel
Easter
Fewchuk
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Irwin
Jordan
Keyes
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Manley
Massé
McGuire
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O’Brien
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wells
Young

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bélisle
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Jacob
Johnston
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)

Ablonczy
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bridgman
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Davialt
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier
Gouk
Grubel
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Jennings
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel

Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	St-Laurent
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)	Williams —74

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bergeron	Caron
Chamberlain	de Savoye
Deshaies	Gerrard
Guay	Guimond
Harper (Churchill)	Iftody
Lefebvre	Loubier
Marchand	Marchi
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	Nunziata
Stewart (Northumberland)	Wood

• (1755)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5.30 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]

BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.) moved that Bill C-216, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy) be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to begin second reading debate on Bill C-216, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy). The act has one objective and that is to control the relationship more completely between the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, which Canadians love to call the CRTC, and the public. For the purposes of this discussion I refer to the public as those people who presently receive television services by way of cable transmission, but this bill will also cover those Canadians who will soon receive television services by way of telephone lines or direct to home satellite services.

Controlling a relationship is never easy, we all know that. Yet this is a relationship, the connection between the CRTC and its public, which the Government of Canada through the Broadcasting

Private Members' Business

Act brought into existence and which we by Bill C-216 can once again bring back under control.

There are three components or factors to this argument which I refer to for discussion purposes as the three *cs*. These are: cost, choice and culture.

Last year when the CRTC authorized the grouping or bundling of new programs on to cable carriers and at the same time allowed cable companies across this country to charge more for them, that commission, those people who are supposedly protecting us and nurturing Canadian culture, forgot, ignored, or what I would suggest, turned their collective backs on Canadian cable subscribers. The consumers had two choices: they either paid more or they received less.

Who in this place could forget the anger, the vitriol and the simple disgust of those who were being held for ransom? We, the representatives of the people in this place, were besieged, harangued and generally deluged with hundreds of calls from angry consumers who from their perspective generally knew that their pockets were being picked with the express consent of the CRTC, the very government agency which was put there to protect them.

• (1800)

Canadian consumers quite simply were held ransom by an industry with an astounding 52 per cent return on its capital investment. Who can forget at the same time the reaction of the CRTC, which referred to this practice of negative option billing as a necessary evil?

From my perspective as a representative of a certain group of people, it was a necessary evil to tell my constituents that they would receive, wrapped in the bundle of new channels, Canadian culture.

As to the issues of cost and choice, the CRTC chose not to do anything. Who can forget that Keith Spicer, the architect of this policy, was out of the country on vacation when this storm struck?

Keith Spicer, the so-called czar of Canadian culture, was on a foreign holiday as Canadians received a post Christmas gift they did not want.

While Keith was out exploring foreign cultures, members of the House were publicly stating, to use one quote, that the CRTC was in bed with the cable companies. Newspapers across the country gave anecdotal reports of what individual consumers felt and planned to do. All ridings across the country are certainly aware of that.

Let us in the House not forget that it was not the cable companies that decided Canadians would receive seven new channels they did not ask for. It was the CRTC that licensed the new services after deciding which, in its collective wisdom, were best for the whole country.

At the same time, it was the CRTC that permitted the packaging of new channels, totally unsolicited by Canadians, with popular

Private Members' Business

programs such as "CNN", an American network, to give its favourite seven infant channels a chance of survival.

The *Globe and Mail* noted in its editorial of January 7, 1995: "Effectively the commission was levying a tax on television viewers to support quality broadcasting".

Canadians some 15 months later understand what the Consumers Association of Canada observed in January 1995, that the equality for the practice was backward.

The CRTC and the cable industry justified the negative option tactic in the name of culture, but in reality it was driven by business imperatives. It is very interesting.

It was reported on January 7, 1995 that the president of Rogers Cablesystems, Colin Watson, in an interview which was reported widely across the country stated that this sleight of hand called bundling or negative option billing was the only way that Rogers Cablesystems could sign up enough new customers.

I do not have to suggest to anyone in the House or anyone watching the proceedings today that every business in the country would love to be the beneficiary of this kind of largesse which the CRTC was doling out but for which the Canadian consumer was being told they would pay.

Canadian viewers were being told what they could watch and what they would pay in the name of Canadian culture. Is it not interesting that one of the conduits of Canadian culture has today as its most popular program, according to the rating agencies, reruns of the "Mary Tyler Show", a great Canadian show, and that another has that hybrid of *Cosmopolitan* and *Vogue* magazines called the "Fashion File" as its most popular program.

In return for this, seven new networks were guaranteed cash for life—that is my term—by the CRTC. Cable companies, as we now know, reluctantly bent to public pressure. They bent in the sense that they apologized for the behaviour and most gave a window of opportunity to opt out of the new channels, but never did they allow Canadians to decide up front that they could decline the channels.

The onus, the burden, the obligation was decidedly on the individual within a certain timeframe to either cancel the channels or pay for them. This is a unique and tragically Canadian way of selling Canadian culture.

More important, did Canadians receive any assurances from the CRTC that this would not happen again? Apologize? The cable companies did. The CRTC? Certainly not. Mr. Spicer and his commission, in my opinion, are much too busy regulating to acknowledge any errors.

• (1805)

Last week my office received from the CRTC a recent bulletin which stated: "The CRTC regulates the rates but expects each cable operator to inform subscribers in advance what subscribers

must do to have optional packages removed". I have to emphasize "removed", not "added".

The Canadian public today, 15 months later, does not have real choice on what services are to be added but only, in the words of the CRTC, what can be removed. Quite simply, negative option billing still survives. It is very much alive and well.

Canadians would also be upset to learn the CRTC is about to consider 40 new applications for specialty channels. Members of the House and Canadians will be pleased to know that the potential exists to receive, if the CRTC will bless them, such great Canadian programming as the "Horse Network", the "Home and Garden Network" and the "Mystery Network".

Forty corporations, most of them individuals who have recently incorporated shell companies, are poised to sell a concept which they hope will be richly rewarded by these guardians of Canadian television.

Soon telephone companies and direct to home satellite services will be channelling TV programming into homes across the country. What can those people expect? If we follow Mr. Spicer, the chair of the CRTC, in a speech delivered to the Canadian Cable Television Association, he noted that Canadian consumers want, deserve and will increasingly settle for nothing less than the maximum control possible over which services they select and pay for. As a consumer, Mr. Spicer agrees 100 per cent with that goal. He went on to say that full pick and pay, beyond a few rock bottom, common national interest services, can come only after this decade, meaning sometime in the year 2000 or thereafter.

With 40 applicants lining up, with new carriers pressing to enter the marketplace, we in the House have a choice, a choice we must make for consumers. That choice is clear. Bill C-216 would amend the Broadcasting Act, specifically section 3, so that consumers from this time forward will be given control over what they receive and the cost of what they receive.

Section 5 of the act imposes an obligation on the CRTC to regulate and supervise all aspects of the Canadian broadcasting system with a view to implementing the broadcasting policy which is set out in the act.

This bill would amend the broadcasting policy section, section 3, so that a cable distributor or other distribution undertaking, which could be a telephone company or a direct to home satellite company, could not demand money from a person for the provision or sale of a new programming service when the person has not agreed to receive the new service. In the vernacular, consumers will not pay for what they do not want. Certainly this is what consumers want.

The Consumers Association of Canada liked this bill. It issued a press release yesterday which called on members of the House to support it. At the same time the Public Interest Advocacy Centre has endorsed it. That group noted there are generations of laws protecting consumers against unsolicited goods and yet still today

cable companies, as merchandisers of goods, do not have to await the consumer's choice.

• (1810)

Section 3 of the Broadcasting Act imposes a statutory duty on the CRTC to be "responsive to the evolving demands of the public". Since the CRTC has been silent for 15 months, we as members of the House can now move to respond to the demands of the public. There are those who would suggest that as members of the House we have a statutory duty to uphold the laws of the country.

As is often the case there is always the question of powers between the federal government and the provinces. Certainly in the House we have the authority to regulate in this domain throughout Canada and we, the members of the House of all parties, have the opportunity to take in hand the rights and the interests of consumers.

The issue of provincial versus federal jurisdiction is as old as the country. The question of whether a law is *intra vires* or *ultra vires* has always been a healthy industry for the legal profession and certainly has kept the judiciary busy.

When the storm erupted over this issue last year the then minister of Canadian heritage stated, as was reported by the press, that this was a matter of provincial jurisdiction. He then a few days later acknowledged that broadcasting was four square within federal jurisdiction.

We must remember that cable companies as federally regulated undertakings can claim immunity from provincial laws, especially consumer protection laws. Quebec has a consumer protection act which would appear to forbid the practice. In section 5 of that act the following are exempt from the application of the title on contract regarding goods and services: contracts regarding any telecommunication service supplied by an operating company within the meaning of section 2.

Professor Hudson Janisch in an interview with the *Ottawa Citizen* January 7, 1995 noted that provinces are free to control commerce but they lose that control. Quebec acknowledged that in section 5 when it comes to federally regulated industries such as cable.

Professor Janisch, an expert and professor in regulatory law at the University of Toronto, pointed out that the Broadcasting Act instructs the CRTC to protect consumers as set out section 3 of that act.

There are a number of underlying factors we must realize. Consumer protection is not clearly federal, it is not clearly provincial. The federal government has jurisdiction over cable

Private Members' Business

television pursuant to its powers. Consumer protection legislation, whether enacted by the federal or provincial governments, usually provides a remedy. This bill does not provide a remedy. Proposed Bill C-216 does not provide this remedy to consumers because clearly it is not consumer protection legislation.

The CRTC does not prohibit cable companies from using negative option billing, we all know that, to sell new discretionary services because it does not regulate discretionary services. It could regulate discretionary services but it has decided not to do so.

Instead it informs cable operators that it expects them to notify subscribers when they will be given new services and how to opt out if they wish. The CRTC is required by section 5 to regulate and supervise all aspects of the Canadian broadcasting system with a view to implementing the broadcasting policy set out in section 3(1).

We know that cable companies have used negative option billing. There are 40 applicants which now want to get on the system and enter the homes of Canadians. There is a new method by which cable providers could still slide those services in without using negative option billing. If we assume there are four new channels, they will provide these services free for six or eight or twelve months and then will apply for a rate increase. We have the opportunity by this bill to stop these hybrid variations on negative option billing.

There will be those who say this bill is not necessary. I have heard representations from public servants who maintain this legislation is not necessary; it can be done by regulation, it can be done by ministerial directive, it can be done by all sorts of methods. We know that regulation changes. Regulation is not law. It is not in a statute. All of us know that ministers come and go and that ministerial directives can easily be changed.

• (1815)

The only assurance anyone could possibly give would be that there is no assurance at the moment unless Bill C-216 is passed. We must embody in statute, in the Broadcasting Act, that this practice is policy in this country. On behalf of Canadian consumers we must be willing to build a firewall between the CRTC and the consuming public to ensure that this does not happen again, either directly as it did last year or in some other hybrid variation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak to Bill C-216, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act, which was introduced by my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton. I am happy to participate in this debate both as the member for Richmond—Wolfe and as the official opposition's critic on heritage and cultural industries.

Private Members' Business

I would like to tell my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton that I applaud his initiative because it clearly shows his concern for consumers, who are too often left to fend for themselves when dealing with organizations such as the CRTC. Also organizations like the CRTC and others often let things slide without taking a stand.

The purpose of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton is to protect consumers against a questionable business practice called negative option billing that forces people to pay for a cable service they did not request. They receive this service and, if they do not ask for it to be stopped, they are considered to have bought it.

For the benefit of our listeners and my colleagues, I would like to put the situation in context. I would remind you that, by amending section 3 of the Broadcasting Act, this bill provides that a cable distributor should not demand money from a person for the provision or sale of a new programming service where the person has not agreed to receive the new service. It seems to me that, in our society, people should not have to pay for a product or service they did not ask for.

This business practice of selling programming services to consumers who have not asked for them, which is called negative option billing, started in 1994 when the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission or CRTC granted eight new special cable service licences.

Why were eight new licences issued? The CRTC had one main goal, namely to strengthen the Canadian presence in the Canadian broadcasting system in anticipation of this system being inundated by American services, thus preventing an American invasion of Canadian distribution systems.

This goal in itself is certainly commendable. However, after this decision was made by the CRTC, in many cases, new channels were added to cable subscribers' discretionary service package. This means that those who already paid for a cable package now had this service added, and that made them angry. Why? Protests were sparked by this marketing strategy used by cable operators, which consists in imposing new and unrequested services on consumers and charging them extra for it.

No one in this House has to pay nor wants to pay for services they never asked for, that appear out of nowhere.

• (1820)

The CRTC decision resulting from the public hearings on the industry's structure released in 1993 kicked off a number of regulatory reforms that were implemented when the eight dedicated cable broadcasting licences were issued. Marketing strategies based on negative optioning were debated and tacitly agreed to, since the CRTC did not take a stand.

The CRTC never regulated or attempted to regulate the negative optioning marketing practices of cable operators.

It seems obvious that a deliberate choice was made not to make public statements on the appropriateness of such practices. The CRTC did not react. It gave tacit approval by letting cable distributors set the rules themselves. It seems that, in the past, such practices helped new specialty services succeed on the market, while also promoting the cultural development goals set out in the Broadcasting Act.

So, the CRTC said: "Since this has worked before, we will leave them alone". Monopolizing consumers' ability to buy at their own expense is definitely a curious way to protect the culture of Quebec and Canada. Consumers are the ones who should decide on the content and the services they want.

During the 1993 public hearings on the industry's structure, however, some witnesses expressed their concern regarding the negative option billing for new services. Later, consumer protection groups expressly asked that the Broadcasting Act be amended to force the CRTC to protect the interests of consumers, not just cultural interests, when regulating the monopoly that the cable television industry is.

We agree that the content should be Canadian and should be protected from neighbouring countries, but not at the expense of consumers, not by leaving them at the mercy of cable distributors. This does not make sense.

Cable television subscribers had already started rebelling. The CRTC's way of looking after their interests was to merely urge cable distributors to pay greater attention to consumers' requests. It said to those who provide the service and make money in the process: "Set your own rules, but please act properly".

In reality, the marketing component in the Canadian cable distribution industry is left to the association itself. In the end, the association is the one that sets the marketing standards advocated by the national Cable Television Standards Council. As regards this issue, it is clear that not only the CRTC but also the Liberal Party dragged their feet and did not take their responsibilities on time, since consumers had to send a wake up call.

On January 5, one year after consumer associations protested against negative option billing, Rogers Broadcasting Ltd., the largest cable distributor in Canada and the initiator of that practice, gave up the idea and apologized for its mistake. The company called itself to order, which is a good sign. But it was the result of pressure from consumers and not the government acting responsibly and declaring that, in this field, the commercial practice was unacceptable. From now on, says the Canadian Cable Television Association, in an attempt to reassure us, the practice of negative

Private Members' Business

option billing is a thing of the past and the cable distribution industry will listen to consumers. [English]

Thus, the bill introduced by the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton merely confirms a single practice. This brings me to the question of duplication. A single practice. The bill confirms an intrusion into the jurisdiction of provinces that have already taken responsibility in this area. This is not the case in all the provinces, I admit, but for Quebec particularly, where the Consumer Protection Act is strong and has been around for a long time, the proposal of similar legislation in the House of Commons represents a direct intrusion into one of Quebec's areas of jurisdiction.

● (1825)

I am pleased to see this initiative by the hon. member, because he is, to all intents and purposes, reminding his own government of its responsibilities. He has just told it: "You have neglected the situation". And unlike in Quebec and in another province that has a consumer protection act, in all the other provinces, no action is taken and cable distributors are asked to regulate themselves and decide on their own what the rules should be.

The Government of Quebec has already established its jurisdiction by way of its Consumer Protection Act through a general prohibition on the sale of any service through negative option billing. Paragraph 230 (a) of this act is very clear. By regulating the commercialization of cable distribution services through an amendment to its Broadcasting Act, Ottawa reveals once again its determination to interfere in an area of provincial responsibility.

In Quebec, however, any contractual agreement between a consumer and a cable distributor has been subject, since the introduction of these services, to the Consumer Protection Act.

I must therefore reiterate that any such bill tabled in this House is very clearly a duplication of regulations and an intrusion of the federal government into the jurisdiction of the State of Quebec. It is not ill will on the part of the member. It is because his own government has not taken its responsibilities and he is calling it to order. He is also reminding the government that many provinces have no consumer protection legislation and that the present government, with the CRTC, is sending a very clear signal to cable distributors to take whatever action they see fit.

In terms of the content of the bill and the concerns of the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton, I would say to him that we think alike. But as for the principle of tabling a bill in this House that represents a direct intrusion into the province's area of jurisdiction, we have no choice, as the official opposition, but to vote against Bill C-216.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the Reform Party. Our position on this bill, subject to individual members' votes, is that we would be supporting the bill.

Part of the problem and one of the hesitations I had as heritage critic in recommending to my caucus that we look at supporting this bill is the fact that it does not really deal with the issue. It is a little band-aid on a great big problem.

Anybody who comes to my home will see some of the construction I have done. It is really quite laughable and identifiable. There is a fairly broad piece of trim which covers up the error I made when I was trying to put the corners together. On top of that broad piece of trim is a medium size piece of trim to cover up the errors I made when I was crafting the broad piece of trim. Then there is a very small piece of trim which actually covers up the problem that was created with the medium size piece of trim. In other words, I am not a particularly good carpenter and it requires a tremendous amount of work to cover up the fact that the whole thing is being held together by chicken wire and chewing gum.

It seems to me that is a word picture of what we have with the CRTC and the fact we are dealing with this issue. This bill is a band-aid, a small piece of trim on a far larger problem. This is the reason there was concern about supporting the bill.

● (1830)

The heritage minister has called for a review of the CRTC. I am not sure how serious she was. It seems to me that just about every time she wakes up in the morning she has some new ideas and then her department has to run around after her picking up the pieces. Whether or not she was really serious about a CRTC review, I do not know.

The problem is that there is a need for a CRTC review. The CRTC reflects what would be best classed as horse and carriage electronics. What I am saying is we have moved from the horse past the car to the jet, to the space age piece of equipment, while the CRTC mandate itself and the way it goes about doing its regulations is held back still feeding oats to the horse. An awful lot of the regulations show the results of feeding the oats to the horse by the road apples.

The problem is the CRTC comes forward with the kind of regulations that it does, particularly the kind of decisions it makes with respect to content. It ends up effectively forcing the cable companies to find creative ways to get around the problem, that somehow they are going to have to get dollars for some of these programs and some of the content that is going to be put on the air.

Private Members' Business

Clearly with the way the technology is right now in 1996 in the majority of homes in Canada, there cannot be true competition in the cable industry. In fact, we have to go outside the cable industry, speaking of technology, in order to create competition for the cable industry.

The marketplace probably would take care of this kind of negative option billing, this kind of high handed approach that was exercised by the cable companies in trying to come forward and get the revenue the CRTC said they had to get for these channels that nobody wanted. It would have worked out.

For example, there would have been competition if we had had a coherent policy from this government with respect to direct to home satellite service. Right now the DTH and the decision cabinet made to not interfere with the CRTC is driving a grey market of gigantic proportions.

Across the border from my constituency is a very small town in the northern area of Idaho. On a very busy day I do not think we would find 50 people in that town but amazingly there are 600 mailboxes. I wonder why there would be 600 mailboxes for 50 people. I bet it has something to do with the fact that if someone wants to get into the satellite grey market they have to have a post office box in their name in the United States. I will bet that is the answer.

That is the reality of what is going on, not only to people who are adjacent to the border as my constituency is but to people further north, in northern areas of British Columbia and in northern areas of Alberta. That is what is going on in western Canada. Quite frankly if it is not happening in Atlantic Canada, Ontario, the prairies and Quebec, I would be very surprised. That is going on because of the very bad, antiquated, out of touch, out of date policies this government is having the CRTC enact. We are driving people to become electronic Americans. That is the shame of it.

This is the same cabinet that made the decision not to interfere with, not to question the decisions that were made with respect to the direct to home satellite. This is the same cabinet which said: "No, we cannot do that". It is the same cabinet which on the same day decided it was going to interfere for the second time with digital audio services that had been proposed by Shaw Cable. It defies logic to have people believe that the same cabinet which would not overturn the boneheaded position of the CRTC with respect to direct to home satellite service, on the same day by some coincidence would interfere with a Canadian company trying to bring digital audio services to Canadians on a Canadian service. It defies logic for the cabinet to suggest that it could not do one but could just happen to do the other.

• (1835)

It is for that reason, if the heritage minister is serious and if she is calling for a real CRTC review from top to bottom particularly

with respect to its mandate, we would be fully supportive of that. However, I do have a caveat on that as well. The difficulty is that these little mental droppings she gave to us about her thinking of having a CRTC review, which I happened to see in ink in the newspapers, indicated that she was going to have the CRTC review itself.

Heaven forbid that we should get into another \$2.5 million Juneau boondoggle as we did with the CBC review. That was pretty ridiculous when the budget for the CBC review I believe was struck at around \$900,000 and the Canadian taxpayer ended up paying out over \$2.5 million for it. I am not recommending that.

On the other side of the coin I also think it is very short sighted, narrow minded and myopic on the part of the minister for her to say: "Why don't we have a review of the CRTC by the CRTC for the CRTC so that it can tell me about the CRTC and what it should be doing". The minister does not seem to have a tremendous amount of control over a lot of things, quite frankly.

Let me get back to the issue of Bill C-216. The reason I support it and in spite of the fact that I see it as being a necessary little band-aid on the larger issue of whether the CRTC should be doing these things is that I do believe there has to be protection in our society for tactics that can be used by people in a broadly based commercial marketplace.

Let me make my position really clear on that. I do not believe in overregulation in a narrow marketplace. The reason I do not believe in overregulation in a narrow marketplace is that I do believe in the basic assumption in business of caveat emptor, let the buyer beware. Far too often we try to mandate with government action things that could be better handled by the free market.

In this instance, there is a very broadly based marketplace and there are seniors and people who require some protection. Therefore, I would support and I am recommending to my colleagues in the Reform Party to support Bill C-216 to afford that protection to a broadly based marketplace.

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to enter into the debate on Bill C-216 introduced by my colleague from the riding of Sarnia—Lambton. I applaud his initiative in this matter.

Generally I recognize the importance of maintaining the cultural industries within our country. I believe it is part of the mandate of the CRTC to ensure that there is a cultural identity that goes from sea to sea to sea. I also believe this is part of its mandate that the CRTC attempts to do reasonably well.

Having said that, I also realize that the concept of dividing up our country into areas where cable providers can function is a method of granting monopolies. From someone who believes in free competitive forces in the marketplace, I have initial reservations about that process.

I have also realized that there is a significant advantage to Canadians rationalizing their marketplace to provide enough revenue for some of these businesses to do research and development. We are talking about convergence in the communications businesses throughout Canada. Canada has been able to compete internationally and allow the penetration in telecommunications because we have taken these initiatives.

• (1840)

When creating a monopoly it must be done with a certain degree of caution. We do not want people to use their market areas in such a way that they disadvantage their customers. This is the essence of the bill. It attempts to address a practice which for some reason has become acceptable to the cablevision industry but clearly is not acceptable to everyday Canadians. Why do I say that?

Most of my riding is serviced by the Rogers cablevision network system, on which I do a program once every two weeks. When this process of negative option billing was introduced, there was an immediate outrage among my constituents. It would appear that governments had allowed the monopolistic part of the CRTC regulatory environment to gouge them. It was not really any different from a neighbourhood theatre sending a bill to someone for a movie they have never seen or ever desire to see. This is what we did to average Canadians.

It was not that Canadians were upset about the concept of Canadian content. Maybe if somebody took the time to explain to them the need for Canadian content, they would pay more themselves directly or they would agree to support it through their governmental system, as we do with the CBC, or possibly through public broadcasting arrangements. The bottom line is that they were not given the choice and that is what upset them.

I talked to my local cablevision company to see what was the fallout to this, what actually happened after the smoke cleared. Rogers said it was sorry and so on but the bottom line is that most people, after having been given the option to send in a little card to say they want out of the system, did not do that. In reality, the negative option billing system was successful for Rogers and that industry.

Why do we need negative option billing in the first place? It is interesting to note a comment from Mr. Watson who was a director at the time. He said: "Outlawing the negative option sales tactic"—I underline the word tactic—"would decrease subscribers' acceptance rates, cut cablevision services expected revenue and choke new channel source of cable fees and advertising". What he is saying is that this tactic was designed for the express purpose of making people pay for things they would not normally have. He is saying that if they were given this choice, they probably would not do it.

Private Members' Business

We have set up a governmental process that is unacceptable to the average Canadian. It is clear that the essence of this bill is to address that wrong. For that reason, it is highly appropriate.

A number of other things were going on in the cablevision industry at that time. There was a concept of consolidation. In my area it used to be Maclean's. Maclean's became Rogers and Rogers became a huge organization. Part of that consolidation cost a lot of money. People got some money out of this. They were paid off and so forth. How will that be financed for rationalization? It will be done through a fee structure. That is exactly what this is all about. The CRTC acquiesced in that situation. Possibly it saw the rationalization of the cablevision market to be a long term goal for Canada. Maybe it is. I have not really taken the time to study all that.

• (1845)

However, the bottom line was that Rogers, in particular, gave a new definition to the word over-extended. Indeed, by subsequently reducing its rates, I suspect it is having financial problems.

Nobody took the average Canadian into consideration. Some of my colleagues have noted that at least two provinces already have legislation in place that prohibits negative option billing. In addition, the industry is attempting to develop the technology to give recipients of cablevision the choice.

At the time, a Regina company had the facilities to give certain numbers, approximately 9,000 of its 50,000 subscribers the option to say no. If they did not want certain channels coming into their houses they did not have to pay for it.

The industry realizes the importance of individual choice. As I understand it, the industry is now working on the technology to provide that very service. In four or five years from now people will have the choice of channels. They recognize the importance of consumer choice. It appears that the menace of negative option billing is still within the system today. The purpose of this bill is to eliminate it.

In conclusion, I believe this has told us that we must have another way to sell Canadian content. Maybe we need to allow free access to home environments for a period of time so that people can become adjusted to new programming and learn to accept or reject it. People cannot be charged for services they did not ask for. It is just not fair within the existing marketing system.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I want to take this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party to indicate our support for the bill that has been proposed by the member for Sarnia—Lambton.

Private Members' Business

As the member of Parliament for Burnaby—Kingsway, I recall the tremendous sense of outrage and the anger of my constituents at the time that Rogers Cable proposed the negative option billing. There were many calls and letters. I spoke out at the time against that option and urged the government to move forward with strong and effective legislation. Therefore, I am pleased to see that this bill is now before the House.

I also want to note that the New Democratic government of British Columbia has also shown national leadership on the issue. I know that members of the House and those watching would want to know that the B.C. New Democratic government has shown leadership and has moved on this front at the provincial level under consumer legislation to ban negative option billing in the province of British Columbia.

However, this is a matter that falls within federal jurisdiction under broadcast regulations. I welcome the opportunity to support the legislation and I hope members of the House will pass this bill.

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like the other speakers in the debate on Bill C-216, I too received hundreds of calls over a period of one week in my constituency office. This issue is perhaps the one on which I have received the most calls during my period as a member of Parliament. One resident of Kitchener continues to call me every two or three days on this topic.

The importance of this issue to my constituents is clear. I do not intend to talk today about the questions which have been raised by the member for Kootenay East or the member for Durham, which were on technology and the CRTC regulations in general.

• (1850)

The questions of negative option billing and consumer choice are important to me and to my constituents. Negative option billing is not something new to the cable industry in Canada. It is a practice which has been sanctioned and condoned by the CRTC. With the rapid change in telecommunications and the way in which television is delivered with black box decoders and satellite dishes, the cable industry faces major difficulties in adjusting to market changes.

We know fairly clearly what is in the cable companies' interests in this regard, but we must ask ourselves what is in the interests of the consumers.

When this issue first arose and when I heard about the intention of the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton to introduce this bill, I immediately decided that I would second it when he asked me to do so. I did so because of the interests of my consumers and also because this practice raises other problems in the area of consumer choice.

Some have spoken about Canadian content and have seen that issue to be of particular difficulty. I do not share that concern. In fact I talked to many of my constituents about their reaction to the action by the Rogers cable system. It led some of them to be concerned about Canadian content. Indeed, they even suggested imposing higher Canadian content rules because of negative option billing. In short, there were unintended consequences of the action which impaired the support that Canadian cultural content has had in Canadian broadcasting.

There is a danger. Canadian content is very important. The CRTC, through its regulations, has accomplished some fairly important things. It has promoted the Canadian music industry.

We have heard a great deal about Alanis Morissette recently. At the Grammy awards Canadian entertainers did extremely well. CRTC practices may have in fact created this very strong and vibrant Canadian music industry.

Canadians, in general, support the cultural practices of previous governments in supporting the CRTC and its regulations. However, they do not support a policy which misleads consumers. As the hon. member for Durham said a few moments ago, this is a tactic which has developed. People take these channels without realizing the additional cost. Even after the controversy ended, it turned out that most did not opt out.

This approach undermines moral principles. The CRTC received a lot of criticism. Rogers cable system admitted that this practice would not be accepted. There was negative publicity about the entire industry. The fact that negative option billing still exists is unacceptable to all Canadians.

The government should listen to the statements which were made by consumer groups. The Consumers' Association of Canada was mentioned earlier. I would like to read into the record a statement which was made by the executive director of the Consumers' Association of Canada. She stated:

The new telecommunications environment is about competition and choice—this Bill will help to make sure that Canadians are informed and willing consumers of cable services.

Of course the bill she was talking about is Bill C-216.

The executive director of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre stated:

Bill C-216 drags the regulation of the Canadian cable industry into the twentieth century. Governments have long recognized that consumers should not pay for unsolicited goods. No matter what the motive is behind negative option marketing, it is an abuse that must be corrected.

Further, Michael Janigan of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre stated:

This Bill is an important precedent for the future, when multi-media program services will be fighting for a niche on the Information Highway. Consumers have every right to know what they are receiving and to obtain only what they request.

• (1855)

The consumers of Canada have spoken. The member for Sarnia—Lambton has listened and I stand with him supporting the interests of the consumers of Canada.

Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on private member's Bill C-216, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act with respect to broadcasting policy, put forward by my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton.

In the week between Christmas and New Years in 1994, my office, like those of my colleagues, received a deluge of calls from Erie constituents who were concerned with their cable package and the billing option that was to take effect on January 1, 1995. They were angry and they had had enough. I certainly did not fault them. They were right. Negative option billing is unacceptable.

I am in favour of Bill C-216 because it would ban negative option billing. It would apply not only to cable companies but to any other company that provided a distribution undertaking which is defined under the Broadcasting Act as "an undertaking for the reception of broadcasting and the retransmission thereof by radio waves or other means of telecommunications to more than one permanent or temporary residence or dwelling unit or to another such undertaking".

Today we are looking at more players entering the market for broadcasting services such as telephone and satellite companies which will soon provide competition to cable companies. By passing Bill C-216 we can ban negative option billing for new programming services no matter who provides them.

My constituents were calling me because the cable companies are federally regulated by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, commonly referred to as the CRTC.

In 1994 the CRTC licensed six new English language and two new French language specialty services. The commission's two primary objectives in doing this were to strengthen the Canadian presence in the Canadian broadcasting system, especially in anticipation of an invasion by American direct to home satellite services and to ensure that the widest possible selection of new Canadian services would be available at a reasonable cost.

I support these objectives. I support strong Canadian content and a strong Canadian presence in the entertainment industry. However, this cannot be achieved by taking advantage of the Canadian consumer. My constituents were not upset there were eight new channels on January 1, 1995. They were angry because they would automatically be billed for a service they did not request. They felt

Private Members' Business

manipulated through higher fees and the repackaging and repositioning of channels—

The Deputy Speaker: I am very sorry to interrupt. Unfortunately the time has expired.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is in the middle of his speech. We are wondering if he could have the unanimous consent of the House to finish. Perhaps the Speaker would not see the clock for the remainder of this member's speech.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to let the member have three more minutes to finish his speech, if that is sufficient?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Maloney: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and that of my hon. colleagues.

In recent years Canadian producers have proved themselves to be formidable broadcasters, able to compete at home and around the world in the fields of drama and entertainment. Many of these new specialty channels licensed by the CRTC offer excellent programming and would have survived without having to be forced on anyone. However, I am afraid that the consumer backlash did little to enhance the popularity of the new specialty channels.

On January 5, 1995 a major cable company had partially capitulated, apologizing for its mistake in not presenting the new services as a separate discretionary package. It offered consumers the choice of keeping only their current package of specialty services at additional fees. However, the much disputed negative option marketing scheme used to launch the new line-up remained firmly in place, leaving the onus on the consumer to refuse the new package.

This brings me to my role as a parliamentarian and a representative of my constituents in this House. Some would argue this is a consumer rights issue under the jurisdiction of the provinces but provincial consumer laws do not apply to cable companies which are clearly under federal authority.

I do not understand how the protection of the choice of Canadian cable consumers is a matter outside of federal broadcasting jurisdiction, as some have suggested. Section 5 of the federal Broadcasting Act creates an obligation for the CRTC to regulate and supervise all aspects of the Canadian broadcasting system with a view to implementing the broadcasting policy set out in the act. Proposed changes to section 3 of the Broadcasting Act would ban the practice of negative option billing for new programming services.

Adjournment Debate

• (1900)

There is no doubt that over the next decade the cable industry will change drastically. More and more consumers are beginning to demand that they pay only for those channels they want. However, I understand the technology to allow this is not to be realized until the turn of the century. Thus television and the cable industry are currently in a period of transition. Program selection is increasing but the technology to give viewers real choice has not yet arrived.

In May 1994 the CRTC chairman acknowledged that television consumers want more control: "Consumers want, deserve and will increasingly settle for nothing less than the maximum control possible over which services they select and pay for. As a consumer and the CRTC chairman, I agree 100 per cent with this goal".

Cable television services in Canada are distributed either as part of a basic service or on an discretionary basis. Basic cable service is a standard package of services provided to all subscribers within a cable company's service area. It consists of a number of mandatory or priority Canadian programming services, including the CBC English and French network services, local and regional stations, provincial educational services, a community channel as well as various optional services.

The proposed changes in my colleague's bill are timely because commencing May 6 of this year the CRTC will consider licensing more TV channels and all these new channels will be scrambling for an audience. My constituents must be allowed to make a positive choice to obtain these services. Some may not realize a response is necessary or even possible. Some may inadvertently forget. They do not want to have to call their cable company to say stop these extra channels.

I criticize the negative option billing approach used to introduce the new services on the grounds of fairness and consumers' right to choose. Consumers should have the right to select the brand of programming they want rather than having it imposed on them by a paternalistic regulator and monopolistic industry.

Negative option marketing favours corporations and disempowers consumers. The Broadcasting Act is too one sided in requiring the CRTC to protect only Canadian cultural interest, not consumer interest.

As MPs we have a golden opportunity to respond to Canadian consumers who demanded that we put an end to negative option billing for new programming services. Government have long recognized that consumers should not pay for unsolicited goods. No matter what the motive behind negative option marketing, it is an abuse that must be corrected.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The Deputy Speaker: The item is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper, the time having expired.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

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

HEALTH

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, March 31, a profoundly important deadline for Canada's medicare system, is approaching.

Earlier this month I asked a question of the Minister of Health concerning the impact of NAFTA on Canada's medicare system. I asked the minister to show some leadership with respect to some very serious differences in interpretation of NAFTA and its impact on the medicare system in Canada.

It was on March 13, the day I asked the question, that a legal opinion was made public by Dr. Brian Schwartz, a respected lawyer. He indicated that there are serious ambiguities in annex II of the NAFTA agreement. He went on to note in his legal opinion that there are a number of grey areas that exist in the health care sector, and that U.S. providers and their federal government will be exerting political and economic pressure on Canada and the provinces to open up markets.

He went on to point out that United States trade representative Mickey Kantor has issued an interpretation of annex II of the NAFTA agreement that is very alarming because it opens wide a tax on Canada's medicare system. Mickey Kantor said that if social services are supplied by a private firm on a profit or not for profit basis, chapter 11 and chapter 12 apply.

In other words, what he is saying is that the United States considers Canadian not for profit health providers subject to the full force of NAFTA's investment and services rule. That means they are wide open to big American for profit corporations to move in on those sectors.

• (1905)

Much of Canada's health care system is delivered through the non-profit sector. A large majority of our health delivery takes place in the private sector through non-profit agencies such as hospitals, labs, nursing homes, community clinics, regional health boards and so on.

If our government and if the Minister of Health do not stand up for Canadian medicare and do not reject this interpretation by the United States trade representative vigorously, it is clear we will open up the Canadian medicare system to U.S. corporate health care giants. We know the power of these giants. They have taken on Bill Clinton on health care reform.

Adjournment Debate

I support the B.C. minister of health, Andrew Petter, who has shown leadership on this issue. I urge the Government of Canada to show the same kind of leadership and to stand up and say we will protect the Canadian medicare system against this kind of narrow interpretation of the United States trade representative.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that we are better than prepared on this and we will not shirk any of our commitments and that medicare is one of the highest priorities of the government. It will not be unprotected in NAFTA or open to competition by the NAFTA signatories.

The federal government has been working for over a year with the provinces to ensure the broadest possible protection for our health system within the existing provisions of NAFTA.

In recent weeks the Minister of Health has been working very closely with his colleagues, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade, to clarify and resolve the issue.

Within NAFTA, Canada, the U.S. and Mexico each has its own social service reservations entitled annex II which exempts health and other social services from key NAFTA requirements such as the most favoured nation or national treatment. This exemption protects our health system. It means Canada and provincial governments maintain the flexibility and control they need to operate and decide what is best for the health system.

The exemption for health and other services applies to the extent that these sectors exist for "a public purpose". Each of the NAFTA partners must interpret the meaning of public purpose to the situation in its own country. NAFTA does not make that definition.

The scope and coverage of annex II are being interpreted as broadly as possible to provide maximum protection for Canada's health system. The great majority of health services exist for public service and are considered to fall within the exemption of annex II reservation.

I know you are trying to get me to close, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps you will allow me to make the point the hon. member opposite so clearly wants to have made. Do I have the unanimous consent of the House?

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I welcome the opportunity to give unanimous consent to the member to clarify the government's position with respect to Mickey Kantor's very narrow interpretation.

The Deputy Speaker: My reading of the clock is that the member's time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to let the member have another 30 seconds to finish his answer?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Volpe: Mr. Speaker, I will try to address the government's policy, which is what the member wants to hear. Canada's interpretation of annex II includes the fact that the test of a public purpose under NAFTA is not restricted to whether a health service is wholly funded or insured by a provincial health insurance plan.

Annex II is the main protection for our health system. For health services wholly funded by provincial health plans there is no question of exemption under NAFTA. Under annex I, with its March 31, 1996 deadline, there is also provision—

The Deputy Speaker: The time has now expired. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 7.09 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. BOB RINGMA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiaq	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	Quebec	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Quebec	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Alberta	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ontario	Ind. Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	British Columbia	Ref.
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Ontario	Lib.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Manitoba	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	Quebec	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Quebec	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Manitoba	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	British Columbia	Ref.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Manitoba	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	BQ
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Ontario	Lib.
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	Saskatchewan	NDP
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	British Columbia	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Ontario	Lib.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Ontario	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	Lib.
VACANCY	Etobicoke North	Ontario	
VACANCY	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	
VACANCY	Labrador	Newfoundland	
VACANCY	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	
VACANCY	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	
VACANCY	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; BQ—Bloc Québécois; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	Lib.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	Ref.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	Ref.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	Ref.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	Ref.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	NDP
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Lib.
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Lib.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Lib.
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Lib.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Lib.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Lib.

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	Lib.
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	Lib.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
VACANCY	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	
VACANCY	Labrador	
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Lib.
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Lib.
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Lib.
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Lib.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Lib.
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Lib.
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Lib.
ONTARIO (99)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ind. Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	Etobicoke North	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	BQ
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ
VACANCY	Lac-Saint-Jean	
VACANCY	Papineau — Saint-Michel	
VACANCY	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	NDP

YUKON (1)

McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP
-------------------------	-------	-----

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells**

Diane Ablonczy René Canuel	Harold Culbert Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Ted McWhinney Jean Payne	Mike Scott Harry Verran	(11)
-------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Vic Althouse John Cummins	Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin	Roger Simmons Paul Steckle	Elsie Wayne
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English**

Sarkis Assadourian Colleen Beaumier Michel Dupuy	Jesse Flis David Iftody Francis G. LeBlanc	Bob Mills Lee Morrison Philippe Paré	Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller	(15)
--	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Leon E. Benoit Jag Bhaduria Bill Blaikie David Chatters	Maud Debien Jack Frazer Beryl Gaffney Herb Grubel Jean H. Leroux	John Loney Ron MacDonald Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin Ted McWhinney	Val Meredith Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić Paddy Torsney
--	--	--	--

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair: Albina Guarnieri

**Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare
Gilbert Fillion**

John Bryden Paul Crête	Bill Gilmour Dick Harris	John Harvard Ovid L. Jackson	Gurbax Singh Malhi George S. Rideout	(11)
---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------

Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland	Carolyn Parrish Janko Perić	George Proud Randy White	Ted White John Williams
---	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

HEALTH

Chairman: Roger Simmons

**Vice-Chairs: Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard**

Michel Daviault Sharon Hayes	Grant Hill John Murphy	Andy Scott Georgette Sheridan	Paul Szabo Joseph Volpe	(11)
---------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman Jan Brown Maurice Dumas	Laurent Lavigne Keith Martin Audrey McLaughlin	Réal Ménard Pat O'Brien Svend J. Robinson	Roseanne Skoke Rose-Marie Ur
---	--	---	---------------------------------

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BILL C-222 (FORMERLY C-337), AN ACT TO AMEND
THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (WARNING ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINERS)**

Chair: **Beryl Gaffney**

Grant Hill John Murphy	Pauline Picard	Andy Scott	Paul Szabo	(6)
---------------------------	----------------	------------	------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

Chairman:

Sharon Hayes Réal Ménard	Svend J. Robinson Paul Szabo	Rose-Marie Ur	Joseph Volpe	(6)
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------	--------------	-----

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: **Maurizio Bevilacqua**

Vice-Chairs:

**Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**

Warren Allmand Jan Brown Paul Crête	Antoine Dubé Daphne Jennings Dale Johnston	Larry McCormick Robert D. Nault Pat O'Brien	George Proud Geoff Regan Anna Terrana	(15)
---	--	---	---	------

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Chris Axworthy Leon E. Benoit Bonnie Brown	John Cannis Marlene Cowling Paul DeVillers Wayne Easter	Jim Gouk Herb Grubel Réal Ménard	Maria Minna Svend J. Robinson Andy Scott
--	--	--	--

**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Chair: **Sheila Finestone**

Vice-Chairmen:

**Maurice Bernier
Andy Scott**

Jean Augustine Jan Brown	John Loney Russell MacLellan	John Maloney Ian McClelland	Réal Ménard Rey D. Pagtakhan	(11)
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Robert Bertrand	Sharon Hayes Audrey McLaughlin	Philippe Paré Svend J. Robinson	Roseanne Skoke Myron Thompson
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

INDUSTRY

Chairman: **David Walker**

Vice-Chairmen:

**Nic Leblanc
Tony Valeri**

Morris Bodnar Pierre Brien Bonnie Brown	Ed Harper Tony Ianno Walt Lastewka	Philip Mayfield Réal Ménard Ian Murray	Werner Schmidt Alex Shepherd Roseanne Skoke	(15)
---	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Peter Adams Pierre de Savoye Nick Discepolo Jay Hill	Karen Kraft Sloan Ghislain Lebel Andy Mitchell John Nunziata	Denis Paradis Yves Rocheleau John Solomon	Darrel Stinson Paul Szabo Len Taylor
---	---	---	--

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chairman: Andy Mitchell

Vice-Chairmen: René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer

Réginald Bélair
David Chatters
Marlene Cowling

Bernard Deshaies
Monique Guay
Bonnie Hickey

David Iftody
Julian Reed
Benoît Serré

Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Bob Wood

(15)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Leon E. Benoit

John Finlay
Roger Gallaway

Jay Hill
John Solomon

Brent St. Denis
Derek Wells

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Paul Zed

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
François Langlois

Don Boudria
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jack Frazer

Mac Harb
René Laurin
John Loney

Peter Milliken
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

Bob Ringma
Ray Speaker

(14)

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken Epp
Ron Fewchuk

Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen Harper
Dick Harris

Jim Hart
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel Stinson

Suzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish

Mauril Bélanger

Darrel Stinson

François Langlois

(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes
Richard Bélisle
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard
Jim Silye

Benoît Tremblay
John Williams

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Jag Bhaduria

John Bryden
Mac Harb

Ed Harper
René Laurin

Ian McClelland
Alex Shepherd

TRANSPORT**Chairman:** Reg Alcock**Vice-Chairmen:** André Caron
Joe ComuzziDavid Chatters
Joe FontanaJim Gouk
Charles HubbardJim Jordan
Stan KeyesRaymond Lavigne
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate MembersVic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Ivan GroseDick Harris
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. JacksonJohn Maloney
Philippe ParéBernard Patry
Elsie Wayne**STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES****LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT****Joint Chairman:****Vice-Chairman:**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Philippe D. Gigantès
Maurice RielPeter Adams
Roger Gallaway
Jim Karygiannis
Philip MayfieldPaul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**Joint Chairman:****Vice-Chairman:**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Marie-P. Poulin
Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. Robichaud

Jean-Louis Roux

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare
Cliff Breitzkreuz
Patrick GagnonJohn Godfrey
Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS**Joint Chairman:****Vice-Chairman:**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson
Michel Cogger
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly
P. Derek LewisShirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. TaylorGilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson
Ghislain LebelDerek Lee
Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE**A CODE OF CONDUCT****Joint Chairman:**

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

W. David Angus
Peter Bosa
Consiglio Di Nino
Jean-Robert Gauthier
Donald H. Oliver
Mira Spivak
Peter Stollery

Vice-Chairman:

Representing the House of Commons:

Mauril Bélanger
Don Boudria
Marlene Catterall
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jack Frazer
Mac Harb
François Langlois

René Laurin
John Loney
Peter Milliken
Carolyn Parrish
Bob Ringma
Ray Speaker
Paul Zed

(21)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Neutrino Observatory			
Mr. Bonin	1283	Mr. Manning	1288
Justice		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	1288
Mr. Johnston	1283	Mr. Manning	1288
Canada Health and Social Transfer		Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	1288
Mr. Robinson	1283	Statistics Canada	
Nisga'a Land Claims		Mr. Fillion	1289
Mr. Cannis	1284	Mr. Manley	1289
Pontiac Regional County Municipality		Mr. Fillion	1289
Mr. Bertrand	1284	Mr. Manley	1289
World Figure Skating Championships		Canadian Security Intelligence Service	
Mr. Loney	1284	Ms. Meredith	1289
Mascouche Board of Trade		Mr. Gray	1289
Mr. Sauvageau	1284	Ms. Meredith	1289
Indian Affairs		Mr. Gray	1289
Mr. Ringma	1284	Statistics Canada	
Valley Regional Hospital		Mrs. Venne	1290
Mr. Murphy	1285	Mr. Manley	1290
Greek People		Mrs. Venne	1290
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	1285	Mr. Manley	1290
Alberta Premier		Justice	
Ms. Bethel	1285	Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	1290
Montreal Botanical Garden		Mr. Gray	1290
Mr. Discepolo	1285	Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	1290
Montreal Region Economy		Mr. Gray	1291
Mr. Daviault	1286	Broadcasting and Telecommunications	
Justice		Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	1291
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	1286	Mr. Manley	1291
Internet		Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	1291
Mr. Patry	1286	Mr. Manley	1291
The Bluenose		Indian Affairs	
Mr. Wells	1286	Mr. Gallaway	1291
		Mr. Irwin	1291
ORAL QUESTION PERIOD		Nisga'a Land Claims	
Fees for Marine Services		Mr. Duncan	1292
Mr. Gauthier	1286	Mr. Irwin	1292
Mr. Anderson	1287	Mr. Duncan	1292
Mr. Gauthier	1287	Mr. Irwin	1292
Mr. Anderson	1287	Quebec City Bridge	
Mr. Gauthier	1287	Mr. Dubé	1292
Mr. Anderson	1287	Mr. Anderson	1292
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	1287	Mr. Dubé	1292
Mr. Mifflin	1287	Mr. Anderson	1292
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	1288	Goods and Services Tax	
Mr. Mifflin	1288	Mr. Solberg	1293
Government Budgets		Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	1293
Mr. Manning	1288	Mr. Solberg	1293
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	1288	Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	1293
		Fisheries	
		Mrs. Brushett	1293
		Mr. Mifflin	1293
		Unemployment Insurance Fund	
		Mr. Loubier	1293

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	1294
Mr. Loubier	1294
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	1294
National Defence	
Mr. Frazer	1294
Mr. Collenette	1294
Mr. Frazer	1294
Mr. Collenette	1294
Pacific Salmon Treaty	
Mr. Robinson	1295
Mr. Mifflin	1295
Point of Order	
Hostage Taking of Canadian Citizens	
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	1295
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	1295
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Zed	1295
Criminal Code	
Bill 246. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	1295
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	1295
Criminal Code	
Bill C-247. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	1296
Mr. Forseth	1296
Criminal Code	
Bill C-248. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	1296
Mr. Forseth	1296
Nuclear Liability Act	
Bill C-249. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	1296
Mr. Allmand	1296
Parliament of Canada Act	
Bill C-250. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	1296
Mr. Hermanson	1296
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence in 11th report agreed to	1296
Mr. Zed	1296
Petitions	
Employment Centres	
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	1297
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	1297
Alcohol Consumption	
Mr. Szabo	1297
Human Rights	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	1297
Consent	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	1297

Tobacco Products	
Mr. Duhamel	1297
Taxation	
Mrs. Hayes	1297
Justice	
Mrs. Hayes	1297
Taxation	
Ms. Catterall	1298
Human Rights	
Ms. Catterall	1298
The Constitution	
Mr. Karygiannis	1298
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	1298
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Zed	1298

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Law Commission of Canada Act	
Bill C-9. Report stage	1298
Motion for concurrence	1298
Mr. Goodale	1298
(Motion agreed to.)	1298
Motion for third reading	1298
Mr. Kirkby	1298
Mrs. Venne	1300
Mrs. Ablonczy	1303
Mr. Abbott	1305
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	1307
Ms. Catterall	1308
Mr. Milliken	1308
Mr. Bodnar	1308
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	1309
Mr. Abbott	1310
Division deferred	1311
Agreement 20 On Internal Trade Implementation Act	
Bill C-19. Report stage	1311
Speaker's Ruling	
The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette—Maltais)	1311
Motions in amendment	
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil)	1311
Mr. Benoit	1312
Mr. Bodnar	1314
Division on motion deferred	1315
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	1316
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil)	1316
Motion No. 3	1316
Law Commission of Canada Act	
Bill C-9. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	1316
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 133; Nays, 74	1316
(Bill read the third time and passed)	1317

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Broadcasting Act	
Bill C-216. Motion for second reading	1317
Mr. Gallaway	1317
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	1319

Mr. Abbott	1321
Mr. Shepherd	1322
Mr. Robinson	1323
Mr. English	1324
Mr. Maloney	1325

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Health

Mr. Robinson	1326
Mr. Volpe	1327

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

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.

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 française 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.**