



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 037 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 1, 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, May 1, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesdays, we will now sing O Canada, which will be led by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

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

* * *

[*English*]

VACANCY

HAMILTON EAST

The Speaker: My colleagues, it is my duty to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely, Ms. Copps, member for the electoral district of Hamilton East, by resignation effective May 1, 1996.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to paragraph 25(1)(b) of the Parliament of Canada Act, I have addressed a warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer today for the issue of a writ for the election of a member to fill this vacancy.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

MISSING CHILDREN

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today in honour of Child Find's Green Ribbon of Hope month.

Thousands of children go missing in Canada every year. Each time a child is abducted, a family and a community is devastated. They suffer a loss that is unbearable. Together they hope and pray for the child's safe return. The reality is that many children are never found and many others lose their lives to their abductors.

Our children must be protected. It is the responsibility of this government and indeed of all Canadians to guarantee that protection.

Members of this House can help Child Find in its search by printing pictures of missing children in their householders and by supporting recent initiatives to have missing children posters displayed in our government buildings.

Today I encourage all hon. members to wear the green ribbon of hope throughout the month of May to raise awareness and support for this very urgent cause, our missing children.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE WORKER

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this May Day, I wish to pay tribute to all workers in Quebec and Canada.

Thousands of people are taking this day to demonstrate publicly their dissatisfaction with the federal government and to condemn the antisocial measures, especially the unemployment insurance reform, advocated by this government, as well as the lack of a real job creation policy.

For over a century, workers have gathered together on May 1 to commemorate the Chicago martyrs who fought for better living and working conditions.

The Bloc Quebecois wishes workers in Quebec, Canada and other countries a good workers day. We support their fight for justice, equity, dignity and solidarity.

* * *

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the plain and simple truth is that I made a mistake. The comments attributed to me regarding minority employees are neither a reflection of my personal views nor of Reform Party policy. They were hypothetical answers to hypothetical questions posed by reporters and they were the wrong answers.

I do believe all Canadians are equal and should be treated fairly without regard to race, religion, language, culture, sexual orientation or any other characteristic. Human rights are paramount. I

S. O. 31

would never fire or discipline an employee based on anything other than his or her performance. This is the point I was trying to get across in the interview.

Having discussed this with my colleagues in caucus, I realize that nothing less than an unequivocal apology to everyone is in order. That is what I am saying. I apologize without reservation for the statements made and for any hurt they may have caused any person or group.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CREDIT CARDS

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about “shylocking” or usurious lending rates. I must keep on condemning the outrageous interest rates charged by the banks and by some companies on credit card balances.

According to an Industry Canada report, the interest rates charged on credit card balances exceed the bank rate by 12 percentage points.

The government has a duty to legislate to prevent these abuses and protect consumers. The government is currently turning a blind eye to this legalized “shylocking”. The time has come to end this nearly scandalous exploitation.

* * *

[*English*]

DIABETES

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to draw attention to the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the discovery of insulin by the team of Canadian researchers Banting, Best, Macleod and Collip.

The discovery of insulin ranks as one of the medical world’s greatest achievements. Previous to the discovery of insulin in the summer of 1921, hundreds of thousands of sufferers of diabetes faced almost certain death from the disease.

Insulin however is not a cure for diabetes but rather only an effective treatment for a disease that affects over 1.5 million Canadians annually.

Research into the cure of diabetes continues. I urge all Canadians to support the work of the Canadian Diabetes Association and give generously to this cause.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE WORKER

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a trade unionist myself, it gives me great pleasure to rise on this the day we celebrate the International Day of the

Worker. On this occasion we should think about the situation facing working men and women on the verge of the 21st century.

Production methods and changes in the workplace present Canadian workers and governments with new challenges but also with new opportunities.

As a federal government, our role is to ensure that Canadian men and women have the opportunity to find meaningful, satisfying work and contribute to society. Through initiatives like employment insurance and our youth task force, we are meeting that challenge.

I am sure all members of this House join me in recognizing the contributions made to Canada every day by working men and women in a countless number of occupations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SEMINAR ON CYPRUS

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a seminar on Cyprus is being held today on Parliament Hill by the international committee seeking justice for that country.

On behalf of the Canada-Cyprus parliamentary committee, I wish to welcome His Excellency the Canadian High Commissioner to Cyprus, Andreas Iacovides, and all the other people attending the seminar.

[*English*]

Today’s event is just another example of the continued efforts of PSEKA to see that the Cyprus issue is not forgotten. I commend it and the Hellenic-Canadian Solidarity Committee for Cyprus for their continued efforts.

I invite all members of this House to attend this important conference. It is my hope that Canada through our Minister of Foreign Affairs will play a leadership role in restoring peace to this island after 22 years.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday May 4, every resident of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean region is invited to participate in a solidarity rally. This general mobilization was called for by the regional coalition against the unemployment insurance reform.

According to Michel Desbiens, of the diocesan pastoral board: “The goal is clearly to give the public a chance to express, loud and clear, its disapproval of this reform, which is once again geared toward impoverishing a great many people who would be only too pleased to work. Knowing how precarious the situation of the unemployed in our region is, we can only be outraged by the oppressive and discriminatory measures the federal government

wants to put in place. The people must be able to vent their legitimate anger, and the only peaceful means remaining is a public demonstration”.

* * *

• (1405)

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in a democracy the rules of governance must be controlled by the governed and not dictated by the governors. These fundamental principles, integral in the very foundations of a democratic society, are being denied to the first peoples of this land.

First Nations people are being downtrodden, bankrupted and oppressed under elitist power structures sanctioned and financed by the Government of Canada. With the full knowledge of and condoned by Indian affairs, irresponsible self-serving native leaders are diverting, mismanaging and misusing funds earmarked and allocated to fulfil treaty obligations.

This unconscionable state of affairs has become epidemic in Indian country with honest accountable native leaders being notable exceptions instead of the rule. The concerns and grievances of the general membership of First Nations must be investigated thoroughly and resolved accordingly before discussions on native self-government proceed any further. To do otherwise would result in fascist states disguised as native self-government.

This from Leonard Iron, a Cree of the Canoe Lake Band and president of the First Nations Coalition for Accountability, who I am pleased to represent.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, recently a bomb was sent to a Jewish community centre in Calgary, a gay man was beaten in a park, a First Nations person was denied lodging, and a woman was denied a promotion because she is a woman. Racism, sexism and homophobia are not the issues of the dark past. For too many people they are everyday experiences.

As parliamentarians we have a special responsibility to show leadership in building a society founded on equal respect for every Canadian. Extremism gives legitimacy to those who would justify racism, sexism and homophobia for reasons of profit or simply to deny others equal rights and respect.

If we as parliamentarians do not demonstrate leadership on this issue, we have failed our country and our democracy.

Today the Reform Party deputy leader has said she is committed to fighting intolerance. I therefore challenge the Reform Party to

S. O. 31

vote for the amendment to the human rights act on sexual orientation, not just to apologize, but to show real action.

* * *

[Translation]

SIR WILFRID LAURIER

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this day, a century ago, Canada was in the middle of an election campaign. On May 1, 1896, Wilfrid Laurier was campaigning to become the first French Canadian Prime Minister from Quebec.

And what a campaign it was. Everywhere he went, he attracted flocks of people, unleashing their enthusiasm.

Laurier used to say: “I am of French origin and proud to be; knowing my Anglo-Saxon fellow citizens as well as I do, I have no doubt that, were my heart not filled with pride for my origin, they would just look down on me with scorn, and I would deserve it”. And he added: “I have no intention of losing sight of my origin but I am, first and foremost, a Canadian”.

That said, I tip my hat to Sheila Copps for her courage; she has not lost sight of her origins either and she is, first and foremost, a great Canadian.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan called upon me to table with him a petition presented to him by residents of the Hudson area of my riding.

Last Monday I met with the same concerned citizens of Hudson. Their message was also very clear. They fear for their future. They expect all those who share their concerns to put their political differences aside and join efforts to ensure that Quebecers are all made to feel at home anywhere in Canada. Their concern is Canadian unity and not partisan politics.

The member stated that Reformers stand solidly behind the constituents in my riding who express clearly their desire to remain Canadian. The time for grandstanding is now over. I challenge the member to reverse his vote of December 13, 1995 and to now support the initiatives of the government to recognize the distinct character of Quebec which he and his party have voted against.

Only then will the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan earn my respect and that of the constituents of Vaudreuil. Only then will he clearly demonstrate his commitment to working hand in hand with the federal government for the greater cause of Canadian unity.

S. O. 31

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make it clear to all Canadians what my personal belief is and what the position of the Reform Party is regarding the treatment of all Canadians, including minority groups. I strongly believe in the principle of equality for all people and deplore discrimination for any reason.

• (1410)

The very first statement in the Reform blue book is a statement of principle which reads: "We affirm commitment to Canada as a balanced federation of equal provinces and citizens".

Mr. Alcock: How are you going to vote? Are you going to vote for equality?

Mr. Benoit: I cannot support any bill which breaks away from this principle of equality. Canadians do not support discrimination from their citizens and especially not from their governments.

Mr. Harvard: How are you going to vote?

Mr. Benoit: This government once again is allowing discrimination under Canadian law. Equality before the law and the merit principle should be the only principles on which we are judged.

Mr. Harvard: Are you going to vote for equality, Leon?

The Speaker: Colleagues, sometimes it happens that we are near microphones that are open. I am sure we make inadvertent statements, but I wish we would be very conscious of the microphones near us being open.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this International Day of the Worker, the federal government is adding insult to injury by amending the Unemployment Insurance Act without a true debate.

By going ahead with its reform, which seeks to make the poor pay for part of the deficit, the federal government is breaking a long Liberal tradition.

Liberal MPs in Fredericton, Shediac, Halifax, St. John's, Charlottetown and Bonaventure, who were elected to govern differently from the Conservatives, are being asked by their constituents to challenge their government. Canadians expect their MPs to oppose this unfair reform.

They too, like the official opposition, must demand that the minister go back to the drawing board and propose a new reform that will be fair to workers and regions of this country.

* * *

FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that, this week, opposition parties are trying to outdo each other with racist and discriminatory statements.

After a Reformer made totally unacceptable comments about black people and homosexuals, the Bloc member for Québec-Est is now trying to win the prize for bigotry.

While commenting the report tabled yesterday by the commissioner of official languages, the Bloc member compared French speaking people outside Quebec to paraplegics in wheelchairs with only two wheels.

The intolerant and discriminatory comments of the Bloc member are an insult to French speaking Canadians outside Quebec and to physically disabled persons.

If the Bloc member and the Reformer had the least bit of respect for Canadians, they would make a formal apology.

* * *

RICHARD LE HIR

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Quebec's former minister responsible for restructuring, Richard Le Hir, resigned from the PQ caucus.

In his letter of resignation, which his leader, Lucien Bouchard, apparently did not have the time to read, Mr. Le Hir said, and I quote: "Quebecers must understand that sovereignty has hung like a cloud over the province for 30 years now—It is high time to begin thinking about the billions spent pursuing it, on the tax revenues that did not come our way and that could perhaps help us to hold on to what we already have".

Quebec's separatists must realize that though they may get rid of the messenger, his message still remains. Lucien Bouchard should take the time to read the important message sent him by Mr. Le Hir and recognize that it is time that the threat of sovereignty stopped weakening Quebec's economy.

* * *

[English]

OLD AGE SECURITY

Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 21 over 50 people gathered at the Wu Centre in my riding to partake in an afternoon of discussions focused on seniors issues.

The forum provided constituents with the opportunity to voice their concerns regarding the old age security system. Although there was not a great deal of consensus on the issue, I believe that a lot of misunderstandings were cleared up about the new plan.

The most common concerns surrounded taxation and whether or not the new plan will be harder on middle class earners. Many felt there still needs to be a great deal of educating of the public surrounding the details of the new plan before those details are finalized.

This is an important debate over a fundamental change in the system. I encourage my colleagues to hold similar forums in their ridings.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in response to the speeches by all the members of this House, as well as public pressures, the Deputy Prime Minister has finally stepped down. She had no other choice, moreover, since she had made a public commitment to quit if the GST was not abolished.

Will the Prime Minister admit that this resignation is evidence that it was not only the Deputy Prime Minister who did not keep her word concerning the GST, but the Liberal government as a whole, and he himself?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Ms. Copps, who resigned earlier today—and I must express my admiration for her in this connection—had made a personal commitment. At her press conference, she indicated clearly that the government was respecting the commitments it had made in the red book, on page 20 in French and page 22 in English, that she herself had made an additional commitment, and that now her credibility was being criticized or questioned by the public.

In response to the incessant attacks against her, she has decided to rely on the judgment of the voters of Hamilton East, and I am convinced that, after the June 17 byelection, she will be back with the support of the people of Hamilton East.

She had made a personal commitment to which she has been faithful. For this lady, who has so well served the province of Ontario, first as an MPP and then as an opposition MP and later a minister and Deputy Prime Minister in this House, an attack on her integrity was unacceptable. She is putting her fate in the hands of

Oral Questions

the voters. They have always had enormous confidence in Ms. Copps, as do we on this side of the House.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, Number Three in the government, that is the Minister of Finance, admitted his error and apologized for it. Number Two has just done the same, and has resigned.

Does the Prime Minister realize that now there is just Number One left, who has not admitted, nor is he capable of admitting, to the Canadian people that he has not respected his commitments?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some ten times or so I have read out here in the House the Liberal Party's commitment, made at the time of the election, namely that we were going to replace the GST by a form of taxation that would be harmonized with the provinces, that would generate the same level of revenue as the GST did in the past, that there would be a single administration to implement it, that there would be only one group of auditors bothering businessmen, etc.

We have begun the process of having a national tax harmonized with the provinces. We regret not having been able to do so across the board immediately, but we have had the co-operation of four provinces so far, and are counting on the others, in order to have a single tax. According to many of the opposition members, we are the only country in the world to have two competing levels of sales tax.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to clarify things for the Prime Minister and for anyone else, the Minister of Finance had promised to abolish the GST. He said "We did not do so, and I apologize for that, it was a bad thing to do". The Deputy Prime Minister had said "We are going to scrap the GST or I will quit". Acknowledging her commitment, she has resigned. As for the Prime Minister, he had said "We are going to scrap the GST". So what is he going to do now?

• (1420)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would the Leader of the Opposition kindly tell us, is he in favour of harmonizing the sales tax, or is he not? Would the Leader of the Opposition kindly tell us, is he in favour of our harmonizing the tax with the province of Quebec? Is he in favour of doing what his former leader, Lucien Bouchard, said was necessary, creating a harmonized tax?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Is he in favour of doing what the Quebec Minister of Finance has said, that if we wanted a harmonized tax—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. The Minister of Finance has the floor.

Oral Questions

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak of the Prime Minister, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak of the government, let him look at what has been done, let him look at how the government headed by this Prime Minister has succeeded in tidying up public finances, despite the Bloc Québécois' declarations to the contrary, a Prime Minister who has successfully protected our social programs, despite the Reform Party's objections—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): Those are your promises.

Mr. Martin: —a Prime Minister who has given integrity to this country—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, even if the Minister of Finance shouts himself hoarse issuing all kinds of challenges, he will not make us forget that we heard him admit on television he made an honest mistake. Everyone heard him.

I understand why the Prime Minister had him responding to the third question: because the Minister of Finance has far more credibility than he does as a result of admitting he made a mistake.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister usually—although we have not seen him do it today—brandishes the red book to try to confirm his promise with respect to the GST.

Will he finally realize that millions of people heard him say on television and in all other forums that he would scrap the GST? When will he admit that he has not kept his promise, as his Minister of Finance and his Deputy Prime Minister have done? Number Two and Number Three on either side of him have both realized this; only the one in the middle has not.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, the Deputy Prime Minister stated that she was totally satisfied the government had kept its word, as mentioned in the red book on page 20 in French and 22 in English.

We have kept our campaign promise of a new tax generating equivalent revenues. If the hon. member refuses to believe what is written, there is not much I can do about it. We campaigned on this. That is what we have been saying for weeks, and the Minister of Finance will work on a new national sales tax with the co-operation of all provincial governments.

Furthermore, an all-party committee of this House, which spent one year studying the problem, recommended the strategy used by the Minister of Finance to honour the commitment in the red book.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we, too, have read his red book more than once. However, when one compares what is written in the red book with what his government has just done, one can see that, even then, the government has not kept its word since, on page 20 in the French version of the red book, the Liberal Party promises, and I quote: “Nous substituerons—”.

If the Prime Minister consulted a dictionary from time to time or watched the evening news on Radio-Canada before going to bed, he might understand the meaning of this French word. “Substituer” means “to replace”, to replace the GST with something else. Two weeks ago, the Liberal government confirmed that the GST would be maintained. All it did was give it a different acronym.

• (1425)

Will the Prime Minister admit, as his Minister of Finance and his former Deputy Prime Minister did, that he has laughed at the people and broken his promise, as he has done for his entire political career on all kinds of issues?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in Quebec and in the other provinces with which an agreement was reached, there will now be a single sales tax instead of two, a single tax collector instead of two, a single tax base instead of two.

Let us be very clear. Is the hon. member telling us that we should not rationalize taxes with Quebec? Is the hon. member completely out of step with the Quebec government? I think he should call the head office so they can tell him they support what we did.

* * *

[English]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, although under great public pressure, the former Deputy Prime Minister has done the right thing and resigned her seat in the House of Commons.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Miss Grey: She made a promise and is now keeping that promise.

The Liberals promised to abolish, scrap and kill the GST and broke that promise. Now even Sheila Copps realizes that the government cannot continue to justify the unjustifiable.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will he now finally admit that his government has broken its election promise to abolish, scrap and kill the GST?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in talking about integrity, I would like to mention the flip-flop by the hon. member within a few hours and the fact that his party

totally ignored the same statement by the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan for two years before reluctantly asking him to change what he said.

I do not think we have any lessons to learn from that party about anything in politics, especially after hearing words like that which are completely unacceptable in a modern society like Canada where tolerance is the *modus vivendi* of the whole nation.

I have always said that the red book is clear. We said we would replace the GST with a national harmonized sales tax with the provincial governments. So far we have done this with four provinces. With the help of the provincial governments it will be done with the rest of them. It is the red book commitment and the promise we have kept.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is funny that Sheila Copps did not see it that way and all we have left in her memory are roses on her desk used as a prop.

Sheila Copps said today in her press conference that she overstepped the red book. She had every opportunity to overstep the red book when it was lying on the floor because that is where that red book belongs, especially page 22.

Liberal candidates campaigned on a promise to abolish, scrap and kill the GST and they know it. What Canadians demand to know now is why has the Prime Minister tried so hard to hide the fact that the Liberals broke their number one election promise.

I ask the Prime Minister again, why did he not simply come clean with Canadians from the very start and tell them that he had absolutely no intention of eliminating the GST?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if you want to quote Madam Copps, she said a few hours ago that we are doing exactly what we said in the red book. She said that she had made a personal promise that was more than what the red book stated and that she had to live with that promise.

Yesterday, you challenged her to have the guts to go to her riding. She is waiting for you to come to her riding with the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan. She will tell the people of Hamilton what kind of party you are, which attacks everybody who is coloured or who has other differences in order to please the narrow-minded people in Canada.

• (1430)

The majority of the people of Canada are not like the Reform Party. They are generous people who tolerate people of colour, of different religions and different mode de vie, which was so shamefully mentioned yesterday by the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan and supported by the acting leader of the Reform Party. During that time, the leader of the party has been hiding in British Columbia.

Oral Questions

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would remind you of two things. Would you please all address your remarks to the Chair. Second, would you please refrain from mentioning whether a member is here or not.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a challenge has been put out for me to be in Hamilton East. I will be there, you betcha.

The member for Hamilton East—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, the former member for Hamilton East's decision to honour the promise she made to her constituents puts the rest of the Liberal caucus in a pretty tight spot. I think we can see that today.

Like Sheila Copps, they ran on a platform that included scrapping the GST. I am sure there will be a lot of soul searching going on in Liberal offices today now that the former Deputy Prime Minister has blown the GST red book sham completely out of the water.

I ask the Prime Minister one more time, what does he have to say to Liberal MPs who got elected on a promise to abolish the GST and are now considering whether to follow Sheila Copps' lead?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we go back to the basic issues.

On the issue of human rights, we saw what happened to the chief whip. The member for Beaver River claimed yesterday that what the chief whip said was supported by the majority of her constituents.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, I have been in the member's riding and I do not believe that reflects the views of her constituents. I do not believe it reflects the views of Canadians. If the hon. member is going to go to Hamilton East, we will all be there. I want to make sure I am there the day she is.

[*Translation*]

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

The history of the Liberal Party's election campaigns is revealing. In 1974, they promised not to freeze wages and prices. They did not keep their word. In 1979, they made a commitment not to raise the gasoline tax. They did not keep their word. In 1989, they promised to tear up the free trade agreement if elected. They did not keep their word. In 1993, they got elected on the promise of eliminating the GST, and again they did not keep their word. And that is not to mention countless unkept constitutional promises made to the people of Quebec.

Facts clearly show that, in every election over the past 20 years, the Liberal Party has repeatedly taken office under false pretences.

Oral Questions

How can the Prime Minister still expect the public to have any confidence in his government?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we got a fair number of our candidates elected in the last election. The next time an election is held, we will get re-elected with a substantial majority. I can bet the hon. member a much smaller number of her colleagues will be elected to this House in the next election.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is very well known in Quebec. In the last referendum, the people voted yes—

Mr. Duceppe: In his own riding.

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): —in his own riding. He should run in Rimouski—Témiscouata to see who would win then.

• (1435)

My second question is as follows. When will the Prime Minister come to the realization that the only thing he can do at this point is to apologize to the people of Canada for breaking his promise regarding the GST?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is to be found on page 22 of the red book.

[English]

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister has apologized for his role in the GST fiasco. The former Deputy Prime Minister, Sheila Copps, has jumped, or was she pushed? Now we have the situation of the Prime Minister in denial.

The question is very simple. When is the Prime Minister going to admit that he and his government broke their promise to scrap the GST?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has brought in a policy after going through over 20 options and after working for close to two and half years to find a better solution. This policy is the one recommended by the finance committee and supported fully by the Reform Party.

Why is it that the Reform Party now stands up day after day denying what it said? Why is the Reform Party swallowing itself whole? Why does it not admit what it admitted at the time of the finance committee, that this is good public policy. Is it afraid to endorse something that is good for Canadians?

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister knows very well that we have called on the government from day one to fulfil its promise to scrap the GST. It is how the Liberals won the election. He and all the members across the way who ran on that promise should take the high dive.

I want to quote from the House record from June 16, 1994. These are the words of the Prime Minister. He said: "There can be no substitute for responsibility at the top. The Prime Minister sets the moral tone for the government and must make the ultimate decision when issues of trust and integrity are raised. That is what leadership is all about. As Harry Truman put it: The buck stops here".

My question is for the Prime Minister. When is he going to start accepting responsibility? When is he going to admit that he broke his promise on the GST?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said what was the policy of the government very clearly.

A committee of the House, as promised in the red book, studied the problem of finding an alternative to the GST. The committee came up with this recommendation. It was supported by the Reform Party, the same party that changed its position five times on the GST.

We were consistent. We said that it had to be replaced by one sales tax. I remember very well the Reform Party saying that it was completely unacceptable to have 10 different provincial sales taxes plus a federal sales tax.

The members of the committee went across the nation for a year. Their report was supported by the Reform Party and it is exactly what the Minister of Finance is implementing at this time.

We have nothing to apologize for. It is what is written in the red book on page 22 and it is what was recommended by a committee of the House formed by Liberal members and Reform members who supported that policy as the only good alternative to the present system.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that the Prime Minister has decided that the members of his party will vote freely on Bill C-33, which seeks to add sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination under the Canadian Human Rights Act. Yet, the Minister of Justice has said on numerous occasions that there would be a party line vote on Bill C-33.

In a letter dated October 18, the Prime Minister—

The Speaker: Dear colleague, I have trouble following the question. I would ask the hon. member to put his question, but I would remind him that, in doing so, he should not anticipate the agenda, as he is doing now with this bill. Please put your question.

• (1440)

Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is an important one. It concerns Bill C-33. Will the Prime Minister keep to his word and make sure that his members follow the party line regarding Bill C-33?

The Speaker: The question is out of order. The hon. member may ask a second question if he so wishes, but not on this bill. Again, you may ask another question, but not on this legislation.

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can we ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to fulfil his commitments regarding all the bills, and Bill C-33 in particular? Does the Prime Minister—

* * *

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The current consultation process for the Canada pension plan is a top down, closed door, elitist sham. The fix is in. The chair has been ordered to report by mid-June and he has already decided the outcome, and now I have been denied the opportunity to stand before that committee in my home town of Calgary to make a five minute presentation.

I ask the minister to explain to the House why a member of Parliament has been denied this opportunity.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the process of consultation on the CPP is a joint effort between the Government of Canada and the provinces. As we go across the country federal representatives are conducting hearings in co-operation with their provincial counterparts.

There are very few Canadians who have the kind of opportunity the hon. member has to make a contribution on a whole series of subjects brought before the House. This and other topics can be discussed in the House on any number of occasions. Whatever contribution the hon. member wishes to make to the consultative process on CPP we would be happy to receive.

To have members of Parliament take up the time of committees when they are travelling across the country does not appear to be necessarily the best use of committees time.

I want to tell the hon. member that whatever her views on this consultative process, I would be happy to receive them and will make sure they are taken into consideration.

Oral Questions

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that answer. It is the one that I did anticipate.

I would like to tell the minister to put a red circle around Tuesday, May 7 in Calgary next week because I will be at the committee hearing.

We keep hearing the government wants to consult with all Canadians on how to save the Canada pension plan. This should mean people from all provinces of Canada. The only hearing in British Columbia has been cancelled, well before the B.C. writ was dropped.

Will the minister explain to the House why he refuses to hear from people in all provinces on how to save the Canada pension plan?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because of the nature of the Canada pension plan and how it can be modified, I am sure the hon. member knows it is a very complex situation requiring a large number of provinces representing a very significant percentage of the population of Canada before anything can be done. We will have as extensive a consultation as possible.

A very integral part of the process of consultation involves the provinces because the CPP is a partnership. As we enter into the consultative process, obviously we have to ask our provincial colleagues how they wish to proceed as well.

There is no intention on the part of anyone either at the national government level or at the provincial level to preclude the participation of anyone. This process of public consultation is only one of the many available to members of Parliament and to Canadian citizens.

• (1445)

I repeat my offer to the member and to any other Canadian who wishes to participate to make their views known to us. We will take them into account.

* * *

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on pages 88 and 89 of the red book, it is written that funding cuts to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation illustrate the Tories' failure to appreciate the importance of cultural development and that a Liberal government will be committed to stable multiyear financing for the CBC. The result of this other promise is close to \$400 million in cuts since this government came to power.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Yesterday, the official languages commissioner voiced his concern about the impact of

Oral Questions

cuts on francophones outside Quebec. Does the Prime Minister acknowledge that, by making these cuts, his government is directly responsible for the CBC's inability to meet the needs of the country's francophones?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that Radio-Canada and the CBC must respect not only their own act but also the Official Languages Act. I think we can say that the corporation respects this act.

As for the cuts, it is very clear that Radio-Canada and the CBC have a board of directors and that it is up to them to make choices consistent with the needs they must meet throughout the country. We respect the responsibility of the CBC's directors.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the corporation may be respecting the act, but this government is not, when it comes to keeping its promises not to cut funding to the CBC. Everyone recognizes that the absence of adequate means of communication is a factor in assimilation.

By going back on his promises not to reduce the CBC's budget, just as he went back on his promises to scrap the GST, will the Prime Minister go on much longer denying that it is through measures such as these that his government is playing an active role in the assimilation of francophones outside Quebec?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is astonishing what the member for Québec-Est comes out with. He is not capable of recognizing the facts. He is not capable of seeing what we now have in a country whose government has very clear commitments to its minorities, throughout the country, commitments that it has met. It supports minorities throughout this country and it will continue to do so.

We are not saying that things are perfect. What we are saying is that we stand by our objective of supporting all the minorities in this country. Show me another government that is doing as much as we are.

* * *

[English]

RACISM

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Windsor—St. Clair is a diverse riding. Many of our constituents came to this country knowing that the majority of Canadians treat one another with dignity and respect.

Recent events have served to remind us that we must remain vigilant against racism, even in the House. Could the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism please tell the House what the government is doing to combat racism in Canada?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for this

question because the incident to which the hon. member refers has created extremely deep wounds in the visible minority community of the country, wounds that no apology could erase for a very long time.

This country has been based on some very fundamental values such as respect, tolerance, justice and equality. The government has been committed to those values with our proposal of Bill C-41 dealing with hate crimes and our employment equity bill, both of which were voted against by the Reform Party. It voted against those issues of fairness and equality.

The department of multiculturalism has fostered racial tolerance and inter-racial harmony by working among youth, with the police chiefs and with the Teachers Federation of Canada to bring about racial harmony in the schools and among young people. We have continued to work with the public to increase awareness. Around the world we have been recognized as a country—

● (1450)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said he will cut the B.C. salmon fleet by 50 per cent to conserve salmon stocks. However, he knows this will not decrease the number of fish caught. It will only reallocate the fish to the large commercial fishing boats, putting small independent fishermen out of a job. This plan will kill jobs. It will kill fish and it will kill communities in B.C.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, what will you tell these communities—

The Speaker: Always address the Chair, my colleague. The hon. minister.

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not finish his question but I can anticipate it.

Contrary to the belief of his colleagues, the Pacific salmon revitalization plan was developed over a period of about a year, stemming from the Fraser report, 70 stakeholders and a round table that went on for a long time.

It is not a perfect plan. It is not a plan which has 100 per cent consensus. I doubt if any plan would have 100 per cent consensus in the commercial salmon industry. However, the plan does address the difficulty of overcapacity in the fishing industry.

He is right, it may not result in fewer salmon caught. However, at least it will reduce the pressure on the salmon that exist. The salmon stocks are at a very low level.

Oral Questions

This plan will address the problem. It will help the stocks. It will help the industry at a time when it is low. It will help in the revitalization despite the plan the member has, which would derail everything that would help the fishermen and their families.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if it will not decrease the number of fish caught, how will it decrease the pressure on the fish? It makes no sense.

The minister is running a bloated, inefficient ministry and yet has decided to cut financing for salmon hatcheries based on some report he has refused to release to us for six months.

Will he table the report in the House this week and will he support a self-financing Sooke River fish hatchery?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the hon. member has difficulty with the plan from what he said. I will not get into detail.

I suggest to the hon. member that if he has difficulty understanding the plan perhaps he could speak with his colleague, the hon. member for Comox—Alberni, who came out with a press release a couple of days after the plan was released to criticize it sentence by sentence, only to have one of his constituents, a fisherman, write to him to criticize his criticism, actually calling the press release drivel, which means silly nonsense, like the hon. member.

The Speaker: I urge members to stay away from any kind of personal remarks about other members.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In March 1993, the then Leader of the Opposition and current Prime Minister of Canada made the following comments about the amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act introduced by the Conservative government, and I quote: “The Liberal Party is appalled by these measures. Obviously, by reducing benefits and further penalizing those who leave their jobs voluntarily, the government shows very little concern for the victims of the economic crisis. Instead of getting to the heart of the problem, it goes after the unemployed”.

As his government is getting ready to adopt a so-called reform of the unemployment insurance program, which makes existing penalties even harsher, is solely designed to cut billions of dollars in funding and will have a more devastating effect than any reform to

date, how can the Prime Minister justify this new about-face on the part of the Liberals?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we had to find ways to improve on the Unemployment Insurance Act was precisely the fact that tens of thousands of women could not have access to the program at all.

• (1455)

The hon. member knows full well that, as a result of changes made to the Unemployment Insurance Act, women working less than 15 hours per week for instance, who used to be penalized for all kinds of reasons, will now be covered and have access not only to the unemployment insurance program, but also to a variety of programs also designed for those considered to be ordinary employees by their employers.

There is no doubt that the Unemployment Insurance Act had to be amended. Everyone agrees with that. But what is happening now? The government has introduced legislation. Members of the committee to which the bill was referred have proposed amendments. But all we hear coming from the official opposition party is that the bill should be withdrawn.

We do not know whether they in favour of the status quo, whether they have amendments to suggest that might be regarded as improvements, or whether they are just playing petty politics at the expense of the most vulnerable segment of our society.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the then Prime Minister told people protesting against a reform less devastating that this one that they could count on the Liberals to demand that the bill be withdrawn.

Does the Prime Minister not agree that this reform is of no help at all in resolving the unemployment problem? In his own words, it does not go to the root of the problem. Worse yet, it is anti-employment.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very important point in her question and that is this concern with employment. The bill does provide among other things for \$300 million to be invested in a transition fund, precisely to create jobs in the most disadvantaged regions of the country.

As an extra benefit, once the program is fully implemented, \$800 million will be invested in job creation programs. There is one thing on which we agree with the hon. member, who is her party's critic on the subject. We agree that the solution to the problem facing the unemployed is job creation. And that is what we are working on.

Oral Questions

[English]

EDMONTON INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Correctional Services Canada is showing how innovative it can be in the Edmonton Institution for Women. There were three more escapes last night. That means that one-quarter of all inmates have walked away from that place.

Since it opened last November there has also been a suicide, an assault on staff, and several reports of attempted suicide and self-mutilation.

Does the acting solicitor general agree with the warden that there is nothing to worry about at this prison even though there are children being raised there? Or does he think it is time to close this mistake until they get their act together at the Edmonton prison?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right to raise this issue. The solicitor general is concerned about it, as are the department, the warden and I. We are taking steps to upgrade security at the facility.

Many practical steps have already been taken. Today the solicitor general called the attorney general of Alberta and arrangements have been made in the meantime to transfer many of the inmates to provincial institutions, another example of co-operation between the two levels of government and corrections.

Many of the inmates have been transferred to provincial institutions in Alberta. There are difficulties at the Edmonton facility and steps have been taken and will be taken to address them.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has built five such prisons in the country. I have visited two of them.

Virtually all of the guards at this prison in Edmonton were hired straight out of college. I think it is time the government look not only at the Edmonton Institution for Women but at the Nova Institution for Women and all the other facilities to revise its policy. Change it.

• (1500)

I ask the justice minister if that is the case. Is the government looking to change its policy on women's prisons?

Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the opening of the correctional facility in Edmonton was the result of a task force, established in 1989, which recommended the closure of the correctional facility in Kingston in favour of opening five regional centres.

To date we have had problems in Edmonton, but there are other facilities that have proven to be without incident, one in Maple Creek, Saskatchewan and one in Truro, Nova Scotia.

On the question of safety and security in Edmonton, today Correctional Services Canada announced an additional eight measures it is implementing to ensure safety, which was a concern expressed by my colleagues from Edmonton East and Edmonton North.

These measures are taken very seriously. We have implemented the procedures and are doing so immediately.

* * *

FLOODING

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, flooding in southern Manitoba has reached critical levels. In the Red River Valley region alone 180 families have been evacuated.

The Government of Manitoba is saying national defence is not meeting its responsibility to the flood victims.

Can the Minister of National Defence tell the people of Manitoba what actions and financial help Canada has provided to southern Manitoba flood victims?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the flooding in Manitoba this year has been particularly severe. As was the case in southeastern Saskatchewan last year, there are mechanisms in place whereby the federal government can assist the provinces.

The prime responsibility for co-ordination of disaster relief is with the provinces, and the province has requested relief and assistance from the Canadian Armed Forces. Seventy class A reservists have been working over the last three or four days to assist with flooding in the Saint-Adolphe area.

However, under the disaster financial arrangements regime there is a program whereby the federal government can assist the provinces and in turn the provinces can compensate individuals or municipalities. Officials of the two governments are working on this right now. Official requests are to come in the next few days.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans regarding his department's massive changes to licensing and the fishing zones of the west coast.

Point of Order

B.C. communities have elected their representatives, raised the money to support them and sent them to Ottawa to get the minister to halt the plan so that improvements can be made to it.

Will he now commit to suspending the May 24 deadline and commit to beginning a serious discussion with representatives of the affected communities who have already been chosen to negotiate effective ways to achieve fish stock enhancement that will also maintain west coast communities?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's question, which I know is a serious one.

I met with a community sustainability group yesterday. It expressed some of the concerns and misunderstandings with the Pacific revitalization plan which, as I said, is not 100 per cent perfect. I understand these difficulties and I understand the uncertainty involved. I have great concern for the concerns of fishermen and their families.

I will be in British Columbia tomorrow meeting with fishermen, addressing their concerns, listening to them, bridging some of the gaps, addressing uncertainties and fine tuning the program, which will probably address some of the items mentioned by the hon. member.

[Translation]

The Speaker: My colleagues, I have received notice that the hon. member for Laval Centre wishes to raise the question of privilege.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MEMBER FOR NANAIMO—COWICHAN

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I feel that my privileges as a member of Parliament have been breached by the unacceptable remarks made by a member of this House.

• (1505)

The discriminatory and racist comments made by the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan prompt me to ask you to suspend him from this House until his case is reviewed by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

In an interview to the *Vancouver Sun*, the hon. member said that if he ran a business and if he had a homosexual employee—

The Speaker: My dear colleague, you may be a few seconds late, as the hon. member has already made a speech today in which he offered to withdraw his comments and admitted he had made a mistake.

It seems to me that, given this fact, the question of privilege is not in order at this point.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed aware that the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan did apologize in this House, but I insist that apologies are necessary. The fact remains that the comments made by our colleague infringe on the dignity of the people of Canada and Quebec, and I really think that this statement—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

The Speaker: Many times statements are made outside the House which are not made in the House. Our precedents tell us these are things said outside of the House and therefore are not necessarily the purview of the House.

We are dealing here with opinions of some people. At this point they have tried to clarify them. The member does not have a point of privilege in this matter. I would like to pass from this matter now.

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER

MEMBER FOR NANAIMO—COWICHAN

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on the same issue. I wish to remind the Chair that, less than three years ago, the hon. member for Rosemont, who then sat as an independent, was ordered by the Speaker to apologize for comments he had made outside the House.

[English]

The Speaker: The hon. member brings up something that happened in 1993. I have no reason to doubt that. I am going from memory because I was a member of the House at the time. I will inform myself of this in a formal way, but it seems to me the member for Rosemont made suggestions about members of the House and the House itself. However, in this case, to my knowledge, the words used did not reflect on the House, on a member or on the works of the House.

• (1510)

Because the hon. member does bring up a very specific point, I wonder if the House would grant me some time to look into this and see if that precedent can apply.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I point out that according to the standing orders, once you have made a ruling members of the House should not question your ruling. Therefore I object to what is going on here.

The Speaker: It is true I have made a ruling on a point of privilege. I am not dealing with a point of privilege here. I am dealing with a point of order brought up by an hon. member. I will look at this precedent and if it does exist I want to see what the bearing would be on this point of order, not privilege. That is behind us.

Routine Proceedings

Therefore I will come back to the House if necessary on this point of order. [English]

JUSTICE

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

PETITIONS

SENATE REFORM

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a group of students, a grade 11 history class from Dakota Collegiate in my riding.

This petition was conceived, drafted and brought forward by this group of innovative and creative students. There are approximately 185 signatures on this petition calling for Senate reform. These students not only call for Senate reform but offer constructive suggestions and ideas on what changes could and should be made to our institutions of government. I commend them for having taken this initiative.

[Translation]

VOLUNTEERS FROM ABROAD

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with interest and hope that I table in this House a petition signed by 339 persons who support the organization Le Patriarche, which provides therapy to drug addicts.

Founded in France in 1972, Le Patriarche is established in Canada and it also provides services to drug addicts in over 15 countries throughout the world. Le Patriarche needs volunteers from abroad to apply its therapy and to train Canadians to take over this responsibility.

• (1515)

I therefore support these petitioners, who ask the government to make it easier for volunteer therapists from abroad to come to Canada. Since the problems related to drug addiction are on the rise and affect more and more young people, it is essential to support organizations such as Le Patriarche.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of Mrs. Gerda Swift of North Vancouver and 116 others, who pray and humbly call on Parliament to keep dangerous sex offenders and pedophiles locked up for life; to eliminate statutory release; impose stiffer sentences for violent offenders; have violent offenders serve their full sentences and have time added for bad behaviour; have a central register for the names and addresses of violent offenders; give more power to the legal institutions to keep dangerous criminals, even after the sentence is served if they are still a risk to society; give police more authority in apprehending and interrogating violent offenders and to reinstate capital punishment for first degree murder in which there is no doubt of guilt.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present two petitions. The first is from Kelowna, B.C.

The petitioners would like to 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 society.

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

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes from Timmins, Ontario.

The petitioners draw 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 by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

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.

BOAT LICENCE FEES

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions.

The first petition is from the residents of the regional municipality of Sudbury who object to the proposed legislation that would see boaters paying vessel licence fees of up to \$1,000 every five years.

Therefore, your petitioners request that Parliament drop this proposal because it would put boating out of the reach of ordinary citizens.

I agree with the petitioners.

LAMPREY CONTROL

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by constituents requesting that Parliament continue the lamprey control funding at the previous level and at no extra cost to the Canadian public.

I also agree with the petitioners.

The Speaker: As members know, it is not our practice either to agree or disagree with petitions. I would ask you to refrain from mentioning it.

[Translation]

TRAN TRIEU QUAN

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for two years now, a resident from my riding, Tran Trieu Quan, has been held prisoner in Vietnam. People in the Quebec City region and throughout the province are upset by this situation and the 5,300 petitioners ask Parliament to ensure the safety and freedom of Tran Trieu Quan.

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by 51 of my constituents regarding section 718.2 of Bill C-41.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament not pass Bill C-41 with section 718.2 and not include the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and pleasure to present a petition on behalf of my constituents pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners have a whole variety of concerns regarding what they perceive to be excessively high prices for gasoline, propane and diesel fuel. They suggest that there seems to be price fixing taking place among the oil companies and that consumers are being gouged. They suggest that perhaps a consumer boycott of selected company stations would be an appropriate course of action.

• (1520)

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have another in quite a long list of petitions that I have been presenting on section 745 of the Criminal Code, known as the faint hope clause.

These petitions come from Airdrie, Crossfield and Fernie, B.C. They add to the hundreds of names of people from my area of the

Routine Proceedings

country who say that this clause in the Criminal Code puts our whole criminal justice system into disrepute.

This makes over 19,000 names that I have presented to this House on this issue.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the pleasure to present signatures of a few hundred of my constituents, primarily from the Kindersley area in west central Saskatchewan.

The petitioners state that section 241 of the Criminal Code says that everyone who counsels a person to commit suicide and who aids and abets a person to commit suicide, whether suicide ensues or not, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 14 years.

The petitioners ask Parliament not to repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way, and to uphold the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada of September 30, 1993 to disallow assisted suicides and euthanasia.

MERCHANT NAVY

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36, that has been approved by the clerk of petitions. It contains 100 signatures and was forwarded to me from the British Columbia area.

The petitioners, all being residents of Canada, petition the following: that the wartime merchant navy was the fourth arm of the armed services; that veterans of wartime merchant navy are under the Civilian War Related Benefits Act; that one in ten Canadian merchant seamen lost their lives, the highest proportional rate of all services, and that merchant navy prisoners of war spent 50 months on average in imprisonment but only 30 months are recognized.

Therefore, your petitioners call on Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to that enjoyed by the veterans of Canada, World War II armed services.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by numerous residents of Kingston and area.

The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code to ensure that the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired, reflects both the severity of the crime and a zero tolerance by Canada toward the crime.

Government Orders

JUSTICE

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition with almost 2,000 signatures that calls on the government to enhance the protection of children under the age of four from sexual abuse.

The government has taken some preventive action, including the introduction of a child sexual abuse register, to deal with this terrible crime, however, more work remains to be done.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from my constituents who oppose the extension of benefits of government employees to same sex partners.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: 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.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

BILL C-33. TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the second reading stage of the bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the allotted day of the second reading consideration of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

● (1525)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 50)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Adams | Alcock |
| Anawak | Arseneault |
| Assad | Assadourian |
| Augustine | Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre) |
| Baker | Bakopanos |
| Barnes | Beaumier |
| Bélair | Bélanger |
| Bernier (Beauce) | Bertrand |
| Bethel | Bevilacqua |
| Blondin-Andrew | Bodnar |
| Bonin | Boudria |
| Brown (Oakville—Milton) | Bryden |
| Byrne | Caccia |
| Calder | Campbell |
| Catterall | Chamberlain |
| Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) | Cohen |
| Collenette | Cowling |
| Crawford | Culbert |
| Cullen | DeVillers |
| Dhaliwal | Dion |
| Discepola | Dromisky |
| Duhamel | Dupuy |
| Easter | Eggleton |
| English | Fewchuk |
| Finestone | Finlay |
| Fliis | Fontana |
| Fry | Gaffney |
| Gagliano | Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) |
| Galloway | Gerrard |
| Goodale | Graham |
| Grose | Harb |
| Harper (Churchill) | Harvard |
| Hickey | Hopkins |
| Hubbard | Ianno |
| Ittody | Irwin |
| Jackson | Jordan |
| Keyes | Kirkby |
| Knutson | Kraft Sloan |
| Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul) | LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | Lincoln |
| Loney | MacAulay |
| MacDonald | MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys) |
| Malhi | Maloney |
| Manley | Marleau |
| Martin (LaSalle—Émard) | Massé |
| McCormick | McGuire |
| McKinnon | McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest) |
| McWhinney | Milliken |
| Minna | Mitchell |
| Murphy | Murray |

Government Orders

Nault
O'Reilly
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Whelan
Young

O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wells
Wood
Zed—146

● (1605)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

CONSIDERATION RESUMED OF SECOND READING

The House resumed from April 30, consideration of the motion that Bill C-33, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, there are four minutes remaining for questions or comments on the intervention of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I know it has been some time for Canadians who are watching this on television. This debate is on Bill C-33, which is a government order to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act by inserting the two words, sexual orientation.

Since we are in the period for questions and comments, I will ask my honoured and learned colleague from Fraser Valley East if he would tell the television viewers across the country what the implications of the insertion of those two words in the Canadian Human Rights Act might be for them.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I have four minutes or maybe less now. Parliamentarians have an hour left to speak on this. Again it is a travesty that the Liberals have brought in closure to restrict open debate.

Last night I asked for unanimous consent to split my time with the member for Ontario who is not being allowed to speak by the Liberal Party. That permission was denied by the members of the Liberal Party, which is a shame. They talk about freedom to speak one's mind and their own members are not allowed. One of their members was not even allowed to split my time with me.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member has made a statement which is not accurate and reflects badly on other members of the House. Anybody who wants to speak is allowed to speak—

The Deputy Speaker: That is a matter for debate, not a point of order. The time will not come out of the time of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the person who was just on her feet denied unanimous consent when I tried to obtain it yesterday.

It is a shame—

The Deputy Speaker: There is a second point of order which will not come out of any member's time. The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order. I hope it is not the same point of order.

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bachand
Bellemeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Jong
Debien
Dubé
Duncan
Fillion
Frazier
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Paré
Plamondon
Ramsay
Robinson
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
White (North Vancouver)—83

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélisle
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bhaduria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast/Sud-East)
Chatters
Crête
Davialt
de Savoye
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Grubel
Guimond
Hayes
Hill (MacLeod)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Mayfield
Ménard
Meredith
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solomon
Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Caron
Pagtakhan

Godfrey
St-Laurent

Government Orders

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member is making accusations which are not correct. He has also made an accusation which to me has taken the Chair in question. He is attributing that we are deciding who speaks in this House.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary will know that his party will have the floor for the next speaker after the present speaker finishes in two minutes. Then the parliamentary secretary will be permitted to get up and explain what he has just said as part of debate.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley East has about three minutes left.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I guess I am down to two minutes now. I am not sure if they are going to jump up again.

If they would care to look in yesterday's *Hansard*, I stood in this spot and said that I would like unanimous consent to split my time with the member for Ontario. That unanimous consent was denied by members of the Liberal Party.

I want to make it clear that it is disgusting that the Liberals will not allow people in their own party to speak. It is disgusting that they have invoked closure. If I had another 40 minutes, I could get wound up again on the whole issue we are debating here.

However, the issue I am raising now is that I made an offer to the member for Ontario. I had talked it over with him previously and said that I would do that. Consent was denied. He has been denied the privilege to speak by his own party. That is truly disgusting. Now the rest of the members will not be allowed to speak because closure is in place.

I have gone through the issue and my remarks are in *Hansard* for everyone to see. Closure is being invoked for the umpteenth time, which is far worse than what the Mulroney Tories ever did.

• (1615)

I would just like to point out that the Liberals are denying free speech in their own House of Commons and I think that is truly disgusting.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say how ashamed and upset I am that people in this House—

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the next speaker in the normal order is in fact a Liberal member. I believe it is the secretary of state for—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member was sitting there an instant ago and watched me look at her whole bench and nobody moved a muscle. The only person who was standing was the hon.

member for Calgary North. The hon. member for Calgary North has the floor.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of real concern to Canadians. The phone is ringing off the hook in my office. I have scores of letters from my constituents about this legislation yet debate is being stifled in this House by the government. The most undemocratic thing that has ever happened in this Parliament is to have debate on contentious issues simply cut off at the knees because the Liberals want to ram it through. Shame. I speak with the outrage of many Canadians across the country.

Unfortunately this debate has been surrounded by a high degree of politicization and emotion. I want to touch on the perception that was conveyed by the reported remarks of my colleague from Nanaimo—Cowichan. Those remarks were most unfortunate and were completely inconsistent with Reform policy.

Once again, I want to put on the record that the Reform Party will take a back seat to no one in opposing unfairness and discrimination. We believe strongly in the principle of equality, that all Canadians are equal, entitled to equal protection under the law, equal freedoms, equal protection from discrimination and hate mongering. Even where we may disagree with the lifestyles or viewpoints of others, the innate value, dignity and worth of each individual is to be respected and affirmed.

This legislation must be looked at on the merits of whether it is serving the best interests of Canadians and whether it is in fact furthering the goal of equally protecting Canadians from unfairness and discrimination in our society because that is a goal we all believe in and to which we are all committed. There are four reasons that this legislation should not proceed at this time.

The first point is it negates the key principle of equality in a democracy. This is a very important principle which we need to be looking at and have not looked at properly in my view. We should not be looking at whether we should be adding one group or another to the federal human rights legislation. We should focus instead on the broader principle of equality and individual rights.

The principles of equality and individuals rights apply to individuals and are based on the position of each person as a human being, not on group membership. Recognizing different categories of people for the purpose of defining or augmenting their rights under the Canadian Human Rights Act is negating the principle of equality and polarizing Canadian society.

So far the Canadian Human Rights Act lists 10 categories of Canadians deserving special protections. Special interest groups have used and are using these categorizations to demand preferential treatment, not equal treatment but preferential treatment. Often their claim is based on the rationale that special treatment is required to make up for past injustices or for certain inherent

disadvantages. This has led to a situation where Canadians are no longer equal. Groups not currently included in the list justifiably argue for inclusion.

• (1620)

We see this in the United States where there is a real movement to include prohibitions against discrimination of people based on their height. I personally would applaud that. That is another expansion that logically this kind of approach leads to. There is a movement for the prevention of discrimination based on size or weight. There is a movement for the prevention of discrimination based on looks. If one is not attractive, according to that particular lobby, then one is discriminated against and not given the same opportunities as others. Where does it all end?

We need to look carefully at the kind of approach we are taking to this legislation before we rush it through. We should back up and take a long range look at it.

The Reform Party strongly believes that all Canadians are entitled to the same rights and privileges under the Canadian Human Rights Act. However, the protections awarded by this act do not ensure equality but rather tend to have the opposite result in some cases. It sets Canadians against each other in a quest for economic benefits which benefit one group at the cost of another.

All of us have friends and family members who want to pursue different professions or different opportunities in the federal public service but are told: "No point in applying. You do not have the special group characteristics that are required at the current time". Extending the special protections of the Canadian Human Rights Act to a constantly growing list of groups will lead to increasing infringement of the existing privileges and rights of other Canadians.

Under the current wording of the Canadian Human Rights Act, inequalities clearly do exist. Therefore, the only logically consistent and defensible way to oppose extending these special rights to groups not currently included is by proposing to eliminate those inequalities while strongly affirming a belief in the equality and rights of individuals.

The debate we really ought to be having is to back up, take a clear look at the big picture and the principles we are attempting to protect. Before we go too far down the road of adding more and more specially designated groups, we should first consider replacing all prohibited grounds of discrimination. We should also replace the special categories currently listed in the Canadian Human Rights Act with a clearly worded straight definition of fundamental human rights that applies to each and every Canadian without discrimination and without any inequality at all. We have not looked at this approach. It is one I believe must be considered

Government Orders

and properly debated before we move to add more and more groups to the human rights legislation.

The second reason this legislation should not be passed at this time is that Canadians are very unsure, and I believe rightly so, about the effects and the consequences of passing this legislation. The government put out a little book about what would be the effect of passing this legislation. It says that it would not extend economic benefits to different groups and a number of other things which it is alleged this legislation would not do. Unfortunately I do not think it is any surprise to Canadians that once legislation is in place, its interpretation or application very much depends on decisions of the courts.

• (1625)

Canadians are rightly asking: Will this legislation change our application of economic benefits? Will this legislation change our definition of family and the basic building blocks for our society? Will this legislation prohibit people who disagree with certain viewpoints from voicing that disagreement, or if they choose to speak their own opinion, will that be considered discrimination? Will they be muzzled and their freedom of speech abrogated? These are very real logical questions and they should be answered.

What does the Liberal government do when these very serious questions are put forward by the Canadian people? It cuts off debate, in effect saying: "We do not want to talk about this. We are not going to answer your questions. It is going to go through and let the chips fall where they may".

Canadians are increasingly losing confidence in their lawmakers and no wonder. They are often told one thing and the consequences are something quite different. Canadians have a real lack of trust and confidence in their lawmakers.

We have a duty as lawmakers to address that by being open and transparent and taking all the time necessary to answer the very real concerns, fears and objections of the people who are going to have to live with this legislation. We must do that. It is our responsibility. We represent these people. Pushing something through because a few people in their wisdom have decided this is the way the country should be going is not the way a democracy should be working. Shame on us.

Shame on us for not taking the time to respond to the concerns that I am hearing in my constituency office. I am willing to wager that every single member of Parliament is hearing those same concerns. That is not the way to bring in good legislation.

The third reason we should hesitate in pushing ahead with this legislation particularly in such a high-handed manner is that it does not enjoy the support of the majority of Canadians. I have already mentioned that Canadians are concerned about the real effects and

Government Orders

consequences of this kind of bill. In addition to that, simply put, it does not enjoy the support of the broad base of the Canadian public.

Surely if we have to live with laws, they should at least meet with our approval. If we think that people would approve if they knew all the ins and outs, then it is up to us to place that information in front of the public, to inform them to the point where public opinion would broadly support this kind of a measure. If we truly believe this is right for our society, that it is something which is necessary, proper, fair and just, then it would be no trouble at all. There would be no problem in getting Canadians behind it.

But what does this Liberal government do? It introduces the legislation, it introduces closure, it shoves the debate through and just pushes it upon Canadians without any consideration for their hesitation, their concerns and their lack of support. That is wrong. It should not be done that way. I protest in the strongest possible terms on behalf of the people of Canada at the way this legislation that is going to affect us and the way we perceive society is being dealt with and that there are special protections for yet another group.

I did a survey in my riding of Calgary North in anticipation that this issue would come forward. I listed arguments that were most often brought forward in favour of the inclusion of sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act and the arguments that were most often brought forward against it. I received over 1,000 responses. Not one response criticized the objectiveness or completeness of the background information that I provided to my constituents.

• (1630)

As an elected representative I need to give people objective information. They need to know both sides of any question. They need to know the pros and the cons, which there always are in whatever proposal comes forward. They need time to look at the information, to consider it and discuss it in order to make an informed decision.

Of the 1,035 responses I received to the question: Do you think the federal government should amend federal legislation to add sexual orientation as a prohibited grounds of discrimination, 67.9 per cent said no; 26.3 per cent said yes; 4.4 per cent were undecided; and 1.4 per cent had no response.

I then asked a second question: If yes, would you support this amendment if it meant extending economic and family benefits that heterosexual couples currently enjoy such as medical, survivor, income tax benefits, marriage and adoption to homosexual couples? Of the 272 people who answered yes to question number one, that sexual orientation should be included, 64.3 per cent of

those 272 people agreed that economic and family benefits should also be extended to same sex couples, 28 per cent disagreed, 7.7 per cent were undecided and no one omitted a response.

That is the result from one poll in one urban riding. It has a very wide and broad range of people and backgrounds. It is incumbent upon us, it seems to me, to take more time to canvass the public when putting into place legislation that is going to affect our society for many years to come. It would have results we cannot clearly foresee pending court interpretation of the legislation.

As this legislation deserves a more sober, broad based and public dimension and consultation, I would move an amendment to the bill before the House at this time. I move that we:

Delete all the words after "That" in the main question and substitute the following:

Bill C-33, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time six months hence.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion is acceptable.

• (1635)

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said in her remarks that the Reform Party was all in favour of equal rights for all Canadians. Yet it appears that her intention is to get rid of part of the Canadian Human Rights Act and take away rights that have been granted.

It is my view, and I think the view of most Canadians, that the provisions of the act which prohibit discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, family status, disability and conviction for which a pardon has been granted, have been widely accepted as advancing the interests and the opportunities for the persons named on that list, which is, of course, the vast majority of the Canadian population, since sex after all is one of the prohibited grounds.

I understand that most women's groups feel their interests have been advanced by the legislation. I am also of the view that most persons who come from various ethnic backgrounds or persons of colour feel that their interests have been advanced by this legislation and so have persons with disabilities in particular. I mention those groups because they are strongly in support of this legislation.

If the hon. member thinks that there should be equality for all, why does she oppose the inclusion of persons who are being discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation? They have provided ample evidence of this discrimination over the years. They have sought this amendment for many years and now Reform Party members seek to exclude them from this list because in their view they are unworthy of inclusion.

Government Orders

Why does the hon. member not come clean and admit that is the real reason behind her remarks? It is not because she does not think this act has done a good job. She is not advocating repeal of this act and she knows it. I invite her to answer that comment. Is she not trying to simply whitewash the Reform Party position by saying everyone should be equal.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the intervention of the member for Kingston and the Islands because he is on record as supporting the first remarks in my intervention in this debate that the use of closure in this House is morally wicked. I appreciate the fact that he feels so strongly on behalf of the right of members to fully and fairly debate issues. Unfortunately the comments he made in that regard were in the last Parliament. He seems suddenly to have changed his stance in this one.

We need to look at what we are trying to accomplish in this legislation. The member talks about advancing opportunities but is that what we are trying to do in this legislation? I would submit that this legislation is trying to eliminate unfairness and discrimination against Canadian citizens.

If we are doing that, it is something that each and every Canadian citizen is entitled to. We are all individually and equally entitled to protection against discrimination and unfairness.

What happens? We have a Canadian Human Rights Act. The member is quite correct. I certainly would never support abrogating that act. It enshrines very important principles of fairness, equality and anti-discrimination in our society. Instead of a straightforward definition of fundamental, individual human rights, it puts in categories. It says these people are entitled to special protection against discrimination, not all of us equally, but these groups.

The member even mentioned a category that is not in the legislation: the disabled. The point he is making is quite correct. Many people in our society for many reasons suffer unfairness and discrimination. That should be stamped out. They should be protected against that but on the basis that they have fundamental individual rights and individual liberties and not because they are a member of a group. No one would be excluded at all if there were no categories because we would all be equally entitled to equal protection, equal fairness and equal protection from discrimination. I submit that is exactly what our legislation should be doing.

• (1640)

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Reform member this question. Would the addition of the proposed term to the legislation, namely, the prevention of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, not cover all Canadians, regardless of their sexual orientation?

Mrs. Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope so. If it does, why do we need to put it in? If we are all equally covered, then we are all equally covered. We do not need to list some defining characteristic of the people who are covered. If we are all covered, why are we defining who is covered and who is not?

What the hon. member just said is that he agrees with the logic of my argument and I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Kirkby: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I believe the hon. member from the Reform Party has completely missed the point, but that ought not to surprise any of us.

I will make it clear for her. At present an individual who is a heterosexual could be discriminated against and could be fired for that reason. This legislation will prevent that from happening. Is that not a good thing?

Mrs. Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, if the member is suggesting that I am mentally challenged, then perhaps he ought not to discriminate against me by asking vague questions and then be unhappy because I do not answer properly or to his satisfaction.

Again, the point that I am making is that any person in our country who is discriminated against, who is treated unfairly for any reason, whose fundamental, individual human rights are being contravened, should be protected. That should not be allowed in our society and that person should have a recourse to have that discrimination reversed and addressed.

For whatever reason the hon. member wishes to raise it, I would agree that if there is discrimination and unfairness taking place, it should not be allowed. There is no need to say that these people are going to be protected and these people are going to be protected and if a person is in this group they will be protected, but then be silent about the rest. That abrogates the fundamental democratic principle of equality and is not the right way to go about protecting human rights.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief comment on what my colleague from Calgary had to say.

Yesterday in the mail I received a little booklet that describes why the government is adding sexual orientation to the Canadian Human Rights Act. I find it very interesting that it has already put this out as a fait accompli. The government has limited debate in the House.

What is being done here today is a sham. It is not going to change the mind of the government. The government has already decided what it is going to do. It has printed the information as if it is an accomplished fact already that the amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act will be passed.

Government Orders

This is a travesty of democracy and debate. There is absolutely no point to what we are doing in the House. It becomes abundantly obvious when the government invokes closure on the motion that it has already set its course. The Liberals will not listen to the Canadian people. They will not listen to the debate in the House. That is unconscionable. It is a travesty of democracy and the way things should work.

• (1645)

If the people of Canada were demanding this we would have a very different view of this entire thing. However, what we have here today is top down, "we are telling you the way it is"; it is being published in advance, before the bill is even put through the House.

Liberals refer to their speaking notes all the time. Are those speaking notes binding on this legislation? I do not think they are any more binding than the promises they made on NAFTA, the GST and all of these other things. They do not mean a thing and they will not be binding on this bill.

Mrs. Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I accept the comments of my hon. colleague and thank him.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The five hours for debate were up one minute ago, so we shall now move on to the period when each member is given 10 minutes on debate.

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake—the goods and services tax.

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am dividing my time with the member for Ottawa West.

I rise with pleasure and pride to speak to Bill C-33, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to add sexual orientation as a prohibited grounds of discrimination. I congratulate the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister for bringing this amendment forward at this time, because there has never been any doubt about the government's commitment to this principle.

This amendment is about the principles of justice and equality which have always been the bedrock of the Liberal Party's belief. They have always been the bedrock of Canadian values that we hold dear, values of tolerance, respect and social responsibility.

Today more than ever we need to emphasize and set strategies to promote equality. Today more than ever we need to name in legislation what we mean by equality and how we intend to implement that equality.

Today we see attempts by some groups to erode fundamental Canadian values, groups like the Reform Party which speaks of equality and yet its members espouse discrimination. They speak about representing the grassroots of Canadians yet seek to divide Canadians into different classes of citizens, those who would be relegated to the back of the bus or the back of the shop, those who would eat in different establishments eventually or go to different schools. I thought that ended with apartheid.

The third party, which will undoubtedly vote against this bill, as it has been saying, will have proven yet again that apologies or not, its record is clear. It has voted against every equality seeking piece of legislation the government has put forward.

Let me speak about the ugliness of discrimination. I know because I am a member of a visible minority. I was a family physician who listened daily to the pain, the anguish, the shame and the loss of self-esteem that each patient of mine who was a target of discrimination told me about, whether it was because of their religion, colour or sexual orientation. These people lived with that loss of self-esteem, with their mental health, with their ability to walk proudly down the street, damaged and harmed with the pain of discrimination.

Discrimination kills the soul. The idea of optional discrimination is the antithesis to the fundamental values we hold dear. It is the antithesis to the whole idea of equality. In a fantasy world, which one day I hope to live in, where we are all equal under the law, where it has been established that we no longer need to seek equality, then the hon. member across may have something to say.

It is interesting to look at what history has taught us. It is interesting to see how at every point in history and at every stage where the fight for equality and freedom has been fought arguments have always been made by majority groups against the equality and the freedoms of the groups seeking equality.

• (1650)

Arguments have been made giving quasi-logical and legal reasons for denying those freedoms. There were arguments for slavery based on the fact that blacks were mentally inferior. All the excuses were made on the mass genocide of Jews. People were told there were economic arguments for ensuring the Jews were put down.

The equality of women was denied consistently for centuries based on the fact they were merely chattel and lacked the intellectual ability to take an equal place in society.

I would not be standing here today in the House of Commons if these kinds of legislation were not put into place to ensure I had the same fundamental and basic equality as the other people sitting in the House of Commons.

Government Orders

I have listened to the arguments made by the third party to deny this amendment. The arguments go on about groups and that equality means we should all be treated equally. Equality can be achieved only by removing barriers.

I am disabled and I cannot achieve equality if I cannot get into the building to participate without a wheelchair ramp. That is a special measure taken to ensure the equality of disabled people.

Today we know, and it has been well documented, that gays and lesbians in this country are denied the right to employment based on sexual orientation.

As a physician I have seen on a Friday or Saturday night gays and lesbians who were beaten purely because of their sexual orientation, taken bloodied into an emergency room.

The fundamental amendment we are discussing seeks to give equality of access to employment and housing. I know what it is like to be denied housing. When I was a medical student in England I sought an apartment. Because I came from a Commonwealth country I sounded quite British on the telephone. When I went to the door, about one minute later because I telephoned from around the corner, the woman took one look at me and said: "I am sorry, it's gone".

People have to know what it is like to feel that way, to suddenly feel inferior, subhuman, dirty and disgusting. That is what we mean when we talk about the reality of the lives of people who are discriminated against.

I do not hear the third party talking about equality in terms of "then let us not let gays and lesbians pay taxes. Why should they be equal and pay taxes?" We know this group belongs to one of the highest income groups in the country and pays an extraordinary amount of taxes.

We talk about equality and I do not think members of the third party understand the reality of people's lives because they come from a privileged majority. We sit here and listen to them espousing very warm, fuzzy and logical arguments, not to speak, based on airy-fairy ideas. They do not understand. They seek to represent true Canadians and I do not think they even understand the reality of the lives of ordinary Canadians.

The statements repeatedly made in the House by the members of the third party tell me they represent only a particular group in the country. They do not know what it is like to be a person of colour. If they did they would never talk about some of the things they do. They do not know what it feels like to be disabled. If they did, they would talk about special measures to be taken to ensure that disabled people are able to take their places in the workforce. They would support the kinds of changes which would give people the

ability to seek equality opportunity from a level playing field. That is what the amendment is about.

The amendment speaks to the fact that 71 per cent of Canadians have supported the bill in poll after poll and survey after survey. Canadians are fundamentally and basically people who espouse freedom, justice, equality and who talk about respect, not just tolerance. Tolerance means to put up with people. Respect means we know that person belongs and that they have something to share, something which will enrich the lives of Canadians. This country is based on respect. We are the role model to the world.

The third party talks about discrimination. Name any country that within the last part of this century has understood discrimination better than South Africa? Yet as soon as it got rid of apartheid and formed its first democratic government, one of the first things it did was put into its constitution lists of all those people who had been held back and who have a long way to go to achieve equality. In that list the South African Parliament put sexual orientation.

• (1655)

There was not a debate. The reason there was not a debate was that people who have been downtrodden, people who have been seeking equality understand the reality and do not seek to keep anyone from that basic fundamental freedom we talk about when we speak of equality in this country.

Equality and justice are based on the fact that the greatest of us in society will always seek to lend a hand to raise the smallest and the least of us. This is what we are talking about. This is what this party stands for. This is what this government stands for. This is what the third party opposite does not even begin to understand.

I am proud to stand here and I am proud to support this bill. Every Canadian looking on today, the 71 per cent of Canadians who continue to believe in the things that hold us together, the common values that hold us together as Canadians, will be applauding in their homes today when they see us speaking to this bill because they believe in it.

It is no coincidence that we have been seen as a role model to the world. It is no coincidence that when Boutros Boutros-Ghali met the Prime Minister at the 50th anniversary of the United Nations he said: "Your country is the greatest country in the world because you have learned how as a diverse people to live together, respecting differences, sharing equally, seeking constantly to bring equality to the world. It is you who will lead us into the 21st century". This piece of legislation is beginning to do exactly that.

The Deputy Speaker: The 20 minutes speeches ended at 45 minutes past the hour. We are now into 10 minute speeches rotation across the floor. The hon. secretary of state spoke for 10 minutes. Now it is the turn of the other side of the floor and then it will come back to the deputy whip for the Liberal Party.

Government Orders

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-33 to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act.

This legislation will add the undefined term sexual orientation to the list of categories which offer special protection under the Canadian Human Rights Act. This contravenes the concept of equality, the idea that all people are equal and should be treated as equals under the law.

This bill sets aside one more category under the Canadian Human Rights Act to include people who will get special treatment under the law. This is a break away from equality. I believe the intentions of the government in presenting this legislation are good and are honourable, but the results of this legislation, should it pass, and we know it will because closure has been invoked and the government whip will make sure it passes, will be one more category enshrined in the Canadian Human Rights Act.

The argument used by some members opposite of how could anyone oppose adding protection based on sexual orientation under the Canadian Human Rights Act is not a valid argument. What should happen is that all categories set aside for special treatment should be eliminated. We should, pure and simple, view Canadians as equal, and under the law we should treat all people in this country as equal.

I cannot support a bill which breaks away from this important basic principle of equality.

• (1700)

I would like to read the very first principle written in the Reform blue book. It is the most important principle that guides Reform policy.

It says: "We affirm commitment to Canada as a balanced federation of equal provinces and citizens". The most important principle of Reform is the principle of equality. I will support no legislation that goes against this principle. It is a basic principle that I think Canadians support without reservation. For that reason, I will vote against this bill.

I would like to comment on what my constituents say about this legislation. I did a survey about a year ago in anticipation of this legislation coming forward. The survey went out to all eligible voters in the constituency through a householder. I would like to read some results of this survey.

I will read the question so members know what was asked. It was a fair, unbiased question: Should sexual orientation, undefined, be included as a protected category under the Canadian Human Rights Act? That is quite a simple, straight forward question.

What response did I get from my constituents? The message was very clear. There is no doubt how my constituents feel on this issue. Eighty-nine per cent of respondents said they are against having sexual orientation, undefined, included as a protected category under the Canadian Human Rights Act. Only 6 per cent were in favour. The rest were undecided or did not respond to that question. Those results are pretty clear. They certainly guide my vote.

When going to constituents to determine their view on an issue, it is important to do the background work. This issue has been well debated in my constituency. The media have played their role on this issue. They reported what has gone on at public meetings. They reported what different people are saying on this issue. They have my point of view on it. They have the point of view of many others from the constituency who have an interest in this issue. The debate has taken place at public meetings. There has been media involvement. This has taken place over some time.

Finally, the formal mechanism, a key part of the process, which is a householder survey that went out to all constituents, indicated that 89 per cent are against having sexual orientation, undefined, included as a protected category under the Canadian Human Rights Act.

I also asked in the householder some other questions about related issues. These related issues, although the government argues otherwise, are pertinent. When this change passes—we know it will—it will lead to more changes down the road.

Many members in this House and people outside who support this legislation say that this is only a first step. I firmly believe that.

The other related questions that I asked in this survey were these. I will read them and give the results: Do you agree with the definition of the family as those individuals related by the ties of blood, marriage or adoption and that marriage is the union between a man and a woman as recognized by the state? The response to this question: 96.5 or 97 per cent were in favour, only 2 per cent were against and about 1 per cent were undecided.

I asked two other two related questions. One question was: Should spousal benefits for any program funded or administered by the federal government be extended to same sex couples? In response 94 per cent said no, only 4 per cent said yes and about 1 per cent were undecided. Those results are quite clear.

• (1705)

I believe that not only do the results reflect the position and the beliefs of the people in my constituency but they reflect a much larger view. I have heard this certainly in Ontario, Atlantic Canada and across the prairies as I have gone around the country over the past couple of years.

Government Orders

The fourth question that I put to the people in my constituency was: Should a new category called households be established for the purposes of identifying dependent relationships that are not currently included in the definition of a family? In response 88 per cent said no, 7 per cent yes—

The Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase a famous orator: "Never in history has so much been said by so many about only two words".

I want to begin by reading from the Canadian Human Rights Act. This act enshrines the fundamental principle of Canadian society:

Respect for the dignity and equality of all human beings and their right to live and to work free from discrimination.

A great deal has been said to suggest that in fact this act treats Canadians unequally. Let me therefore read from the act:

For matters coming under the legislative authority of Parliament—every individual shall have an equal opportunity—to make for himself or herself the life that he or she is able and wishes to have, consistent with his or her duties and obligations as a member of society, without being hindered in or prevented from doing so by discriminatory practices.

Every individual. Equal opportunity.

It then lists the characteristics on which discrimination most commonly occurs: race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, a conviction which has been pardoned. The amendment before Parliament today adds two words to that list, nothing more. The words are sexual orientation.

As far as I know every single Canadian has a sexual orientation. You are bisexual, you are heterosexual or you are homosexual. Everybody is covered by this act.

Inclusion of race in the Canadian Human Rights Act does not say that black people are protected but white people are not. Inclusion of religion does not say that I am protected as a Roman Catholic, but a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Protestant is not. We are all protected from discrimination based on our religious beliefs, whatever they may be.

Not one person who has written or spoken to me on this issue has said that it should be acceptable to discriminate against someone, to deny them employment or services just because they are gay or lesbian. Nobody says it is all right to discriminate and that is what this act is about. It is saying it is not all right, it is not acceptable, it is not legal in Canada to discriminate.

People have raised with me issues that they are afraid may be implicit in this act so let me deal with these concerns. They are concerned about pedophilia. The preamble specifies the right to be free from discrimination based on respect for the law and lawful conduct. Pedophilia is not a sexual orientation, it is a crime. It is

prohibited by the Criminal Code and it will continue to be prohibited by the Criminal Code.

The Canadian Human Rights Act applies only to lawful conduct. Churches and schools are worried it will interfere with their right to preach religious values on matters of sexuality. Churches and schools are not under the jurisdiction of the federal government. The Canadian Human Rights Act applies only to those matters under the purview and the legislative authority of Parliament.

Even when this issue was dealt with by the Supreme Court of Canada under an Ontario human rights act which does include sexual orientation and has for a decade, the Supreme Court of Canada said that Catholic schools were completely free to ensure that those people they hired had religious beliefs which were consistent with the purpose of the school.

• (1710)

People are concerned that this amendment may affect the definition of marriage. Again I want to go back to the preamble of the bill, which says very clearly that the government recognizes and affirms the importance of family as the foundation of Canadian society and that nothing in the act alters its fundamental role in society. In any case, marriage is primarily a provincial matter. If having sexual orientation in the human rights act automatically implied recognition of same sex partnerships, the Ontario government would not have had to go through introducing a piece of legislation 10 years after it included sexual orientation in its human rights act. It would not have had to introduce legislation to establish same sex relationships on a legal basis.

Again I want to go back to the courts because people are also concerned about the extension of employment benefits to same sex partners. It was very clear in the case of *Egan and Nesbitt v. The Queen*. The unanimous decision of the court was that sexual orientation is a prohibited ground of discrimination under section 15 of the charter of rights and freedoms. Not the Canadian Human Rights Act, but the Canadian charter, which is constitutional law. Notwithstanding the court's finding, it did not support the extension of same sex benefits in that case.

The claim that this bill establishes special rights is simply not accurate. This covers all Canadians. It protects us all from discrimination, from whatever source.

We are bringing our Canadian Human Rights Act into conformity with the human rights acts of eight of the provinces and territories in Canada. We are bringing to 10 per cent of Canadians who work in federal jurisdiction the same rights which are enjoyed by the majority of the workforce employed in eight of our provinces and territories. Is it not about time we had equality of rights across the country?

Government Orders

There are complaints. People can argue that there is no discrimination, but there are many complaints from gays and lesbians. The vast majority are about something as basic as the ability to get and keep a job.

Discrimination hurts us all. Discrimination hurts our society. It leads to isolation from society, to alienation, to being forced into hiding who we are for fear of discovery, for fear of losing our jobs, our apartments, the right to go where we want to go, to do what we want and to buy what we want. It means being ostracised. That is not good for the individual and it is not good for society.

Legislation will not end discrimination. Our Criminal Code does not end murder, robbery, beatings or rape. However, it gives a legal recourse to people who are victims of those actions which we have determined are unacceptable in our society.

This subject is often argued on religious grounds. As a Christian I have very strong religious principles that also guide my personal behaviour. The strongest of the commandments that I obey is the one that says: "Love one another as I have loved you". A similar principle is in other religions and I respect them all; however, to me it is a simple matter of human dignity, of fairness, of respecting every other person on this earth and treating them fairly.

• (1715)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those in favour of the amendment 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 nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 51*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Bridgman
Chatters
Epp
Gilmour
Grubel
Hart
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Mayfield
Meredith
Ringma
Scott (Skeena)
White (North Vancouver)—29

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast/Sud-Est)
Duncan
Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (MacLeod)
Johnston
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Ramsay
Schmidt
Strahl

NAYS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand
Barnes
Bélair
Bélsisle
Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Byrne
Calder
Canuel
Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy
Collenette
Crawford
Culbert
Dalphond-Guiral
de Jong
Debien
DeVillers
Dingwall
Discepolo
Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway
Gerrard
Goodale
Grose
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lalonde

Alcock
Anawak
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Cowling
Crête
Cullen
Davialt
de Savoye
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Dion
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Godin
Graham
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jacob
Keyes
Kirby
Kraft Sloan
Landry

Government Orders

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

(Division No. 52)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Althouse
Arseneault
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bélisle
Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brien
Byrne
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Cowling
Cullen
Davault
de Savoye
Deshaies
Dhaliwal
Dion
Dromisky
Duceppe
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier
Godin
Graham
Guay
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Irwin
Jacob
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Mercier
Minna
Murphy
Nunez
Paré
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson

Alcock
Anawak
Assad
Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Caccia
Canuel
Cauchon
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy
Collenette
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Jong
Debien
DeVillers
Dingwall
Discepolo
Dubé
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway
Gerrard
Goodale
Grose
Guimond
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Ianno
Jackson
Keyes
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Landry
Laurin
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McLaughlin
McWhinney
Mercier
Minna
Murphy
Nunez
Paré
Parrish
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Rocheleau

Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
Malhi
Manley
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McWhinney
Mercier
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Paradis
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Regan
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

Laurin
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Marleau
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
Ménard
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunez
O'Reilly
Paré
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Plamondon
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Sheridan
Solomon
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—198

PAIRED MEMBERS

Caron
Pagtakhan

Godfrey
St-Laurent

• (1740)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Private Members' Business

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Rock | Sauvageau |
| Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) | Sheridan |
| Simmons | Solomon |
| St. Denis | Stewart (Brant) |
| Stewart (Northumberland) | Taylor |
| Telegdi | Terrana |
| Thalheimer | Torsney |
| Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) | Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) |
| Valeri | Vanclief |
| Walker | Wells |
| Whelan | Wood |
| Young | Zed—178 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Abbott | Ablonczy |
| Baker | Benoit |
| Bhaduria | Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) |
| Bridgman | Brown (Calgary Southeast/Sud-Est) |
| Bryden | Calder |
| Chatters | Crawford |
| Culbert | Duncan |
| Epp | Frazier |
| Gilmour | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Grubel | Guarnieri |
| Harper (Simcoe Centre) | Hart |
| Hayes | Hermanson |
| Hill (MacLeod) | Hoepfner |
| Hubbard | Iftody |
| Johnston | Jordan |
| Mayfield | McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest) |
| McGuire | McTeague |
| Meredith | Murray |
| O'Brien (London—Middlesex) | O'Reilly |
| Peric | Pillitteri |
| Ramsay | Ringma |
| Schmidt | Scott (Skeena) |
| Skoke | Speller |
| Steckle | Strahl |
| Szabo | Ur |
| Verran | Wappel |
| White (North Vancouver) —53 | |

PAIRED MEMBERS

| | |
|-----------|------------|
| Caron | Godfrey |
| Pagtakhan | St-Laurent |

● (1750)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Persons With Disabilities.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): It being 5.55 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed in today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved that Bill C-217, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of witnesses), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce Bill C-217 in this House. The purpose of this bill is to protect any person testifying in criminal proceedings in which the accused is charged with a sexual offence or a violent crime.

Under this bill, the accused could no longer personally cross-examine witnesses. In such cases, witnesses would be examined or cross-examined by the court.

First of all, I would like to thank the members on both sides of this House who have already told me they would support my initiative. I wish to thank them all. I hope that my presentation will convince other members and that a majority in this House will feel that my bill is well founded.

Bill C-217 is a solution to the problem of accused people defending themselves. In fact, the accused can choose their own defence strategy, including defending themselves. They can then cross-examine their victims and confront them face to face. I have two examples of legal proceedings supporting my arguments.

My first example is the trial of former Concordia University professor Valery Fabrikant. That circus lasted five months, ending in August 1993. Fabrikant assumed his own defence after firing his lawyers. He was finally found guilty of murdering his four colleagues, and he is currently serving a life sentence in the Donnacona penitentiary, close to Quebec City.

The second case is that of Ferreira, whose trial took place in Montreal, last fall. This person was accused of forcible confinement and sexual aggression. As in the above-mentioned case, Agostino Ferreira assumed his own defence. He even personally cross-examined his two victims. I deplore the fact that these aberrations in our legal system were not more strongly condemned outside Quebec. I presume that a certain regionalism prevails when it comes to news items of this sort.

For example, reaction to horrible murders committed in British Columbia is not as strong in New Brunswick. To fully understand the purpose and the objectives of my bill, it is imperative to see the facts in these two legal cases that led me to propose this solution.

Here are these facts. On August 24, 1992, around 3 p.m., Valery Fabrikant, a teacher and researcher at the mechanical engineering

department, entered Sir Henry F. Hall, in Montreal's Concordia University. He was carrying three fully loaded revolvers, as well as boxes full of ammunition. He went to his office on the ninth floor with his union president, professor Michael Hogben, 52, and shot him point-blank.

He then killed in the same manner professors Ziogas, 48, Saber, 46, and Matthew Douglas, 66. He also shot secretary Elizabeth Horwood several times, 66, without managing to kill her. He then locked himself up in an office with the security guard, Daniel Martin, and Georges Abdou, who managed to disarm him when he was momentarily distracted. That is the first horror story.

● (1800)

On January 4, 1995, Agostino Ferreira entered a clothing store on Saint-Denis in Montreal. It was 10.30 a.m. and the store was empty. He indicated to the two young female employees that he needed their help to write a suicide note, but they did not take him seriously. In the face of this reaction, Ferreira showed them a bomb attached to his belt. He said it was powerful enough to blow up the whole neighbourhood.

He was also armed with a pistol. He calmly told the girls to get into a taxi. They were afraid that he would set off the bomb, and did what they were told. The three went to Ferreira's apartment. In a gloomy room, lit by candles, he had one of them write a suicide note in which he confessed to a double murder five years earlier.

He then bound the girls with tape. He gagged them, blindfolded them and tied their hands and feet. He cut the clothes off one of them with a knife. He then raped both girls. They managed to escape when he left the apartment to get some cocaine. So much for the facts.

The Fabrikant and Ferreira cases caused quite a stir in the metropolitan Montreal area. Apart from the cruelty and the perversity of these individuals' actions, these two sordid affairs have one fundamental point in common. These two individuals presented their own defence, without legal representation, and took advantage of their rights to personally cross-examine the victims of their crimes.

In the case of Valery Fabrikant, the trial lasted five months. Fabrikant, who refused to plead insanity, as his lawyers had suggested he do, wanted to show that he had been persecuted by Concordia University. He wanted to mount a defence mid-way between that of provocation and the battered woman syndrome. In all, the accused rejected 10 lawyers.

His defence, obviously, was not admissible in law. Provocation supposes that the accused has been subjected to an insult or an unfair action such that a reasonable person in the same situation would have been unable to maintain control and, in the heat of the moment, would also have killed his victim. This is a defence which, if accepted by the court, would not have led to an acquittal,

Private Members' Business

but to lessened criminal responsibility. The individual could have been found guilty of involuntary homicide rather than murder.

I dare not even touch the battered wife syndrome argument for fear of losing my cool. There can be no more twisted and abject individual that one seeking to justify his foul crime by identifying himself with a woman who has been the victim of spousal violence. These are nothing more than the dreadful machinations of a paranoid and narcissistic mind.

The right to a full defence is a fundamental one in our society, and probably the grounds on which Mr. Justice Fraser Martin allowed Fabrikant to parade 77 witnesses, mostly from Concordia University, despite the inadmissibility of the defence of provocation.

During the entire trial, Valery Fabrikant presented himself as the victim of persecution, of a plot by the Concordia University community. He even summoned Elizabeth Horwood, the secretary who survived the massacre. Our system allows such things.

● (1805)

But I would ask this: Is our system better served when someone who has been accused of attempted murder can cross-examine his victim and attempt to discredit him or her? No. When there is a legal counsel, he or she serves as a middleman to cross-examine the victim without confrontation with the attacker.

I will give you an example of the type of question Fabrikant was allowed to ask Mrs. Horwood, whom he had shot at: "Where did I hit you? What did I look like at the time? Can you describe what I did?" Mrs. Horwood acquitted herself very well under the circumstances, but might she not have been spared a second attack by the perpetrator?

Take a moment to imagine the state of mind of Mrs. Horwood, when she again saw her attacker coming toward her to question her on the events that have left a permanent scar on her life? After five months of trial, the jury deliberated seven hours before finding the ex-professor guilty of the charges against him.

During the trial, Fabrikant did not hesitate to insult Judge Martin, which earned him six citations for contempt of court. The Supreme Court of Canada finally sealed this murderer's fate on June 2, 1994, by refusing him leave to appeal. That put an end to the circus trial.

The story of Agostino Ferreira is scarcely any better, in fact in some ways it is more loathsome. I shall not go into the facts of the case, except to point out that Ferreira was charged with forceable confinement, kidnapping and assault. At the trial, the victims were cross-examined by Ferreira himself, who did not have a lawyer.

He started out by apologizing to the first of the two victims for asking her questions. He asked her if the suspect—the suspect being himself—had acted not out of spite but out of love. Ferreira also asked questions related to his statement that someone or some

Business of the House

force may have been with him in the room when he committed these rapes. This cross-examination lasted an hour and a half.

The next day, Ferreira cross-examined the second rape victim for an hour and ten minutes. Referring to a crucifix, he asked her if her legs were spread apart in the shape of a cross at the time of the rape. He also asked her: "Were you flogged? Did you have to wear a crown of thorns?" This, to me, is an abomination.

I readily admit that such incidents are fortunately not representative of most cases before the courts. Nonetheless, we as legislators have a duty to review Canada's criminal law so that it recognizes the rights of the victims.

If this House cannot give them an active role in legal proceedings, the least it can do is protect them adequately. This is the logic behind Bill C-217.

This bill would amend the Criminal Code so that the protection already provided to victims of sexual or violent offences who are younger than 14 is extended to all victims.

That is why I am asking the members of this House to support my bill.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

BILL C-33—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. An agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the committee stage of Bill C-33, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice of my intent to propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stage.

* * *

● (1810)

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would also like to offer my comments on Private Member's Bill C-217.

[English]

In our opinion the bill itself would extend to all witnesses certain provisions of the Criminal Code which protect witnesses under the age of 14 years in prosecutions for sexual offences and offences involving violence. The proposed bill would extend these protections to all witnesses.

I believe that all members would agree with the member's goal of removing any traumatic element and facilitating witness participation in the criminal justice system. However, because the amendment would affect fundamental principles of the criminal justice system, such as open justice and the right to conduct one's defence, I think it needs to be examined seriously before we agree to include it in the Criminal Code.

The protection granted to witnesses in the criminal justice system has been improved significantly in recent years. The Criminal Code already includes a number of provisions to safeguard adult victims of sexual offences. At the discretion of a judge, he or she may exclude members of the public, place publication bans on the identity of complainants and witnesses, make evidentiary provisions such as restrictions on questioning about previous sexual activity and even hold in camera hearings for the determination of admissibility of certain evidence.

All of these safeguards would apply even where the accused is not represented by counsel. These protections have been granted to ensure that victims and witnesses can provide their testimony without being intimidated. We must examine Bill C-217 in light of the protections that already exist.

Bill C-217 would extend to adults protections that are currently provided to children. What protection would be extended to all witnesses under Bill C-217? Basically there are two protections. The first would allow the judge to exclude the public from the courtroom when he or she believes the interest of the witness requires this. The second would permit a judge to prevent an accused from personally cross-examining a witness.

Bill C-217 would build upon the recent Criminal Code provisions enacted on August 1, 1993. The issue is whether these protections which are justified by the particular vulnerability of young persons would also be justified if extended to adults.

Let us examine the first protection. The prohibition for an accused to cross-examine a child witness comes from concerns that a cross-examination conducted by the accused would nullify the protection granted by allowing the child to testify behind a screen. In the case of a child, it is therefore justified by this concern and the need to avoid that child from coming face to face with the aggressor. This is particularly important because we know that child abuse occurs in part because of the dominant position of the adult in relation to the child.

Business of the House

Cross-examination by an accused of a child victim would continue that abuse. This is the reason the Criminal Code provides that an accused shall not personally cross-examine a witness under 14 years, unless the judge is of the opinion that the proper administration of justice requires that the accused do so.

What happens when a judge does not allow an accused to personally cross-examine a child? The judge in that case can appoint counsel to conduct the cross-examination of the child. This provision applies in all sexual offences and in all offences in which violence against the person has been used, alleged or threatened. This provision, coupled with the provision for the use of screens or closed circuit television, ensures that child victims will not have to face their abusers. This may assist them in providing their evidence.

Bill C-217 would extend that protection to all victims and witnesses of sexual offences and crimes of violence. In all cases of sexual or violent offence the judge could appoint counsel for an unrepresented accused to conduct the cross-examination not only of the victim, but also of any witness.

I readily agree with the hon. member that this protection would be beneficial. I would question however whether this protection is necessary and I would like to examine its implications. There would be implications on costs when counsel is appointed by the court to conduct cross-examination for an unrepresented accused.

The Criminal Code already provides for the appointment of counsel for unrepresented accused persons in specific circumstances. For example, the court can appoint counsel to act for an accused considered unfit to stand trial.

• (1815)

The Supreme Court of Canada can appoint counsel when it appears that the accused, whose case is brought before the Supreme Court, is financially unable to retain counsel and it is in the interest of justice to have the accused represented by counsel.

Who pays for these lawyers? As members know, under the Constitution the administration of justice is a provincial responsibility. Where a judge appoints a counsel to act on behalf of an unrepresented accused, it will in most cases be the responsibility of the provincial attorney general to pay for that appointment.

Bill C-217 would significantly increase the number of cases where the courts would appoint counsel, if the courts were permitted to appoint counsel, for an unrepresented accused in sexual offences, sexual assaults and crimes of violence against the person regardless of whether the witness is a child or an adult.

This would create the potential for imposing major costs on the provinces, which have already expressed their concerns about the cost implications where counsel is appointed in the rather exceptional circumstances covered under present Criminal Code provi-

sions. Cost implications would significantly increase if the amendments provided for in Bill C-217 were to in effect become law.

Because of this, I would think it is absolutely essential that all provinces be consulted about the proposed bill before it is passed. I doubt if the hon. member has had the time to perform these consultations.

I now want to examine another protection that would be extended in Bill C-217, the exclusion of the public from the courtroom. It is a general principle of our criminal justice system that all proceedings take place in open court. The presiding judge does, however, currently have discretion, provided by section 486(1) of the code, to exclude all or any of the members of the public where the judge is of the opinion that it is in the interest of public morals, the maintenance of order or the proper administration of justice to do so.

In addition, section 486(1.1) of the code currently directs the judge, when considering the term "proper administration of justice", to include in that consideration ensuring that the interests of witnesses under 14 are safeguarded in proceedings arising from a sexual offence, a sexual assault offence or an offence involving violence against the person.

The proposed bill before us would expand the direction given to the judge in interpreting the proper administration of justice. In interpreting the proper administration of justice the judge would have to consider that the interests of all witnesses, not just those under 14, are safeguarded in sexual offences, sexual assault offences and crimes involving violence.

Can we believe that a judge who is asked to decide on whether the public should be excluded from court does not already consider whether a particular witness would be able to provide the necessary and relevant evidence in a public courtroom? I believe the discretion to exclude members of the public is carefully exercised by all judges. I do not believe it is necessary to require the judge to consider the interests of all witnesses in determining whether to exclude members of the public.

While I am in agreement with the hon. member's intentions in introducing the bill, I cannot support it for two basic reasons. First, some implications of the bill involve provincial jurisdictions, and we should not impose on them without proper consultations. Second, I believe the actual modifications proposed are not necessary at this time.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I commend the drafter of this bill, my colleague from the Bloc, for her compassion and concern for the comfort and rights of victims of monsters such as in the case she talked about in her presentation. I am a little surprised she did not see fit to support our motion that a victims' bill of rights be drafted and passed by the government

Business of the House

because I see in her presentation today that she is very concerned about victims' rights.

However, in this draft bill we have to balance two competing interests. The first is the desire to put as little stress and unfairness as we are able on victims of terrible crimes in order for them not to have to relive their horror. We also have to look at the principles of jurisprudence that will be affected by the changes being suggested by my hon. colleague.

• (1820)

There are two principles of jurisprudence which will be affected by this bill. One is the right to face one's accuser, which has long been a cornerstone of common law. Second, justice will be done in the open. Justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done, to quote a very long established principle of our justice system.

This proposal would amend two subsections of section 486 of the Criminal Code of Canada to allow in certain circumstances, particularly those of sexual assault and violent assault, that even in the case of an adult victim, the victim or the witness could give evidence in a closed courtroom and also that the accused could be prevented from personally facing their accuser.

As has been pointed out in the previous intervention by a government member, there is already in the Criminal Code the flexibility, the discretion of a court to protect witnesses in certain ways. These discretions are sufficient to prevent the excesses the member moving the motion is talking about.

For example, in the murder trial of Fabrikant which was alluded to, the judge ended the testimony of one witness after Fabrikant, acting as his own lawyer, became, in the judge's words, insulting, sarcastic and brutal. The judge did have and did exercise discretion to prevent further abuse of and unwarranted interference with the witness.

We do not condone trials behind closed doors. When it is absolutely necessary, we do allow judges in the interests of public morals, the maintenance of order and the administration of justice, to curtail somewhat the right of the public to access to a public trial. We saw that in the Bernardo trials and in others.

Because an open court is fundamental to the pursuit of justice in Canada and it is guaranteed under the charter of rights and freedoms, we should be very careful about further interference with that right. Section 11(d) of the charter states: "Any person charged with an offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal".

It is interesting to note that when the current age restriction of 14 was introduced in Bill C-126, the matter was referred to the

Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. The criminal lawyers association testifying before that committee questioned why the legislation decided 14 was the proper age at which the interests of the witness could be better protected than by provisions already in the code. Previously there had been a very full debate into the whole question of at what age and in what circumstances special protections for witnesses should be written into our legislation.

In a society which values the principle of open court and where the principle of open court is deemed essential to our legal system so that Canadians can have faith in it, we as legislators should be extremely cautious about changes which will affect those fundamental rights.

• (1825)

I concur with the mover of the bill that it is terrible and repugnant that victims who have already gone through a tremendously traumatic and terrible experience be unfairly asked to relive this and should be further abused in the trial. Our courts should do everything possible, and there are discretions available to the courts, to prevent that.

Legislating for the most extreme scenario, for cases furthest out on the swing of the pendulum, is not the proper way to structure our justice system. We have to deal with those kinds of extreme cases by other measures, not changing fundamentally our entire justice system because there has been a very extreme and unusual abuse of it.

The second amendment to the Criminal Code being sought by this private member's bill deals with a person's right to cross-examine a witness. Currently the code provides for a witness under the age of 14 not to have to face direct cross-examination. Instead the court may appoint counsel to conduct the cross-examination. Bill C-217 would remove the age restriction of a witness whom a defendant could personally cross-examine.

This part of the Criminal Code also deals with people who act as their own defence lawyers. As the mover of this bill quite properly pointed out, there are some occasions when an accused acting as their own defence lawyer very much abuses the system. That should call for the proper intervention of the court.

Again, denying or limiting that person a right to defend herself or himself does interfere with the fundamental element of our system of jurisprudence and we should be very cautious about expanding further the erosion of that principle.

While giving protection to a witness to avoid unpleasant court room tactics by a defendant is something we all recognize is a desirable aim, there is the competing interest of upholding the established principles of our justice system. The issue has been studied by a number of organizations in the past, including the law

Business of the House

commission. As I said, there has been legislation dealt with by the justice committee of the House of Commons.

It appears the protections and the discretion available to the court are already present to prevent the excesses this bill is trying to address. An expansion to the extent contemplated in this bill would not be warranted. We should be very cautious about expanding these every time an extreme case comes along.

I recommend to the House that we applaud and recognize the intent behind the bill and the humanity which motivates it but reject the logic and the necessity for the measures being proposed.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Bill C-217 seeks to extend certain protections in the Criminal Code currently provided to young witnesses under the age of 14 in prosecutions for sexual offences and offences involving violence. The bill would extend these protections to all witnesses.

I applaud the member's intentions in proposing these amendments to the Criminal Code. The criminal justice depends on victims and witnesses to report crimes and co-operate to the fullest extent possible, including participating as witnesses at preliminary inquiries and trials. The criminal justice should therefore facilitate a witness's participation. Participating as a witness should not turn out to be more traumatic than the crime itself.

• (1830)

Over the past 10 years many improvements have been made to ensure that victims and witnesses can provide their testimony without fear of intimidation. While Bill C-217 would build on these improvements, we would be cautious in supporting the amendments without a very careful examination of their implications and without consideration of the background of the current provisions.

I am well aware of a recent sexual assault trial in Montreal where the accused represented himself and subjected the victims to hours of cross-examination. This case has naturally outraged victim advocates and the public. If those victims had been under 14 years the Criminal Code would have permitted the judge to appoint a lawyer to act for the accused and conduct the cross-examination. The victims would not have had to be personally questioned by their attacker.

The member's proposed bill would respond to that case by extending these procedures to all witnesses. My concern is that the amendments may be too broad and too far reaching and may not in the current form be necessary.

The Criminal Code already includes several protections to ensure that young victims and witnesses are able to provide

necessary testimony. In addition there are several provisions to facilitate the participation of sexual assault victims whether young or adult. While these recent reforms to the law are designed to assist victims and witnesses, we cannot ignore the fact that people have an obligation and a duty to report crime and provide relevant information and evidence. In some cases it will not be a pleasant experience.

In the case of young victims and witnesses there is a requirement in the Canada Evidence Act that the judge must conduct an inquiry to determine if a witness under the age of 14 is able to communicate the evidence and understands the nature of an oath or affirmation. Even where a young witness cannot be sworn they may still be able to provide evidence wherever young witnesses are deserving of special protection.

The provisions of the Criminal Code which the proposed bill would amend, that is sections 486(1.1) and 486(2.3), were only proclaimed into force August 1, 1993. The amendments were included in Bill C-126 which proposed a wide range of proposals which in part responded to the recommendations made by the parliamentary committee that reviewed the child sexual abuse provisions of the Criminal Code.

Bill C-126 resulted in additional reforms to the child sexual abuse provisions of the Criminal Code, including abrogating any requirement that the court warn a jury about convicting an accused on the evidence of a child; providing for special prohibitions and probation orders for persons convicted of certain offences against children, for example, prohibiting offenders from seeking employment or volunteer work involving children.

It also included providing for peace bonds where it is feared a person will commit a sexual offence against a child; permitting a support person to accompany a child while testifying; providing that the judge consider the need to safeguard the interests of the witnesses under the age of 14 when determining whether the exclusion of the public from the courtroom would be in the interests of the proper administration of justice; permitting a judge to prohibit an accused from personally cross-examining a child.

These amendments were designed to enhance the reforms made in 1988 by Bill C-15 to effectively deal with child sexual abuse. One of those original amendments provided that child sexual abuse offences and sexual assault offences, the complainant could testify from behind a screen or by closed circuit television if the judge is of the opinion that the exclusion is necessary to obtain a full and candid account of the acts complained of from the complainant.

In other words, if the face to face contact with the alleged abuser would make it difficult to obtain the necessary evidence, the judge could order the use of a screen or closed circuit television.

Business of the House

• (1835)

However, the protection provided for young complainants by this section was illusory where the accused chose to represent himself. The accused, acting as his own lawyer, could come face to face with his young victim. The amendments passed in 1993 were designed to address this problem and were accordingly focused on young witnesses.

We know that child abuse occurs in part because of the inequalities between children and adults in size, knowledge and power. Cross-examination by an accused of a child victim continued the abuse. Therefore, the Criminal Code was amended to provide that an accused shall not personally cross-examine a witness under 14, unless the judge is of the opinion that the proper administration of justice requires the accused to do so. The judge can appoint counsel for the unrepresented accused to conduct the cross-examination of the child.

This provision applies in sexual offences or in an offence in which violence against the person has been used, alleged or threatened. This provision, coupled with the provision for the use of screens or closed circuit television ensures that child victims will not have to face their abuser which may assist them in providing their evidence.

The private member's bill before us would open that protection to all victims and witnesses of sexual offences and crimes of violence. The judge could appoint counsel for unrepresented accused to conduct the cross-examination of a victim or witness.

I have no doubt this protection would be beneficial and desirable, but is this protection necessary for all adult witnesses or only certain more vulnerable witnesses? We must carefully examine the implications of such proposals.

As I indicated, these provisions were designed to address the problems of child sexual abuse to ensure that young victims of abuse could provide the necessary evidence. However, adults are presumed to be able to provide necessary and relevant evidence.

The Criminal Code already includes a number of provisions to safeguard adult victims of sexual offences, including the discretion of a judge to exclude members of the public, to order publication bans on the identity of complainants and witnesses, to make evidentiary provisions such as restrictions on questioning about previous sexual activity and in camera hearings for the determination of admissibility of certain evidence. All those safeguards would apply even where the accused is not represented by counsel.

We must also consider the cost implications. Who will pay for the lawyers appointed to act for unrepresented accused? As members know, under our Constitution, the administration of justice in the provinces is a provincial responsibility. Where a judge appoints

a counsel to act for an unrepresented accused, it would in most cases be the responsibility of the provincial attorneys general to pay for that appointment.

If we permit the court to appoint counsel for unrepresented accused in sexual offences, sexual assaults or crimes of violence against the person, we are creating the potential for imposing major costs on the provinces. It is therefore absolutely essential and necessary that all provinces be consulted about the proposed amendment.

The Criminal Code already includes similar provisions to appoint counsel for unrepresented accused persons in specific circumstances. For example, where an accused is thought to be unfit to stand trial, the court can appoint counsel to act for the accused. For appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, that court can appoint counsel where it is in the interests of justice and where it appears the accused is financially unable to retain counsel.

These are exceptional cases that arise rather infrequently. Nevertheless, the provinces have expressed their concerns about the potential cost implications where counsel is appointed in these circumstances. Perhaps we should consider permitting a judge to appoint counsel to conduct the cross-examination on behalf of an unrepresented accused where the victim makes an application and where in the judge's view, the interests of justice demand. However, even this more limited measure should be discussed with the provincial attorneys general.

It is a general principle of our criminal justice system that all proceedings take place in open court. The presiding judge does, however, have the discretion provided by the act to exclude all or any members of the public.

There are many protections in place at this time. We acknowledge the positive intent of the bill but we believe that consultations should be conducted with the provinces and all aspects of the bill reviewed.

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to give my unconditional support to Bill C-217, tabled by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, whom I want to congratulate. This bill will amend the Criminal Code to provide increased protection to witnesses who were victims of sexual assault, or against whom violence was attempted or threatened.

These witnesses would therefore avoid being cross-examined by the accused, as is currently the case for persons under 14 years of age. This would eliminate a sometimes absurd situation which has gone on for too long.

Business of the House

Recently, an increasing number of people charged with assault have decided to undertake their own defence. Every time an accused decides to do without the services of a lawyer, his victims run the risk of being once again confronted with their aggressor, this time in public.

Moreover, the legal system is also affected by austerity measures. Among other things, eligibility criteria for legal aid are becoming more stringent. This means that an increasing number of people are not eligible for legal aid, since their income is deemed too high. Still, these people do not have enough money to afford a lawyer.

Undertaking one's own defence then becomes an alternative that many will choose, thus increasing the risk of a court confrontation between the aggressor and the victim. It is important to think about the plight of a victim having to testify in court before the person who assaulted her.

Our adversarial system is based primarily on the confrontation of two parties: the state on one side, represented by the crown attorney, and the accused on the other side, usually represented by a lawyer. The victim of a criminal act is not considered to be a third party in the case. However, he or she remains a key witness who can often provide invaluable evidence. Therefore, it is important to ensure his or her protection and to see that his or her testimony is made in the best possible conditions.

This is precisely what Bill C-217 seeks to ensure. It is not a magic formula that will turn the victim's testimony into a fun thing, but it is a simple way of making sure that he or she does not have to go through the absurd ordeal of facing the aggressor again and be forced to answer his questions.

A few years ago, the federal government amended section 486 of the Criminal Code in a fashion similar to the one proposed by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert in her bill, except that it legislated to prohibit the accused who has undertaken his own defence from cross-examining victims under the age of 14. This goes to show that the federal government is aware of the fact that, in some cases, to ensure the protection of the witness who is also a victim, the court may have to impose on the accused that the cross-examination at least be conducted by counsel.

Age is not the only factor that makes a victim vulnerable. In rape or verbal, physical and psychological abuse cases, the victim often ends up in a cruelly and painfully fragile emotional and psychological state. Having to take the stand is already hard enough, and answering questions from their aggressors represents quite an ordeal for victims who often are still in a state of shock.

Beyond the legal aspect, there is also a whole human aspect, which cannot be ignored. Our system certainly recognizes the

rights of the accused. The accused has every right to conduct his case without counsel. But many experts maintain that it is suicide to go it alone, the rules and proceedings being far too complex to be readily assimilated by lay persons and used in a trial.

However, for various reasons, some individuals accused of violent and sexual crimes choose to conduct their own defence. The risk remains then that the accused could misuse this right to once again confront and traumatize his victim by asking abusive questions, making the victim relive every instant of this painful experience.

• (1845)

Recently, two cases have clearly illustrated the absurd nature of the situation that prevails at this time. We need only to think of the notorious Agostino Ferreira, who was allowed to cross-examine, for several hours, the two employees from a boutique on rue Saint-Denis in Montreal, whom he had assaulted and raped.

We can barely imagine the state of mind of these two victims, when brought face to face with the same person who had humiliated them in the worst possible way. Imagine what was going through their minds when the person responsible for their rape was asking them questions about the details of this horrible event.

Let us remember the Concordia killings as well. The person responsible, Valery Fabrikant, dismissed his lawyers and cross-examined the witnesses himself, which was truly a verbal torture for them.

In most cases where the accused himself cross-examines the victim, the victim, after having been humiliated by the accused, is forced to relive the whole event, this time in public.

There is a way of sparing the victims this additional torture, without infringing on the rights guaranteed to the accused by law. Restricting the rights of the accused to defend himself in assault cases of a violent or sexual nature, as proposed in the bill of my colleague for Saint-Hubert, would afford the victims additional protection during the trial process.

In conclusion, the system can be as efficient as possible, but one fact remains: the key element in the legal process in cases of assault and sexual abuse is the victim's reporting of the attack and charging the attacker or attackers. If, for one reason or another, the victims do not testify as to what they experienced, any legal system, even the best in the world, will prove totally ineffective.

But, as long as assault victims continue to courageously bring their abusers to justice, and as long as the law makers and legal precedent recognizes their rights, the basic and vital objectives of criminal law—protecting society and setting an example—still have a chance to be met.

Adjournment Debate

These are the reasons why Bill C-217 represents a giant step toward a more efficient and effective legal system, through a greater understanding and protection of those who are still the key element in the system, the victims.

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 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 nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Call in the members.

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The division stands deferred until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

• (1850)

[English]

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

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Madam Speaker, last week, just after the Minister of Finance announced the federal government was harmonizing the GST with the provincial sales tax of three Atlantic provinces, but before the Deputy Prime Minister resigned because the Liberals had broken their election promise on this issue, I had the opportunity to question the Minister of Finance about the harmonization scheme.

The government knows this is the most hated tax in the history of the country, and Canadians remember well that in the 1993 campaign the Liberals campaigned strongly against it. We all remember well the candidates on our doorsteps, the literature in our

mailboxes and the words of the high profile members of the Liberal Party stating that if elected, the Liberals would get rid of the GST.

When he announced the harmonization package last week, the Minister of Finance apologized to Canadians. He said the Liberals were wrong to promise they would get rid of the GST. With the Minister of Finance and the Deputy Prime Minister we now have two senior government ministers acknowledging the Liberal's mistake. Perhaps it is time to acknowledge that the replacement harmonization program is also a mistake.

Harmonization is clearly a shift in the wrong direction. It shifts an even greater share of the tax burden from the corporations to the consumers.

New Democrats think it is time to acknowledge that what the country needs instead of harmonization is meaningful tax reform. In reality it is the consumers who need the tax break, not the corporations.

When I posed my question to the minister I pointed out he had already boasted that the GST harmonization would be good for business. At the same time I pointed out the provinces were saying harmonization would end up costing them money because at the present time the corporations pay provincial tax but under the new harmonization scheme they would not. In Saskatchewan that shift is pegged at around \$400 million in losses to the province.

It has already been readily acknowledged outside the Chamber that harmonization is a fabulous giveaway to the large multinational profitable corporations doing business in Canada. For this giveaway the corporations have had to do absolutely nothing.

Did the corporations have to agree to lower prices? No, they did not. Did the corporations have to agree to create any new jobs or even maintain the ones that exist today? No, they did not. Did the corporations even have to promise to keep their profits in Canada for investment in jobs or investment in our communities? No, they did not. The corporations get this huge windfall for absolutely nothing.

When we look back at what the Mulroney Tories did when they first introduced the GST, we see they provided a great deal of documentation to substantiate their claim. Much of that documentation was subject to debate. Nevertheless the documentation was made public.

Today we have the Liberals introducing the harmonized tax but nowhere is documentation provided to substantiate the new claim. The Liberals say the economy will boom, jobs will be created and prices will be lowered. However, they have introduced or produced absolutely no evidence, no studies to back this up.

The Minister of Finance seems to want Canadians to trust him, to take him on his word on this one. Surely the minister understands that when he said he would get rid of the GST Canadians did trust him. When he said he was wrong, when he said he made a mistake, Canadians lost their trust in him. He must now rebuild and regain that trust, which will be very difficult.

Adjournment Debate

Surely he has reviewed the issue of harmonization and the tax shift from corporations to consumers very carefully. Surely he has done his homework and has the evidence to support the claims he is making to the Canadian public.

Surely in the interests of public trust he can produce this material and at the same time outline for all Canadians to see how much of the current tax burden is being transferred from the corporate sector to the ordinary taxpaying consumer. That is what I asked in my question of last week.

Canadians are tired of being treated like uneducated, unthinking children. Let us admit that harmonization is wrong. Stop the process and begin to address the real issue of tax fairness.

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will avoid the temptation to do anything other than answer the question that I thought was asked and use the time to respond to that question as is intended to be the case at this hour in the House. Let me begin by reminding the House what the Minister of Finance said in his statement on sales tax harmonization on April 23.

Anyone who believes that business in this country does not pass on provincial sales taxes to the consumer is simply naive. Consumers are already paying for the imposition of retail sales tax on business inputs in the form of higher prices. Because of reduced competitiveness for Canadian products in both domestic and international markets as a result of those higher prices, consumers are also paying in the form of fewer jobs and lower wages. There will therefore be no shift in tax burden from business to consumers under harmonization. Canadian consumers are already bearing these costs in one way or another.

In fact, consumers will benefit from harmonization. Competitive market conditions will ensure that businesses pass on the tax savings under a harmonized valued added tax to consumers. This

will result in a decline in price on most goods and services they buy. In combination with the lower sales tax rate in harmonized provinces, these price declines will result in lower after tax consumer prices on many purchases and substantial overall sales tax savings to families and individuals.

Removing sales tax from business inputs will also enhance the competitiveness of Canadian goods and services when competing with foreign suppliers in international markets and at home which will benefit individual Canadians through higher and more stable employment and income levels.

Moreover, harmonization will lead to an additional benefit to business and consumers, reduced complexity and tax compliance costs. For business, harmonization will mean one sales tax not two, one tax base not two, one tax rate not two, and one sales tax administration not two.

These savings will be substantial. As much as \$700 million in annual sales tax compliance costs will disappear under harmonization on a national basis according to the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. Like the tax savings which businesses will receive under harmonization, these savings will also lead to lower consumer prices and increased economic competitiveness in harmonizing provinces.

The only real consumer costs associated with this issue are those imposed on Canadians in non-harmonizing provinces by governments which continue to cling to inefficient and uncompetitive retail sales tax systems.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. The House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

(The House adjourned at 6.59 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

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 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. |
| Bélangier, 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. |
| 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Brushett, Dianne | Cumberland — Colchester | Nova Scotia | Lib. |
| Bryden, John | Hamilton — Wentworth | Ontario | Lib. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Newfoundland | 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. |
| 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. |
| Cullen, Roy | Etobicoke North | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cummins, John | Delta | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Dalphoné-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. |
| Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Saint-Laurent — Cartierville | Quebec | 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, Lawrence D. | Labrador | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| O'Brien, Pat | London — Middlesex | Ontario | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| O'Reilly, John | Victoria — Haliburton | Ontario | Lib. |
| 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. |
| Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie | Papineau — Saint-Michel | Quebec | 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 and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage | 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 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. |
| 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, Stéphan | Lac-Saint-Jean | 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 | Hamilton East | Ontario | |

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. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Lib. |
| Hickey, Bonnie | St. John's East | Lib. |
| Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Bonavista — Trinity — Conception | Lib. |
| O'Brien, Lawrence D. | Labrador | Lib. |
| Payne, Jean | St. John's West | Lib. |
| Simmons, Hon. Roger | Burin — St. George's | Lib. |
| 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. |
| Crawford, Rex | Kent | Lib. |
| Cullen, Roy | Etobicoke North | 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 | Hamilton East | |

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 |
| Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs | Saint-Laurent — Cartierville | Lib. |
| Discepolo, 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 |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mercier, Paul | Blainville — Deux-Montagnes | BQ |
| Nunez, Osvaldo | Bourassa | BQ |
| 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. |
| Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie | Papineau — Saint-Michel | Lib. |
| Picard, Pauline | Drummond | BQ |
| Plamondon, Louis | Richelieu | BQ |
| Pomerleau, Roger | Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies | BQ |
| Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage | Saint-Henri — Westmount | Lib. |
| Rocheleau, Yves | Trois-Rivières | BQ |
| St-Laurent, Bernard | Manicouagan | BQ |
| Sauvageau, Benoît | Terrebonne | BQ |
| Tremblay, Benoît | Rosemont | BQ |
| Tremblay, Stéphan | Lac-Saint-Jean | BQ |
| Tremblay, Suzanne | Rimouski — Témiscouata | BQ |
| Venne, Pierrette | Saint-Hubert | BQ |

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 |
|-------------------------|-------|-----|

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 1st, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Claude Bachand
John Finlay

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|
| Jack Iyerak Anawak Robert Bertrand | Margaret Bridgman Maurice Dumas | John Duncan Elijah Harper | John Murphy Bernard Patry | (11) |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
| John Bryden Marlene Cowling | Paul DeVillers Hedy Fry | Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin | Len Taylor |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

| | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|-----|
| Claude Bachand | Raymond Bonin | Margaret Bridgman | John Murphy | (5) |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|-----|

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Lyle Vanclief

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|------|
| Mark Assad Cliff Breitzkreuz Murray Calder | Bernie Collins Wayne Easter Elwin Hermanson | Jake E. Hoepfner Jean Landry Réjean Lefebvre | Jerry Pickard Julian Reed Rose-Marie Ur | (15) |
|--|---|--|---|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Peter Adams Vic Althouse Leon E. Benoit Morris Bodnar | David Chatters Harold Culbert John Cummins Allan Kerpan | Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis | John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor |
|--|--|--|--|

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Gaston Leroux
Pat O'Brien

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|
| Jim Abbott Jack Iyerak Anawak | Guy H. Arseneault Mauril Bélanger | Hugh Hanrahan Janko Perić | Beth Phinney Louis Plamondon | (11) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Robert Bertrand Jan Brown John Bryden | Simon de Jong Pierre de Savoye Stan Dromisky | John English Jean-Paul Marchand Rey D. Pagtakhan | Georgette Sheridan Monte Solberg |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells**

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| Diane Ablonczy Gerry Byrne | René Canuel Harold Culbert | Ted McWhinney Lawrence D. O'Brien | Mike Scott Harry Verran | (11) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Vic Althouse John Cummins | Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin | Jean Payne 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 John Godfrey 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 Dan McTeague | (11) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Mauril Bélanger Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland | Carolyn Parrish Janko Perić George Proud | John Solomon Randy White | Ted White John Williams |
|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|

HEALTH

Chairman: Roger Simmons

**Vice-Chairs: Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard**

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| Antoine Dubé 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 Bernard Patry | 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: Bernard Patry

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----|
| Sharon Hayes Réal Ménard | Pat O'Brien Svend J. Robinson | Paul Szabo Rose-Marie Ur | Joseph Volpe | (8) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----|

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 | Gerry Byrne 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 Peter Milliken 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
Roy Cullen

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 BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Chair: Marlene Catterall

René Laurin
John Loney

Rey D. Pagtakhan

John Solomon

John Williams

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish

Mauril Bélanger

François Langlois

Darrel Stinson

(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes
Pierre Brien
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 Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne
David Chatters

Joe Fontana
Jim Gouk

Charles Hubbard
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Ivan Grose

Dick Harris
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. Jackson

John Maloney
Philippe Paré

Bernard 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 Riel

Peter Adams
Roger Gallaway
Jim Karygiannis
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairmen: Sen. Jean-Louis Roux
Patrick Gagnon

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairmen: Sen. P. Derek Lewis
Ghislain Lebel

Vice-Chairman: Derek Lee

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson
Michel Cogger
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

Shirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE**A CODE OF CONDUCT****Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**
Peter Milliken**Vice-Chairs:** **Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier**
Suzanne TremblayRepresenting the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus
Peter Bosa
Consiglio Di Nino
Mira Spivak
Peter StolleryDon Boudria
Marlene Catterall
Ken Epp
John Godfrey
François Langlois
René LaurinJohn Loney
Rey D. Pagtakhon
Carolyn Parrish
Bob Ringma
Ray Speaker
Paul Zed(21)

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. 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 and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage |
| 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 |

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

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Vacancy Hamilton East The Speaker 2175</p> | <p>Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2180 Mr. Duceppe 2180 Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 2180</p> |
| STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS | |
| <p>Missing Children Mrs. Brushett 2175</p> <p>International Day of the Worker Mr. Nunez 2175</p> <p>Human Rights Mr. Ringma 2175</p> <p>Credit Cards Mr. Bernier (Beauce) 2176</p> <p>Diabetes Mr. Assadourian 2176</p> <p>International Day of the Worker Mr. Nault 2176</p> <p>Seminar on Cyprus Mrs. Bakopanos 2176</p> <p>Unemployment Insurance Reform Mr. Fillion 2176</p> <p>Aboriginal Affairs Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) 2177</p> <p>Human Rights Ms. McLaughlin 2177</p> <p>Sir Wilfrid Laurier Mr. Paradis 2177</p> <p>National Unity Mr. Discepola 2177</p> <p>Human Rights Mr. Benoit 2178</p> <p>Unemployment Insurance Reform Mr. Crête 2178</p> <p>Francophones Outside Quebec Mr. Patry 2178</p> <p>Richard Le Hir Mr. Bertrand 2178</p> <p>Old Age Security Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) 2178</p> | <p>Goods and Services Tax Miss Grey 2180 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2180 Miss Grey 2181 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2181 Miss Grey 2181 Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 2181 Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) 2181 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2182 Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) 2182 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2182 Mr. Solberg 2182 Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 2182 Mr. Solberg 2182 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2182</p> <p>Canadian Human Rights Act Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) 2182 Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) 2183</p> <p>Canada Pension Plan Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) 2183 Mr. Young 2183 Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) 2183 Mr. Young 2183</p> <p>Francophones Outside Quebec Mr. Marchand 2183 Mrs. Robillard 2184 Mr. Marchand 2184 Mrs. Robillard 2184</p> <p>Racism Ms. Cohen 2184 Ms. Fry 2184</p> <p>Fisheries Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) 2184 Mr. Mifflin 2184 Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) 2185 Mr. Mifflin 2185</p> <p>Unemployment Insurance Reform Mrs. Lalonde 2185 Mr. Young 2185 Mrs. Lalonde 2185 Mr. Young 2185</p> <p>Edmonton Institution for Women Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) 2186 Mr. Rock 2186 Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) 2186 Mr. Discepola 2186</p> <p>Flooding Mr. Iftody 2186 Mr. Collenette 2186</p> <p>Fisheries Mr. Althouse 2186</p> |
| ORAL QUESTION PERIOD | |
| <p>Goods and Services Tax Mr. Gauthier 2179 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2179 Mr. Gauthier 2179 Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 2179 Mr. Gauthier 2179 Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) 2179 Mr. Duceppe 2180</p> | |

| | |
|---|------|
| Mr. Mifflin | 2187 |
| Privilege | |
| Member for Nanaimo—Cowichan | |
| Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral | 2187 |
| The Speaker | 2187 |
| Point of Order | |
| Member for Nanaimo—Cowichan | |
| Mr. Plamondon | 2187 |
| ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS | |
| Government Response to Petitions | |
| Mr. Zed | 2188 |
| Petitions | |
| Senate Reform | |
| Mr. Duhamel | 2188 |
| Volunteers from Abroad | |
| Mrs. Guay | 2188 |
| Justice | |
| Mr. White (North Vancouver) | 2188 |
| Taxation | |
| Mr. Szabo | 2188 |
| Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages | |
| Mr. Szabo | 2188 |
| Boat Licence Fees | |
| Mr. Bonin | 2188 |
| Lamprey Control | |
| Mr. Bonin | 2189 |
| Tran Trieu Quan | |
| Mr. Paré | 2189 |
| Human Rights | |
| Mr. Duncan | 2189 |
| Gasoline Prices | |
| Mr. Riis | 2189 |
| Criminal Code | |
| Mr. Hill (MacLeod) | 2189 |
| Assisted Suicide | |
| Mr. Hermanson | 2189 |
| Merchant Navy | |
| Mr. Culbert | 2189 |
| Impaired Driving | |
| Mr. Milliken | 2189 |
| Justice | |
| Ms. Beaumier | 2190 |
| Human Rights | |
| Ms. Beaumier | 2190 |
| Questions on the Order Paper | |
| Mr. Zed | 2190 |

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Motions for Papers | |
| Mr. Zed | 2190 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

| | |
|---|------|
| Canadian Human Rights Act | |
| Bill C-33. Time Allocation Motion | |
| Mr. Gagliano | 2190 |
| Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 146; Nays, 83 | 2190 |
| Consideration resumed of second reading | |
| Bill C-33. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading | 2191 |
| Mr. McClelland | 2191 |
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 2192 |
| Motion | 2194 |
| Mr. Milliken | 2194 |
| Mr. Kirkby | 2195 |
| Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) | 2195 |
| Ms. Fry | 2196 |
| Mr. Benoit | 2198 |
| Ms. Catterall | 2199 |
| Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 29; Nays, 198. | 2200 |
| Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 178; Nays, 53 | 2201 |
| (Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) | 2202 |

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

| | |
|---|------|
| Criminal Code | |
| Bill C-217. Motion for second reading | 2202 |
| Mrs. Venne | 2202 |
| Business of the House | |
| Bill C-33—Notice of time allocation | |
| Ms. Fry | 2204 |
| Criminal Code | |
| Bill C-217. Consideration resumed of motion | 2204 |
| Mr. Discepola | 2204 |
| Mrs. Ablonczy | 2205 |
| Mr. Kirkby | 2207 |
| Mrs. Picard | 2208 |
| Division on motion deferred | 2210 |

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Goods and Services Tax | |
| Mr. Taylor | 2210 |
| Mr. Campbell | 2211 |
| 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://www.parl.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.**