



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 060 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 12, 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, June 12, 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 Beaver River.

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

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

FORESTRY

Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a group of extremely hardworking individuals from townships in the district of Nipissing.

The Mattawa and Area Forestry Committee is made up of members from the Bonfield, Calvin, Mattawan and Papineau-Cameron townships and the town of Mattawa.

Forestry companies like Calvin Forest Products, Clouthier and Sons Logging, Columbia Forest Products, Wunsch Forest Products and Tembec Incorporated are developing ideas for value added products to complement current production in the forestry industry.

This forward thinking committee is hard at work developing new sectors for economic growth in the forestry industry in our area. Human Resources Development Canada and the Ontario ministries of national resources and northern development and mines provide ex officio help that is greatly appreciated.

I congratulate this group of communities for looking to the future and not just seeing the problems, but instead actively working to be part of the solutions.

* * *

HAMILTON EAST

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have kept my word and gone to the battlefield in Hamilton East and, lo and behold, my opponents are not there.

A few weeks ago the finance minister, in the cosy comfort of this House, challenged me to meet him on the doorsteps of Hamilton East to talk about his broken GST promise. Where is he? Is the finance minister afraid to go door to door with me and defend his broken promise?

I was on the doorsteps in Hamilton East last night, ready to go toe to toe with Sheila Copps but I did not see her, or any minister. Is she afraid? I will be there today and I will be there again tomorrow. I am looking forward to seeing them soon because, after all, there are only four days left until the vote.

Is the justice minister afraid to defend the inept Young Offenders Act that I spoke about with young people last night? Is the Prime Minister afraid to defend his broken promises on the GST, immigration, child care, free trade and MP pensions?

Once again I challenge the timid souls on the front benches here. Come with me this afternoon at 4 p.m., Canadian flight—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra.

* * *

DOUGLAS KENNY

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Douglas Kenny, who died last week, was a respected professor of psychology who became president of the University of British Columbia in the stormy years after 1968 when universities were torn apart by larger community demands for fundamental change in institutions and structures, and for radically new approaches to learning.

As a pragmatic scholar, Dr. Kenny sought accommodation between the warring factions operating inside and outside the university. He also actively promoted international recognition of the University of British Columbia as a world leader in science, medicine and other disciplines.

His epitaph may perhaps be found in Claude Bissell's phrase, borrowed from Arnold Toynbee: "Halfway up Parnassus". Dr. Kenny showed the way, and it has been for his successors, David Strangway and others, to try to reach the top of the mountain.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

THE JUDICIARY

Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Micheline Paradis, a lawyer from the Lac-Saint-Jean riding, was appointed to the Quebec Court.

She is the first woman judge in that region's 160-year history. When she began her career some 20 years ago, there were practically no female lawyers in the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean region.

Today, over 50 per cent of the members of the regional bar association are women. This appointment opens another door and represents another step toward equality between men and women, thus enhancing Quebec's judicial system and giving it even greater credibility.

I am happy to congratulate Ms. Paradis on how far she has come and I wish her the best of luck in her new career.

* * *

[English]

VETERANS

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, we just finished celebrating the 50th anniversary of the end of the second world war and people around the world thanked our vets for the freedom we all enjoy today.

The Ridgewood veterans wing in Saint John is operated under the jurisdiction of the McKenna government and receives a grant from Veterans Affairs to operate. The McKenna government has decided to introduce rethermalized food for the vets. The meals are prepared in Toronto. Even the toast, bacon and eggs are shipped down frozen to Saint John and reheated.

This process has been tried in other local hospitals in Saint John and has had terrible reviews from the patients, the doctors and other staff.

The Legion is outraged that these veterans will be used as guinea pigs. Veterans Affairs has prided itself in the past on the humanitarian treatment of veterans.

The present on-site food preparation is very good. For the sake of our veterans' health, dignity and quality of life, I ask the Secretary of State for Veterans Affairs to stop these unnecessary changes.

* * *

• (1405)

EDUCATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Quebec government announced it would cut student aid for undergrad study outside the province. Quebec will no longer offer loans to most CEGEP and undergrad

university students who want to study in English in another province.

This policy is discriminatory, unfair and totally unacceptable. Ottawa helps fund student aid in Quebec. In 1996, federal transfers will amount to \$98 million.

The Minister of Human Resources Development said he will investigate this matter to see what can be done to reverse the decision by Quebec. I urge him to act on this quickly since many Quebec students who study elsewhere are now scrambling to find other sources of funding. As an alternative I suggest that the minister allow Quebec residents who lose their loans to apply under the Canada student loans program in the provinces where they study.

The Quebec policy should not be allowed to remain. It has no place in a fair, diverse and democratic society.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the linguistic debate heats up once again in Quebec, we in this House are faced every day with the sorry spectacle of two regional political formations competing for the linguistic intolerance award.

The Bloc Québécois and its twin, the Reform Party, are unable to rally all Canadians around a common project. Both of them would rather try to destroy what they know they cannot control.

In his latest report, the Commissioner of Official Languages draws an objective portrait of the linguistic reality. The situation in this country has greatly improved since the Official Languages Act was passed. Attitudes have also started to change for the better.

I hope the commissioner's message will be heard and that the extremist attitudes of the Bloc Québécois and the Reform Party will start to evolve.

* * *

THE MEMBER FOR OTTAWA—VANIER

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, given that, in Ontario, the rate of assimilation of francophones is in excess of 36 per cent and that francophones are still not allowed to run their own schools, given that Conservative Premier Harris is blithely chopping Franco-Ontarian organizations and that English is in fact the language of work in the public service in Ottawa, I would have thought that the primary duty of any Franco-Ontarian MP would be to look after the interests of his own constituents. But that is not what is happening.

I may be naive but I think the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier is forgetting his primary duty to launch a crusade against the Quebec referendum act.

In other words, instead of opposing cuts imposed on Franco-Ontarians by his own government, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier prefers to crusade against Quebec's election laws, which are among the most democratic in the world.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the governments of the world, including Canada, have made strong representations to the Government of Nigeria to stop its alleged human rights abuses. The desire for peaceful, democratic change has been widely promoted.

We have been making statements and innuendoes that something should be done. To this point these statements have had little or no effect on the Nigerian government.

The minister is well aware that the imposition of sanctions and the boycotting of Nigerian oil would have little hope of success. If they did work, it would take a great deal of time.

We encourage the Minister of Foreign Affairs to not only push for more rapid and concrete action against Nigeria but to consider demanding the outright removal of Nigeria from the Commonwealth until it improves its human rights record.

* * *

[Translation]

TRADE MISSIONS

Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, major newspapers were reporting this morning that, next September, the "Team Quebec" trade mission to South America will be led by Bernard Landry, the PQ finance minister and minister responsible for economic development.

This is great news and we are pleased to see that the PQ government finally decided to follow in the footsteps of Team Canada. It is somewhat unfortunate however that, for the sake of political rhetoric, members of the PQ government made the deliberate choice of ignoring previous economic missions led by our Prime Minister.

All economic stakeholders agree that Canada's prosperity is dependent upon its capacity to expand its export markets. Through this decision, the Quebec government is sending investors and financial markets a positive message.

We wish every success to this Team Quebec mission and to its leader, who, this time, will have an opportunity to trade the minivan for a limousine.

• (1410)

[English]

S. O. 31

QUEBEC REFERENDUM

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the chief electoral officer of Quebec has now charged 50 students at Bishop's University with voting illegally in the referendum. Their fine is \$500 for showing a commitment to their province of residence and to their democratic duty as citizens to vote.

What is the fine for those who illegally discarded ballots, depriving citizens of the right to vote? One hundred dollars.

These students turned to their member of Parliament to help them. And what did the member for Sherbrooke, the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the erstwhile defender of federalism, have to say? He could not help them because it was a provincial matter.

People have fought and died for the right to vote in this country. Taking away that democratic right only merits a fine of \$100. Exercising one's responsibility as a citizen costs \$500. Is this the democracy of the separatists?

* * *

[Translation]

BLOC QUEBECOIS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1996, the Bloc Québécois will celebrate its fifth anniversary. Indeed, it was on June 15, 1991, that Lucien Bouchard, along with a few other members of Parliament, founded our party, which now has 131,250 members.

At the time, the Conservatives, the Liberals and the New Democrats tried, with a rare show of unanimity, to muzzle the nine Bloc Québécois members and to silence Quebec's claims and aspirations. It turned out to be a bad mistake on their part since, on October 25, 1993, 1,846,024 Quebecers elected 54 sovereignists members of Parliament. To top it all, the Bloc Québécois became the official opposition.

Quebec has a strong voice in Ottawa to defend its interests and to promote sovereignty. This shows unequivocally that Quebec chose to stand up for itself.

It is with pride that we wish all Bloc Québécois members a very exciting anniversary, and we invite them to join us in Sorel, on June 15, to celebrate with us.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Oral Questions

[English]

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt I rise to demand that the federal government stand up and protect the rights of victims from violent young offenders.

It was only a few weeks ago that young offenders hijacked a school bus in my riding and threatened the lives of young students. This week another case of a young offender threatens some people in my riding.

Three years ago a young offender was convicted in the unprovoked shooting murder of 63-year old Edward Francis McDermott. He was convicted under the Young Offenders Act and sentenced to the maximum sentence, a ridiculous three years. The murderer is set to be released and four psychiatrists have testified that he is too dangerous to go back on the streets. The murderer is being described as a psychological time bomb. Crown counsel is trying to get around the Young Offenders Act to keep him in prison.

Penticton crown counsel should not have to find a loophole in the Young Offenders Act to protect society from violent young offenders. The Liberal government should act to make our streets, homes and playgrounds safe. So far it has failed.

* * *

NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Gerry Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the Reform's national assembly this past weekend, Michael Walker, executive director of the Fraser Institute, said to an audience of Reform delegates: "Newfoundland is a morally bankrupt society. They do not even think to ask what I can do to solve my problems. They ask: What can the federal government do to solve my problems for me?".

Not one person challenged Mr. Walker's statement. Instead they applauded.

Let me tell the House that Newfoundland has an enterprising society. Let me further tell the House that since 1990, Newfoundlanders have made the highest contributions per capita to charities in this country.

Reform has the audacity to accuse us of being morally bankrupt. It is Newfoundland that understands what this country is all about. Reformers do not.

* * *

NEWFOUNDLAND

Mrs. Bonnie Hickey (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a Newfoundlander, I too am very upset at the statement by Mr.

Walker calling us morally bankrupt. I am from Newfoundland and I am offended by this statement. Never have such untruthful, misleading, degrading words been uttered against me and my fellow Newfoundlanders.

• (1415)

Such a statement is an affront to Newfoundlanders and it demands an immediate apology from the Reform Party. Newfoundland is an equal partner in this nation. There is no prouder group in this country than Newfoundlanders. We have enriched this country with talented people, vast natural resources and economic contributions to this nation.

To allow this statement to go unchecked is one of the poorest examples of strong leadership in the history of this country.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said that the federal government wanted to be highly effective and competent and in a position to help Canadians in its areas of jurisdiction, wanted the provinces to be highly effective and competent in their areas of jurisdiction as well and wanted a very strong partnership between the two levels of government.

Are we to assume from the remarks of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that the federal government is keeping the leading role for itself in a whole series of sectors, so it can set broad standards and objectives, and giving the provinces a supporting role, that is, the role of administrator?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that this is the most pithy answer we have had from this minister. May he always be so concise.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said the following with respect to the federal proposal on unemployment insurance:

This offer was acclaimed everywhere in Quebec as a great step forward, if not the finishing line for a concrete solution.

Are we to understand from what the minister said that the federal proposal in the area of manpower is not a starting point for negotiations, but, rather the finishing line?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a framework where each province will be able to

exercise the responsibilities it wishes and where the Government of Canada will have its own responsibilities on this Canada-wide issue. Whether it involves ensuring a movement of workers within the country or whether it involves ensuring the various governments help each other in situations of exceptional crisis, the Government of Canada has its own particular responsibilities.

This is why Quebecers who believe in Canada have said that the minister set a very good policy, and only those who do not believe in it are continuing to fight it.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you will note that the level of obscurity increases with the number of words: the more he talks, the less we understand.

Can the minister deny that the attempt to set up a model where the federal government would establish standards and keep control and have the provinces carry out the programs is not a sort of back door revival of the spirit of the Charlottetown accord, which Quebec rejected for one reason and the rest of Canada for the very opposite reason?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I invite the Leader of the Opposition to make a bit of an effort. What we are saying is quite simple. We can keep on repeating it.

We have the most decentralized federation there is. The Government of Quebec has certain responsibilities. It has a hard time assuming them all the time, and we are offering government assistance to ensure that this responsibility is carried out as well as possible. We have responsibilities as the Government of Canada and we are assuming them together with the provinces.

• (1420)

We are going to improve things in various sectors, be it manpower training, mining, forestry, recreation, public housing, tourism, the environment, freshwater habitats, etc.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House, the Minister of Human Resources Development stated:

If it is only a matter of transferring funds with no strings attached, then they will have to speak to someone other than me, because I am not in the habit of sending money anywhere without making sure the interests of Canadian taxpayers are protected.

My question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Are we to understand from what his colleague, the Minister of Human Resources Development, says that the government does not trust the provinces to administer the taxpayers' money in areas which are exclusively a provincial jurisdiction, and furthermore has no intention of withdrawing from any areas except those in which it does not have even a cent of financial involvement?

Oral Questions

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I assume that my hon. colleague, the hon. member, is aware that the unemployment insurance fund, as it used to be known, is financed by all Canadians. Money is transferred from certain provinces to others. The Government of Canada has the responsibility of ensuring that these moneys are administered responsibly.

Moreover, the provinces are responsible for education, which is rather closely related to occupational training. It is, therefore, all these constitutional responsibilities which the Government of Canada, in conjunction with the provinces, will be better assuming, thank to the reform proposed by the minister.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Minister of Human Resources Development will educate his colleague, for he is barking up the wrong tree, absolutely.

With the statements made by the minister yesterday, is the government telling us that, when it is announced that the federal government is pulling out of some area of exclusively provincial jurisdiction, this will be only under its conditions, with the provinces having no say in the matter whatsoever?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member trying to say that unemployment insurance is not a federal responsibility? If so, he had better take a refresher course on the Constitution.

* * *

[English]

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, only a week ago the Prime Minister appeared on national television with the premier of Quebec saying that he was not going to discuss the Constitution at the first ministers conference in June. Now, a week later, the Prime Minister is insisting that the constitutional amending formula be on the agenda at that conference. Would the Prime Minister tell the House what made him change his mind?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the hon. member on being confirmed in his position.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): It was a very good weekend for the Reform Party and a very good weekend for the Liberal Party too.

Oral Questions

I did not change my mind. If the hon. member would listen to the whole meeting with the press, Mr. Bouchard said himself:

[*Translation*]

“I am downplaying it a bit, because the Prime Minister says he will perhaps want to touch very briefly on the question of constitutional review, section 49 of the Constitution, but I understood that the Prime Minister would not spend a lot of time on it in any event”.

I did not change my mind.

• (1425)

[*English*]

I said that we were to discuss section 49. As to how long we will take to discuss section 49, I say an hour.

The premier of Quebec told me that he does not want to talk about it and he does not want me to help with a veto for Quebec. Since we need unanimity, if one of the participants says no, the meeting will be very short.

Miss Grey: They said no in Charlottetown.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Yes. But I am for a veto for Quebec. I hope the Reform Party will be too. If the premier of Quebec is not interested in that, the meeting will be short because of Mr. Bouchard's desire not to get Quebec a veto from the rest of Canada.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if we could follow the logic in that answer, the Prime Minister appears to be arguing that section 49 of the Constitution requires this first ministers conference to discuss the amending formula. But there have been at least three major first ministers conferences at which the constitutional amending formula was discussed: the two Meech Lake discussions and the full-blown first ministers conference with respect to the Charlottetown accord in 1992.

Why does the Prime Minister insist that another meeting is required to discuss the constitutional amending formula when these three previous meetings satisfy that requirement?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a debate about whether or not it was done in the proper framework.

If in reality we have talked two or three times about it, I do not think it will hurt to talk a fourth time. It will mean that we have met the requirements of the Constitution four times. Nobody will be in a position to say that we did not want to meet the obligations of section 49 if, according to the Reform Party leader, we will have talked about it four times while the Constitution requires only one time.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Charlottetown accord discussions of the amending formula

went on for several days. They were preceded by consultations by officials. They resulted in formal proposals to amend the amending formula which were agreed to by 10 provinces and the federal government.

If that did not satisfy the section 49 requirement, what is it that makes the Prime Minister think a half hour discussion at this conference in June will satisfy that requirement?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just explained that a lot of people including some lawyers have said there is a very specific need to have a meeting on it and we have called a meeting. In the agenda we stated clearly section 49 of the Constitution passed in 1982. We are officially meeting this requirement.

Some would argue that we do not need to do it. I want to be on the safe side. I am respecting the Constitution and I am being extremely prudent. That is why people vote for my party.

* * *

[*Translation*]

KENWORTH PLANT

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Last April 9, PACCAR announced that it was closing the Kenworth plant in Sainte-Thérèse, and this was confirmed in a letter that day to plant employees and the Quebec Minister of Labour. But yesterday the Department of Human Resources Development was still refusing to pay unemployment insurance benefits to laid off employees.

Does the minister find it acceptable that his department is depriving over 700 people of unemployment insurance benefits, when it is clear that PACCAR announced the closure of the Kenworth plant on April 9, 1996?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the PACCAR issue is obviously a very difficult situation for workers and their families. I think we shared the hope of the hon. member and of many colleagues in this House that, perhaps, with the help of the Government of Quebec and the participation of the Government of Canada, together with employees and company directors, we could find a solution.

• (1430)

It is true that the closure was announced, but there was also a strike. In addition, there was also this hope that the industry could be started up again.

I can tell the hon. member today that it is with great regret that we see that it is finally true that PACCAR, as we knew it, is closed. As I said, it is a source of great regret, because we had always hoped that the industry could be started up again. Just today, in

fact, we have finally decided to accept the fact that the industry has closed its doors and that these people will be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 700 people without resources for two months. It is my understanding that the minister recognizes that these people are now entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.

Can he guarantee us that he will do everything in his power to speed up the payment process, now that they are entitled to these benefits?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are aware of course of the needs of these individuals and of their families. We have been following the situation closely. If we had accepted the fact that the plant had closed and that there was no possibility of starting it up again, I think that would not have been well received by most stakeholders.

Today, however, as I said in my reply to the hon. member's question, we are accepting our responsibilities in this situation, because we recognize, as does the union, the company, and especially the workers, that the end has now come. We are going to do everything we can to try to help these employees, who have been going through some very rough times for quite a while now. We will do everything we can to try to help them as quickly as possible.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are really confused about the Airbus deal and whether there is something in the works behind the scenes to settle the \$50 million libel suit regarding Brian Mulroney out of court. CBC and its sources say yes. Government lawyers say no.

I would like to ask the minister what he thinks about this and what he has to say. Is there a deal in the works with Brian Mulroney? Yes or no? Has the federal government ever offered to settle this matter out of court? Yes or no?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question of whether there is a deal in the offing is no.

I cannot take responsibility for what the CBC may have reported, nor can I explain why it reported what it did. However, I can tell the House in response to the hon. member's question that so far as I am aware there is no settlement imminent. Indeed, there is no concrete proposal on the table to settle it.

Oral Questions

I remind the House that this litigation was commenced by the plaintiff. It is up to the plaintiff, if he chooses to do so, to instruct his solicitors to bring a proposal forward. That is well within his authority and he may choose to do so.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, regarding ministerial accountability, it may be that the minister does not know of any concrete proposal on the table, but regarding what we hear on the news, there certainly are some questions about it.

I understand the minister is busy with the Young Offenders Act, section 745 and the Airbus deal, but I am going to ask him again.

Contrary to what he is saying, that he knows there is no concrete proposal on the table, the Canadian taxpayer is going to have to pay the bill on this regardless of what the price is. I ask the minister one more time: Where is the cash going to come from when any settlement is ever arranged? Who is going to pay for the incompetence if there are federal bureaucrats involved and the justice minister's poor judgment on this? When is he going to accept ministerial responsibility?

The Speaker: Colleagues, this is dealing with a matter which I believe is before the courts right now. Therefore, I do not know that the question is in order.

The minister has not indicated whether or not he wants to answer. If the minister wishes to address himself to this problem, I will give him permission to do so.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the matter is before the courts, but the hon. member raises the question of whether discussions are under way for the payment of any money. I can tell the hon. member that no matter what may have been reported last night, there is no proposal, there is no settlement imminent and there is no discussion of payment of money.

In the course of litigation—and I practised litigation law for 20 years—the parties are always exchanging feelers and that is appropriate. However, as I said, the plaintiff started this lawsuit. If the plaintiff wants to instruct his lawyers to come to us with a proposal, it is within his authority to do so.

• (1435)

I can tell the hon. member that there is no settlement imminent. That report to that extent was incorrect. There is no discussion at present of a settlement on those terms.

* * *

[Translation]

RAILWAY SAFETY

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Oral Questions

CN employees responsible for repairing railroad track maintenance equipment at the Joffre station in Charny were told on Monday that their shop will be shut down. This means 100 or so jobs will be lost in Charny while the same number will be created in a shop in Winnipeg. By closing the only track maintenance equipment repair and overhaul facility in eastern Canada, CN could compromise the safety of rail transportation in the region.

How can the minister give the people of Quebec the assurance that railroad tracks will remain safe when these tracks will now be maintained by a shop located in Winnipeg?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I was questioned last week about the changes made by VIA Rail, involving the transfer of 63 or 65 employees to Montreal, the hon. member did not raise concerns about the safety of the people in other parts of the country.

The fact is that changes result from business decisions made by the major railway companies. We have a case here where my department is keeping a close eye on the safety issue. CN has an excellent safety reputation and record, and we at the department will continue to see to it that safety is not compromised by the way CN manages its operations.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Transport realizes that what is at stake is rail safety in all of eastern Canada.

Given that the minister has the duty, under the existing legislation, to ensure the safety of rail transportation, does he intend to impose a moratorium on the closure of the shop in Charny, pending an impact study by the National Transportation Agency?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. We have reviewed the situation from a safety point of view and our review has shown no increased risk. There is therefore no reason to try to reverse CN's decision.

I should point out that CN is now a private company. It can make any business decision that fiscal reality dictates in order to streamline its activities. We do not have to review every business decision made by private companies.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the justice minister said that Bill C-45 will ensure that only the most appropriate and deserving cases are given consideration for early

parole. In other words, the minister is creating categories of killers: good killers with special rights and bad killers without those rights.

What is the difference between a good killer and a bad killer, one that is deserving of special rights and privileges over one that is not?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the first place we do not propose to repeal the section, as my hon. friend and his party would do, because we believe along with the vast majority of moderate Canadians that there is room for this in the law. We are not prepared to say that of the hundreds of people serving life for murder none of them should ever get the opportunity to come before a jury of peers from the community to ask for a shortening of the period.

We have proposed a significant tightening of the section. We said for all those in prison now serving time for murder there will be a tight screening mechanism before they ever get to a jury. That screening mechanism means that only those cases where a judge says there is a reasonable prospect of success under the test in section 745 will ever get to a jury. We have also said that any such jury would have to be unanimous in shortening the period of parole and eligibility, whereas now it is only two-thirds.

• (1440)

I suggest these measures will strengthen section 745, will improve it and will ensure that it is those exceptional cases of deserving applicants who get the remedy provided for.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the real penalty for multiple killers should be consecutive sentences. Clifford Olson should be serving 11 consecutive life sentences, not looking for early parole.

This serial killer, Clifford Olson, and those who are in jail today will still have the right to apply to a superior court judge for a hearing under Bill C-45, and a jury hearing may be granted.

Why has the justice minister not simply scrapped section 745 instead of introducing a bill that still allows Clifford Olson and hundreds of other first degree murderers to apply for early release?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes reference to some of the present prison population.

There are victims reported today in the press calling for the passage of the bill we introduced yesterday, victims' families calling for the passage of the bill.

If this bill is passed the present prison population will face a much tighter and significantly strengthened process under section 745. People who are now in prison will have to get past a judge in the screening process.

If the hon. member and his party are prepared to support us in getting this bill through, we can get it through by the summer break. If they do not, let us face it, they have a choice to make: will they support this bill and see it passed or will they stand in its way so that people now in prison will not have to face that screening mechanism before they get to a jury?

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Tomorrow, some 700 French-speaking employees of the CBC will have to vote on collective agreements written in English only. As we know, these agreements are extremely important, as they drastically change the nature of labour relations at that corporation as a result of the Liberal cuts.

Since the employer stated that francophones will have to read and vote in English, what does the Minister of Canadian Heritage intend to do to ensure that the CBC's francophone employees have access to a collective agreement in French before voting tomorrow?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, the CBC operates at arm's length from the government. Furthermore, I am well aware that the Commissioner of Official Languages has apprised the president of the CBC of the problem and that the president has given assurances he would take all necessary measures to comply with the law.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, may I remind the minister that people will vote on the agreement tomorrow.

Given her answer and the fact that the CBC's francophone employees do not have access to their collective agreement in French, that they must sign a petition and appeal to the Commissioner of Official Languages to get one, will the minister admit, without trying to dodge the issue, that this situation provides a concrete example of how Canada's francophones are indeed treated like second-class citizens?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that, as usual, Bloc members are exaggerating the facts.

As I said very clearly, Canada has an Official Languages Act that all crown corporations, including the CBC, must comply with. As I just said, the president of the CBC has assured us he would take all necessary measures.

Oral Questions

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the new value added tax is to replace the GST and PST through harmonization initially for New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

Can the Minister of Finance explain how harmonizing sales taxes will eliminate duplication for small business and also save money for the consumers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think I can handle that.

• (1445)

At present small business has to maintain two sets of books, meet two sets of reporting dates and file two sets of forms. Most small businesses will say they are constantly tripping over tax auditors from either the federal government or provincial governments, which is why the Canadian Federation of Independent Business supports harmonization. The Canadian Association of Chartered Accountants has said it will save business over \$500 million a year, which is in fact a modest assessment.

As far as consumers are concerned, with harmonization we will eliminate the cascading of taxes on each set, each stage of the production process. Provincial taxes are imposed; tax on tax on tax. This represents a disguised tax grab that is a penalty on jobs.

Consumers will benefit from lower prices, Canadians will benefit from lower prices and the economy will benefit from harmonization.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago I visited Nova Scotia to see the Sydney tar ponds, one of Canada's biggest environmental disasters. Yesterday I had the chance to see the Taro dump site in Hamilton. Both sites are in desperate need of a federal environmental assessment and yet it seems the minister is doing all he can to stay miles away from these controversies.

Sheila Copps had the power to hold full panel environmental reviews but never did. Is the new minister prepared to use his statutory powers or will he hide his head in the sand like his predecessor?

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Sydney tar ponds, the minister has given his commitment before the committee that before the end of the term of the government something will be done with that situation.

Oral Questions

The proposed Taro dump is under provincial jurisdiction. I suggest he speak to the provincial minister of the environment on that.

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked Environment Canada's silver anniversary, but it is safe to say the clouds hanging over the minister's head have no silver lining.

These last few years of pathetic federal-provincial relations concerning the environment and poor legislation, all courtesy of Sheila Copps, have only hurt Environment Canada.

When will the minister stop behaving like Sheila Copps and start putting the environment ahead of personal political gains?

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government welcomes the scrutiny of the Sierra Club and other environmental organizations.

We have made advances on the environmental agenda. We have reintroduced a bill to ban MMT, something the Sierra Club supports. We have introduced tough regulations on new car emissions and we have created an environmental commissioner.

We have important legislation that represents throne speech commitments that will address many of the concerns outlined in this report.

* * *

[Translation]

AIDS CONTROL

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

From July 7 to 12, people from all over the world will meet in Vancouver to discuss AIDS. In Canada alone, it is estimated that 15,000 people have AIDS, while about 50,000 more are HIV positive. Canada has had a national AIDS strategy since 1990. It has now reached phase II. However, the health minister has repeatedly refused to extend the strategy when it expires, in March 1997.

Given the imminence of the conference in Vancouver, will the Prime Minister use this opportunity to tell AIDS victims, community groups and members of the scientific community that there will be a phase III to the National AIDS Strategy?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this issue has to do with next year's budget. The health and finance ministers will discuss it. I am not in a position to report on it at this point.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): No respect for the conference in Vancouver, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Prime Minister confirm, as he is being asked by his five major national partners on the AIDS issue, that the current funding for the strategy will be maintained beyond 1997? This is important for AIDS victims.

• (1450)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies for now. The issue is being reviewed. The Minister of Finance, along with each minister representing his or her respective interests, have discussions with the Department of Finance regarding the content of next year's budget.

The budget is usually tabled in February. If an announcement is to be made before then, the concerned ministers will do so. I cannot answer the question right now, because it would be premature to do so.

* * *

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the foreign affairs minister.

The governments of the world, including Canada, have made strong representations to the Government of Nigeria about its alleged human rights abuses. The desire for peaceful, democratic changes has been widely promoted around the world. Can the minister tell the House the progress made in this area?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the concern of the hon. member about the tragic and unacceptable developments taking place in Nigeria.

The matter was first brought forward by the Prime Minister at the Commonwealth meetings over a year ago when he asked that Nigeria be suspended from the Commonwealth. Since then we have held a meeting of CMAG, the Commonwealth ministers advisory group, at which a decision was taken on a number of sanctions that could be applied. Those are now being presented to various Commonwealth members. We are also undertaking to talk to the Europeans and the Americans to see if they would share in applying a series of economic sanctions.

I am hoping we will be able to get the full concurrence of the Commonwealth and these other partners so that we can make a very strong international statement that we will not accept the violations going on in Nigeria.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister whether he thinks it is time to stop threatening, talking and discussing sanctions and to start taking some real action by proposing that Nigeria be expelled from the Commonwealth until it is in a position to deal with this matter.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is presently suspended. I think it is the clear intention of

Oral Questions

the Commonwealth ministers to see if this first round of actions and initiatives will have the necessary impact.

There will be a meeting with Chief Ikimi, the foreign affairs minister of Nigeria, in London next week, at which he will be presented with these alternatives. If the alternatives are not accepted and if we cannot get the kind of response and change we need, the kind of proposition put forward by the hon. member should be considered.

* * *

HEALTH

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Recent American research shows that dioxins, which are cancer causing substances, are more dangerous to health than originally believed. In Canada safe dioxin exposure levels for humans have been under review for over a year.

Can the minister tell the House when he will inform the public of Health Canada's revised dioxin safety levels?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member will know exposure of Canadians to dioxins has declined over the last 20 years. This in part is the result of the effectiveness of controls that have been put in place to prohibit the creation of these unwanted substances.

Health Canada, as all members in the House will acknowledge, has been reviewing all available information on dioxins, as have other countries such as Sweden, Germany and the United States. Canada's current guidelines are similar to all other countries with the possible exception of the United States.

While we have no plans at this time to revise the guidelines, Health Canada will not hesitate to pursue any necessary additional measures if the dioxin data indicate we need to do so.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IRVING WHALE

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Last Monday, I asked the Minister of the Environment whether the insurance coverage for the contractor responsible for refloating the *Irving Whale* had been revised since last year, and whether it now covered PCBs? Taken unawares by my question, the minister did not make any reference to insurance coverage in his response.

• (1455)

I am therefore asking again whether he can give us a guarantee that the new insurance contracts have been revised and do contain coverage for PCBs?

[*English*]

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has undergone a number of consultations and assessments on the *Irving Whale*. We are going ahead with the lift this summer.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to date, the refloating of the *Irving Whale* has cost the Canadian taxpayer no less than \$18 million. What is more, it has not been successful, so several millions more will have to be spent.

Can the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans make a commitment before this House to claim the entire costs of this operation from those who are in reality the only ones responsible, that is to say the Irving Company?

[*English*]

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to the polluter pay principle. Once we bring the *Irving Whale* up, we will be able to assess the real reason for its sinking. At that time we will take appropriate action.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, by removing the tax credit on the GST, the finance minister has raised the purchase price of all used goods bought by ordinary Canadians while quietly reaping a huge tax windfall for his own coffers.

Car dealers, auctioneers, people who sell used furniture and used clothing, virtually anybody employed in the used goods sector, will be under pressure. They tell us that bankruptcies and lay-offs are imminent.

Can the finance minister tell the House if it is his intention to use this silent tax windfall financed from the pockets of ordinary Canadians to pay for his billion dollar pay-off to Atlantic premiers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a used question. Because it is a used question, let me simply deal with the last part of the question, this constant reference to a bribe, this constant insult to Atlantic Canada.

It is really important to understand this is one country. It is not incumbent upon a member of any political party to stand up and insult one region of the country.

Oral Questions

This is fundamental change that will benefit small business in Atlantic Canada. It is fundamental change that will benefit the consumers of Atlantic Canada. It will give Atlantic Canada a chance to basically get its business costs in line.

I do not think it is incumbent upon any member of the House to stand up and constantly insult a region of the country.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the member would please answer the question. Page 22 of the red book said any changes to the GST would be revenue neutral. This clearly is not, since it will cost consumers hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Will the finance minister admit today that not only is he incapable of keeping his promise to abolish the GST, but that he has reneged on his page 22 promise of revenue neutrality. Is he not just like Sheila Copps?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, let the hon. member understand that on June 17 Sheila Copps will win an overwhelming majority.

Second, let the hon. member understand that his own party talked about ripping the heck out of the GST and scrapping it. Then, when the finance committee came to me, his own party recommended harmonization. His own party recommended broadening the base. His own party has flip-flopped back and forth on this issue more times than anybody can count.

The fundamental issue is why does this hon. member, after his convention at which they said they would adopt a more enlightened view, continue to expostulate the voices of extremism?

* * *

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AIDS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It concerns the 11th international conference on AIDS, being hosted by Canada in Vancouver next month. Is the Prime Minister prepared to reconsider his decision not to attend this very important conference, particularly in view of the letter which his own colleague, the Minister of Health, sent to him on May 15 stating: "If you choose not to attend, Canadians and representatives from other countries will receive a signal that Canada is less than committed to fighting this disease"?

• (1500)

Will the Prime Minister listen to the Minister of Health, listen to Canadians who are fighting desperately against HIV and AIDS?

Will the Prime Minister now agree to attend the conference and make a commitment to renew the national strategy on AIDS at the conference?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I considered the possibility of attending the conference. If I cannot go, I hope the head of state for Canada, the Governor General, will be there.

The commitment I have expressed in support of this cause is well known. I was one of the leaders who went to the conference in Paris which was convened two years ago. It is possible that I will not be able to be there. If I cannot be there, I hope the Governor General as the head of state for Canada will be there.

* * *

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

One of the commitments in the throne speech was legislation on endangered species. In light of the Sierra Club report, can the parliamentary secretary tell this House what action we can expect on endangered species in Canada?

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister remains committed to introducing federal legislation relating to endangered species in the House. As the member has pointed out, it is a throne speech commitment. If we are to have effective endangered species legislation, then we have to factor in habitat as well.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to bring to your attention the presence in the gallery of Mr. Robin Teverson, member of the United Kingdom Delegation of the European Parliament.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would also like to bring to your attention the presence in the gallery of some of what I would call our unsung heroes who represent us as Canadians. I am referring specifically to the physicians who in our name travel to third world countries at their own expense to treat people, thereby doing a great service for them and for Canada.

Would these physicians please stand and be recognized.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

POINT OF ORDER

MOTION OF HON. MEMBER FOR KOOTENAY EAST

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to a motion I placed on the Order Paper. The motion is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, a message be sent to the Senate respectfully requesting a free conference with Their Honours to consider the issue of the relationship between the two Houses of Parliament with respect to the accountability process for the main estimates.

• (1505)

My point of order will address the issue of where the motion stands on the Order Paper. I do not feel it should be the subject of a private member's motion but a matter that can be moved under Routine Proceedings under Motions. I will also address the issue of the necessity of a procedure that has fallen into disuse.

I understand that historically conferences with the Senate are to work out disagreements with respect to legislation. In fact it is part of the legislative process. However this is the first time that the Senate has been asked to account to this House for its spending. Consequently it is the first time there has been a disagreement or misunderstanding on how to proceed in this matter. There is no mechanism nor are there any references to meetings with the Senate on this issue. That is why a free conference may serve the purpose.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, messages sent to the Senate are usually made under Motions. In addition there is the definition of section (p) of Standing Order 67 which describes motions that can be made under Routine Proceedings. These motions are for the maintenance of the House's authority and "the management of its business". My motion is such a motion.

The estimates of the Senate are not an issue of ministerial responsibility, which I will explain further, but are a matter of the Senate as a whole and consequently a matter of this House as a whole. If this House needs to take action on such issues, then there should be a quick mechanism through which it can take that action.

We need this conference to manage our business of supply and maintain the authority of the elected House. The deadline to deal with the estimates is June 21 or possibly earlier. We are under a deadline and we need to get together with the Senate soon.

I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 745 which states:

Either House may demand a conference—to communicate resolutions or addresses to which the concurrence of the other House is desired—

Point of Order

Citation 746(3) states: "The free conference is a meeting of managers attempting, by discussion, to effect an agreement between the two Houses".

Although citation 748 of Beauchesne's says that conferences between the two Houses are now obsolete, a motion for a free conference with the Senate is still on our books. It can be found in Standing Order 67(1)(h).

Citation 750 of Beauchesne's makes a qualifying point:

While still theoretically possible under the Standing Orders, both the conference and the free conference have been effectively replaced by the exchange of Messages between the two Houses and the attendance of Ministers at the committees of both Houses.

Citation 751 goes even further:

What may be described as less open and ostensible means of communication arise from the fact that representatives of the government sit in both Houses, so that every public question is presented by the executive to both Houses—

As I mentioned earlier, the matter of the estimates of the Senate is not a matter of the government. It is not the Leader of the Government in the Senate who is responsible. The responsibility lies with the Senate as a whole. It does not matter if ministers from this House attend Senate committees or that a minister sits in the other place.

This is a unique situation. The arguments set out in citations 750 and 751 do not apply because ministerial accountability does not apply in this case. The use of a free conference is therefore justified and suitable to this particular issue.

Since it is a matter respecting the authority of the House or lack thereof to consider the management of its business, it is therefore a matter to be considered under Motions. I understand that it has been a long time since such a conference has been sought. However with respect to the relationship of the two Houses regarding the main estimates in modern times, it is fitting that an archaic rule will be necessary to attempt to bring the accountability practices of the Senate from the 1880s to the 1990s.

In conclusion, I view this situation as a very serious one. Outside of voting down the funds of the Senate, we in this House are virtually powerless to do anything about the issue of the main estimates of the Senate.

I would like to give this process another chance. We need to come to some agreement with the Senate so that the public can have confidence in this institution and the way it accounts for the spending of their money.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few issues raised by the hon. member.

I disagree with his interpretation of the rules whereby Standing Order 67(1)(h) could be used for such a purpose. I also believe that

Tributes

his reading of Beauchesne is inaccurate, or at least the interpretation thereof is inaccurate. Let me deal with both issues.

• (1510)

Standing Order 67(1) refers to debatable motions. Standing Order 67(1)(h) refers to a conference with the Senate. That may be quite true. However, *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, sixth edition, as my colleague across the way has just indicated, under the general rubric of conferences, it is referred to under the heading "Intercourse Between the Two Houses". Citation 743 reads in part:

When the House of Commons does not agree to the Senate amendments, it adopts a motion which states reasons for its disagreement. This is communicated to the Senate by written Message.

It then lists the steps that are to be followed following that kind of a disagreement on Senate amendments to a bill or a motion coming from the House. This of course has never occurred. Therefore, the prerequisite for invoking Standing Order 67(1)(h) that the hon. member brings to our attention has not, in my opinion, been satisfied.

With respect to the calling of such a conference, citation 745 states:

Either House may demand a conference upon the following matters: to communicate resolutions or addresses to which the concurrence of the other House is desired; concerning the privileges of Parliament; to acquire or to communicate statements of facts on which bills have been passed by either House; to offer reasons for disagreeing to, or insisting on, amendments—

The House has not made that kind of determination to make the request to the other House. Therefore, that has not been satisfied either. That is citation 745 which follows citation 743 under the general rubric to which I referred.

For all of these reasons the criteria have not been satisfied. There is absolutely no provision under which the standing order in question should be allowed, that is to say, a motion under Standing Order 67(1)(h), nor is the interpretation of citation 745(1) of Beauchesne accurate as presented to the House by our colleague across the way.

It is quite true of course that this House can invite another House or a committee of another House for a review of whatever, presumably estimates and other things. If the House wants to do that—and I understand that such an invitation has been sent—that is one thing. However, the fact that such an invitation has been sent does not at all satisfy the prerequisite which I have just outlined. Therefore, I believe the hon. member's point of order should be rejected by the Chair.

The Speaker: Colleagues, although we are dealing here with procedure, I wonder if the House would give its Speaker the time to get more information on the matter. In the first place, the point is well taken. I also accept the other side of the argument which has

been put forth by the government whip. I will look at this particular procedure and I will return to the House as soon as I can with a decision on this matter.

* * *

THE LATE JOE FLYNN

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the former member of Parliament for Kitchener, Joe Flynn.

Joe Flynn died Monday morning in Kitchener. He served in the House between 1974 and 1979. He retired in 1979. After that, he took up a position on the Canadian Pension Commission where he served with distinction until 1984.

• (1515)

Joe Flynn is remembered best as a son of Ireland. Joe talked endlessly about Irish tales, the Irish past and his own Irish heritage.

He was born in Ireland in County Cork in 1921 and came to Canada in 1925. He came, like nearly all Irish immigrants, as a poor boy from a poor family. But as the greatest Irish poet of this century once wrote, "but being poor I have only my dreams. I have spread my dreams under your feet". Those dreams for the Flynn family led very far.

The dreams that his parents spread out beneath the Flynn feet led one son to the House of Commons as the member for Kitchener and another son to the office of the chair of Metro Toronto and unfortunately to the Conservative Party. But Joe was the Liberal member for Kitchener with great pride between 1974 and 1979.

In 1939 when war broke out, Joe Flynn joined His Majesty's Canadian Navy, with more emphasis on the Canadian than on His Majesty. He served with great courage during the second world war.

In 1948 he came to Kitchener and raised his family in that city. His role in the community was notable. I list a few of his accomplishments, probably the major one being that he raised seven children in the city of Kitchener. Today several of his children occupy posts of considerable distinction.

He was active in the Knights of Columbus, the Sales and Ad Club. He was the past president of the K-W Blue Line Club and the founding director of the Kitchener Rangers Hockey Club. Many of us who attended Rangers games remember Joe's booming voice when he sang with great pride O Canada. He was a founding member of St. Teresa's Catholic Church and at the House of Commons chaired the committee on veterans affairs.

He was a model immigrant. He was a model resident of Kitchener. He was a wonderful member of this House.

Today, I would like to recall Joe Flynn and the many memories he has given us and to express on behalf of all of us our sympathy to Betty and the family. Kitchener will miss Joe Flynn very much.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would also like to express the sincere condolences of all the members of the Bloc Québécois to his family and friends.

[English]

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Reform Party of Canada I would like to express our sympathies, our understanding and certainly condolences to the Joe Flynn family and all of his friends.

We recognize the contribution Mr. Flynn made to the House of Commons and to his constituents during his hard work and the contribution in his own community. He worked with the school board, the Chamber of Commerce and a number of other organizations.

I am sure he will be missed and truly recognized for the contributions he made. We extend our condolences and our understanding.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Benoît Tremblay (Rosemont, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to defer debate on Motion M-169, which was to be debated this evening under Private Members' Business, and to place it last in the order of precedence.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex—Windsor, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second

Routine Proceedings

report of the Standing Committee on Finance on Bill C-36, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax, the Excise Tax Act, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, the Old Age Security Act and the Canadian Shipping Act, of which most sections passed unanimously.

* * *

● (1520)

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-46, an act to amend the Criminal Code (production of records in sexual offence proceedings).

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

* * *

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF CANADA ACT

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-302, an act to establish an oath of allegiance to the flag of Canada.

She said: Madam Speaker, this legislation will adopt an official oath of allegiance to the flag of Canada. No such oath presently exists. The flag is an important symbol in our lives. We remember British fishing boats flying it in support of us. We look with pride when it is raised at the Olympics. We see it on the sleeve of our peacekeepers. It is a unifying symbol of respect and tolerance throughout Canada.

The oath can be recited at school or before meetings, wherever the flag is prominent. The bill calls on a committee to consult with Canadians regarding the wording. As this will be an oath which will be used by Canadians, it is important that they participate in its wording. Canadians are proud of their flag and what it means to us and to the world.

This legislation will give Canadians an official oath to acknowledge its importance in all of our lives.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-303, an act to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce my private member's bill, which is an act to amend the Criminal Code, so that it includes a statement of intent about victims' rights and provides for the application of those rights within the legislation.

Routine Proceedings

The bill will provide recognition of the importance of victims' rights in criminal law. It will achieve a greater balance between the rights of the victims and the rights of the accused and those who are convicted of crime.

This bill works to protect the rights of victims and deals with restitution, the right to information and the right to be heard. We have a responsibility to the protection of victims' rights in this country. I call on all members to support this bill.

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

* * *

• (1525)

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-304, an act to amend the Criminal Code (aiding suicide).

He said: Madam Speaker, I have the honour to introduce a bill that would amend the Criminal Code to allow people with terminal or incurable illnesses, who are often suffering terrible pain, anguish or indignity that cannot be relieved by palliative care, to seek the assistance of a physician to end their life at the time they choose.

The current legislation, which dates back to 1892, can be extremely cruel to those who are dying and to their families and loved ones.

Sue Rodriguez and Austin Bastable are two people who lived their lives and faced their deaths with great courage and dignity. They urged the Minister of Justice in their final days to introduce this legislation.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice have both promised a free vote on this issue. I join with many Canadians in urging them to honour that promise.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-305, an act to amend the Criminal Code (protection of children).

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to repeal section 43 of the Criminal Code, the section that allows corporal punishment of children by parents and teachers.

Condoning corporal punishment can lead to physical and psychological injury and even ultimately to the death of children. It contributes to violence in society and is contrary to both the charter

of rights and freedoms and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Section 43 allows punishment causing bruising and contusions. It allows children to be struck with belts and other objects. It is a relic of a bygone age and has no place in a democratic society that respects and values children.

Finally, I would note that several European countries have ended the legal approval of corporal punishment with very significant, positive results. I urge the government to uphold the rights of children and repeal this harmful and discriminatory section of the Criminal Code of Canada.

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

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL REFUGEE AWARENESS DAY ACT

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill 306, an act respecting a national refugee awareness day.

He said: Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table a bill establishing a national refugee awareness day on April 4 of each year. Because of my origins, this is something I hold dear. The Geneva Refugee Convention was signed in July 1951. It has been ratified by Canada.

On April 4, 1985, the Supreme Court of Canada handed down its decision in the famous Singh case saying that the charter of rights and freedoms applied to refugees as well. This day will help make Canadians more aware of the often dramatic situation of refugees.

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

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

BILL C-205

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have four petitions to present under Standing Order 36. Two of the petitions deal with Bill C-205 which was introduced by our colleague, the member for Scarborough West.

The petitioners call on the government to make sure that criminals do not profit from committing a crime.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Madam Speaker, another petition deals with the issue of assisted suicide. The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to make assisted suicide not allowed.

Routine Proceedings

• (1530)

ABORTION

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the final petition deals with the whole question of holding a national referendum on abortion. These constituents call on the Government of Canada at the next election to hold a national referendum on abortion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have 50 signatures here from people of Nepean who request that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or any other federal legislation that would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): I have another petition, Madam Speaker, with 325 names from people of Harrowsmith, Verona, Portland, Hartington, Kingston and Brockville.

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

JUSTICE

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have petitions that requests Parliament to repeal section 745. These petitions add to the 32,000 names I have presented directly to the justice minister. There are 4,274 names in this group today.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions today.

The first comes from Russell, Ontario. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to society.

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

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): The second petition, Madam Speaker, comes from Bloomfield, Ontario. The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability, and specifically that fetal alcohol syndrome and other

alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable 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 to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

BILL C-205

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by approximately 200 individuals from my constituency in Saskatoon asking that Parliament enact Bill C-205, introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West, asking that Canadian law provide that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

[Translation]

TESTING OF EXPLOSIVES

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wish to table a petition today signed by some 3,000 residents of Pointe-du-Lac and environs. Pointe-du-Lac is located in the federal riding of Trois-Rivières.

This petition asks Parliament to halt immediately all testing of explosives at the National Defence Proof and Experimental Test Establishment located at Nicolet-Sud in the riding of Richelieu. According to the petitioners, this testing is causing shock waves that are damaging to both property and people and therefore is harming the environment of the people in the surrounding municipalities and in Lac-Saint-Pierre.

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to introduce in the House today pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The first is from residents of my riding of Prince George—Bulkley Valley. They are concerned that Parliament does not include among human rights a right to behaviour that is considered morally wrong, that marriage plays a pivotal and societal role in the stability of the family, and that any legislation such as Bill C-265 which might weaken the family unit is the antithesis of a sensible social policy.

Therefore the petitioners pray that Parliament defeat Bill C-265 in order to protect marriage and the family from the possible social upheaval that might be caused by its passage into law.

• (1535)

BILL C-205

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205, introduced by the hon. member for

Routine Proceedings

Scarborough West, at the earliest opportunity in order to provide that in Canadian law no criminal profits from committing a crime.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the third petition containing over 500 names comes from the Nepean area. The petitioners are very concerned with the penalties given to drunk drivers who kill.

They pray and request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code that will ensure the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired reflects the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward this crime.

ABORTION

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I table a petition signed by the constituents of Lambton—Middlesex, pursuant to Standing Order 36 and duly certified by the clerk of petitions.

The petitioners state that Canadians deserve a real say in how our scarce health care dollars are spent and which health care procedures they consider to be essential.

They request that Parliament support a binding national referendum to be held at the time of the next election to ask Canadians whether they are in favour of federal government funding for abortions on demand.

AIDS

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the national AIDS strategy, expiring on March 31, 1998, funds and co-ordinates prevention, education, support and research in Canada.

Residents of Delta, B.C. call on Parliament to urge the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health to commit to a renewal of the funding for the national AIDS strategy at current levels.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a further petition signed by 300 persons in my riding, who have joined with another 12,000 who already signed petitions asking that Bill C-12 be withdrawn and all powers relating to employment and manpower training be transferred back to Quebec, along with the associated budgets.

[*English*]

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition to present today on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre concerning age of consent laws. The petitioners ask that

Parliament set the age of consent at 18 to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse.

BILL C-205

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 131, I present a petition today with 150 names from citizens united for safety and justice.

The petitioners pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205, which prohibits criminals from exploiting their victims through profiting from their crimes. I would like to add that I endorse this petition 100 per cent and have already spoken on this bill in the House.

AIDS

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York Simcoe, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition calling on Parliament to urge the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health to commit to renewal of the national AIDS strategy for at least the current level of funding.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my elected duty to table petitions signed by residents from different regions of Ontario regarding the national AIDS strategy.

Whereas the national AIDS strategy funds and co-ordinates prevention, education, support and research in Canada, and whereas the national AIDS strategy expires March 31, 1998, while at the same time AIDS infection continues to rise, the petitioners call on Parliament to urge the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health to commit a renewal of the national AIDS strategy to at least the current levels of funding.

[*Translation*]

DREDGING OPERATIONS

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table another petition against the planned dredging operation at Pier No. 2 in the port of Sorel, which would involve discharging sludge in open waters.

This petition is signed by more than 300 residents and these signatures are in addition to the many already tabled. I am also pleased to support this petition and to inform the House that, this week, the Quebec Minister of the Environment, who finds this project unacceptable, has given me his support.

[*English*]

HEALTH

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a number of petitions today. The first is signed by hundreds of residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway and elsewhere in the lower mainland, in particular supported by A & A Foods, Cioffi's Meat Market & Deli, Angelo Tosi, and National Cheese Co. (Western) Ltd.

It notes that a new regulation proposed by Health Canada will result in the banning of some imported Italian Parmesan cheese as well as some other types of cheeses, that small cheese factories and specialty cheese stores will be adversely affected, that Health Canada has not adequately demonstrated the health benefits of this proposed regulation.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed regulations concerning unpasteurized cheese. I strongly support that.

• (1540)

STRAIT OF GEORGIA

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second petition is signed by residents of the Sunshine Coast and elsewhere in British Columbia, collected by the Sunshine Coast Peace Group.

The petition opposes the presence of nuclear powered and nuclear armed vessels in the Strait of Georgia, British Columbia, and calls on Parliament to end the agreement allowing nuclear powered and nuclear armed vessels to use CFMETR in the Strait of Georgia.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the third petition is signed by residents of my constituency in British Columbia, in particular Irene Tong and Leung Hok Sum, opposing the recently adopted changes to the Canadian Human Rights Act concerning sexual orientation.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the third petition has been signed by a large number of residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway and elsewhere in British Columbia. It concerns the veterans of the merchant navy, co-ordinated by Roy Finlay of the Canadian Merchant Navy Association. It calls on Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to that enjoyed by veterans of World War II armed services.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the final petition is signed by a large number of residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway. It notes that gasoline prices have increased dramatically in recent days and that two committees of Parliament have recommended federal gas tax increases which should be far lower than those which have currently been proposed.

The petitioners therefore request that Parliament not proceed with the a federal excise tax on gasoline and strongly consider reallocating its current revenues to rehabilitate Canada's crumbling national highway infrastructure.

Routine Proceedings

NEWFOUNDLAND EDUCATION

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition signed by 56 residents of Victoria, British Columbia and related areas of Vancouver Island.

The petitioners request that Parliament not amend the Constitution as requested by the Government of Newfoundland. They request that the problem of education reform in that province be referred back to the Government of Newfoundland for resolution by some other non-constitutional procedure.

AIDS

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have a petition to present on behalf of citizens from across Ontario, concerned about the national AIDS strategy.

The petitioners call on Parliament to urge the Prime Minister and the Minister of Health to commit to a renewal of the national AIDS strategy at its current level of funding.

[Translation]

CHILD LABOUR

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to table a petition signed by 162 residents of Quebec, and more specifically of my riding of Bourassa, concerning the minimum age for admission to employment. In 1973, the International Labour Organization signed convention 138. Unfortunately, Canada never signed this convention, in spite of the fact that child labour, which affects approximately 200 million children around the world, is a real scourge.

These petitioners ask that Canada sign this convention and I support this petition.

[English]

BILL C-205

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a petition signed by approximately 71 members of the constituency of Wetaskiwin.

The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to enact Bill C-205, introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West, at the earliest opportunity so as to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting a petition signed by approximately 60 people from the Scarborough area calling on Parliament to take notice of the inadequacies in the sentencing regimes of those convicted of criminal impaired driving causing death and recommending that Parliament consider enacting a

Government Orders

sentence regime of between seven and fourteen years as an appropriate sentence for that crime.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition from over 1,100 residents of Saskatoon, protesting gas price hikes and the gouging of consumers as the gas pumps by multinational gas companies without any intervention on the part of the federal government.

The petitioners urge Parliament to establish an energy pricing review commission to keep gasoline prices and other energy products in check.

* * *

• (1545)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Question No. 37 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 37—**Mr. Duncan:**

What is the amount of financial assistance provided by the federal government for Tsa-Kwa-Luten Lodge, Quadra Island, B.C., for: (a) construction of the lodge; (b) operation of the lodge; and (c) total federal contribution to date since its inception?

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed by the Departments of Human Resources Development and Industry as follows:

	a)	b)	c)
Human Resources Development Canada	\$92,834	\$114,542	207,376
Industry Canada	\$1,800,000	\$311,275	\$2,111,275
	\$1,892,834	\$425,817	\$2,318,651

The following federal government departments have no information on this subject: Canadian Heritage, Fisheries and Oceans, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Western Economic Diversification Canada.

[English]

Mr. Zed: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

OCEANS ACT

The House resumed from June 11, 1996 consideration of Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of motions in Group No. 11.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The hon. member for Richelieu has the floor to conclude his speech.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Madam Speaker, around 9 o'clock last night, I received the unanimous consent of the House to complete my speech. As the Chair interrupted my speech at 9.30 p.m., I have the opportunity today to complete my speech on the motions in Group No. 11 put forward by the Liberal Party.

I will not only conclude my speech, but also recap the reasons behind our amendments to this bill. The government seems uncomfortable with its bill, for it could not get any Liberal member yesterday to explain the relevance of these amendments and of the bill itself.

The Bloc Quebecois reiterated the reasons behind its proposed amendments to this bill yesterday and we will do so again, forcefully, today. This hastily introduced bill does not meet the people's demands, the government's objective to cut spending, or users' expectations. Yet, users told the committee they were ready to share costs, provided this is done in a reasonable manner and they can specify what their needs are in relation to the fee structure, navigational aids on the St. Lawrence, as well as icebreaking and dredging.

What hurts stakeholders is that the government based its bill on the IBI report, which in no way reflects the reality. All the witnesses who appeared before the committee said they were appalled to see that the government's hare-brained bill is based on that report.

This unfair bill has been condemned not only by members of the opposition, and not for partisan purposes, but also, for logical reasons, by well-known associations that realize what a heavy price

they will have to pay, in economic terms. This could lead to enormous job losses along the St. Lawrence.

This bill will result in unfair competition, making it impossible for us to compete with ports in Halifax and Philadelphia. The unfair fee structure will compromise any expansion plan for these businesses and even threaten their very existence.

Speaking of the unfair fee structure, it is funny to hear the minister invoke fairness and the user-pay principle to justify the division of Canada into the three regions referred to in this bill.

• (1550)

If we read this proposal, we notice that all the regions, and particularly those of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, will pay part of the marine services provided to Newfoundland, which happens to be the province of origin of the minister responsible.

Ships going to Newfoundland will benefit from substantial rebates paid for in part by ships elsewhere. Moreover, according to the minister's policy, the port of Churchill, in Manitoba, would not have to pay for coast guard services.

The bill creates a situation which could be described like this: "Look, since you are my friend, I will give you an exemption. This port is in my riding, so it will get an exemption. We are indebted to that region, so we will also give it an exemption". And then: "The coast guard is under the responsibility of the transport department, but it will be transferred to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans". And finally: "You will have to pay for the costs related to the coast guard. Ports in the St. Lawrence will pay this amount, those in the second group will pay that amount, while those in the third group will pay that much", without knowing the impact of all this on the companies using these services. The government does not even know about the impact. No economic impact studies or economic forecasting were done to see what kind of operating cost increase companies will face.

This is what we object to, and we want the government to think things out thoroughly. After all, there is no urgency to establish a new policy which could greatly hurt the economy of a region, particularly Quebec. But the Liberal Party has a history of always targeting Quebec. Such is the story of the Liberals and their leader.

If the government could not find a single person to speak in favour of its bill, it is because there is something wrong with it. It is because people, and particularly the 21 Liberal members from Quebec, know this is a terrible blow to all Quebec businesses that will be affected by these changes.

The government cannot find a single speaker. Last night, we kept asking for a Liberal member to give us one reason why motions in Group No. 11 should be passed, in fact not only those motions, but

Government Orders

all the other ones, the bill itself. We were interested in the justification for the bill, but nobody wanted to explain it to us.

I can understand why Liberal members would hide behind their desks and not want to comment on such an unacceptable bill. I can also understand that they would see this bill as breaking their promises, the promises in the red book. The bottom line is that they are ashamed to have to appear in the House to defend a bill like this one.

This bill has been rejected by all the people directly affected by the amendments, in other words the users, and it has also been rejected by the general public, when they see how unfair it is for ports in the St. Lawrence. This unfairness will reduce, not to say eliminate, the competitiveness of affected businesses.

We therefore say: Let us wait a few months, go back to committee and, instead of hiring a firm like IBI, whose report just went through the motions, make sure that users, all those who are affected or who believe in the survival of shipping, who believe in the development of ports along the St. Lawrence, who believe in a fairer distribution of costs, are consulted. We agree with the government that costs must be reduced, but why is this not done by charging according to dimensions and not tonnage, for instance?

If we heard today that tariffs would be set according to the dimensions of vessels, all regions would be treated equitably. But no, the tariff goes by tonnage. Certain regions do mostly transshipment, while others are primarily unloading points. Adopting a different fee structure for every region would hurt and do a flagrant injustice to Quebec ports.

In this regard, there is talk of going back to the table, looking at the issues and taking the time to think about them. If the government is so keen on seeing the bill passed at report stage today, it should at least have the decency to defer third reading until the fall.

• (1555)

This would give users time to lobby the minister, to try to get him out of his office and convince him to change his decision. This would also give him the time to consult the members of his own party and to come back in the fall and say that, through certain procedures, the bill can be amended at third reading to make it more acceptable.

This is quite simple. Like some of their Liberal colleagues, the members of our own party regularly refuse to come to the House to speak to this bill because they are so ashamed of it. Furthermore, what can we say once we realize the new fee structure is unfair to a given region of Canada? Since there are so many disputes, we should go back to the drawing board. Let us take this month to consider the issue more carefully, now that all the parties are aware of the problems, that the responsibilities for dredging, ice breaking operations and other fee-generating operations to be carried out on

Government Orders

the St. Lawrence will be reassigned, that the costs will be shared by users.

However, let us make sure that users will not be adversely affected and forced to declare bankruptcy, shut down their operations, or put projects on hold, as is the case for some companies in the Sorel area, such as Fagen, and also Richardson, the grain elevator company, which are greatly concerned that the new fee structure might affect their projects for the future. These companies were prepared to invest a lot in the Sorel region.

I could also talk about my riding, in the region of Bécancour, which has the largest industrial park. A major dock, entirely built by Quebec and used by all the industries in Bécancour's industrial park, will be hard hit. This will hurt, among other things, major industrial development projects in that park.

This fee structure could adversely affect one of the most important economic sectors in Canada and in Quebec, because of the minister's stubbornness. We say to the government: stop this stubbornness, postpone the adoption of this bill for a few months and listen, not to the official opposition or to the third party, but to those who are directly concerned.

Let us have the committee accept briefs, submissions and claims, to help the minister make a better decision in the fall. This is what the official opposition is asking. We are not doing this to stall the government's bill, but because the witnesses heard by the committee said that something had to be done and that the famous IBI report should be ignored.

I also read a release put out by the Montreal region, in addition to the one sent by the minister, saying that the city's economy might be significantly affected. It was not the Bloc Québécois saying this. It was the president of the executive committee of the Conseil régional du développement de l'Île de Montréal, the president of the executive committee of the Montreal Urban Community, and Patrice Simard, president of the Metropolitan Montreal chamber of commerce. These are not sovereignists or members of the Bloc Québécois. These are business people who want to work with the government to defray the cost of using the St. Lawrence Seaway, as well as look at the new fee structure and so on. They are prepared to pay, but they say that the government is on the wrong track.

They sent official requests to the Canadian government and obtained the consensus of the shipping industry to submit this document to the government, which has turned a deaf ear and wants absolutely nothing to do with it. It is stubbornly going ahead with a bill that is not at all in the interest of those it claims it wants to protect.

• (1600)

As for what is at stake for Quebec and for Montreal, this letter said: "Shipping is a fundamental activity for the economy of

Quebec. All port activities in Quebec will be affected by the proposed fee structure". This was what Mr. Ménard, the minister responsible for Montreal Island, had to say.

The port of Montreal handles 20 million tonnes of cargo per year. I said it yesterday and I say it again today, 726,000 containers go through the port each year. All this activity has created 14,000 direct and indirect jobs, in addition to generating revenues of \$1.2 billion annually. Many industries in Quebec are dependent on this mode of supply.

Furthermore, the port of Montreal is in stiff competition with ports on the eastern American seaboard. Fifty per cent of Montreal's container traffic has as either its point of origin or its destination the industrialized regions of the U.S., the Midwest, New York State, New England. Since 60 per cent of goods passing through the port of Montreal are then loaded onto rail cars to be shipped to various destinations across the continent, the minister's planned fees will also have a negative economic impact on Montreal's rail traffic. The Canadian government's projected charges are a threat to the port of Montreal's competitive position in the U.S. shipping market, as well as to the supply lines for Quebec industries.

Such was the conclusion of the minister who joined forces with the group I have just referred to in criticizing the bill. It is not a member of the official opposition who is today asking the government to change its tune and not blow the shipping industry out of the water. Some 14,000 direct and indirect jobs in Montreal will be affected, not to mention those in all the ports along the St. Lawrence. They are the reason I am asking the minister on their behalf today to listen carefully to what I have to say.

Yesterday, the House allowed me to speak longer in order to make the reasons for our actions clear to the government. I could repeat them here, since you offer me the opportunity and the time. The Bloc Québécois has issued several press releases as a result of our consultations and the mail and phone input we have received. Our correspondents were asking the Bloc Québécois to save them from this insensitive government. We have issued our press releases in order to make the minister aware of the situation. But since he continues to turn a deaf ear, now the press has got into the act.

Look at what the business publication *Les affaires* used as a headline. This is not a Bloc Québécois publication, a Parti Québécois publication, a sovereignist publication. It chose as its headline: "The fee scale proposed by the Coast Guard primarily penalizes the users of the St. Lawrence. The St. Lawrence shipping community sees this as a concession to the Halifax lobby". This minister has been like a weather vane, letting himself be turned this way and that, first promising to protect this or that port, and then blowing in still another direction when the west wants this or that port

Government Orders

protected. Then he had to find the money, so he got the idea to raise the charges for Quebec ports.

Its always the same, whether the government is Liberal or Conservative, the insensitivity to the Quebec reality is unchanged. It is worse when it is a Liberal government. Almost all of the harm done to Quebec by the federalist regime has had the Liberals behind it, the present leader of that party in particular.

In this article, the journalist for *Les Affaires* spoke of all the reactions along the North Shore, the economic threat, the costs industries would have to recover. Once again, we must quote the minister, for he ought to take heed and to defer the adoption of this bill on third reading at least until the fall, by which time he will have had the opportunity to find out more about the harmful effects of the bill.

On Saturday, March 16, a headline in *La Presse* read: "Maritime services: Quebec's bill goes up". No one can say that *La Presse* is a Bloc Québécois publication, an official opposition publication. It is the voice of Power Corporation, of the Liberals. Their very own paper is telling them that they are overdoing it in raising the charges to Quebec.

• (1605)

The columnist, Mr. Arcand, goes on to say: "Each revision hits Quebec a little harder". Quoting Mr. Massicotte, he gives examples of the charges proposed by the Coast Guard for maintaining navigational aids such as buoys, lighthouses, shipping control, radio beacons.

The latest Coast Guard proposal, dated February 26, proposed a set rate for Canadian vessels of \$3.40 per ton gross tonnage, or in other words per 100 cubic feet of cargo. With this proposal, the charge would rise to \$4.48. A laker has a gross tonnage of 25,000, which would mean \$112,000 per ship for navigation aids alone.

With this amendment, one vessel alone would have to pay \$112,000 more a year. Clearly things are unfair, costs are being allocated crazily. We must come back to reality and have this changed.

"In the context of cut-throat competition with east coast American ports and even those of the Mississippi", the journalist went on to say, "many shipowners, exporters and importers fear that the St. Lawrence River is becoming too expensive. Montreal could lose a lot of traffic". The cost will stop the ports from competing. And what will the ships do? They will head to Philadelphia and the east coast. This bill will harm industry in Quebec and Canada and will send it to the United States.

This is perhaps what free trade is understood to be. This is not free trade was supposed to be, and we can talk about it. While they were in opposition, for eight years, throughout the debate on free

trade, even during the electoral campaign, the Liberals were tearing at their clothes in an expression of rejection. Once in office, they were the first to sign NAFTA.

Yesterday, when the President of Mexico was praising free trade, the Prime Minister was applauding non stop. The Liberal Party has always been the party of double speak: one way for the electoral campaign and one for after their election.

In another vein, *The Globe and Mail* said: "Making deal to replace GST evading Ottawa". Even that paper spoke of the injustice this bill creates. Raymond Giroux, a journalist for *Le Soleil* said: "A gunboat on the St. Lawrence". That says a mouthful.

It is not a Bloc member who said that, but a journalist who has been following the economic situation for years, who has an in depth knowledge of this issue, who has consulted users, the public, read the documents submitted to the committee and heard the very accurate arguments presented by the critic for our party, the member for Gaspé.

Our colleague from Gaspé too has conducted many consultations; in an attempt to get the government to see it was on the wrong track, he gave an exceptional speech when this bill was first introduced.

I mentioned the member for Gaspé, but I should also talk about the fascinating speech the member for Trois-Rivières gave last night. As we know, he is a former industrial commissioner, a senior official in the Quebec government. Yesterday, in 10 minutes, my illustrious colleague from Trois-Rivières briefly summarized the problem in eloquent terms indeed. It seems to me that the few Liberal members who were here were amazed at the logic of his arguments since they were nodding in approval without even realizing it.

As I was saying before, my illustrious colleague has spent many hours researching this subject. In Miami, they throw rats on the ice during hockey games; for our part, we are proud to have our own book worm, our expert in research, our friend from Trois-Rivières. He is so good that now our party's research branch consults him, not the other way around. That says a lot.

• (1610)

Yesterday, the member for Trois-Rivières pretty much covered all aspects of the problem in just a few minutes. I must also congratulate the member for Châteauguay who, after the member for Trois-Rivières, gave his own description from another angle, reviewing the issue from the Montreal point of view and explaining how terrible the impact of that bill would be for the Montreal region.

We all know the numerous observations of the member for Lévis enlightened all members in the House; we hope they were also

Government Orders

useful for the minister and will help him decide to postpone the passing of this bill for a few months.

The member for Lévis spoke for several minutes after the brilliant performance of the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, and we had the impression that the government finally understood because no Liberal member asked to be heard. Not one member spoke in favour of the government's bill. The whip raised his arms to the sky and tried to convince a Liberal member to speak for the bill, but he found no one. Nobody dared to support that bill. This is very significant.

When a government party cannot find a single speaker to support a bill in such a serious debate, at the end of a session when the hours are extended hours because the government said the matter was urgent, when not one government member will accept to work overtime to speak in favour of this supposedly urgent bill, then there is a problem. Not one speaker from the Liberal Party has risen in support of this bill.

Of course, I understand them, they are ashamed. They are getting ready to end a difficult year, a year of shame, of broken promises, a year, in fact, in their party's image, a party that, during the election campaign, can promise anything, but once in power, forgets its promises and is content to encourage its buddies to make a few backstage deals.

The former heritage minister was good at that; the defence minister, with a \$150,000 contract given to a buddy, is good at that; the immigration minister, who uses his discretionary powers and signs as a priority documents allowing into Canada criminal immigrants who had been refused under the usual rules, is also good at that. So, this is a "scheming" government, a government unable to make the decisions that would satisfy the people as a whole and, in this case, users as a whole.

Actually, this bill could go in the direction that all the people want, that is, cost reduction in all departments, but, at the same time, this reduction should not hinder industry, which creates jobs. As I said earlier, it is not a few jobs, but 14,000 jobs in the Montreal area that are affected.

I talked earlier about the reporter from the newspaper *Le Soleil* who wrote, and I will conclude here: "Ottawa has managed until now to keep the lid on this volatile issue. The St. Lawrence River will come out a loser, unless premier Bouchard and the business community react strong and loud. Ottawa will not understand anything else".

This was not said by the Bloc or the Parti Québécois, but by a journalist at *Le Soleil*, who, after analyzing the situation, concluded it would be disastrous for the St. Lawrence if this bill was passed.

I would like to have another hour to comment more fully on this bill, and my colleagues told me they, too, have more to say. I know the hon. member for Champlain, for example, a former businessman with experience in this area, could shed new light on this issue for the government. He has had frequent business dealings with St. Lawrence users. In that regard, this brilliant businessman and dedicated member for Champlain will have an opportunity later to speak to this bill.

• (1615)

That is why I wish I had a few more hours, with the unanimous consent of the House, to explain things to the government and the minister, but I will conclude, to leave some time for the hon. members for Lévis, Trois-Rivières, Gaspé, Champlain, and other ridings to add their own voices, the voices of their regions and, in fact, the voice of common sense.

In closing, I hope that, if the government stubbornly refuses to withdraw its amendments, it will at least have the decency and sensitivity to defer third reading until the fall. I challenge it to do that. You will then see all the lobbying that will be done to make it realize that this bill needs major amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): According to the agreement, Motion No. 67 in Group No. 11 is deemed to have been put to a vote and the recorded division is deemed to have been requested and deferred.

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 yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Debate is now on Group No. 12, which includes Motions Nos. 76, 78, 80, 82 and 88.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-26, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 1, on page 30, with the following:

“47. (1) The Minister may, subject to section 49.1 and to any”.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-26, in Clause 48, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 30, with the following:

“48. The Minister may, subject to section 49.1 and to any”.

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-26, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 30, with the following:

“49. (1) The Minister may, subject to section 49.1 and to any”.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-26 be amended by adding after line 35, on page 30, the following new Clause:

“49.1 The fixing of fees under sections 47, 48 and 49 is subject to adoption by the House of Commons of a resolution debated for three hours in the ordinary course of the business of the House.”

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-26, in Clause 51, be amended by replacing line 6, on page 31, with the following:

“51. The standing committee may make regula-”.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to resume this marathon debate which has already lasted three afternoons, 11 hours, 77 motions and as I recollect—my counting I think is accurate—11 orators in a row from the opposition party.

There has been some comment made here on the absence of interventions but one should always remember that one gains nothing by iteration and reiteration if nothing new is said. When the debate opened on the first evening, I was very much taken by the witty and informative address of the hon. member for Chambly, by the vigorous imagination of the member for Gaspé, but I have to report, not in anger but with sadness, a certain decline in quality. That comes from repetition. It seemed to me that the ghosts who operate in this Chamber and outside may have become tired. Certainly by last night I felt tiredness had set in with the ghosts.

I was hoping in the spirit of the first evening when the member for Chambly gave us as the sacerdos musarum, the carmina non prius audita, the new songs, new visions, new attitudes that something in the same vein would continue. Instead we have had Mount Pelion piled on Mount Ossa in the poet Flaccus' words, forgetting that it is not by the number of speeches, it is by the weight and content. In a certain sense we are returning again and again to the same themes. I see no particular point in adding to these labours of Sisyphus beyond saying that in the debate from now on, could we hope for something new, something rather exciting, something not very tiring?

To comment specifically on Group No. 12 which has been put forward by the hon. member for Gaspé and which pertain to the fee setting provisions of the oceans act, Motion No. 76 modifies clause 47 which provides the minister with the authority to fix fees for a service or use of a governmental facility provided under the oceans act. Motion No. 78 modifies clause 48 which provides the authority to fix fees in respect of products, rights and privileges provided under the oceans act. Motion No. 80 modifies clause 49, according to which the minister may set fees for regulatory processes or approval provided under this act.

• (1620)

These motions would subject the ministerial fee setting authority to a condition outlined in Motion No. 82, namely that the House of Commons be required to adopt a resolution debated for three hours in its ordinary course of business before a fee could be fixed.

This amendment in our view would clutter House business and cause delays and additional administrative processes when this government is committed to modernizing Parliament, to streamlining its internal processes. That would be a step backward.

In any case, the intent of these motions is already addressed in existing governmental policy. There already exists a regulatory parliamentary review process. It is government policy to consult with affected users on any fees proposed. This serves to ensure the minister is in touch with the views of his clients.

Clause 50 of the bill clearly describes the consultation requirements the minister must comply with before fixing a fee. The clause also provides for the referral of fiscal regulations to the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations.

Quite obviously Motions Nos. 76, 77, 78 and 80 serve no purpose and should be defeated.

The last motion in this group, Motion No. 82, proposes to authorize the standing committee to make regulations relating to the minister's powers to fix fees. I have already spoken of this neo-Montesquieuian confusion of powers when of course we respect the separation of powers as a basic issue of constitutionalism. Do not try to mix up legislative and executive powers unless you have a clear vision of where you are going. In this sense the motion is not well thought out and does not deserve support.

Treasury Board is the central federal authority mandated to make regulations pertaining to fiscal issues. The board is there to ensure consistency and fairness in regulations such as those provided under the oceans act.

The Bloc motion implies that Treasury Board is not ensuring this consistency and fairness and suggests the authority to make fiscal regulations should be exercised by a standing committee. This is entirely contrary to government policy and established parliamentary practice. Indeed in its aspect of all power to the assembly, it is

Government Orders

what we might refer to in our law schools as a Henry VIII clause. Need I say any more?

All of the motions in this group should be defeated. The House is here to improve the quality of the legislation put before it, not to hinder the progress of government. I hope I have not spoken too long because I do not want to set a bad example for this House. Brevity is the art of wit.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is always with pleasure that I rise to speak when the subject-matter of the bill under consideration is close to my heart. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and parliamentary secretary, who knows the customs and practices of this House as well as I do, will have to graciously accept, as part of his parliamentary duties, the fact that the hon. member for Richelieu has decided to use not only all the time he was allotted, but time he was given by unanimous consent of this House. I think it is very good for parliamentary relations that the system allows this.

You know, Mr. Parliamentary Secretary, how things work here—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Excuse me, you must always address the Chair.

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé): I apologize, Madam Speaker. I was not trying to initiate a conversation between the parliamentary secretary and myself. The point I would like to put across, through the Chair, is that British parliamentary rules are such that the only way members of Parliament can express their views and make themselves heard of the government is through the procedures made available to them in Parliament. From time to time, our friends opposite may find their decisions are not approved as fast as they would like. What can I say? It goes with the territory.

Now, coming back to Group No. 12. As the official opposition critic, the Bloc Québécois critic on this matter, I would like to discuss the substance of the motions in Group No. 12. The substance is quite simple to understand.

• (1625)

I will not read them in full, but we are talking about five motions tabled by the Bloc. The gist of these motions is that, whenever the minister's power to fix fees is referred to in clauses 47, 48 and 49, the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, wants to promote transparency, as it has been its goal since the beginning of the proceedings at report stage of Bill C-26.

Such transparency would be ensured by Motion No. 82, which reflects the other ones, and which provides, as regards the minister's power to fix fees:

That Bill C-26 be amended by adding after line 35, on page 30, the following new Clause:

“49.1 The fixing of fees under sections 47, 48 and 49 is subject to adoption by the House of Commons of a resolution debated for three hours in the ordinary course of the business of the House.”

The purpose of this motion is to promote transparency and to provide all elected members of the Canadian Parliament an opportunity to express themselves, regardless of their political affiliation. Such a procedure would only require one afternoon, in fact three hours. It would in no way delay any other decision which the minister may make.

I hope it was not the minister's intention to fix these fees in secret. The minister must give members of this House the opportunity to express their views.

We could discuss the issue for a long time, or we could, as the hon. member for Richelieu did on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, ask the government to postpone the bill at least until the fall, and to review its form as well as its content.

My goal here is to get the message across. The spirit of the letter must be preserved. If we manage to do that, we will have fewer problems in administering the act afterwards. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra pointed it out to the Chair. The member for Gaspé is also trying to make the best of the situation by improving the bill, even though the Bloc Québécois is devoted to sovereignty. But as long as we are a part of Canada, I will try to improve this bill, because it will apply to Quebecers too.

Whatever the political suasion of people in my party or of Quebecers in general, I will do whatever I can to make laws of this Parliament easier to implement and to live with. I urge hon. members to read once more motion No. 82, which underlies all of this, and see for themselves that openness is our goal.

I have even been generous enough to suggest a three-hour debate, which is really not long, you have to admit. It would be more of a technicality, but at least, the exercise would take place. Nobody in Canada could suggest that we have not given it a try. But time flies, and since a number of my colleagues would like to speak to Group No. 12, I will yield the floor to the next speaker.

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries has unilaterally decided to charge the shipping industry fees for Coast Guard services, including the provision of aids to navigation and ice breaking services. Clauses 41, 47, and 52 of Bill C-26 give the minister the power to charge these fees.

• (1630)

Several amendments to these clauses were put forward by the Bloc Québécois for the following reasons: to make the fees

principle more equitable and to force the minister to co-operate with the industry and the provinces before fixing or increasing the fees. These changes would prevent the minister from making unilateral decisions without holding public consultations, as he has done for the fees he wants to charge as of June 1996.

In fact, all the witnesses who appeared before the fisheries and oceans committee decried the decision making and consultation process of the Coast Guard, especially the fact that the minister went ahead with the fees without assessing the economic impact on the shipping industry and all the other industries that rely on shipping.

Also, 75 per cent of the witnesses asked the minister for a moratorium on the fees until the impact studies ordered by the Department of Fisheries come out next fall. The witnesses also recommended that the minister cooperate with the shipping industry in carrying out economic impact studies. Lastly, the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes stakeholders reached a clear consensus against the minister's proposal which they, along with the Ontario and Quebec governments, found unacceptable.

Dismissing all these recommendations and objections, the minister is apparently determined to go ahead with this fee structure and does not care about its possibly devastating effect on jobs in the shipping industry, a very important sector of the Quebec economy.

Moreover, several questions on the department's fee structure policy remain unanswered. First of all, this whole policy is based on the regionalization that divides Canada into three regions: the West, the East and the St. Lawrence region. This rather artificial division was advanced by the Coast Guard under pressure by the maritimes and the West. Each new proposal by the Coast Guard means higher fees for boats in the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes region.

The minister mentioned fairness and the user-fee principle to justify this regional division. Yet, when we read the proposal, we see that all the regions and especially the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes area will pay part of the marine services to Newfoundland, which is the minister's province, since the boats that go there will get substantial reductions at the expense of boats in other regions. Moreover, according to the minister's policy, the port of Churchill, in Manitoba, will not have to pay for Coast Guard services.

Another major problem is that the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes ports are increasingly less competitive than American ports. On the one hand, boats using the St. Lawrence Seaway to go to the United States without stopping at any Canadian port will not pay for Coast Guard services, thus greatly threatening the competitiveness of the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes ports.

On the other, the user pay principle advocated by the minister is not respected in a number of instances, in particular for the ports of

Government Orders

Sept-Îles and Port-Cartier, which will pay up to \$5 million annually for the use of a single buoy.

Finally, the user fees the minister would like to impose are only the tip of the iceberg, since they only include navigational aids such as buoys, lighthouses, and so on. The other services the department intends to charge for are the dredging of Seaway harbours and ice breaking in waterways.

These other fees may turn out to be much higher than those for navigational aids, and there is reason to be concerned about the survival and ability to compete of ports along the St. Lawrence, particularly the port of Montreal and a number of ports in the regions such as those of Matane, Rimouski and Trois-Rivières.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the effects of this fee structure in my riding, the riding of Champlain, on pleasure boats, pedal boats and other small craft. These should be exempt from this tax in disguise. The riding of Champlain abounds in hunting spots and lakes and is known as a tourist centre.

This disguised tax, or user fee structure as the government calls it, will harm the tourist industry, which provides the riding with jobs it needs to survive. Imagine the impact of charging user fees for pleasure boats on the economy of a region such as mine. We do not yet have all the details, but there is talk of charging fees for pedal boats and sailboards. I do not know where they will hang the plates, but I am sure they will think of something.

• (1635)

You can imagine what fees on rowboats and canoes will do to the tourist industry in my region. Small and medium sized businesses which depend on the rental of this kind of equipment during the summer season will have to pay these fees. Will they have to be paid annually, every five years, every four years or every three years? I do not yet know how it will work. We could have big surprises. Will these fees be progressive? All that to collect a few million dollars because the finance minister needs money. It is absolutely outrageous!

And think about what it will cost to collect that money. How will the government find all the people who own a pedalboat, a sailboard, a rowboat or a canoe? It is practically impossible and unmanageable. Again, in the end, it will be the small and middle income people who will pay the bill, who will pay the price for the federal government's financial problems. That is why the Bloc Québécois and myself, who represent the riding of Champlain, will oppose Bill C-26.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): 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

Government Orders

follows: the hon. member for Lévis—Quebec Bridge; the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Hollinger Inc.

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Madam Speaker, this bill is divided into three major sections. Part III, with which we are dealing now, describes the powers of the minister. The amendments in this group, and many of the amendments being proposed in other groupings dealing with part III, describe limits to the minister's power.

Motions Nos. 76, 78, 80 and 82 limit the minister's power. These amendments state that any changes to the regulations with respect to fees or other parts of the bill must be debated in the House of Commons for three hours prior to being enforced or enacted.

I cannot see any reason why the House would not support these amendments. I commend my friend, the hon. member for Gaspé, for moving them. When we seek to limit the power of government, we end up doing Canadians a service.

I am not saying that the minister is not acting in good faith or not trying to do the best job he or she can, whoever the minister of the day is, but it is important that there are limitations on the minister's powers.

In this case, if the minister chooses by regulation to increase or change the fee structure, it will be debated in the House for three hours. That will give Canadians and their representatives an opportunity to have some discussion before it takes place. Frankly, I cannot see any reason why the House would not support these amendments. Certainly Reform will be supporting them.

Reform will not be supporting Motion No. 88 because it proposes that the standing committee would be the body to fix fees in the future. I do not have a great deal of parliamentary experience but I do not believe that standing committees are used in any other areas to fix fees. I do not believe it is appropriate for the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans to be fixing fees with respect to regulations in this legislation.

It is appropriate for the standing committee to review changes to regulations. I am certainly in favour of having the fee regulation process opened up so that everybody can see how it works and provide their input prior to the changes being made.

However, I do not see the standing committee being the body to actually draft the regulatory changes or make the changes to fee structures and so on in the future. I simply do not believe that the standing committee is the appropriate body to do that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak again in this debate, this time on the motions in Group No. 12.

• (1640)

But before I go any further, with your permission, Madam Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to our venerable colleague, the member for Richelieu, who surpassed himself these past few hours, last night especially, when he made an improvised speech that lasted a good half hour and in which he succeeded in casting the government in a bad light and in forcing it to think. The few members who were around, even those in the government members' lobby, heard the relevant and judicious speech delivered by our colleague.

We saw how his experience as a former Conservative member served him well because he knows the rules of procedure. We saw how generous the member for Richelieu is, deep down inside, because he succeeded in rallying all the members present, as well as all those representing the region that will be affected by the bill. This man is really a natural leader.

I would now like to recall the principal points of the speech I made last night in the House. First, the whole process by which the government presented this bill is questionable, very negative and lacks transparency, starting with the study made by a private firm called IBI, study that was denounced and ridiculed by all kinds of experts, all interested parties and all stakeholders. As I mentioned yesterday, one witness who appeared before the committee went as far as to say that this report was not worth the paper it was written on, which says a lot.

It is all the more serious not only because the report was paid for by the public purse, but also because this document that is not recognized by the people involved forms the basis of the minister's rationale for implementing these fees. So if we want a healthy debate where everybody agrees on the general parameters, we are off to a very bad start. We do not have this basis for discussion since the document in question is not recognized by the people involved.

Then, under pressure from the official opposition, the fisheries and oceans committee heard witnesses. There again we saw the same attitude on the part of the government, an attitude of non transparency, of narrowmindedness, a kind of military attitude in some way—it is understandable—from the commissioner to the minister, who both happen to have the same profile. It is an attitude of non openness to the very sensible and very sincere arguments presented by witnesses who came maybe not to talk about their survival, but about good management, in the public interest.

Unfortunately, our colleagues opposite did not listen seriously to the evidence presented to them and made absolutely no effort to follow up on it. There was a huge gap between the comments made by the commissioner of the coast guard, our first witness—I sat on this committee as an associate member—and the comments made by the other witnesses, the users, who came to criticize the commissioner's position and to tell us how they perceived the situation and how they intended to co-operate. In point of fact, by this operation, the government is trying to get money from

users—though we do not know at what cost and what the impact it will have—to the tune of \$160 million by the year 2000, in four years.

Witnesses mentioned three major grievances concerning the approach adopted by the government and it is obvious users are also upset for three basic reasons. First, no impact study was done to evaluate the impact of the fee structure although several witnesses talked about the potentially destructive effects of this new fee structure. Secondly, no detailed description has been given of services actually provided by the Coast Guard to users, despite the fact that the term user-payer is used. The government wants them to pay because they use services but there is not precise description of those services. I find that approach a bit clumsy and arrogant. If they said: “From now on, you will have to pay a precise fee for such and such a service”, that could facilitate a positive dialogue between the parties. Instead, people are plainly told they are getting a service for which they will have to pay a given amount.

● (1645)

Finally, despite what users wanted, the Coast Guard made no effort, in their opinion—and this is the third complaint—to streamline its operations. This would have reduced potential costs to users all the more. These then are three aspects of the debate to bear in mind, because they illustrate the almost extemporaneous and extremely arbitrary position taken by the government in this matter.

Yesterday, I related a number of distressing facts, but I would like to carry on in this debate. It was said, among other things, that Canada is being arbitrarily divided into three regions with different rates for each: the west, the centre—Quebec and the Great Lakes—and the maritimes. Three different rates for three different regions, to the great chagrin of the federalist witnesses.

We were told that for a 25,000 tonne vessel—as the member for Richelieu said earlier—with respect only to aids to navigation—buoys—the cost would be \$112,000 a year. That is awful. Imagine the shipowner with 12 or 15 ships. He will have to pay \$112,000 per ship just for aids to navigation, the least expensive of the three items, the others being ice breaking—the most expensive—and dredging—of both the St. Lawrence and approaches to harbours and wharves. That means \$112,000 for a single 25,000 tonne vessel, just for aids to navigation.

Another fact we should take into consideration is that a foreign vessel entering the largest inland waterway in the world—the St. Lawrence River—en route to an American port will pay nothing. There is no charge to such a vessel for aids to navigation and ice breaking, because it is not stopping in Canada, but going directly to

Government Orders

the States. This will no doubt increase competition between American ports on the Great Lakes and the ports along the St. Lawrence. There will therefore be no charge to foreign vessels heading directly to the United States.

Another item that arose out of the committee's deliberations concerns ice breakers and ice. The fact is that, in the case of the ports along the North Shore, such as Baie-Comeau, Port-Cartier and Sept-Îles, there is no ice. There is no ice in Halifax, another major port, either. Except that user fees will be charged for ice-breakers in Port-Cartier, Sept-Îles and all along the North Shore whereas Halifax will not pay a cent for ice-breaking. Members must know that Halifax is the home port of the big ice-breakers that come all the way up to lake Saint-Pierre, where I come from, so the economic impact on the region will be dramatic.

Finally, I want to say a few words about Trois-Rivières, in my riding. For the port of Trois-Rivières only, the new fee schedule will entail additional costs of \$500,000 per year for navigational aids and buoys alone, not including ice-breaking and dredging. This is awful and unacceptable. Everybody will have to pay these new fees even though there was no debate.

This measure is based on an accounting approach not even tempered by political sensibility and not taking socioeconomic consequences into account. We must put all our energies in denouncing such a polity.

Hopefully the government will come to its senses and postpone until the fall third reading of this bill to allow all stakeholders to make their opinion known once and for all, after having heard from the minister and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Hopefully the minister and his whole department will bow to public pressure and come to their senses in the best interests of everyone.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, this is the third opportunity I have to address this bill and the amendments in Groups Nos. 11, 12 and 13.

● (1650)

Before beginning to seriously address this bill, I want to voice an objection against what the member for Vancouver Quadra said, despite the kind words he had for me. He said the last Bloc Québécois speakers were running out of arguments. True, this is a political arena and we play the game. The member for Vancouver Quadra came to politics after an outstanding university career and he is fast learning the political role in this House.

However, he must recognize that the role of MPs, especially those of the party I represent, is to express their views and that this role is inalienable. Members of the Bloc Québécois, at the risk of repeating themselves, properly exercise their parliamentary right to speak. It is about the only thing we have here.

Government Orders

I would like to point out to the member for Vancouver Quadra that we have been debating this bill, its inherent nature, for two days and that there are also Quebec members in his party. There are about 20 Liberal members from Quebec and they are absent from this debate. I do not mean they are not in the House. What I mean is they do not show any interest whatsoever in this debate. They are invisible on this matter. They are not taking to heart the interests of their constituents because they might be at odds with the national caucus of their party.

This is not the first time. It has happened on several occasions. I remember when Ontario Liberal members tried to quash, annihilate and have declared *ultra vires* the regulations under the Drug Patent Act. Quebec Liberal members remained quiet then also so as not to go against the impressive representation of Ontario Liberal members which had won 98 seats out of 99.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleague from Vancouver Quadra that Bloc members have not only the right but the duty to speak up on this bill, to take it completely apart to try to explain what is at stake to people who voted for the Bloc Québécois but also—this is politics—to those who, in Quebec, voted for the Liberal Party, which is not doing a very good job at defending their interests in this matter. Of course, they would have to forget partisanship and realize what the dangers of this legislation are.

The fees are arbitrary. The minister in charge, a former professional soldier, is the only one in his army who marches in step. He knows it all. He is the one who decides what is good for his government and his department.

I will give you an example. Clauses 25 and 26 deal with regulations concerning fees and extraterritorial fishing zones. I would like the member for Gaspé, through you, Madam Speaker, to allow the member for Vancouver Quadra to listen to the important remarks I am going to make. I know you agree, Madam Speaker, since you are not saying anything. Silence gives consent. I assume you have recognized how right I am.

All this to tell the member for Vancouver Quadra that when you write, in clause 25, “The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of Foreign Affairs—”

• (1655)

A little further it says: “The governor in council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans”. This may seem harmless. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who is also an expert in administrative law, will understand that this would deprive the House of its only power in the decision to legislate or regulate.

As the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra knows, the old wording was: “The governor in council may, by order”, that is to say, after the House of Commons has made a decision to that effect.

But this government, as it is wont to do, is now trying to make the presence of members representing all the regions of Canada irrelevant, because bills like this one affect everybody.

Therefore, if the minister can decide with his friends, in a Sparks Street restaurant, to regulate, to raise fees, to designate or eliminate an area, to redefine boundaries, he can do so. It used to be said that the only thing he could not do was to turn a man into a woman, but even that is possible today.

Through you, Madam Speaker, and with all the respect I have for my colleague, I wish to say that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is nonetheless a not-so-young man—no offence—who has been left with the burden of defending this bill to save his Liberal friends and colleagues from Quebec, who are hiding behind the curtains or in the lobby on the other side.

They have nothing to be proud of, unlike the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who, at his age, had the courage and the heart to stoically rise in this House to defend what I would not have defended, but at least he is doing so with conviction and intellectual honesty. Such is not the case for the Liberal members from Quebec.

I would like him to suggest that his minister defer third reading of this bill until the fall and finally listen to reason and realize that this bill will have a disastrous, unspeakable impact on the Quebec economy, and on transport in particular.

Are the senior members of the Liberal Party currently deciding to do to maritime transport what they did to rail transport, that is to say, deprive Quebec of most of its traffic, leaving only pleasure boats to sail without hindrance on the St. Lawrence? Did they decide to favour other means of heavy transport, even if this benefits our American friends' eastern ports? We have a right to ask this. I would like the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, in an ultimate effort to be fair and honest, to set the record straight and be fair to Quebecers in this matter.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to add that I support the point the hon. member for Chambly made quite eloquently about the major impact this bill will have on Quebec in particular.

Since the rules of this House do not allow us to speak of the absent, I am delighted to see that the minister responsible for Quebec is here. I think that references to someone's presence are allowed. At any rate, he is here and he has been all ears, especially since the remarks made by the last few speakers, including the very significant remarks made by the hon. member for Richelieu, have also attracted another minister from Quebec, I think.

It seems that our efforts to catch the attention of ministers from Quebec through our arguments are starting to pay off. Great. We commend them for being here and for listening to what we have to

say. We must take advantage of their being here to go over the economic considerations coming into play.

• (1700)

Let me remind the House that the Minister of Finance told the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to come up with savings of \$120 million over four or five years.

For this year alone, the finance minister's order is for \$20 million. What were the options? The minister first considered implementing a fee structure. I need not elaborate on this subject, as my colleagues discussed it at length, but I feel that there would be room for improvement and, if the Liberals agree to defer consideration of this bill at third reading until the fall, this might be a good time to invite suggestions.

Here is what I have to suggest, in my personal capacity and as a member from the Quebec City area, after wondering if it would not be possible to further streamline coast guard services. Indeed, this is an option the administrator of the port in Trois-Rivières had come up with some time ago. He said: "At present, all of eastern Canada is divided into three areas and administered by three separate regional directorates. Why not consider merging the three into a single regional directorate for the whole region? This would cut costs by at least \$17 million, with \$2 million in savings coming just from moving icebreakers from the maritimes to bases located closer areas where the Coast Guard operates".

It is surprising indeed that nine icebreakers are currently based in Halifax, when we know that the eastern coast of Nova Scotia is ice free year round. That is incredible. Icebreakers are based in locations where there is no ice. To break the ice in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, they must travel 460 kilometres from their home base. Only four icebreakers are based in Quebec City's harbour. In 1993, there was an incident and it took more than five days for an icebreaker to travel to Lac Saint-Pierre, to break the ice that completely paralysed marine traffic.

Since 85 per cent of the goods transiting through the Cabot Strait are headed for ports in the St. Lawrence, it would make sense to establish the regional centre in Quebec. A journalist recently said I wanted to have the centre in Saint-Romuald, in my riding. I am not asking for that much. I am not trying to convince the minister responsible, but the centre should at least be located in Quebec, in the most appropriate location, since that is where icebreakers are needed, in the St. Lawrence River and in the gulf.

There are other issues which come to mind. The *Louis S. Saint-Laurent*, an icebreaker, costs \$56,500 a day. It is the most costly ship to operate in the whole coast guard fleet. If we stopped using it, we would save \$12.4 million. Why are we making this request? It is because the *Louis S. Saint-Laurent* has not been used to break the ice in the last five years. It was used for all sorts of other tasks. In other words, we were able to do without it.

Government Orders

It comes down to one thing: Why would rescue operations not be taken over by others? The Auditor General of Canada tells us they could be taken over, for instance, by the Canadian Navy, since it already does rescue work. I am not saying the coast guard is not doing a good job in Quebec, quite the contrary. However, since we must streamline operations, we should, instead of increasing fees, better integrate these services.

I know that other members wish to speak on Group No. 13.

• (1705)

Since there is only a half hour left to discuss this group, I will conclude by paying tribute to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and by asking the Secretary of State responsible for Quebec to use his influence within the Liberal caucus, so that third reading be postponed until the fall to allow the various stakeholders to make suggestions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): As agreed, Motions Nos. 76 and 88 in Group No. 12 are deemed to have been put to the vote and recorded divisions are deemed to have been requested and deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 76. 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): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 88. 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.

Government Orders

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): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We will now proceed to Group No. 13, which includes Motions Nos. 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, and 87.

[English]

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-26, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 13, on page 30, with the following:

“(2) Fees for a service or the use of a facility that are fixed under subsection (1) shall not exceed the cost to Her Majesty in right of Canada of providing the specific service or the use of the facility to each beneficiary, within the specific marine sector within the specific geographical marine environment in which the service is delivered.”

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-26 be amended by adding after line 21, on page 30, the following new Clause:

“48.1 Fees in respect of products, rights and privileges fixed under clause 48 shall not exceed the cost to Her Majesty in right of Canada of providing the specific product, rights and privileges to each beneficiary, within the specific marine sector within the specific geographical marine environment in which the product, rights and privileges are delivered.”

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-26, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 35, on page 30, with the following:

“(2) Fees that are fixed under subsection (1) shall not exceed the cost to Her Majesty in right of Canada of providing the specific service or the use of the facility to each beneficiary, within the specific marine sector within the specific geographical marine environment in which the service is delivered.”

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-26, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing lines 36 to 39, on page 30, with the following:

“50(1) Before fixing a fee under this Act, the Minister shall consult with all beneficiaries, according to stipulations in subsection 41(2). In this context a recommendation shall be sought from the Marine Advisory Board to the Commissioner of the Canadian Coast Guard.”

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-26, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing line 37, on page 30, with the following:

“the Minister shall consult with the provincial governments and with such persons or”.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-26, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing line 37, on page 30, with the following:

“the Minister shall consult with the standing committee and with such persons or”.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-26, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 44, on page 30, with the following:

“(2) The Minister shall, within 30 days after fixing or amending a fee under this Act, publish the fee in the Canada Gazette by such appropriate electronic or other means that the Treasury Board may authorize by regulation. A subsequent period of 90 days shall be allowed from the date of publishing in the Canada Gazette before implementing the fee or an amended fee. The text of the Marine Advisory Board's recommendation shall be included in the published announcement, together with a clear illustration of the justification for the new fee.”

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-26, in Clause 50, be amended by adding after line 44, on page 30, the following:

“(3) Any interested person who has reason to believe that the proposed fee is not fair and equitable may file notice of objection with the Minister no later than 30 days after the publication of the proposed fee.

(4) Where a notice of objection is filed, the Minister shall appoint a person to investigate whether the charging of the proposed fee is fair and equitable. The person so appointed shall report to the Minister within 60 days and the Minister shall, by order, approve or amend the proposed fee. The Minister's decision together with the report shall be published in the Canada Gazette with immediate effect, namely at the end of the original 90 day period as specified in subsection 50(2).”

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise again on what looks like the end of our odyssey. We have had a good debate. I appreciated the last several interventions from the Bloc with wit and brevity which, as we have said, is a delightful fact in a debate on a hot, muggy Ottawa afternoon.

The suggestions made in the debate have been valuable. I have listened and I have heard what has been said. There is a distinction between those two phrases. It is part of the government's attitude to respect parliamentary debates and to acquire wisdom from the process of give and take. On that basis we can certainly look forward to a valuable third reading.

I have to make some comments on the motions as presented which are without prejudice to positions I might take on third reading.

In the atmosphere of goodwill that attends us in the twilight hours of this debate I hate to say that Motion No. 77 would create an administrative nightmare and an expensive one at that. It would obligate the minister to calculate the costs of the facility or service for each beneficiary on a sector specific basis. It would provide an administrative, expensive, time consuming need to calculate cost per individual user. It would rigidly and arbitrarily preclude the minister from choosing any other fee implementation scheme, even if it were preferred by the beneficiaries.

The government feels this would not meet favourably with the many Canadians who have expressed to us that they want to avoid excessive governmental regulation.

Government Orders

Motion No. 79 proposes the same thing. The minister has to calculate the cost of providing a protected right and privilege to each beneficiary on a sector specific basis. The government feels that would be impractical.

With respect to Motion No. 81, technically we feel it is incorrect. Clause 49 refers to fees in respect of regulatory processes or approvals. The proposed amendment refers to the use of facility or service. Therefore, technically the motion is not relevant to the provision it seeks to modify.

Motion No. 83 concerns clause 50 of the act which pertains to consultation and publication requirements. It would obligate the minister to consult with all beneficiaries before fixing a fee and to seek a recommendation from the Marine Advisory Board regarding the proposed fee. It would obligate consultation in perpetuity. We think it would be an administrative nightmare and on that basis we suggest against its adoption.

Bloc Motion No. 84 deals with the same clause. It would obligate the minister to consult with the provinces before fixing a fee. We do not think the minister should be so obligated.

Motion No. 85 deals with clause 50. We feel it again attempts to fetter the discretion of the minister.

Motions Nos. 86 and 87 were put forward by the hon. member for Skeena who has made very thoughtful contributions to the parliamentary committee and in this debate. Motion No. 86 would allow any interested person the right to object within 30 days of publication. The minister must appoint an investigator. It would be a very heavy administrative burden with astronomical costs at a time when we are stressing economy: cutting back on big government and costs.

The Canada Oceans Act is based on consultation, co-operation and partnership. It is in that spirit that we have approached it. We are therefore recommending that members reject Motions Nos. 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87.

• (1710)

We believe the act will provide the legislative foundation upon which federal, provincial and territorial governments can work in a full spirit of co-operative federalism, sharing in decision making on a basis of functional utility in the good interests of all Canadians. In recommending the rejection of these motions, nevertheless, I assure hon. members that I have benefited by their valuable contributions to the debate and that I will pass on their views to the government.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was a bit surprised that the government member spoke to our motions in this group before the Reform Party had spoken, but I am glad he did.

I am very pleased to hear the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra thinks we should not consult with provinces like British Columbia that he is from. He thinks we should not have any obligation to talk to the various users and beneficiaries, for example the Marine Advisory Board. He thinks that we should not talk to any of these people, that it would be time consuming. He is right. It would be a total waste of time because clearly the minister of oceans does not listen to anybody anyway.

The Reform Party believes in the user pay concept but it also believes in—and I think I have even heard a few Liberals use it—user pay, user say. That has not happened. Furthermore, it is abundantly clear from the words of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra that they have no intention of changing their tune and giving the users any say or any input into the various fees and policies they come up with.

I am not a regular member of the committee that dealt with the matter but I sat in on a lot of the meetings. It was pretty clear what was being said by the users the government was pretending to consult with. They understood the user pay concept, the need for them to pay for the services they used, and they are to do that. However first they wanted to make sure they were paying a reasonable amount for it. They had no idea of the true costs of the coast guard.

They are prepared to pay for them but they should be implemented after an economic impact study to determine the real costs and how to bring them forward in a manner that does cripple the industry.

I have risen in the House several times and referred to the minister as the minister of oceans. I specifically and intentionally leave off fisheries. It is not the minister himself, but certainly the department has all but destroyed the east coast fisheries and many species over the years. Now it is doing a hell of a job of doing the same thing on the west coast. If the bill were implemented in an irresponsible and improperly thought out and possibly premature manner, it would do the same thing to the oceans the minister's department has done to the fisheries.

The Reform Party policy dealing with user pay has three basic concepts: first, the users should pay for what they use; second, they should only have to use those things they need; and, third, it should be on a commercially fair and reasonable basis.

With regard to the coast guard, it has not opened its books. We do not even know if it keeps books, in the regular concept of it. We do not know if there somewhere sits a coast guard as a business with a ledger showing its expenses, its revenues, where it spends money, where its costs are, and what it is doing to control costs. There is none of that. Nobody has opened the books.

Government Orders

The coast guard is saying: "Trust us. There is a lot of costs out there and you should pay them". Then it says: "We are even going to be real fair in implementing this. We are only going to charge you 20 per cent so how can you possibly object?"

If the 20 per cent represents 100 per cent or more of the reasonable costs of that portion of the service they are applying to cost recovery and to the marine users, perhaps they are paying too much.

• (1715)

The coast guard says this is something the users should be able to absorb without any harm. The minister says that yes, a study is need but he has done one. He has consulted with the Mariport group which stated in a report that the users are going to be able to accept the impact of this with no harm.

Why should we believe some of the other things we are being told if this is the justification the minister is using? The person from Mariport who did the report has recanted the entire report. The report found there would be no unbearable impact and that these costs could be absorbed based on the information the department supplied.

The department changed all of the parameters after the report came in. The department told the consultant it was going to do this, this and this, (a), (b) and (c). On the basis of that the department wanted a study done to see if it was feasible and absorbable by the users. The department then turned around after the fact and said it was going to scrap (a), modify (b), double (c) and add (d), (e), (f) and (g). The consultant said they were now looking at fees that were four times as much as what they were led to believe would be imposed when they did the study. There is no credibility at all in the ministry or in the minister in the way these fees have been introduced.

As far as an impact study, the minister has said there should be an economic impact study. That is a great idea. It is exactly what the users asked for so it seems they may be on line. The only problem is that the users said they needed to do an impact study to see how to implement this and the minister said something totally different. He said they were going to go ahead and implement it.

The minister's own notes state that they know there will be damage and problems; they know there will be loss of business to American shippers which is going to cause problems. He stated they are going to wait and see what kind of devastation the bill does on the industry and then do an economic impact study to see what they did wrong and how much damage it caused. That is a pretty backward way of approaching this.

Reform has a total of six amendments and the Bloc has two in this group. Contrary to what the hon. member for Vancouver

Quadra said, we do not think it is unreasonable to consult with people. In fact, we are here as the representatives of people, at least that is what I and my colleagues in the Reform Party are here for. We did not get elected to be the rulers.

It is absolutely despicable that the Liberal Party says it should have no obligation to consult with the provinces that are impacted by this. It says it should have absolutely no requirement to talk to the marine advisory board which is supposed to be the expert on this. It says it should have no obligation whatsoever to talk to the users who are going to be impacted by this. Given that the Liberals never listen when people do talk, I suppose they are trying to save the taxpayers money by not bothering with a process that they will end up ignoring.

Contrary to what the hon. member says, I implore members opposite to join with us in bringing in reasonable measures. We need measures that limit the powers of the minister and ministers who follow him in the future, that limit the powers of the government, and which make it necessary that we, the elected representatives of the people, must actually talk to the people so we know what it is they want us to represent.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, following on the words of my colleague, when we look at these motions they deal with principles: the principle of fairness, the principle of efficiency, and the principle of cost effectiveness.

Last year the coast guard announced to the Canadian shipping industry and ports that it was going to start charging fees for services that heretofore had been paid for by the Canadian taxpayer.

• (1720)

The Reform Party and I believe in the concept and principle of user pay. It is not right that Canadian taxpayers living in Winnipeg, Calgary, Thunder Bay, or in Vancouver for that matter, should be subsidizing Canada's shipping industry any more than they should be subsidizing any other industry. In principle, we believe the government is going in the right direction.

There is a serious problem with this legislation. We on this side of the House would like to be able to support this legislation but if these amendments cannot be passed by the House, I fear we will not be able to support it. The powers granted to the minister under this legislation are so broad and there is no provision for accountability that down the road regulations can be changed at whim.

The minister does not even have to go through the process of gazetting. He does not have to go through the process he currently is required to go through in order to raise additional money. We fear that in the future there will be a powerful temptation on the

Government Orders

part of whoever is fulfilling the role of Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to use this legislation to raise additional money.

That is why we view these amendments and this part of the regulations, sections 81 through 89, as important. We believe strongly that this is a window of opportunity to ensure for all time that any future changes to the regulations with respect to fees for services the coast guard may charge will have to be dealt with fairly and up front, in a manner that is going to require Parliament's perusal.

The way it is set up now, unless these amendments are adopted, there is no requirement for scrutiny down the road. There is no requirement for any future changes to come back to the House or to come back to the standing committee. There is no requirement for any kind of review. We argue strongly that this is wrong in principle. It does not provide anything for the shippers and the people who depend on the shipping industry.

We on the standing committee heard witnesses from coast to coast telling us about their concerns with this new fee for service. They talked about the viability of their businesses. They were not in the shipping industry, but were people involved in the oil and gas business, people involved in the aggregate business, people involved in other bulk products such as iron ore, grain, lumber and coal. We heard from all these people. They have real concerns about how viable their businesses are going to be down the road as the government moves to higher and higher user fees.

Each and every witness who appeared before the committee said that before the coast guard implemented user fees, it ought to be able to justify those fees on the basis that the services it is providing are actually priced at fair market values. It should be able to justify that the services it is providing are actually services the customers want and need and that they are being delivered efficiently.

The parliamentary secretary knows there are many instances where witnesses appeared before the committee and said: "You are proposing to charge us for something that we can do ourselves for far less cost. We are willing to take that responsibility on. We will go out and service that navigational aid. We will go out and look after our own ice breaking. We will go out and look after it ourselves. We do not need the government to do it. We do not need the coast guard to do it".

The people who are being forced to pay the user fees ought to have that opportunity and that right. With the way the legislation now reads, there is no requirement on the part of the government or on the part of the minister to sit down and negotiate a deal with these people in good faith.

• (1725)

A hue and cry went from one end of the coast to the other after the coast guard announced its intent to collect a user fee last year. I

would suggest that there has been a fair bit of movement on the part of the coast guard to take into consideration the concerns of many of the people we heard at the standing committee and this is a good thing.

However this legislation is our window of opportunity. It is our way of guaranteeing as parliamentarians that Canada's shippers and shipping industry are not going to be faced with costs down the road that they will have no opportunity to address and which parliamentarians will have no opportunity to review.

I represent a riding that has a significant marine shipping industry. There could be changes to the regulations that we as parliamentarians may never know about unless the affected bodies complain to us. That is no way to run the country. For us to say: "We can do as we like until people yell and complain at such a level that we obviously have to stand back and take a different approach", is no way to govern the country and no way to change or enact regulations.

In closing, these amendments are important to the Reform Party. We would like to be able to support the bill. We would like to say: "In principle the oceans act is a good bill. There are still some things we would like to see changed but on balance we can support it". However unless we get the motions passed that demand some accountability from the minister, the department and the commissioner of the coast guard, I fear we cannot support the legislation.

Recently we found out that boaters from one end of the country to the other—never mind people who depend on the shipping industry—but boaters are going to be forced to pay a registration fee. If a person owns a rowboat or a canoe an annual fee will have to be paid to the government. For what?

These matters have to be debated in the House Commons and the standing committee. Right now they are not. Some bureaucrat on Kent Street dreams up a regulation and says: "This is where we can make more money. We can tag those guys. We have not tagged them before". In essence it becomes a hidden tax and it is passed without any scrutiny, without any accountability. In some instances parliamentarians are not even aware of it.

We insist that these amendments be passed. If they are not passed, the Reform Party cannot support the legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Group No. 13. These are, again, very important motions. Since this is that last group of motions, let me start with a brief preamble, nothing too long.

Government Orders

During the report stage here in the House, every time I rose to speak on the 13 groups of motions with, as the hon. member for Chambly put it, a hand held out in co-operation and a new approach to constitutional negotiations, because I did not want to launch a constitutional debate, I only wanted to make the government realize that to reach this bill's goal, which is to implement an integrated oceans management strategy, it had to create some kind of partnership.

I wanted to draw the government's attention to the fact that, in my opinion, the government's major partners are the provinces, because they are the ones that formed Canada. For each part of this bill—there are three—I asked the government not to forget about the provinces and to consult with them right at the beginning and, in some cases, to work with them.

• (1730)

Since we are talking about Motions Nos. 84 and 85 concerning the fees stipulated in clause 50, let me say again that I am asking the government to consult with the provinces, because it is within their territories that the action will take place. In many cases, we want the provinces to levy the fees.

In order to improve transparency, I am urging the government in Motion No. 85 to consult with the standing committee. I want to reassure the House that consulting with a House committee is nothing to worry about, especially since the majority of the standing committee members are from the Liberal Party. That is what my motions on this issue are all about.

As for the other motions, Motions Nos. 77, 79 and 81 presented by members of the Reform Party, I regret to say that we are not in agreement with them. We think that the idea of setting fees by specific marine sector runs counter to what the witnesses who appeared before the standing committee were saying. The majority of witnesses objected to the government's proposal of dividing the country into three regions. I therefore cannot go along with the Reform Party's motions.

However, in order to show you that, in the House and in committee, we have taken a non-partisan approach for the good of the cause, the Bloc Québécois will support the Reform Party's Motion No. 83, since the purpose of this motion is to force the government to consult with the users of services.

It would be only natural to consult the users, given that, in the case of fees for navigational aids for commercial vessels, the government has often used the expression "user pay". But there is also the expression "user pay, user say". I think that this is the thought behind the Reform Party's Motion No. 83, which the Bloc Québécois will support.

Motions Nos. 86 and 87 are very interesting and very forward looking. I would not want to get into the wording as such. But I am very interested to see that they contain the idea of a two way communication. Motion No. 83 provides that users shall be consulted. Motion No. 86 specifies how users shall be informed. The idea is a very good one and we will support it.

Time is flying and I must quickly wrap up. Motion No. 86 sets out when the information shall be published and how much time shall elapse. Motion No. 87 provides for a process of feedback. It is not enough to announce something. You must make sure that it will produce the expected results. If someone in Canada can show the government that it is on the wrong track, there has to be a review mechanism. The Bloc Québécois will therefore support the Reform Party's Motions Nos. 86 and 87.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I have appreciated working with parliamentarians from all parties, especially members of the Bloc Québécois, who sometimes got quite carried away. You cannot blame them for their enthusiasm, with all they had to say, and their responsibility as representatives of the people of Quebec. I think we should be proud of the work they did.

We hope that the work we did as the official opposition will bring the government around to delaying third reading of this bill, because they need to go back to the drawing board. On that note, and in the hope that the government will be understanding about third reading, which, we hope, will take place as late as possible next fall, the Bloc Québécois is ready for the vote.

• (1735)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I understand that, under an agreement made earlier, if there is no other speaker at the report stage of Bill C-26, the question is now to be put. I would remind you also that, under a further agreement, the question is deemed to have been requested on Motion No. 77 and to have been deferred.

Furthermore, as requested by the whips, the bell will be rung for only 15 minutes instead of 30.

The vote is on Motion No. 77. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of Bill C-26.

Call in the members.

• (1755)

[English]

Before the taking of the vote

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The question is on Motion No. 1. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 2, 3 and 4. A negative vote on Motion No. 1 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 2 and 3. A vote on Motion No. 3 applies to Motion No. 4.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 102)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Althouse
Assad	Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Benoit	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Cohen	Collins
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
DeVillers	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harper (Churchill)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoeppner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson

Peters
Pettigrew
Ramsay
Regan
Ringma
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Simmons
Speller
Steckle
Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vancielief
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Wood

Peterson
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Strahl
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wayne
Williams
Zed—162

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Canuel	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Davault
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)	Guay
Jacob	LaLonde
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

• (1800)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

The hon. member for Skeena has moved an amendment to Motion No. 90. As a result, it will be voted on separately.

The question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on Motion No. 5 applies to Motions Nos. 22, 38, 42, 43, 49, 57 to 64, 72, 74, 75, 89 and 91. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 5 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 47, 48, 51 and 52. A negative

Government Orders

vote on Motion No. 5 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 47 and 51.

[*Translation*]

If Motion No. 47 is adopted, a vote on Motion No. 48 will not be necessary. If Motion No. 47 is defeated, then a vote on Motion No. 48 will be necessary.

• (1805)

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result taken on report stage Motion No. 1 to report stage Motion No. 5, as well as report stage Motion No. 33 and report stage Motion No. 65.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 102.*]

[*Translation*]

As well, I think you would find unanimous consent in the House to apply the vote just completed, but in reverse, to the following motions: Nos. 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 31, 9, 18, 20, 50, 53, 54, 71 and 88.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Does the House give its unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 104*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Canuel	Crête
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)	Guay
Jacob	Lalonde
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne—40

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Althouse
Assad	Assadourian

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare
Benoit	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Cohen	Collins
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	Cullen
DeVillers	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Gouk
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harper (Churchill)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hickey
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Parry
Payne	Penson
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringma	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Robinson
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Simmons	Speaker
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wayne
Wells	Williams
Wood	Zed—162

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 31, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 104.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 5 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 22, 38, 42, 43, 49, 57 to 64, 72, 74, 75, 89 and 91 carried. Also Motions Nos. 33 and 65 are carried.

(Motions Nos. 5, 22, 33, 38, 42, 43, 49, 57 to 64, 65, 72, 74, 75, 89 and 91 agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay on the motion.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, the members of the official opposition will be voting nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members present will be voting yes, unless instructed by their constituents to do otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members would vote no on this motion.

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting no.

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

(*Division No. 103*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gouk
Grubel	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Johnston
Mayfield	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Williams —30

NAYS

Members

Adams	Althouse
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bachand
Baker	Béland
Bélangier	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria

Government Orders

Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Cohen	Collins
Cowling	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
DeVillers	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fis	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keys	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Langlois
Laurin	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paré	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Wood	Zed —172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare the amendment to Motion No. 90 defeated.

The vote on Motion No. 5 also applies to Motion No. 90. I therefore declare Motion No. 90 carried.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 8. The vote on this motion will also apply to Motions Nos. 14 and 17.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you that the members of the official opposition will be voting yea.

[English]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will be voting yes, unless instructed by their constituents to do otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members in the House tonight vote no on this motion.

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, the PC Party votes no.

[Translation]

Mr. Landry: Mr. Speaker, I was late and would like to be recorded as having voted with my party.

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 105)

YEAS

Members	
Abbott	Ablonczy
Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Canuel
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazier	Gagnon (Québec)
Gouk	Grubel
Guay	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jacob
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Mayfield	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Speaker	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Tremblay (Rosemont)
Williams—71

Venne

NAYS

Members

Adams	Althouse
Assad	Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Béclair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Cohen
Collins	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Robinson
Rock	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Wood	Zed —132

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 8 lost. I therefore declare Motions No. 15 and 17 lost also.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent in the House to apply the vote just completed to the following motions: Nos. 32, 24, 25, 39, 66, 28, 30, 36, 41, 44, 45, 73, 76.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 66, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negated on the following division:)

Government Orders

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 45, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 73, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 76, which was negated on the following division:)

[*Editor's Note: See division under List No. 105.*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent in the House to apply the vote just completed, but in reverse, to Motion No. 67.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 67, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 108)***YEAS****Members**

Adams	Althouse
Assad	Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Cohen
Collins	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)

O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peters
Pettigrew
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wayne
Wood

O'Reilly
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pillitteri
Regan
Ringuette-Maltais
Robinson
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wells
Zed —132

NAYS**Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Canuel
Crête	Dalphondu-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gagnon (Québec)
Gouk	Grubel
Guay	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jacob
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Mayfield	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Speaker	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
Williams—71	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Gummond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

Government Orders

• (1815)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 67 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 29. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, the Liberal members voting yea.

At the same time, might I ask that the same vote be applied in reverse to Motion No. 84?

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: The members of the official opposition will be voting nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, yes, we can apply the results in reverse. Reform Party members present are voting yes unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote no on this motion and agree to the reversal suggestion.

Mrs. Wayne: I will be voting yea, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 106*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Assad
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Benoit	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Caecia	Calder
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Cohen
Collins	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola

Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Gouk	Grose
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Churchill)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hickey	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Johnston	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringma	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Williams	Wood
Zed—157	

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie	Canuel
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Gagnon (Québec)

Government Orders

Guay	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	McLaughlin
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne—46

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 29 carried.

(The House divided on Motion No. 84, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 110)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie	Canuel
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	Debien
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Gagnon (Québec)
Guay	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	McLaughlin
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne—46

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Assad
Assadourian	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Baker	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Benoit	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar

Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Cohen
Collins	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cullen	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Dupuy
Easter	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Forseth
Frazier	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Gouk	Grose
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)	Harper (Churchill)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Harvard
Hickey	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Johnston	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringma	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wayne	Wells
Williams	Wood
Zed—157	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 84 negated.

The next question is on Motion No. 55. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion No. 55 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The next question is on Motion No. 69.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that all members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on this motion, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, the members of the official opposition will be voting yea on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present are pleased to vote yes unless instructed by their constituents to do otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote yes.

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, this Conservative in a Liberal red jacket votes yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 69, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 107)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélisle
Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)
Canel
Dalphon-Guiral
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lebel
Lefebvre

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Crête
Davialt
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Guay
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harris
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)

Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
McLaughlin
Meredith
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Robinson
Sauvageau
Silye
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—77

Loubier
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Speaker
Stinson
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wayne

NAYS

Members

Adams
Assadourian
Baker
Bélanger
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Byrne
Calder
Cauchon
Cohen
Cowling
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepolo
Duhamel
Easter
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fry
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Pagtakhan
Patry
Peters
Pettigrew
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Steckle
Szabo
Terrana
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Assad
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bélair
Bellemare
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Catterall
Chan
Collins
Crawford
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Dupuy
English
Finestone
Flis
Gaffney
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
Malhi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Pillitteri
Regan
Ringuette-Maltais
Rock
Shepherd
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—126

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Brien	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Collenette	de Savoye
Fillion	Gauthier
Goodale	Guimond
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Mercier	Paradis
Phinney	Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 69 negatived.

• (1820)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would also find unanimous consent to apply the results of this vote to Motion No. 85.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 107.*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 85 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 77. A vote on Motion No. 77 applies to Motions Nos. 79, 81, 83, 86 and 87.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 77 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 84 and 85.

[*Translation*]

If Motion No. 77 is negatived, we will have to put the question on Motion No. 84. If Motion No. 84 is agreed to, it will not be necessary to put the question on Motion No. 85. If Motion No. 84 is negatived, we will have to put the question on Motion No. 85.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, members of the official opposition will vote nay.

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members present will be voting yes, unless instructed otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote yes.

Mrs. Wayne: Mr. Speaker, we vote yes.

(The House divided on Motion No. 77, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 109*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Frazier
Gouk	Grubel
Hanger	Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Johnston	Mayfield
McLaughlin	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Robinson	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Wayne	Williams—36

NAYS

Members

Adams	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bachand
Baker	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Canuel
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Cohen
Collins	Cowling
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	DeVillers
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay

Government Orders

MacDonald
Malhi
Marchand
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Ménard
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunez
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi
Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—167

MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maloney
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paré
Patry
Peters
Pettigrew
Pillitteri
Pomerleau
Regan
Ringuette-Maltais
Rocheleau
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Simmons
St-Laurent
Steckle
Szabo
Terrana
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In my opinion the yeas have it.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply in reverse the vote of report stage Motion No. 8 to the motion now before the House.

Let me take this opportunity, in anticipation of that agreement, to thank my colleagues, the whips in other parties, as well as all hon. member for facilitating the voting process.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Does the House give its unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 108.*]

* * *

● (1825)

[*Translation*]

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Collenette
Fillion
Goodale
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Mercier
Phinney

Beaumier
Bethel
Chrétien (Frontenac)
de Savoye
Gauthier
Guimond
Marleau
Paradis
Whelan

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 77 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 79, 81, 83, 86 and 87 defeated.

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved that Bill C-35, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (minimum wage), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I am very pleased to present Bill C-35, amending part III of the Canada Labour Code to increase the federal minimum wage rate.

In the 12 years I have been sitting in the House, I have never missed an opportunity to stand up for the most vulnerable in our society. The bill we are studying today goes precisely in this direction. I will not go as far as to describe it as a revolutionary measure that will change the life of millions, but it is a long-awaited amendment, because the federal minimum wage rate has not been changed for ten years. It is \$4 an hour since 1986.

With Bill C-35, our government wanted to kill two birds with one stone. First, it provides that, as of next July 17, the federal minimum wage rate will really increase. It also includes a mechanism ensuring that, from now on, the rate will be automatically adjusted according to the economic realities of the various regions of our country. After studying several different formulas, our government chose to align the federal minimum wage rate with those established by the provinces and territories. This dynamic initiative is quite logical, practical and fair.

It is logical, because 98 per cent of the workers that are paid the minimum wage rate are employed in industries regulated by provincial or territorial legislation. Every province or territory regularly adjusts its minimum wage rate to meet regional requirements. Indeed, the economy and some of the market conditions

Government Orders

vary from region to region. And so does the minimum wage. Thus, across Canada, it varies between \$4.75 and \$7 an hour. If we had established a federal minimum wage, we would have gone against this reality.

Our formula is also practical, because it simplifies the process for keeping these rates up to date. By harmonizing our rate with the provincial rates, we avoid having to make statutory changes on a regular basis to reflect change in each of our regions.

Therefore, this initiative reflects our government's commitment to simplify government processes and reduce red tape wherever possible. Besides, business people will no longer have to worry about rate differences between both levels of government. Their employees will always be sure to get a pay equivalent to that of their peers.

This is unquestionable proof that the Canadian government is willing to co-operate with the provinces in order to give taxpayers good service quickly and at the best possible cost. We have always said that we should analyze which jurisdiction is in the best position to deliver a service, and adapt our operating procedures accordingly.

• (1830)

This is what we did in the case of Bill C-3 and this is what we are doing now with Bill C-35.

I hope my colleagues opposite, and especially members of the Bloc Québécois, will recognize that we are serious and consistent in our approach. We have always said that Canadian federalism was flexible and dynamic. Here we have further proof that we can improve our operations without resorting to useless and unproductive jurisdictional squabbles.

[*English*]

Bill C-35 clearly reflects the strong commitment of the government to decentralization and to eliminating duplication and overlap. This amendment to the Canada Labour Code increases the federal minimum wages in a new and innovative way by aligning them with provincial rates based on regional economies. This clearly demonstrates our strong commitment to work with the provinces and territories to establish which jurisdiction is in the best position to deliver a specific service to Canadians.

In this case it is clear we are happy to harmonize our rates with those of the provinces and territories and to follow their lead in setting an appropriate increase in the future.

I strongly believe that everybody will gain from this simple and dynamic initiative. I also believe this new system will be practical, efficient and reliable.

However, should it be proven otherwise, the federal government will be ready to intervene to protect the interests of minimum wage workers. Those workers are generally not unionized and have little bargaining power with their employers. We retain the power to set our own federal minimum wages in the event that a province withdraws this floor or sets it at an unreasonable level.

[*Translation*]

I can say that Bill C-35 is based on the indisputable principles of justice and equity. It eliminates any possible discrimination between workers under federal jurisdiction and those under provincial or territorial jurisdiction.

It also allows for more balanced and sounder competition between businesses in any given region because now the obligations will be the same for everyone.

As far as equity is concerned, I would like my colleagues in the House to note that the new minimum wage rate will apply to all employees under federal jurisdiction, whatever their age. You will remember that in some Canadian provinces rates for young people and adults still differ. However, in order to be fair to our young workers, we chose to implement one single rate, that of the adult workers, to all businesses under federal jurisdiction.

Before the government decided to harmonize the federal minimum wage with that of the provinces and territories, it did what it always does: it consulted the major stakeholders.

The provincial governments welcomed the proposal, which will simplify the procedure and guarantee fair treatment of all workers in a given region.

On the management side, there was no opposition since the vast majority of employers under federal jurisdiction are already paying their employees the equivalent of the minimum wage in force in the various regions of the country.

The unions supported this measure because it implements the long awaited increase of the federal minimum wage and it also provides for automatic adjustments in the future.

All the interested parties recognize that this proposal is reasonable and that it takes into account the realities of today's labour market.

• (1835)

I must say, that in my work as Minister of Labour, I am impressed by the spirit of co-operation in our sector. I am delighted by it, because I am convinced that it is through dialogue and consultation that we will maintain effective and harmonious labour relations in Canada.

I think this attitude also reveals that labour and management are aware of the great challenges we must face together at the dawn of

the new century. Their sense of responsibility and maturity are the envy of a number of other industrialized countries.

I therefore set myself the objective of channelling all this goodwill positively in order to amend our Canada Labour Code and to adapt it to the new realities of the labour market in Canada. We are currently working very hard to modernize part I of the Canada Labour Code, which concerns the labour relations process and structures in industries under federal jurisdiction.

Already, the members of the task force under Andrew Sims have agreed on a whole range of recommendations. Rarely have we seen the process of consultation achieve its objectives so successfully, and we must congratulate all those who have helped build this impressive consensus.

One major question, however, remains unanswered: the use of replacement workers during a legal strike. The members of the Sims committee have made two different suggestions. Other options were suggested by different experts, but I wanted to see for myself the mood of the people.

This is the reason why, during the month of April, I participated in consultations all over the country. Almost all stakeholders mentioned the problem of substitute workers and the relevance of a potential federal act respecting strike breakers. I took good note of their opinions, recommendations and warnings.

Consultations on Part I being completed, I am determined to go ahead rapidly. Officials at the bureau of legislation review are currently preparing the amendments I want to submit very soon to my colleagues in cabinet and to Parliament.

At the same time, our analysis of Part II of the labour code, which deals more specifically with health and safety in the workplace is progressing rapidly. Dozens and dozens of changes have been proposed and in this case also, an important consensus has developed. There is consensus on 90 per cent of the changes. There remain only a few questions for the minister to answer.

Finally, we are starting to study Part III of the Code on labour standards. This is the part I consider most crucial for the coming years. Everywhere in the country, a great nervousness and a strong concern can be felt in the face of the rapid changes occurring in the workplace.

[English]

This is why the second priority I have chosen as Minister of Labour is the workplace of the future. The shift from an industrial society to the information age, globalization, demographic changes and the imperatives of budgetary control is causing tremendous worries in society. How we work and how we prepare for our working lives are changing profoundly and irreversibly.

Government Orders

To begin with, fewer and fewer people are working year round, nine to five, Monday to Friday, for one employer on common premises according to established rules. Over the past decade the number of self-employed Canadians has grown twice as fast as traditional job opportunities. In Canada more than three quarters of a million men and women are working out of their homes, and that number is expected to double in the next five years. Furthermore, two-thirds of these home based workers are employed by a company which has its headquarters somewhere else.

• (1840)

At first glance some of these facts appear disturbing. It is true a large number of workers are resigning themselves to self-employment, part time jobs and home based jobs because they have been unable to find traditional work. Sometimes they accumulate two or three part time jobs.

However thousands of Canadians deliberately choose this type of work. Usually they do so to more effectively balance family and work related responsibilities. A growing number of workers are doing so to improve the quality of their lives or to make better use of their creativity, expertise and spirit of entrepreneurship.

[Translation]

Obviously, this more individualized and independent approach to work does not suit all workers. Therefore, in co-operation with the private sector, we must continue to do everything possible to create jobs of all kinds.

At the same time, we must seriously look at the challenges to industrial relations in Canada because of the new trends.

Several questions come to mind: What should be the role of the government when work becomes more individual than collective? How do we define the workplace when a considerable number of employees work at home? How do we better protect transient workers who do not enjoy a continuous employer-employee relationship? How can freelancers and contract workers have access to some kind of social benefits, of security? How do we prevent abuses on both sides?

These are questions we must answer very quickly. The Sims report touched on the subject in its last chapter entitled *Beyond the Code*. Last year, the Donner report carefully studied the whole issue of work distribution. Several researchers in the area of industrial relations are also working on this issue.

This is why I thought it would be appropriate to take a few minutes during our debate to raise the awareness of my colleagues regarding these issues and to ask them to take part in the brainstorming I want to have on the future of work. This is an issue which has a direct impact on Canadians. It is at the basis of our ability to adapt to change and compete in a global economy in the years to come.

Government Orders

In the meantime, I would invite all hon. members to fully support Bill C-35 before us now. This is a simple piece of legislation aimed primarily at bringing justice and fairness to those who are at the bottom of the pay scale. They are entitled to the dignity of work. They deserve our support and our help. We have the duty to provide it to them.

I trust you will find there is unanimous consent, once my colleagues opposite have stated their position, to go into committee of the whole, proceed with the report stage and third reading and refer the bill to the Senate.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the terms of the request from the Minister of Labour. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is no unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his speech. First of all, I want to say that the official opposition will support Bill C-35.

I just discovered that, in his own way, the Minister of Labour follows the principles of Mao Zedong because he proposed several bills in a series that, we know, will culminate in the presentation of a legislation on replacement workers and the more comprehensive reform of the labour code that the minister will propose, naturally.

We must not underestimate the impact, the importance of legislation like this one, because it affects the most vulnerable people in our society.

• (1845)

The minister is right to remind us that the minimum wage issue—and I will get back to this later on—is all about individuals who generally share three characteristics. More often than not they are not protected by a collective agreement. Their jobs are unsure, often in sectors more sensitive to economic contingencies. Moreover, very often these jobs are part time.

It is a good thing the government decided to put an end to a situation that was absurd for two reasons. First of all, the federal government had not increased the minimum wage since 1986; it was still at \$4. Later on I will show how this \$4 rate ties in with the poverty levels. We had a ridiculous situation where a worker working for a company under federal jurisdiction was not entitled to the same wage as other workers in British Columbia, Newfoundland, and Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Labour, with this bill, is correcting an unfair situation by ensuring that, in a given province, all workers will be entitled to the same minimum wage.

I have looked at this bill carefully. I want to point out that we will reach heaven once we have antiscab legislation and once we have revised as fully as possible the Canada Labour Code, which is very complex, with its three parts. I want to let the minister know that I am deeply interested in these issues. We would be very happy to work in committee, because the labour market is, as we have pointed out, about to undergo major changes.

I need only give my family as an example. I believe it is typical of what is going on in the labour market. My father is almost sixty, and has had only one career. He made an honest living, but has always worked for the same employer. I turned 34 in May—I know I do not look that old—and this is my third career. We know that, by the year 2000, workers will go through five or six careers, and that the employer-employee relationship will be considerably weakened because of the increase in home teleworking.

This means that, as lawmakers, we must look carefully at the protection we want these workers to enjoy.

The minister has introduced a bill that we will support and that covers, if I read right, six main points. To start with, the minimum wage would be harmonized with that in effect in the various provinces, and that we agree with. That is central to the bill and we support it.

Let us remember, for the benefit of our audience, perhaps, the reality of the minimum wage across the country. We have said that the federal minimum wage has not changed since 1986 and stands at \$4. In Alberta, the minimum wage is \$5, but a distinction is made between workers under 18 and those over 18. This distinction will be done away with. Unless I am wrong, the minister feared, rightly, that it would not stand the test of the Canadian charter of rights. Such distinctions based on age will be tolerated less and less as time goes on.

British Columbia is the wealthiest province. I do not know whether you have been to Vancouver lately, but I have and I was astonished at the meaning of wealth in a province. British Columbia has the smallest debt. There is a correlation between the debt of a province and its ability to provide services. I was surprised to find that in B.C.—to give an example with which I am familiar—25 medications are made available to people with AIDS.

You will understand, then, that this global wealth index is reflected in the minimum wage. It will come as a surprise to no one that the minimum wage in our westernmost province is the highest at \$7 per hour.

Prince Edward Island, which expects to have increased its minimum wage three times between 1991 and 1997, will reach the Canadian average of \$5.40.

Government Orders

• (1850)

The minimum wage in Manitoba is \$5.40; in New Brunswick, it is \$5.50; in Nova Scotia, it will be increased from \$5.35 to \$5.50 in February.

In Mike Harris' Ontario, where, as you know, the situation is not always rosy, the minimum wage is \$6.85 but we understand that, with its industrial structure, Ontario may be in a better position than Quebec to support a slightly higher minimum wage.

Quebec's minimum wage is \$6.45, but one might think—I do not know if the minister has a scoop on that subject, but there is a rumour going around—it could be increased in the very near future, thanks to the bread and roses operation. This beautiful operation came about because of a willingness to link social awareness and economic awareness.

In Saskatchewan, the minimum wage is \$5.35; in Newfoundland, about which we have talked a lot in the House in the last few weeks, it is \$4.75; in the Northwest Territories, it is \$7 and in the Yukon, \$6.86.

So, there is a variety of viewpoints that may appear to be discriminatory toward workers and that cannot be explained. One cannot explain why there are two rates in effect in the same province or territory.

So, the minister has done something useful in proposing a bill aimed at harmonizing the wages that will be in effect on the same territory.

Second, if Bill C-35 is passed, the general rate will apply regardless of occupation, status or work experience, which is also desirable.

Third, there are still people who do piecework and therefore are not paid by the hour. My understanding of the bill is that the minister is making provisions so that, where applicable, an employee will never get less than the minimum wage.

Fourth, as it was said, the minimum wage based on age will not be permitted any more.

And fifth, the federal government—I had some questions about that, but the issue will probably be raised in committee of the whole in a few minutes—retains the authority to clearly set the minimum wage. The minister has been discreet on that matter, but he will be able to explain it, if it is indeed the legislator's intent.

This is essentially what the minister is proposing.

I would be doubly satisfied because, as I have said, we agree with the minister's logic. We are happy to see that the proposed harmonization really provides an increase in the minimum wage, given that the federal government was the jurisdiction with the lowest wage rate. We are happy to see that workers will no longer be discriminated against because of their age.

Of course, this legislation will affect a limited number of workers, as the Code protects only 10 per cent of the workforce. According to department officials, only 2 per cent of those 10 per cent will be affected. So, while we must recognize that the legislation has limited scope, it is important for the workers concerned.

I was pleased to hear the minister saying that, all through his career, which I followed from a distance, he has always stood up for the poor in our society. This awareness was apparent when we discussed the Program for Older Workers Adjustment or issues related to social legislation. The fact is that we witnessed a considerable erosion of what the minimum wage represents in relation to the policies needed to fight poverty.

Let me remind the minister that he should—and perhaps would like to in the coming days—review the report tabled by the National Council of Welfare, as I did last night. The report was tabled in October 1993 and is entitled *Incentives and Disincentives to Work*.

• (1855)

The National Council of Welfare is an organization which is affiliated with the Department of Human Resources Development and which must regularly report on the evolution of poverty levels.

I simply want to tell you about what the 1993 report said: comparing the reality of the minimum wage in 1976 and in 1992 leads to two findings. In 1976, most people who were paid the minimum wage had an income above the poverty line. In 1992, in every province, the minimum wage was below the poverty line.

It goes without saying that this situation is not the exclusive responsibility of the Minister of Labour, but involves the whole issue of policy directions. But the fact is that, as we speak, the minimum wage in effect in every province is below the poverty line.

This means that, for some people, there is no incentive to work. I often meet, in my riding of Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, in Montreal, people who have difficult choices to make. When they are beneficiaries of income security programs, it is sometimes more advantageous for them, particularly couples with children, to remain on these programs than to work. As a society, we have to have to wonder about this.

I know the Minister of Human Resources Development also has something to say about that, but the fact is that the minimum wage is now below the poverty line.

Let us take 1976 as an example. Collectively speaking, 1976 was a particular year. The minister surely recalls that, in 1976, a very progressive government came to power in Quebec. It is therefore a benchmark I like to refer to. In 1976, in Newfoundland, a person with a salary comparable to the minimum wage had an annual income of \$5,200, an amount which was 5 percent above the poverty line.

Government Orders

In 1992, the minimum wage in Newfoundland gave an income of \$9,880, which was 74 per cent of the amount needed to be at the poverty line. As you can see, there has been significant erosion of what the minimum wage buys for those who must live with it.

The same thing goes for Prince Edward Island. In 1976, the minimum wage meant an income of \$4,992, which was 3 per cent above the poverty line; in 1992, this income was \$9,880, or 76 per cent of the amount needed to reach the poverty line. I could give the numbers for all 10 provinces. This is a fact that the Minister of Labour, who invites us to ponder, should not forget.

Without underestimating the scope of Bill C-35, of which the Bloc Québécois supports both the principle and the self-explanatory references, it would have been interesting if the government had introduced a single bill proposing to harmonize the minimum wage and concrete measures to fight poverty.

Let us never forget that. I hope we shall never discuss social policy or make reference to the minimum wage without keeping in mind that, overall, Canadian society is poorer than ever. There are in Canadian society people who are far from getting richer. Poverty is reaching classes that until now were believed to be protected from it.

I would like to remind the House of what the National Council of Welfare told us in its report last year. It wrote that 4.8 million children, women and men, that is one Canadian out of six, live in poverty. Poverty is defined as spending more than 56 per cent of one's income for basic needs such as clothing, food and housing. A person who spends more than that for basic needs is poor, according to the National Council of Welfare.

• (1900)

One Canadian out of six, or 16 per cent of the Canadian population, is in that situation. We have a fairly precise knowledge of the patterns of poverty. For example, single parent families headed by females are now significantly poorer. In 1994, the poverty rate of single mothers aged less than 65 with children under 18 was 57 per cent.

Now, one Canadian out of six, or 16 per cent of the population, lives in poverty, but the situation is much worse in certain segments of our society. We know that 57 per cent of lone-parent families headed by women with children under 18 years of age live in poverty. There is something very worrisome about this grim reality.

I appreciate the work done by the National Council of Welfare, because it showed us some possible ways to eradicate poverty. Since we have two ministers sitting side by side, two ministers from Montreal, which is quite something, who are committed to promoting liberty and equality, I want to take this opportunity to remind the House that the National Council of Welfare indicated that, if the Canadian government had invested \$15 billion, we

would have been able to eradicate poverty in just one year. Since I cannot say that to the Reform Party, I have to tell the government majority.

I am now quoting, for the listening enjoyment of the Minister of Labour, the National Council of Welfare: "In spite of the grim reality, it is not wishful thinking to think we will win the war against poverty. According to Statistics Canada, to help all the poor improve their lot would have cost \$15 billion in 1994". This is a huge amount. Of course, we are not saying this is insignificant, but it is surely not exaggerated for a country where the federal, provincial and territorial governments spent some \$350 billion in 1994 and where the value of all produced goods and services exceeded \$750 billion. Is this not a reason to be hopeful? Should this not be the way to go?

It would have been very interesting for the Minister of Labour to put forward with this legislation a more general one providing job creation and full employment measures aimed at getting people out of poverty.

To conclude, I ask for the unanimous consent to refer Bill C-35 to a committee of the whole after the intervention of the Reform Party.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the terms of the bill before us are under the guise of giving more powers to the provinces. If it did that, I would be all for it, but I suppose Bill C-35 is a small step toward eliminating useless, outdated regulations. The Canada Labour Code covers less than one million workers.

In 1986, the last time there was a change to the federal minimum wage, only one-tenth of one per cent or roughly 7,000 workers under federal jurisdiction were directly affected. While updated estimates are not available from department officials, there is a presumption that little has changed in that length of time.

• (1905)

In 1935, Canada ratified the ILO Minimum Wage Fixing Machinery Convention, 1928, which specified that workers would be guaranteed a minimum wage in cases where wages were exceptionally low.

It was 1965 before Canada actually began setting minimum wage rates. Since the provinces regulate over 99 per cent of Canadian minimum wage earners, there was not much need for expediency. Since there have been only sporadic changes in the rates since 1965, it is evident that the federal minimum wage is not necessary.

Back in the 1930s an argument may have been made to justify a minimum wage in some countries to ensure that workers were not taken advantage of by single industry employers.

There is a general misconception that without a minimum wage workers would be exploited. Employers want the best workers available and often compete to hire them. Low wages often show there is an abundance of workers available, which is just an example of the supply and demand concept.

The minimum wage, rather than bringing the poverty level up, has the reverse effect. It encourages exploitation. It protects highly trained, well paid workers against competition from the young who lack experience and the unskilled people who require on the job training.

Unions, whose mandate it is to protect jobs and increase the wages of its members, support minimum wage rates to protect themselves from cheaper or trainee labour. Naturally, when asked to respond to the initiative aligning federal minimum wage rates with provincial rates, labour groups wanted the federal government to show leadership by maintaining a single rate that is higher than the provincial and territorial minimum wages.

Business groups, on the other hand, indicated the change would have virtually no impact on their operations as the lowest paid wages were competitive with and generally higher than the provincial wage rates.

In the last 10 years Canada has entered into international trade agreements with the U.S. and Mexico which include labour co-operation. There were also agreements with the provinces to cover the provisions of these accords.

If a minimum wage is deemed to be necessary to meet international agreements and conventions, the government could guarantee the continued existence of a minimum wage by concluding federal-provincial agreements on minimum wage rates. This would eliminate the perceived necessity of section 178(2) which gives the governor in council power to set rates should it disagree with the rate set by a province or territory.

The Minister of Natural Resources boasted a new spirit of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments to an Edmonton group last week. If this spirit of co-operation really exists, section 178(2) can be deleted. The understanding works out to ensure that the provinces maintain reasonable minimum wage standards.

High wages cannot be decreed but must be arrived at through years of experience in the workplace. In the nineties, advances in human rights, collective bargaining and consumer awareness make minimum wages, especially in the federal context, irrelevant.

• (1910)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

* * *

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND CONTROL ACT

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.) moved that Bill C-23, an act to establish the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House on Bill C-23, the Nuclear Safety and Control Act.

In 1946 when the Canadian nuclear industry was in its infancy, Parliament passed the Atomic Energy Control Act which gave the federal government control over the development, application and use of nuclear energy. Fifty years later, despite the dramatic changes in the size and the scope of the nuclear industry, that legislation has never been significantly revised or updated. Clearly changes are long overdue, changes that this House can help bring about today by supporting Bill C-23 at second reading.

I would like to take this opportunity to review the key elements of this proposed legislation so that hon. members will have a true appreciation of why Bill C-23 is important for the nuclear industry and for all Canadians.

I will talk about the paramount importance of worker and public safety and environment protection and a more modern and effective regulatory framework that focuses on these goals. I will talk about reduced overlap and duplication, improved efficiency of the federation, increased competitiveness and job creation but, most important, I will demonstrate that Bill C-23 is a bill of good government.

When the current legislation establishing the federal role in the nuclear sector came into force, Canadians could only dream about the benefits of nuclear technology. Today each and every one of us in this House and each and every one of our constituents has experienced those benefits firsthand.

Nuclear power now accounts for approximately one-fifth of Canada's electricity supply. The nuclear sector has brought tremen-

Government Orders

dous economic benefits to our nation by ensuring a safe and reliable source of energy, supporting industrial growth and high technology jobs and contributing to our balance of trade. Nuclear technology has also brought enormous social benefits. For decades nuclear isotopes have been crucial for a range of medical uses.

The nuclear industry has grown to the point where it affects the lives of Canadians in many different ways. Yet the law governing the industry has not changed significantly since 1946. The focus of regulation is no longer the security of atomic secrets as it was in the 1940s, but it is now on the health, safety and environmental impact of using nuclear technologies.

Societies expectations about how and why government should regulate the nuclear sector have also changed considerably. For 50 years the Atomic Energy Control Board has used its authority under the current act wisely and effectively. The AECB has been influential in the development of strong safety cultures at Canada's nuclear reactors. Its vigilance with regard to safety is one reason why the safety of Canada's nuclear sector is second to none in the world.

Nevertheless, the status quo is no longer acceptable to Canadians or to this government. The current legislation's deficiencies have been noted by the courts, the media, special interest groups, committees of this House and Canada's auditor general.

• (1915)

Bill C-23 addresses these shortcomings by providing for more explicit regulation of nuclear activities and by ensuring that the regulatory body will have the legislated powers needed to fulfil its responsibilities.

Canada's nuclear regulatory agency will be given a clear mandate to focus on public concerns about the safety of nuclear facilities and the environmental impact of nuclear activities in Canada.

In keeping with this mandate, the AECB will be renamed the Canadian nuclear safety commission. This name change will help Canadians better identify with the principal role of the commission and will eliminate confusion with the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited or AECL, the crown corporation responsible for the development and support of Candu nuclear reactors.

The Canadian nuclear safety commission will continue to have responsibility for nuclear security issues. Bill C-23 will ensure a firm basis for implementing Canada's nuclear policy and fulfilling our obligations with respect to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Under the non-proliferation policy, for example, the use of certain nuclear materials including uranium must be fully accounted for by Canada's nuclear customers. Bill C-23 clearly

defines the new commission's responsibility for ensuring the proper accounting of these materials.

Nuclear matters are a federal responsibility. Over the past two decades this has led to some jurisdictional problems and to some overlap and duplication in regulations. The federal government has worked with the provinces to address the issue. For example, the government recently introduced amendments to the Canada Labour Code that would allow the government to adopt provincial legislation governing labour matters including labour relations and occupational health and safety, and to delegate responsibilities for administering these laws and regulations back to the provinces.

The proposed nuclear safety and control act includes similar interdelegation mechanisms that will give the Canadian nuclear safety commission the authority to enter into agreements with each province to adopt other relevant provincial standards, codes and laws that would then apply to nuclear activities. This would effectively establish a regulatory regime that respects provincial jurisdiction. The legislation also allows for the responsibility for administering regulations in these areas to be delegated to the provinces.

This new power to co-operate with the provinces is expected to reduce regulatory duplication between federal and provincial orders of government. In so doing it will help reduce administrative costs and establish greater certainty for the industry, thereby increasing the competitiveness of Canada's nuclear sector. This increased competitiveness will in turn preserve and create high tech jobs in Canada.

By explicitly referring to health, safety and protection of the environment, the proposed legislation will clearly match the commission's mandate to public expectations of its role. The government is committed to protecting the health and safety of Canadians and our environment.

The proposed legislation will permit the Canadian nuclear safety commission to order the clean up of radioactive contamination when responsibility for the contamination is unclear, under dispute, or where the polluter refuses to act. Currently the AECB does not have this power. This is precisely the kind of protection for Canadians that the auditor general called for in a report to the House in 1994.

It is also worth noting that the high standard for worker protection enshrined in Bill C-23 has received significant support from labour. In fact I have received a letter from the Canadian Labour Congress urging quick passage of Bill C-23.

As the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources I am pleased to inform the House that Bill C-23 has a strong environmental focus which is in keeping with the concerns of all Canadians and with the promise made in the red book that the Liberal government would lead in protecting Canada's environment.

Government Orders

• (1920)

Bill C-23 will explicitly require that the environmental effects of a proposed nuclear facility be assessed as part of the commission's licensing process. However I assure hon. members that the legislation will not in any way change the process for ensuring that the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act continue to be met. In addition, Bill C-23 will make it possible to substitute the commission's hearing process for that of the CEEA.

The proposed legislation also contains many other characteristics of a modern regulatory system. The power of federal inspectors will be enshrined in the law. The maximum penalty for offences will increase dramatically from \$10,000 to \$1 million.

The new commission will also have the clear authority to order remedial action where necessary and to require financial guarantees for decommissioning, thus ensuring that owners meet high environmental standards.

At the same time the proposed legislation is intended to conform with the mining reclamation trust provisions of the Income Tax Act. This means that mining companies could be eligible for certain tax benefits, if they are required to settle such a trust as a licence condition.

Bill C-23 authorizes the new commission to charge fees to recover the costs associated with its regulatory activities. Although the AECB has collected fees from licensees to recover costs since 1990, its authority to do so is not explicitly legislated.

Bill C-23 proposes that the number of members of the commission be increased from the current five to seven. The government believes it is important to have a sufficient number of commissioners to deal expeditiously with all licensing decisions. It has become apparent that the current complement of five board members, only one of whom is full time, is insufficient. We believe the commission needs members who represent a wide range of expertise to deal with the broader set of issues now considered by this regulatory body.

These objectives can be achieved by increasing the number of positions on the commission. The cost of this increased representation, which amounts to approximately \$100,000 per year, will be funded from internal reallocations.

Like any other modern regulatory agency, the new commission needs certain authority to function effectively. Consequently the commission will be declared a court of record and will have the authority to conduct formal public hearings, compel witnesses to appear, take evidence and control its proceedings.

Bill C-23 responds to the calls from many quarters for a modern law that will reflect the federal government's responsibilities and powers relating to the regulation of the nuclear industry.

The legislation will enable the federal government to ensure the nuclear industry continues to operate in a manner that protects the health and safety of Canadians and their environment.

Bill C-23 is an important step toward avoiding unnecessary regulatory overlap and duplication between the federal and provincial orders of government. It will also ensure that federal regulations are applied in a fair and just manner.

The steps will minimize the cost to the nuclear industry and allow it to pursue opportunities in an increasingly competitive world, creating new jobs for Canadians and contributing to the country's economic growth.

The commission will be better equipped than the current Atomic Energy Control Board to conduct public hearings and environmental assessments. It will have clear powers to inspect nuclear facilities and other premises where licensed activities are carried out, to enforce federal regulations, to order environmental clean-ups, and to seek suitable penalties.

Further, the use of additional commissioners will enable the commission to work in a cost effective manner while ensuring balanced decision making that fulfils the public interest.

Clearly the proposed legislation represents good government in action. The legislation acts on commitments outlined in the recent speech from the throne for sustaining our environment and for ensuring a modern regulatory regime that will meet the needs of the 21st century.

• (1925)

Based on an open and honest discussion of Bill C-23 and its many merits, I am confident hon. members on both sides of the House will join me in voting to send the legislation to committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to create the new Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. As my colleague has just pointed out, the old legislation dates back to 1946, so it can certainly be described as outmoded.

This commission is primarily a monitoring body, and whenever I hear monitoring, I wonder who will do this. Will the number of monitors be increased? What will their qualifications be? What will this all cost?

The commission's mandate is also to monitor the impact of nuclear activities on health. This is very important. In my riding I see people from Russia who have been the victims of nuclear

Government Orders

accidents. They take years to recover. They need fresh air and good food as well. It is obvious that there can never be too many protective precautions taken.

The commission will also be responsible for safety, which is all very well and good. The environment needs more looking after, as we are told, and I feel that the commission will be better able to protect our environment. Very often the opposition is criticized for doing nothing but finding fault, but I think that, when a bill is worthwhile, that must be acknowledged. The Bloc acknowledges the definite quality of this bill.

The commission may also set national standards. I believe that it is important, yet my colleague was saying earlier that certain powers can be turned over to the provinces. Here again—alas, too often—that can lead to quarrelling. I wonder why more powers are not turned over to the provinces.

The commission will also play a role in implementing policy and international commitments concerning the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Finally, it has a major role to play in co-ordinating emergency measures, for instance in the event of a leak at a nuclear plant.

Where nuclear energy and radioactive emissions are concerned, it is essential that safety be a government priority. Clearly, the old Atomic Energy Control Act which, as I have said, dates back to 1946, was essentially focussed on national security.

Today, as everyone knows, there is a far wider use of sources of radiation. The legislation must, therefore, be brought up to date. The new bill is an improvement over the old. Still, Quebec has voiced certain concerns relating to workers in the nuclear industry who were not covered by either the Canada Labour Code or any provincial legislation.

This legal vacuum posed certain safety problems, in nuclear plants for instance. The Act to amend the Canada Labour Code, passed this March 26, filled the need. It also contains the concept that a person may not be held responsible for an incident if he or she has taken all reasonable steps.

• (1930)

But here again, we must agree on the meaning of the word reasonable. Who is going to define it? I do not think we can be half reasonable. There are however a number of questions to be answered when we look to the courts of law for an exact definition of the criteria of the word reasonable. As for the expression “exercise diligence”, “diligence” is a big word, but it must be clarified in this legislation, in the application of the standards in effect, to prevent an error occurring.

The Bloc Quebecois would like this to be included in Bill C-23, as it is in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

The Canadian commission would also monitor the use of instruments with a radioactive component. Hospitals also use radioactive equipment in certain treatments and diagnoses. The commission would inspect this equipment and ensure it meets safety standards. Business does its own inspections and sends samples to the experts on the commission. Both large and small and medium size business do so.

The commission claims to charge companies using its radioactive source services the actual cost of the inspection. However, certain companies claim that the federal government is not doing everything in its power and that, very often, it is too expensive. Therefore, business has a different story.

The big power companies argue that it is the consumers who end up paying for the ever-increasing fees set by the commission.

We are also in favour of cost recovery so that a balance can be struck. Annual fee increases would, I feel, be improper. A commission like this one is sometimes used to generate profits, even when the fees are said to serve other purposes.

This bill should require the commission to consult with licensees and consider their views before imposing or raising user fees.

This, of course, is a sensitive issue. Some argue that the safety benefits are priceless, that safety standards could always be more rigorous, regardless of the implementation costs. But there is a limit. Few people feel that a regulation's advantages and disadvantages should be assessed before it is imposed on governments, businesses and individuals.

The Bloc Quebecois recognizes the need to act very carefully in this regard, as well as the risk of giving too much weight to economic interests compared to the significant safety needs. Let me give you an example. I was in committee earlier and mention was made of imposing a tax to register small boats such as pedal boats. This shows how a government can take advantage of the people at any time. A supposedly noble motive turns into a money grab. The initially noble motive becomes perverted.

It is, however, necessary to consider the possibility that the commission may have the mandate to conduct its own cost-benefit analysis of the regulations and standards it applies and intends to apply in the future. This would better protect the interests of businesses and their customers.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the many nuclear disasters that have occurred around the world. It can be said that we all played sorcerer's apprentice with nuclear energy.

• (1935)

In certain respects, we went much too fast. We did not have the expertise, but we thought it would be the best form of energy in the world. We are paying the price today.

Man has played sorcerer's apprentice with some extremely dangerous products. We became involved in the production of nuclear energy without being able to effectively deal with the consequences. We became involved in the development and production of nuclear energy without really knowing all the facts. We generated tons of nuclear waste without being able to process them effectively, and that is a tragedy.

Our governments have failed to effectively manage health and environmental hazards. Our governments also proved to be incapable of exercising effective control. It is no wonder that, every time an attempt is made to develop or use new nuclear technologies, environmental organizations cry out against the idea and the public itself is wary, and rightly so.

We must not overlook the fact that the nuclear arsenal currently available worldwide could totally destruct humanity and the public is perfectly aware of this. I would not take much to blow up the planet, just one madman, and in this world of ours there is no lack of madmen.

We all know that there are huge stocks of nuclear weapons, plutonium and heavy water in Russia, and that our governments are afraid a black market might develop. Non democratic countries and terrorist groups could then have access to atomic weapons or anything they need to build such weapons.

How can we expect those who develop and sell new technologies to be able to exercise control? In a great many cases, they should exercise control but do not even have this control they should be exercising.

It took the federal government 50 years to come to the realization that this ill-conceived legislation does not adequately protect the people of Quebec and Canada. How do you expect nuclear wary people to trust this government and the new commission after that? Even with the right tools, will the commission be able to ensure adequate monitoring?

It will also be difficult to restore public confidence. I just cannot believe that passing this bill will solve all our problems. Prudence dictates we must give ourselves monitoring standards. In fact I suspect this government is trying to make us forget about the Prime Minister's last visit to Russia, when the purchase of nuclear waste to be processed in Canada was discussed. Members will recall that there had been an outcry over this decision. And for a very good reason.

The government could probably have resolved another problem by dealing with the nuclear energy issue and introducing a bill on this subject. It is clear from analyzing nuclear energy research and development investments made in Canada that almost all the

Government Orders

economic benefits in that area go to the same province, and this province, as you know, is Ontario.

In Quebec, we inherited the unemployment insurance—which I call and will always call poverty insurance—while Ontario gets money for research and development. We are still, unfortunately, the forgotten ones.

Who, in this federation, benefits as much from the federal government's generosity? Who else in this federation has such an interest in seeing Atomic Energy of Canada maintained? Who else in this federation benefits as much from the spinoffs of this industry? No one else. Ontario is the only one.

Had this government been serious in its approach, it would have seized the opportunity to look at this issue. The government greatly favours the development of nuclear energy, but does so only as a service to the Ontario industry.

• (1940)

While amending the current act, the government should make a formal commitment to better distribute its R and D money between the provinces, particularly those which receive the least, such as Quebec.

But the government did just the opposite when it recently announced the closing of EACL regional offices in Montreal. Montreal was hit again, not to mention the decision affecting Varennes and before that, the Maurice-Lamontagne Institute.

I would also have liked to see the government clearly affirm its will to promote R and D for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. As we know, nuclear energy can be used for the best and for the worst purposes. It can be useful and it can kill. It can save lives and it can eliminate thousands.

The public will only accept atomic energy when it will see its peaceful applications and its usefulness in everyday life.

It will only accept atomic energy when it will see that the government gave itself the means to control almost perfectly—I am tempted to leave out the word almost, but let us keep a margin for human error—all the risks related to its use and its development.

Another important problem we should have been able to tackle openly in considering this bill in the House is the financing of Atomic Energy of Canada, the financing of CANDU reactors throughout the world. Financially, Atomic Energy of Canada is just as much of a bottomless pit as the Hibernia project off Newfoundland may turn out to be.

Since this agency was created, billions of dollars have been sunk into it, and the government is only able to sell CANDU reactors by

Government Orders

financing them with money from Canadian and Quebec taxpayers. If that is not a scandal, what is?

In reality, the sale of CANDU reactors, with their supposedly safe technology, is nothing more than a clever way of subsidizing Atomic Energy of Canada. This government would have done better to overhaul Atomic Energy of Canada's operating methods. The days when the government could squander taxpayers' money have long gone, and gone, I hope, forever.

When a government slashes employment insurance, unemployment insurance, and gets ready to cut pensions and OAS, when a government attacks the poorest members of society, it should first clean up its own act.

Yes, Bill C-23 represents a step forward. The Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this bill.

I pointed out a number of things, and some amendments could probably be made.

I am still critical of the fact that this bill should have been presented 10, 15 or 20 years ago, and at least at the beginning of this Legislature. But we always have to wait. At a certain point, the government wakes up, but it is always ordinary citizens that get it started. In other words, this government needs a good push before it says: "Oh dear, we have not been careful enough. For 50 years now, safety has been lacking in the nuclear field". In 1996, they told themselves it was time to get moving.

This government is like that. The preceding government was no better. So, listen to the opposition for a bit longer. We are making some very good suggestions, because we listen more carefully to our constituents, and our constituents have a lot to tell us. I say that the average citizen is incredibly wise.

• (1945)

When in power, a government realizes that it is inevitably drawn away from the people. After three or four years, it realizes that the people are on one side and it is on the other. At this point in time, those who represent the people best are, of course, the opposition parties, and particularly the official opposition because it does not lean to the far right. When the left has good ideas, they are well received, when the right has good ideas, they are also well received. The important thing here is good ideas.

I will conclude by saying that this bill is a good bill and that it is long overdue. We will follow it closely because a bill in itself is not much, what counts is the way it is implemented. In that regard, we will be there to call the government to order if need be.

[*English*]

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express general support for the changes included in Bill C-23, the nuclear safety and control act.

In part they reflect the changing background against which this act was originally written. The main present day concerns involve: the health and safety of Canadians working in and around radioactive material from the initial stages of mining right through to such things as nuclear power stations; medical and educational purposes; disposal of radioactive waste, both low level and high level; environmental concerns for all, especially for people living in the vicinity of nuclear power facilities; the safe disposal of nuclear waste; and the safe transportation of such hazardous products.

I express general support for the method of putting this legislation together. This included reasonably extensive consultation with the four provinces which use nuclear power or mine uranium: Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick.

We understand there are concerns from the Government of Saskatchewan that Bill C-23 might hamper discussions regarding regulating the uranium mining and milling industry. There is also the possibility that Saskatchewan may wish to develop proper regulations of its own and may wish to license uranium mining and milling. Apparently the federal government's legal beagle so to speak has said that Bill C-23 does not interfere except where federal oversight is needed to maintain the federal role in nuclear matters.

Reformers approve that regulating is being done on a cost recovery basis after some consultation took place with the industry about the fee schedules, with fees being phased in over a fairly extended period of time since the start of the procedure in 1990. I believe Canadians would strongly approve that hospitals and universities should be exempt from such fees.

On the possible objections to Bill C-23, what bothers me the most is that it has taken 50 years to revamp an act which was passed in 1946. The government of the day, and whether it is Liberal or Conservative it never changes, always blames the other for taking so long to get something done, or for putting an act in place and the other one has to follow through on it. I remind the Liberals that probably for 38 years out of the past 50 years their party was the government so that excuse no longer washes.

I also understand from a departmental briefing that changes to the Canadian Labour Code are needed regarding employees in nuclear industries if we do not want to have the federal government intervening in labour matters which are more properly dealt with by the provincial governments. This is a concern. I sincerely hope somebody has ensured that the changes were made. That was mentioned in a departmental briefing yesterday afternoon. They also mentioned that an update was needed on that point. I would appreciate it if the minister or the parliamentary secretary could confirm that for me.

• (1950)

Another concern arises where the federal government possibly will not do all in its power to eliminate overlap and duplication with the provinces by delegating responsibility for administration and inspection. Would there be one environmental assessment needed for the federal government and the provinces? Another is provincial inspections for normal health and safety of employees. The provinces could add radioactivity which would then not require that a separate federal inspector race around the country checking on this.

I caution that every effort must be made to protect the safety of Canadians as cost effectively as possible. Nuclear disasters are a terrible risk to all of us and we have to have zero tolerance for serious accidents. We also recognize that uranium has tremendous potential to supply the energy needs of future generations, once adequate research has resolved the problems of the safe disposal of nuclear waste.

We also recognize that uranium mining and milling is a developing industry which is significant for provinces such as Saskatchewan. The regulatory process must be kept clear, timely and based on science rather than politics or fearmongering.

I also wonder about this government when, on a trade mission, it sells a nuclear reactor to China. Yet there seems to be great concern in this country, especially from the Reform Party, on human rights in that country. Where is the government coming from? Is it more in love with the almighty dollar than it is with human rights? I am concerned about this.

In conclusion, when I was young I read the story about Rip van Winkle. I would have to say that after 50 years it is Rip van Liberals. Something hit them on the head and they woke up to the fact that they had to make this outdated policy more modern. They say it may be better late than never and I guess it is better late than never.

We will support the bill. It is long overdue. I can do nothing but blame this government for the length of time it has taken.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to replace the 1946 Atomic Energy Control Act. It is destined to remedy some of the problems encountered in the existing act and replace the Atomic Energy Control Board with a nuclear safety commission as described in Bill C-23.

It seems to me one area of progress is that the new commission will have the authority to order remedial actions and seek financial guarantees for the decommissioning of nuclear facilities. This is a very important central theme when it comes to nuclear power. This is important because in May 1995 the auditor general estimated that nuclear waste disposal solutions will cost at least \$10 billion, I repeat \$10 billion, over the next 70 years. He estimated that the

Government Orders

federal government's share of this cost would be around \$850 million minimum, and that this cost could increase if the federal government had to assume responsibilities for nuclear waste producers who fail to meet the clean-up and decommissioning obligations.

• (1955)

This bill requires that all reactors and mines produce decommissioning plans by as early as January 1, 1997 which include cost estimates for so-called cradle to grave waste management responsibilities associated with the facility. This is a very good initiative embodied in the bill.

In a cursory look at the bill itself, the language in clause 24(5) needs to be strengthened to ensure that licences necessarily contain a condition that the applicant provide a financial guarantee in a form and to an extent acceptable to the commission itself.

Every effort must be made to ensure that the real cost of nuclear power production is absorbed by the producers and consumers. It must not be externalized, postponed or pushed into the future to be paid for at some later date by the Canadian public.

At the present time, the decommissioning and nuclear waste disposal costs at Ontario Hydro are carried as an internal debt. In other words, as far as I was able to determine, no real dollars are being set aside for future decommissioning. Perhaps it is being done on paper, but that is the extent of the provision being made right now for future generations. When needed, Ontario Hydro would then borrow the money.

I have been informed by the Minister of Natural Resources that it is Ontario Hydro's intention to change this practice in the near future and to begin to set aside real dollars in an external fund. This is an urgent matter. When the time for decommissioning comes, one is not certain that the utility will be in a position to borrow the required funds. Only through setting aside dollars in an external special fund that is known and visible to the public can the long term interest of the public be properly served.

In addition to setting aside real funds for decommissioning reactors, the cradle to grave management of nuclear waste also requires that an appropriate amount be set aside for that purpose. Here again the auditor general has warned us of the magnitude of the nuclear waste problem over the next decades. It seems only reasonable to say at this stage that the new commission must ensure the necessary funds be made available.

For example, there are some 130 tonnes of radioactive sand in Elliot Lake which must be stabilized. By contrast in the United States, there are only 200 million tonnes of radioactive tailings. By law there, the tailings must be properly stabilized. Mining companies have already spent \$2 billion to accomplish this. Here in Canada the mining company in Elliot Lake is talking of posting

Government Orders

some \$4 million in the form of a bond to cover the stabilization of the tailings. You can see the difference in approach, Mr. Speaker.

• (2000)

It is hoped the new commission will ensure that in both the private and the public sectors—I hope the production of nuclear electricity will be in the public sector—the full cost of nuclear power will be paid by producers and consumers from start to end, from production to the final disposition of the spent materials, from cradle to grave as it is commonly said.

Another aspect of this bill requires attention. Bill C-23, which is entitled an act to establish the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and to make consequential amendments to other acts, allows for the incorporation of provincial laws in the nuclear safety and control act and the delegation of administration and enforcement to the provinces. This legislation could lead to the devolution of regulatory powers for nuclear energy to the provinces. With provincial budget cuts of the magnitude that have been announced, for instance in Ontario, one wonders whether the delegation of administration and enforcement is desirable and in the public interest.

Premier Harris and his government have shown a real interest in deregulation in areas of environmental protection and public responsibility by government. For instance, the Ontario government's red tape commission is presently examining proposals to increase toxic effluents from mines into water bodies. Second, the omnibus Bill 26 opens up conservation areas for development. If this were not enough, omnibus Bill 26 shifts the liability for abandoned mines and tailing sites from the private to the public sector.

The risks associated with nuclear power are, as we all know, to be watched. They require direct federal regulatory approaches. They require a federal presence, a federal responsibility in order to ensure the safety of Canadians and their environment.

In a cursory review of the bill, I notice that clause 24 needs to be strengthened. I would say the same for clause 42 which deals with indemnity and liability under the Nuclear Liability Act, and for clause 46 which deals with the treatment of contaminated land.

The Nuclear Liability Act must be mentioned in this debate because it is an act that needs to be revisited. It needs to be strengthened. The liability in our statutory legislation is too low. Times, costs, inflation and other factors require that the government bring this legislation to the House and modify, increase and modernize the approach that was perhaps adequate when that legislation was passed a few decades ago but is no longer adequate now. Therefore I urge the government to bring the Nuclear Liability Act into this House with the necessary amendments.

• (2005)

I would like to make two points. First, the nuclear industry is most likely the most subsidized industry in Canada. It has received, since its inception, over \$5 billion of direct payments. Even now, in times of austerity, we will find an item in the budget of the Department of Natural Resources for a direct grant which exceeds \$100 million, maybe in the range of \$142 million or \$145 million. Last year it was twice as much. It is an industry that is constantly being subsidized by the public at large. It is a subsidy that must come to an end. If everybody has to tighten their belts, from those who have to go on unemployment insurance to those who receive pensions, then the subsidies to industry also have to stop.

Second, our dependence on oil and nuclear sources of energy has to be examined and gradually changed. We need to plan for the future by shifting our dependence from the non-renewables such as fossil fuels and our dependence on the renewables as represented by the rather costly and, at times, dangerous nuclear source of energy to renewable sources.

However, in order to do that research and development have to be activated. Emphasis should be shifted from the continuous support for nuclear and fossil fuels to sources that range from biomass to solar and other forms of energy that are definitely within reach if the funds are put into research and development that are required in order to enhance and accelerate the process of reaching these potential alternatives that are definitely available to humanity.

Therefore, I hope this bill represents a temporary measure. It recognizes our dependence on nuclear power. I call on the government to ensure that this dependence is not increased, that the constant subsidization of the nuclear industry is eliminated, that we ensure that the liability is adequate, and that we move to the discovery of technologies that will provide Canadians and society at large with clean and safe sources of energy.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I know the members opposite are keen to hear another speech on Bill C-23, the nuclear safety act.

As members know, I have a new role within the party and I do not have a lot to do with this bill, but I did spend several months as the critic in the natural resource area and did quite a bit of work in this area. Therefore, I would just like to make a few comments before the bill passes.

As has been mentioned already by our critic, Reform members will be supporting this bill, but there are a few things we would like to see changed. However, this is a good bill and long overdue.

The comments made by the hon. member for Davenport were, by and large, very accurate and very well taken. His concern with the

Government Orders

decommissioning costs, with the true costs of the creation of electrical power from nuclear energy being reflected in the cost to the consumer, is an accurate statement and something that has not been done. It has created an enormous liability for the federal government and provincial governments, but specifically for the federal government as it is on the hook for billions of dollars. That is an unfortunate and should have been addressed years ago. This bill starts the process of correcting that but it has been a long time coming.

• (2010)

We can do a few things to strengthen the bill. It has been mentioned by several people that the bill has been a long time coming. The minister promised it a year ago, again last fall and it finally came in this spring. We are grateful for it after a 50-year wait. It increases some of the fines and punishments that can be dished out. The existing punishments are ridiculously low. A maximum of \$10,000 can be charged under the old act, which is a laughable amount.

The bill deals with the overlap and duplication of arrangements between provinces and the federal government. However, Reformers have several concerns about the bill.

First and most important is the treatment of radioactive waste. I mentioned that the bill has been a long time coming. While we have been waiting, in the last year or two there have been developments which are placing the federal government and the taxpayers on the hook for big bucks. It is going to end up costing a lot of money.

This has been delayed not only by this government but by previous Liberal governments that had introduced bills and then let them die on the Order Paper. It was introduced by the Conservatives who also let it die. Now finally, hopefully, we can get through the bill quickly and get royal assent.

In 1994 the Atomic Energy Control Board Secretary General J.G. McManus said about the old Atomic Energy Control Act:

The deficiencies of the Atomic Energy Control Act have been noted by the courts, the media, special interest groups and parliamentary committees. They include the lack of formal powers for AECB inspectors, an inadequate ceiling on the \$10,000 on fines, no stated provision for public hearings, lack of explicit power to recover the cost of regulation from the users, an inability to hold polluters financially accountable for their actions or for the AECB to initiate remedial action and recover the costs—the AECB is handicapped by its statutory underpinnings which reflect the needs of another age.

This is really a synopsis of the speech by the hon. member for Davenport and almost a synopsis of mine. However, I should go through it in just a little more detail for the hon. member opposite.

There are no nuclear reactors in British Columbia. It is not a big issue and I doubt that it ever will be because I do not think that there is a chance to get public approval for a nuclear energy plant in British Columbia. I cannot foresee that day. However, people in B.C. are very environmentally concerned and this is very high on their list of concerns. As taxpayers they are also concerned about the amount of money that may be required to fix this long lasting nuclear problem.

Nuclear waste is a big problem. To dispose of low level waste in Ontario is going to cost at least \$300 million. That is just an estimate. If anything goes wrong in the transportation or the disposal it could be much higher. That is just \$300 million to start.

I have been to the high level waste test sites where they are trying to find ways to dispose of the high level wastes in Pinawa. To bury this high level waste will cost from \$13 billion to \$16 billion and that is just an estimate. If track records mean anything it is likely to be much higher. The problem for everybody across Canada is that the tab will have to be picked up by the Canadian taxpayer.

I think members on the other side are trying to make the nuclear sign with their hands. So I will go on for a bit longer about this particular cause.

Over the last 20 years if there had been a fund established to look after the decommissioning costs of the nuclear sites and the wastes generated, then this would almost be a housekeeping bill. No one would much care about the details because at least the dollars would have been looked after. However, there was nothing set up 20 years ago and billions of dollars are going to have to be paid by a generation that did not benefit from that electrical energy.

• (2015)

This is a principle which I would hope the Liberal government would pay attention to on more issues. The government is now concerned that the generation which will benefit from this electrical power should be the one that pays for it. If we translated that into other government legislation, we would not have a national debt which is pushing \$600 billion.

If the government was concerned about ensuring that the generation which is benefiting from programs or benefiting from government largesse was the one paying the bills, who could argue with that? However, governments have saddled future generations with excessively high tax rates and problems such as this one which will cost billions of dollars to correct.

When I talk to high school students about this intergenerational transfer of wealth and the fact that people in the federal government have been satisfied to saddle them with these bills, they are upset. We cannot blame them. They will be paying the taxes, the pensions, UI premiums and everything else at excessively high

Government Orders

rates. When I mention to them that there will be another \$13 billion or \$15 billion for a nuclear clean-up and that their environmentally conscious generation will have to pay the bills which their fathers and grandfathers ran up, they are not impressed. It is not right.

The principle should be that if we create an environmental mess, we should clean it up. If the government has a problem, it should pay for it now. It should not ask our children and our children's children to clean up the mess which is being created now. Procrastination has created the problems. It is unfair both financially and environmentally to put off what should have been done a long time ago.

With respect to the funding of the clean-up, there is no fund in place. It is a real problem. There are some bookkeeping entries and yes there is an obligation. However, as the hon. member for Davenport has pointed out, there is no fund. If it is going to cost \$10 billion or \$20 billion to clean up this mess and we ask where the money will come from, the government will say that it will come out of general revenue when the time comes. That may be 10 or 20 years from now. If that is not another intergenerational transfer of wealth I do not know what is.

The government is going to ask somebody to pay for it down the road. When we think of the clean up of the tailings from mines, the clean up of some sites such as the Bruce power plant and so on, we should start setting aside a significant amount of dollars now so that the current consumers and producers will fund those clean-ups. Reformers believe that the policy of pay as you go certainly applies to environmental clean-ups and definitely to the nuclear industry.

In April I received a letter from the Saskatchewan minister of energy and mines, the hon. Eldon Lautermilch. It was in response to a letter I had written to him concerning this legislation. He said that there was concern about overlap and duplication in the regulation of the uranium mining and milling operations and that therefore they were disappointed with the limited provisions within the act to delegate administration to the provinces.

That lack of ability to delegate responsibility is something we will address in committee with an amendment to try to at least give the power to delegate. In other words, we will try to reduce the amount of duplication between the federal and provincial governments and allow the federal government to delegate to the provinces on that issue. Saskatchewan would be the major benefactor of that.

• (2020)

We have suggested that the act could be amended to allow for a clearer division of responsibilities between the federal and provincial governments in the whole area of the clean up of the tailings from uranium mines that have now been decommissioned. There

are problems with leaching and with who is responsible for the clean up. On the one hand it is a provincial resource and on the other hand it has been regulated by the federal government. We have to solve the financial mess and the environmental mess that goes with that.

We have general concerns about the independence of the board from politicians. We do not want a board that is made up of people who have been appointed because they have a paid up Liberal card. We want to make sure that people who are appointed to this board, a superboard with superpowers, will be qualified and will be the right people.

We have suggested that board members not be appointed by a House of Commons standing committee but could be approved or vetoed by the committee. In other words, let us have people who have general qualifications. They could come before a committee and say what they were going to do and why they should have the job regardless of their political background and we could be satisfied with their qualifications. That would be an improvement as well.

We have a small problem with the make up of the board. In 1985 the Nielsen commission said the board was too small and the size of the board has been increased somewhat. That was a good idea but it has still been left that just two members have to be full time members. We think two full time members on this board is not going to be enough. This board is going to have a lot of powers and a lot of responsibilities. With the responsibilities the board has been given under this act, more members will be need.

This new act is going to add legitimacy to this commission. The confidence Canadians have in the nuclear industry will increase if they see that the commission has powers and follows through on some of the problems that the member for Davenport, the auditor general, the Nielsen report and other reports have consistently identified for all to see.

To give Ontario credit, hearings on the nuclear industry have been held from time to time and in times past all these hearings have been public hearings. But the act does not specify that any hearings relating to the nuclear industry must be public hearings. It should be changed so that hearings must be held. Canadians can then be assured that the process is very open and that nothing is hidden from them and nothing is being done behind closed doors.

I know the government, given its track record for example on constitutional issues, would never want to do something behind closed doors I am sure. Well maybe I am not entirely convinced but certainly that is an amendment we will be proposing because we want things out in the open.

In conclusion, we welcome this act. As it goes to committee we are going to find widespread agreement on the act.

Government Orders

I will put in a little plug for my private member's bill which also deals with the nuclear industry and the need for liability insurance in order to protect the Canadian taxpayer and the Canadian public. There is some room for that which is not addressed in this act. There is a necessity to update the nuclear industry regulation into the 21st century so that Canadians can have confidence that the regulation and control of the industry will make it as safe as possible.

• (2025)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

* * *

REGULATIONS ACT

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that Bill C-25, an act respecting regulations and other documents, including the review, registration, publication and parliamentary scrutiny of regulations and other documents, and to make consequential and related amendments to other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill C-25, the new regulations act, be approved in principle.

Let me say how pleased we are to have had the benefit of prestudy by a subcommittee of the government operations committee in the last session. Even though the subcommittee's hearings were interrupted by the prorogation, the input we received has allowed us to make some slight technical modifications to the bill that result in an overall improvement without altering the substance of the bill. We are very much appreciative of the assistance provided by the government operations subcommittee and the members of the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations who sat on the subcommittee.

Regulatory reform continues to be an area of broad interest to Canadians. There are many avenues which the government is pursuing in a way to improve the way it regulates. The new regulations act offers important improvements to the Canadian system of regulation established almost a quarter of a century ago by the Statutory Instruments Act. This act will streamline the regulatory process and reduce delays in the current process by which regulations are made at the federal level in Canada. This will allow regulations to be changed more readily to respond to new circumstances and needs.

Although these reforms were announced as part of this government's broader efforts toward building a more innovative economy and improving jobs and growth, the problems created by the current regulatory process have been identified many times during the past few years. Calls for changes have been most recently heard in the course of the public consultations that took place during the government wide regulatory review in 1992 and 1993. As well, the reforms aim to modernize and reform the legal framework for regulation making at the federal level.

The Statutory Instruments Act was designed for an earlier era of regulation. It is complex, cumbersome, slow and overburdened and this imposes a real cost to all Canadians. Outdated and inappropriate regulatory schemes can impact negatively on respect for law, competitiveness and economic growth as well as upon the working relations of the regulated private sector and government regulators.

Outdated regulatory schemes that are not well tailored to changing circumstances increase the government costs of obtaining compliance. Delays in modernizing and improving regulatory schemes reduce the ability of government to respond to new developments in the fields of health, safety, the environment, international trade and federal-provincial relations.

• (2030)

The negative impact of a slow and cumbersome regulatory process is also experienced by Canadian businesses because of outdated and inappropriate regulations that tend to reduce competitiveness and economic growth, generally speaking.

The limitations and the delays that are created by the existing regulation making system result in hidden, but very real, costs to all Canadians in the form of increased expenditure of revenues spent in enforcing outdated and inappropriate regulations and reduced competitiveness in the global marketplace.

No one could seriously dispute that the current regulatory process must be reformed in order to keep pace with the current realities of regulation in the 1990s and into the 21st century. Bill C-25 will improve the regulatory process for the benefit of all Canadians. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that reform of the Statutory Instruments Act calls for a careful balancing of different interests.

Government Orders

In the new act, the objectives of streamlining, simplifying and expediting the regulation making process are achieved without compromising equally important goals of ensuring adequate opportunity for notice, public comment and effective oversight by Parliament of the creation of binding, subordinate legislation.

It is important, therefore, to emphasize that the reforms being proposed in the regulations act are largely technical improvements that would not radically alter the existing process. Rather, they will clarify existing legal uncertainties that give rise to debate and delay, simplify steps where appropriate and modernize the process.

I would like to emphasize that the new regulations act will preserve and strengthen the fundamental principles and objectives of the Statutory Instruments Act, which provides legal safeguards necessary in making binding laws such as regulations.

These objectives include ensuring the legality, transparency and accessibility of regulations and providing a meaningful opportunity for parliamentary oversight of the executive in the exercise of this law making power.

The new act will improve the capacity of government to respond quickly and effectively to public concerns as well as to changing rapidly for the circumstances of the global economy. It will also reduce the overall volume of regulations that go through the system and provide an expedited process, where appropriate, and allow for a more effective use of incorporation by reference. It will create a framework for achieving important administrative improvements in the way government departments handle regulation making as well.

By facilitating amendment or replacing an outdated regulatory scheme, regulating departments will be better placed to implement new ideas about how to regulate more effectively, and at a lower cost, to all Canadians.

The reforms found in Bill C-25 will create a new regulations act that will be better tailored to the contemporary regulatory climate.

I would like to briefly outline some of the key elements of reform that are found in this bill. They are a simpler, more principled definition of regulation and other plain language improvements; an appropriate view of different classes of documents, including an expedited process for documents that do not require legal review; a revised exemption power that will now be subject to an express public interest consideration; a codification and clarification of the law by expressly authorizing the incorporation by reference of international and other standards into regulations, subject to an express accessibility requirement; a modernized process that allows for the creation of an electronic registry of regulations; and finally, maintenance for government accountability for regulations through parliamentary scrutiny.

• (2035)

The new regulations act will relieve the system of documents that do not need to be subject to the regulatory process or at least to the whole process, either because they are not substantive or truly regulatory in the sense of establishing generally binding rules of conduct, or because their legality and accessibility are assured in some other way. This will allow the attention as well as the resources of the regulatory process and of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations to be focused on the important legal instruments that warrant that attention.

With respect to the provisions on incorporation by reference, it is important to understand that they do not create a new regulatory technique. They merely clarify and codify a legal technique that is currently being widely used across Canada, and whose legitimacy has been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada. This technique is widely employed in Europe and has been advocated by the Standards Council of Canada and many international bodies, including the International Standards Organization in Geneva.

Incorporation of standards into regulations, particularly as they are amended from time to time, is an important way for government to promote the goals of international and intergovernmental harmonization of regulatory standards. Reliance on the expertise and timeliness of international and interprovincial standards writing organizations is of significant value in promoting Canadian competitiveness, particularly in contexts of rapid technological change. The usefulness of this technique in promoting Canadian competitiveness was recognized in the 1993 report of the finance subcommittee on regulations and competitiveness.

I am confident that ministers and cabinet can be relied on to ensure that incorporation by reference of standards that exist as of a certain date or as amended from time to time will be employed in appropriate circumstances and that the bodies creating the standards are expert and reliable such that Canadians will be satisfied with the standards that are being adopted.

While these provisions on incorporation by reference simply reflect the current law and practice, I would like to draw members' attention to the fact that we are also proposing a significant improvement over the current practice in that the new regulations act would create an expressed statutory duty on regulating departments to ensure that incorporated materials are accessible.

I also want to emphasize that the improvements offered by Bill C-25 will not be at the cost of the equally important objectives of the regulatory process, including necessary parliamentary review of regulations. The new act will not only preserve but strengthen the role currently played by the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations by providing that all regulations that meet the new simplified but principled definition of regulations will stand permanently referred to that committee, together with all other documents that are required to be registered. The standing joint committee will be free at any time to call for review and

comment on regulations that incorporate materials, and in so doing will have access as well to the incorporated material. The structure of the current Statutory Instruments Act limits the instruments that are referred to the standing joint committee in a way that the proposed act will not do.

• (2040)

Clear cost savings and environmental benefits will result from the proposed electronic registry with a reduced reliance on paper. The registry will also ultimately provide regulated communities, interest groups and the public generally with quicker and more direct means of consultation and commentary on proposed regulatory changes.

We are well aware that not all Canadians are computer literate yet and that access to laws published in paper form will continue to be the method of choice for many Canadians. Therefore, I would like to emphasize that the proposed electronic system is intended to supplement and not replace the existing system of paper, publication and access. Regulations will continue to be widely available in paper format. They will be published in the *Canada Gazette* which is accessible through local libraries and by subscription. Under the act paper copies can also be requested from the Office of the Clerk of the Privy Council or from the departments responsible for the regulations.

The regulatory process provided for in the Statutory Instruments Act is too complex and burdensome to be able to keep pace with the changing regulatory needs. The overall effect of the reforms contained in Bill C-25 will be less stress on the existing system by reducing the number and volume of regulations subject to the general regulatory process while preserving the important value embodied in the original scheme.

The result will be a system that is more responsive and efficient, which will be in a better position to give the federal government a renewal that modernizes the existing regulatory process and put in place regulatory schemes that better address the need and the interests of Canadians, both the general public and the regulated communities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have to speak to Bill C-25, entitled Regulations Act. This bill had been introduced in the House last fall under the number C-84. Before that, there was the famous Bill C-62, the Regulatory Efficiency Act. I think the hon. member for Fundy—Royal remembers it. Bill C-62 died on the Order Paper and, as he was saying, Bill C-84 was introduced last fall.

Government Orders

I believe the hon. member for Fundy—Royal should remember the saying that the bird that sings best does not always sing the longest. He would certainly have heaped less praise on Bill C-84. I would just like to remind him that I was a member of the sub-committee he mentioned. That sub-committee convened once to set up and, a second time, for about half an hour, in the building facing us, to meet the officials who came to explain the bill to us. Unfortunately, that meeting was interrupted by the bell calling us in. We came to vote and, after that, we never heard about the sub-committee on Bill C-84.

We had made some recommendations to the justice department, particularly to the solicitor general of Canada. We had told him it would be worthwhile to examine that bill in committee, before second reading, because of its effects on the daily lives of businesses, of citizens, of all Canadians. That committee should have been made up of members of the Joint Standing Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations.

• (2045)

As you know a committee was created some 20 years ago, pursuant to Standing Order 90, I believe, namely the Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, which I co-chair with Senator Lewis. The main purpose of this committee is to scrutinize all regulations under federal legislation. The work load of the committee is staggering. Every year, we must study between 800 and 1,000 statutory instruments. We report to the House and make recommendations to the department concerned. We have a team of lawyers working for the committee.

This committee of experts would have been in the best position to give advice to the House. We know what happened last fall. The House adjourned for the Christmas recess. In February, the session was prorogued to the end of February. All the bills which had died on the Order Paper reappeared on the legislative agenda under a different number and Bill C-84 became C-25. In spite of these cosmetic changes, the content of the bill is still the same.

When I told my colleague opposite that sometimes the bird that sings best does not sing the longest I meant that, if I were him, I would not have dared to praise this bill and present it to the House as if it were the best thing since sliced bread. On the contrary, I believe the member should think twice about it, and I am going to give him arguments which hopefully will make him change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, your silence tells me you support my approach. Silence gives consent, obviously. Through you, I will make my arguments known to the member for Fundy—Royal. Regulation is defined as a series of rules established and enforced by the state to limit or clarify the nature of a society's economic and social

Government Orders

activity. Regulation is made following the adoption of a law. That is our rule, the one we know now, the one that has always prevailed in this Parliament.

In practice, most regulations are drafted and adopted by Cabinet. There are an average of 800 new regulations each year. They deal with all kinds of things, some very significant, others less significant, from the diameter of dimes to the fission of the atom. Regulations are always important and must be consistent with the spirit and letter of the enabling act. So, in practice, regulations are proposed by Cabinet and adopted by the governor-in-council.

Regulation has become the most common form of public intervention. It would be unthinkable to monopolize the House and its 295 members every time a regulatory change is needed. If the House was called upon to make these changes, it would soon be completely paralysed. The regulatory process is something useful that we all want.

It is governed by the Statutory Instruments Act. The revision process was initiated in January 1993 when the finance committee called for a comprehensive review of the regulatory process. Bill C-25 is the final result of this reform undertaken more than three years ago.

• (2050)

As I said earlier, it is almost identical to its predecessor, Bill C-84, which was introduced during the first session of this 35th Parliament. In December 1993, the subcommittee on regulations and competitiveness of the Standing Committee on Finance of the House of Commons released its report entitled *Regulations and Competitiveness*, in which it included the results of its analysis of the impact of regulations on competitiveness.

The then Conservative government gave the report a rather good reception. The Bloc Québécois does not deny the fact that the current process can sometimes, and I would go as far as saying quite often, lead to delays and thus additional costs. So, it was in everyone's best interest to try to review the regulatory process so that our corporations which rely on it could benefit from it, by reducing their production costs or simply their operation costs.

The objectives of the parliamentarians were to develop a regulatory system that could produce a high quality product while eliminating all the garbage by improving the drafting, implementation and evaluation of regulations.

Since several recommendations found in the subcommittee report support a more comprehensive framework for the regulatory process and for the role played by the Treasury Board president and secretariat in that process, the government should have included in Bill C-25 additional obligations at some other stages of the regulatory process.

For instance, the government could have racked its brains a bit more—although that is not its forte—and tried to elaborate some more on the decision to regulate. It could have asked parliamentarians or the appropriate authority to hold hearings and consultations, to develop the regulations and do a cost-benefit analysis of the regulations.

It could also have defined the powers of the Treasury Board president and secretariat. Thus the government would have respected the will of the elected members of the last Parliament and put into place a more restrictive legislative framework for the civil servants. Remember this: the legislative framework is the watchdog of the subdelegation of powers as we see it.

If we let the civil servants do as they want, without any legal restriction whatsoever, we may after a while find ourselves with legal monsters, a court overload never ever seen before and administrative costs a hundred times higher than those we wanted to avoid in the first place with this defective regulation.

What I understand also is that, since the administration of justice is a provincial responsibility, the federal government keeps its money and sees to it that others foot the bill. It legislates on principles but never on anything more definite. It says: "The courts will decide." But the provinces are the ones who pay the courts. They are the ones who pay the judges. That costs a bundle.

What is saved with one hand is spent with the other. The hon. member for Fundy—Royal did not dwell on that because he is not known for helping taxpayers or the provinces save money.

As it is, Bill C-25 does not provide any framework for the regulatory powers of the Treasury Board. Several stages of the regulatory process, that is, the decision making, the preparation of the regulation, the consultation of all those concerned and the cost-benefit analysis, remain the responsibility of the civil servants pursuant to Bill C-25.

The President of the Treasury Board is under no legal obligation to develop such directives and the regulatory agencies are under no legal obligation to respect them. This is swell.

I will take Bill C-25 as is but I will not examine it in detail.

• (2055)

I will not do a clause-by-clause review. However, I must admit there are some good things. First off I said we must try to reduce costs associated with the regulation process as well as the repercussions it can have on businesses.

Section 2 of the old Statutory Instruments Act gave an ambiguous definition of statutory instruments or regulations. It was confusing. Sooner or later, lawyers from the department or the

private sector take the matter before the courts. Then people complain about the cost.

Therefore we have grouped under the word “regulation” general implementation texts established under a federal law and creating unilaterally binding rules of conduct. This is fine, but we must still take into consideration the way the government sees privatization.

It happens on a regular basis. Airports are privatized. We have autonomous Crown corporations like Post Canada, Atomic Energy of Canada, Telesat Canada and numerous other agencies which are creations of the federal government but still have powers of their own. Their enabling act empowers them to adopt standards and to legislate.

These people, companies, interests, are not touched by Bill C-25. This was a concern for the Standing Committee on scrutiny of regulations, of which I am a joint-chairman. We received complaints from people affected by the regulations. We could easily see there was something wrong. The legislator’s intent had not been respected.

Since their regulation did not stem from a statute of Parliament but rather from an independent agency, we could not check it or make recommendations to the House. Bill C-25 does not change that; the situation will be the same and could even get worse. We talked, for example, about the corporation created from scratch by the federal government to provide air navigation services. That corporation, like others, will be exempt from control under Bill C-25.

Already Bill C-25 has the pernicious, and I almost said perverse and secret effect of excluding all parliamentarians from the decision making process. This is again a new approach, a Liberal type of neo-federalism whereby management is all done behind closed doors. They make regulations which, more often than not, give preference to major contributors to their slush fund.

They can adopt standards that apply only to them, that are profitable only for them. They can do it secretly, without publishing the information so the adversaries will not know about it, so that the Tories will not know that Mr. Bronfman gave to both the Liberals and the Tories. Nothing is published, all is kept secret so everything looks fine.

I can see where they are going. They come here and sit down and say that the past can vouch for the future. It is easy to say that with a \$600 billion debt. It was not the Bloc Quebecois that invented all those standards. My great-grandchildren will still be paying for that debt.

They can very well brag and say that if God had not created them, the world would be coming to an end, but I disagree. It might be the beginning of a better world, since the debt might not be so huge.

Government Orders

I listen to the member for Mount Royal— You know, I think I preferred the great Groulx to Pettigrew.

Mr. Pettigrew: So you prefer that type of approach?

Mr. Lebel: I was referring to the priest.

• (2100)

The regulatory process can be very onerous at times, but democracy has a price. All of us would like everything to be democratic, but we would rather not pay for that. Unfortunately, human beings will be human beings, Mr. Speaker. I know from your silence that you agree. I am sure my remarks are accurate, and I can assure you I have the best intentions. Even the Prime Minister would not stand up to contradict me. And the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel will not do so either, because they know I am right. These people know that governing a country is important, and that the implications are enormous. Sometimes, when we make miserly economies, we run the risk of stalling the economy and doing more harm than good.

I let the hon. member across throw me off track, but I will now go on. I was commenting on a few clauses in the bill. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal has praised incorporation by reference.

It is not that simple. Clause 19 or 20 of the bill, I believe, deals with incorporation by reference. The hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel will no doubt agree that this procedure can be interesting when you need to incorporate things like automobile standards. Instead of putting them in regulations, it is more simple to say that we accept the standards set in such and such a book of specifications by General Motors on such and such a date. That is fine, but incorporation by reference can also have unwanted consequences.

You will recall an incorporation by reference involving the number 6803, which states that calculating pension income for someone who has worked in the U.S. for some years and might be entitled to a pension requires reference to American Government Order no. 6803 to determine the amount of pension. Order 6803, however, may be cost of living indexed, and we who have referred to it, to an authority outside of Canada, attempt to comply because we are not the ones to decide, a foreign government is.

It might have been wise to state, and I am in agreement with the government on this, that when there is incorporation by reference, this may include a foreign government such as the U.S. Government. This is not done, however, and so we find ourselves before the courts, who will tell us that it is unacceptable for a regulation passed in the United States to be applied by reference to Canadians.

There will also be another problem. Some will say that the regulation was adopted in English only in the United States. Does that not contravene section 133 of Canada’s Constitution? This is going to be another problem. The intent was to lower the standards,

Government Orders

and then we will be forced to increase the number of justices on the Supreme Court from 9 to 27 overnight.

So you see, in an effort to make savings, we are going to find ourselves with additional expenditures. Thus, although we start out with good intentions, when laws are badly written, we end up with legal monsters of a sort. It does not look like anything. We cannot make head or tail of it. We do not know what it is. After all, it probably does not amount to much. This could, however, reward and benefit friends of the party, who, thanks to vague and ambiguous documents, could end up getting some kind of norm applying only to them.

• (2105)

One of my constituents, for whom I have the greatest respect, told me he had heard that the post office in Chambly was for sale. It could have been. When you do not need a post office any longer, you sell it. He was interested in bidding for it. So, I called Canada Post to ask if the post office was for sale. I was told that, no, they had not decided to sell it. So I ask for an assurance that if ever it is put up for sale there will be a public call for tenders. They replied: "Oh, no, Mr. Lebel, we cannot give you that assurance". If they wanted to, the post office could even be given away. They are not under any obligation to follow the regulations of the House of Commons, to call for tenders, etc. If they want, they can give it away even if people are willing to pay a good price for that post office.

The only rule Canada Post Corporation has to abide by is that it must come before the House of Commons every year to say it is making profits. As long as there are profits, nobody complains. That is what I was told and I know these people are acting in good faith. They will not give the post office away. However, I know that legally they could do so because they do not come under the control of the House of Commons.

All we are doing here is giving them some appropriations when they are in the red. However, we do not ask them anything when they are making money. In this way, it is always the taxpayer who pays.

What I just said pertains to incorporation by reference. There is another aspect to this bill. It also deals with the publication of bills and regulations. The rules are changed by saying: "The Governor in Council may, by regulation, exempt from the application of the regulatory process a regulation or class of regulations that was prescribed under— the— Act as exempt from examination, registration or publication under that Act immediately before its repeal". There was none. There were not many, but there were still a few.

It says a regulation may be published, but also that it may not be published. No one can be convicted on the basis of the publication of that regulation, if means had not been taken to make it known appropriately. But this provision is rather vague. It says that people

should know about a regulation even though it was not published. They should have realized that; they are smarter than that. There is no strict rule. That is the bill's greatest flaw.

I said at the beginning of my speech that the hon. member for Fundy—Royal should not have been so full of praise; I wonder if he did read the bill.

The Prime Minister is still sitting; he is not rising to his feet because he knows I am right. He will not rise. The leader of the opposition agrees with me on this. The hon. member for Papi-neau—Saint-Michel will not rise either for the same reason. As for the Prime Minister, he is not rising because he agrees with me and will probably send you back to the drawing board since, as you know, this kind of wording makes it impossible to save money.

Mention is made of defence mechanisms. "No person may be convicted of an offence or subjected to a penalty for a contravention of a regulation". The hon. member for Papi-neau—Saint-Michel, who is responsible for international affairs, should listen. He should pay attention to clause 11. The Prime Minister may even step in at this time. Listen to this: "No person may be convicted of an offence or subjected to a penalty for a contravention of a regulation that was not published in accordance with section 10 on or before the date of the alleged contravention".

• (2110)

We are reasonable people. We do not want to convict someone who committed an offence unwittingly, someone who did not comply with unpublished regulations, regulations hidden in the minister's office. Fortunately not in the office of the hon. member for Papi-neau—Saint-Michel.

However, it says here that this person can be convicted of an offence if it is proved that, on or before the date of the alleged contravention, the person had actual notice of the substance of the regulation or reasonable steps had been taken to bring its substance to the notice of persons likely to be affected by it.

Again, what constitutes reasonable steps? Whatever seems reasonable to us invariably seems unreasonable to them. I guess the opposite is also true: What is reasonable to them can seem unreasonable to us. How can an agreement be reached then, if not through a tribunal, which will have the unenviable task of determining what is reasonable and what is not? I say to the Minister for International Cooperation that this is what I call poorly designed legislation. And I know that his department would not go for this kind of an enactment. He could not show up in Europe with something like this; they would send him packing, and I know he can do better than that.

I must tell the minister that we, the humble people living in Canada, do not find it easy to submit to such legislative imperatives. It is not easy, especially when we are told that, from now on, the regulations will be hidden and will be administered in such a

Government Orders

way that the taxpayer will not even know what is happening. It is their friends who will benefit. It reminds me of what family trusts did with \$2 billion and was discovered two or three years after the fact.

In any case, I can tell you that my father did not benefit from these \$2 billion. Look elsewhere, but not in our house.

There is something wrong in all this, and yet it is still going on. And this is nothing, just think of Bill C-62. I wonder if we are not having the same problem with Bill C-64, or Bill C-25 as it is now called, as we did with Bill C-62 regarding the standards of practice, since what is not prohibited in a statutory instrument is permitted.

So, there was a general outcry. The media were quick to react, saying that this was not possible, that it was impossible to pass a measure such as Bill C-62. The minister backed off. He could no longer go ahead. He was knocked out, if I can put it that way.

I wonder if, with Bill C-84, we are now once again facing the harmful effects of Bill C-62, but in an even more insidious way. This would really be dangerous. We would be missing an opportunity to reduce costs and all that, setting absolutely unbelievable precedents and leaving the door wide open to astronomical legal costs to correct these situations through the courts.

Therefore, the Bloc Quebecois will vote against this bill. We could not vote in favour of it, despite the fact that initially I detected some rather interesting ideas in it, but there are too few good ones as opposed to bad ones.

My mother, who is not as young as she used to be, was very well brought up. She did not want us to use certain words. One day, I got a nail through a foot and the wound looked real bad; my mother, not wanting to call a spade a spade, said that the wound was full of rust and bad stuff. Well, this is it: your bill is full of rust and bad stuff. You should amend it and put forward something palatable, reasonable and transparent. I am sure that this time the Prime Minister, even at this late hour, will jump up and applaud his ministers' initiative.

The Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member concluded his remarks? Concluded.

The hon. minister wants the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Pettigrew: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

• (2115)

The Deputy Speaker: Colleagues, the hon. member has finished his remarks. The minister wishes to raise a point of order, and he now has the floor first.

Mr. Pettigrew: Mr. Speaker, being a new member of Parliament, I would like some advice. The hon. member opposite has repeatedly mentioned a member who is not here, suggesting that he should jump to his feet because of the outlandish statements he made during his speech. I wonder if this behaviour is parliamentary.

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleague that the last speaker never mentioned the presence or absence of another member. If the hon. member is present, then he will no doubt jump to his feet, but if he is absent, the expression was no doubt used in a figurative sense. But since nobody mentioned the presence or absence of that other member, I think this is not a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: This is interesting but it is quite obvious that the hon. member did not say that the member in question is not here. The hon. member for Joliette is quite right.

[English]

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, judging by that last little go round you can tell this is a long, hot summer night. We are so fortunate to be here in the House discussing Bill C-25, which could only come from the minds of Liberals. The bill is a very complex piece of legislation. It is difficult to read, it is difficult to interpret and it is difficult to discuss. It is typical Liberal legislation.

As a matter of fact the bill could almost be called frightening from the perspective of the average Canadian. Understanding the intent of the bill, which is suspect in itself, and based on reading the text, it is a challenge.

We Reformers are up to challenges from the Liberals when they bring in complex legislation, thinking that perhaps the average Canadian whom we represent is not going to understand it. We are the watchdogs. We are leading the charge for average Canadians. We attempt to clarify complex bills with which the Liberal government tries to fool the people.

Despite the complexity of the bill, it is clear that the government is following a trend which has already been set in other parliamentary democracies, like Australia. It is hard to believe but the trend is toward simplification and streamlining of the regulatory process. That is also hard to believe coming from the Liberal Party. It is to make the regulatory process more compatible with the present day needs of commerce, government and the public.

Goodness knows, if there is one thing the public, commerce and government need is more simplified regulations. Any chamber of commerce, any business organization will tell you it costs Canadian consumers and businesses billions and billions of dollars a year because ineffective and unnecessary regulations are still on the books that some government in the past has put in place.

Government Orders

What this country really needs, and what this government should do, instead of trying to put in complex legislation, is do a cost test on every regulation we have and find out whether it is really worthwhile or whether it is just sitting there in a redundant state. There is no doubt that streamlining and simplification, in itself, are both desirable and necessary. However, we found a flaw in this bill and it is a deadly flaw. There is no provision for disallowance. In other words, the regulatory committee, the watchdog of the regulations, cannot disallow a regulation that is unlawful or ultra vires.

• (2120)

My colleague, the member for North Vancouver, sits on the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations. It is a committee made up of members from the House and from the Senate. The task of the committee is to examine regulations that have been made by the government and its departments in order to determine whether they are legal and consistent with the intent of the legislation under which they are made.

The vast majority of the regulations that pass through the committee are entirely in order. They may not be good regulations but from a legal point they are entirely in order. They generally require no comment.

A small percentage have to be followed up with the department involved. Quite often the problem is simply a matter of correcting minor differences in the meaning between the English and French versions of the regulations or clarifying the meaning if a misinterpretation is a possibility.

As I said, under this bill the committee does not have the power to disallow a regulation which is ultra vires or unlawful. This power is rarely used, but nevertheless is a very important power for the committee to retain. I think most Liberals would agree with me on this. The regulation watchdog must have the ability to enforce its decisions or those decisions could be rendered meaningless.

Bill C-25 makes the provision for regulations to be referred to the committee, but contains no provisions for disallowance. This means that even if the committee found that a regulation was illegal, it simply could not disallow the regulation.

It is the failure to include a disallowance procedure that makes Bill C-25 significantly different from the streamlining legislation passed in Australia. That government had the foresight to put in a disallowance clause so that the committee could do some meaningful work and make some meaningful decisions.

My colleague from North Vancouver, in his wisdom and in his common sense, introduced a private member's bill that would add a disallowance procedure to Bill C-25.

Everyone in this place knows that the chances of a private member's bill, no matter how good it is, no matter how much

common sense it contains, no matter how it would help democracy in this place, no matter how much it would make the lives of Canadians better, no matter how much it would make the lives of Canadian business people better, has very little chance of getting through this House.

The reason sits right across the way. This Liberal government allows very few private member's bills to proceed. I can talk personally about that. I knew halfway through this speech I would get to this private member's bill problem.

My Bill C-201, for example, deals with the sentencing of drunk drivers who kill. Liberals know it is a bill that the Canadian people want. They know it is a bill that is long overdue. They know it is a bill that is going to create a deterrent to people who drink and drive, and as a result, kill.

• (2125)

A Liberal legal mind is telling me that because of some legal complication my bill cannot be put through. Despite these legal minds in the Liberal Party or maybe because of these legal minds in the Liberal Party, they are unable to understand what the average Canadian wants.

We have presented thousands and thousands of names on petitions demanding that Bill C-201 go through, at least to committee. This Liberal government, through the whip, through the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, has not allowed any Liberal member who wanted to speak in favour of this bill to speak. That is shameful, absolutely shameful.

My colleague from North Vancouver introduced a private member's bill that would add a disallowance procedure to Bill C-25. Everyone in this place, because of the hard headedness of this Liberal government—I take that back, soft headedness—

Mr. Solomon: Empty headedness.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I will be more kind than my friend from the NDP, although he is correct.

No matter how much merit it has, the Liberal government will not let that private member's bill go through. As a result of its decisions Bill C-278, the private member's bill to have a disallowance procedure in this legislation, was defeated by that party.

The real responsibility for the failure to provide a disallowance procedure lies fairly and squarely with the Minister of Justice. This is not the only mistake that has made since he came to this House.

The Minister of Justice, despite several requests by our party, still has not explained why he refuses to incorporate that disallowance procedure. He has simply not allowed that procedure to go through, and has given no rationale or explanation.

Adjournment Debate

QUEBEC BRIDGE

The Liberal government and the Minister of Justice missed a tremendous opportunity when they left out the disallowance clause in this bill. As Reformers, the watchdogs of the Canadian people, the watchdogs of Canadian business, the watchdogs of all that is right and just in this country, we say shame on the Liberal government. We cannot support a bill that has a fatal flaw in it. This bill has a fatal flaw in it and we will not support it.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: The deputy whip for the government has requested the division on the motion be deferred until tomorrow at the end of Government Orders.

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think if you would ask you would find unanimous consent in the House to further defer the division until next Tuesday at 5.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues, is there unanimous consent to defer the division until next Tuesday?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

• (2130)

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, B.Q.): Mr. Speaker, in this House, on May 10, I asked the minister of Transport a question on the federal government's responsibility with regard to the Quebec bridge.

Again, in his answer, the minister of Transport refused to acknowledge that the federal government had any responsibility with regard to repairing the Quebec bridge. Well, his government changed its mind because last week, on Friday, June 7, during a meeting at the Quebec Citadel, Canada's Prime Minister and Quebec's premier entered into an agreement establishing the costs to be assumed by the various parties: 60 per cent for CN, 30 per cent for the provincial government and 10 per cent for the federal government, through its Department of Transport which, until then, had refused to acknowledge its responsibility.

Let me tell you a short story. This afternoon—it is purely a coincidence—I asked a question on another subject, the closure of a CN service shop, and the minister of Transport refused to acknowledge his responsibility in this area. So, in spite of everything, I remain optimistic regarding this matter, because of the minister's flip-flop on the issue of the Quebec bridge.

But this is not the point. Now that the issue has been settled, I would like to ask the Minister of Transport, or his representative, what led him to change his answer, which he had given me on several occasions, including on May 10, and recognize that the federal government did have responsibility, since it is paying 10 per cent.

I would also like to ask him not to change his mind and to stand by this good decision regarding repairs to the Quebec bridge, which is a significant symbol in the Quebec City area. I would like to know the terms of the agreement, and how long the federal government's involvement—the 10 per cent previously mentioned—will last. I would also like to ask the minister if he recognizes that the federal government can pay immediately or as soon as possible, because people believe that the repairs only involve a paint job on the Quebec bridge, when in fact, important girders have to be replaced. It has been estimated that materials represent a third of the costs involved.

I would like to ask the minister why could we not use the services of a company in my own riding, namely Dominion Bridge, which actually built the bridge and recently acquired the MIL Davie shipyard. Since the government has given no money to the MIL Davie shipyard in the last three years, the Transport Department has a good opportunity to influence CN to have the work carried out by Dominion Bridge's workers at MIL Davie, because we know that its president, Mr. Tellier, is a former senior public servant. They say it is private, but we know that he has spent his whole life here.

[*English*]

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the question of the hon. member for Lévis concerning the government's contribution on the maintenance on the Quebec

Adjournment Debate

bridge. I would think that as a member from Quebec who has in the past harboured some suspicions about whether or not the federation actually works, the member would be standing in his place and congratulating the federal government on its announcement of a contribution toward the ongoing maintenance of the Quebec bridge.

As the hon. member is no doubt aware, the Prime Minister and the premier of Quebec met last week and discussed various issues, including the Quebec bridge. That very successful meeting is further proof of the good work this federation can do when members of the federal cabinet meet with premiers of the provinces. They can work out some of their differences and do what is best for the country.

• (2135)

It was announced by the Prime Minister that an agreement for a maintenance program had been made. The hon. member is also no doubt aware of the framework of the agreement which was outlined during the press conference held by the Prime Minister and the premier of Quebec. It has been agreed that \$60 million will be spent over the next 10 years on a maintenance program. Of that amount CN will contribute 60 per cent, the province of Quebec will contribute 30 per cent and the federal government will contribute 10 per cent.

We are very happy to see the province of Quebec working with CN, the owner of the bridge since 1993, to agree upon an accelerated maintenance program for this important transportation link for the people of Quebec City and all the people of Quebec. In addition to the 14 daily train crossings, 25,000 vehicles use that bridge every day.

Deterioration of the Quebec bridge has resulted from its traffic. Now there is a tripartite agreement between the federal government, the government of the province of Quebec—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry. The hon. member's time has expired.

HOLLINGER INC.

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on May 28 on behalf of many Canadians I asked the Prime Minister to investigate the concentration of ownership in the print media.

The Minister of Industry replied that there are no legal grounds for intervening on this issue. This is a very puzzling response. If I take this a step further, the federal government had no legal grounds to prosecute Canadians for paying for sex with minors in foreign countries, that is, until it passed legislation on the issue. If

the Liberals have no legislation to assist in their investigation of the concentration of media ownership, they should pass some.

Freedom of the press is very important as is the public's right to know. When the newspapers and any other media are not in a competitive environment the fundamental principles of democracy are compromised. It is simply wrong that the Liberal government refuses to correct this situation.

The Bureau of Competition Policy quickly approved the mergers of these newspaper sales, but the minister knows that the Bureau of Competition Policy is ineffective. It has no mandate to investigate concentration of ownership. The bureau does not at this time have the power to look into the problems of having one individual owning 53 per cent of all daily newspapers and 42 per cent of the circulation across the country.

What Canadians need is a Canada newspaper act that would limit concentration of ownership of Canadian newspapers and encourage new newspapers to start. This new law would give Canadians more choice and would ensure more balanced news stories and editorials.

Print journalists play an important role in this country. They inform Canadians about what is happening in their governments, their communities and around the world. They also represent and present opinions. These are basic functions of newspaper journalists. They also have responsibilities. They have the responsibility of telling us what is really going on from a balanced perspective. It is an awesome responsibility that is carried out by the frontline reporters. They carry out their tremendous responsibility by interviewing people, researching issues and investigating stories. I applaud them in their efforts.

This line of work is not without risk. Around the world scores of journalists have been murdered carrying out their jobs. This is the price of effective reporting. Reporters strive to bring us the truth but they cannot do their jobs properly when newspaper budgets are slashed until one reporter is carrying out the work of three.

In the case of the Regina *Leader-Post*, there is no longer a full time reporter dedicated to the agricultural beat. This has happened in a province where agriculture is the very heart of the economy. This is not being accountable to the readers; this is only being accountable to the bottom line of the newspaper's owner, Conrad Black, who is interested in greater profits only.

Hollinger Inc. controlled by Conrad Black now controls 53 per cent of the daily newspapers in Canada. It means one individual is controlling the editorial content of 58 daily newspapers and dictating the activities of their reporters. As Peter C. Newman points out in *Maclean's* magazine: "There isn't the slightest doubt that Mr. Black will use his 58 Canadian daily newspapers to promote his neo-conservative views," as he did with the *Jerusalem Post* just recently.

Adjournment Debate

It is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure that newspapers are carrying out their responsibilities. When news is suppressed or censored because of the prejudiced views of one person, then democracy is threatened. In turn, the federal government is not serving democracy well when it does nothing. Doing nothing means the Liberal government agrees with Conrad Black that the ownership of newspapers in this country should be concentrated and democracy should be compromised.

Why is this so? Why are the Liberals not acting? Is it because Conrad Black and the Prime Minister are good friends, as reported in the June 1 *Globe and Mail*? Or is it simply because political contributions have been made to the Liberal Party for ignoring the concerns of Canadians on this issue? Which is it? Canadians want to know. Canadians have a right to know.

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden, I have some general comments.

First, this government has no authority to freeze or block commercial transactions, as he suggested. He should also take a look at the provincial government's jurisdiction. He should be talking to his counterparts, the NDP government in Saskatchewan, when dealing with matters that are within the jurisdiction of a provincial government and not the federal government.

Second, freedom of speech is guaranteed under the charter of rights and freedoms.

Third, there are fundamental changes under way in methods of communication. Radio, television and now the Internet provide excellent vehicles for the exchange of information and opinion.

The enforcement of the Competition Act is entrusted to the director of investigation and research who is an independent law enforcement official. The director has a longstanding enforcement history in the newspaper industry.

In 1974 monopoly charges were laid against K.C. Irving Ltd. In 1980 criminal charges were brought against Southam and Thomson for market sharing. In 1990 the director challenged the acquisition

by Southam of community newspapers in the Vancouver area where Southam already owned the two daily newspapers. The director concluded that the acquisition of two community newspapers resulted in a substantial lessening of competition in the advertising markets served by these newspapers. This matter is currently before the supreme court.

The focus of the director's examination is on the economic effect a transaction will have on competition in advertising markets. The director is not mandated to look at social issues such as editorial diversity. Newspaper advertising markets are local in nature. A newspaper operating in Vancouver cannot be said to be in competition for advertisers with a newspaper in Calgary. When there is only one newspaper in a community its acquisition does not constitute a lessening of competition but only a change of ownership.

The director has closely followed developments in this industry since 1993 when he reviewed Hollinger's initial 19 per cent investment in Southam. Every subsequent acquisition of newspapers by Hollinger was reviewed to see whether there was any overlap between the newspaper being acquired and either a Hollinger or Southam publication.

With respect to the latest acquisition of Southam shares by Hollinger, Hollinger and Power Corporation approached the competition bureau and made representations. The director reviewed the proposed transaction and concluded that it would not lessen competition in any newspaper advertising market.

Finally, Hollinger's day to day conduct will continue to be governed by all the provisions of the Competition Act. Any further newspaper acquisitions by either Hollinger or Southam will be reviewed by the director.

Indeed, Mr. Black acknowledged publicly that he would likely be—

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 9.43 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. JIM SILYE

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	Ind.

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	Ind. 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	Ind.
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.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélangier, 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	Ind. 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
-------------------------	-------	-----

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

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

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

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Vic Althouse	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
--	--	---	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Bill Graham

David Iftody	Bob Mills	Philippe Paré	Paddy Torsney	(5)
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: John English

Colleen Beaumier	Maud Debien	John Godfrey	(4)
------------------	-------------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

Sarkis Assadourian	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
--------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

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 HayesGrant Hill
John MurphyAndy Scott
Georgette SheridanPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersMargaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice Dumas
Laurent LavigneKeith Martin
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Bernard PatrySvend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur**SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS****Chairman: John O'Reilly**Sharon Hayes
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Bernard PatrySvend J. Robinson
Paul SzaboRose-Marie Ur
Joseph Volpe

(9)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua****Vice-Chairs:****Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**Warren Allmand
Christiane Gagnon
Daphne JenningsDale Johnston
Ian McClelland
Larry McCormickRobert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien
George ProudGeoff Regan
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit
Bonnie BrownJan Brown
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Marlene CowlingPaul DeVillers
Wayne Easter
Jim Gouk
Herb GrubelRéal 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**Sarkis Assadourian
Jean AugustineSue Barnes
Daphne JenningsRussell MacLellan
John MaloneyIan McClelland
Réal Ménard

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Robert BertrandSharon Hayes
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY**Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Nic Leblanc
Tony Valeri**Morris Bodnar
Pierre Brien
Bonnie BrownEd Harper
Tony Ianno
Walt LastewkaPhilip Mayfield
Réal Ménard
Ian MurrayWerner Schmidt
Alex Shepherd
Roseanne Skoke

(15)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Pierre de Savoye
Nick Discepolo
Jay HillKaren Kraft Sloan
Ghislain Lebel
Peter Milliken
Andy MitchellJohn Nunziata
Denis Paradis
Yves Rocheleau
John SolomonDarrel Stinson
Paul Szabo
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Paddy Torsney
Pierrette Venne**Diane Ablonczy
Judy Bethel
Pierre de SavoyePaul DeVillers
Nick Discepolo
Roger GallawayArt Hanger
Gordon Kirkby
François LangloisJohn Maloney
Jack Ramsay
Derek Wells

(15)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Jag Bhaduria
Garry Breitkreuz
Paul Forseth
Patrick GagnonJim Gouk
Stephen Harper
Sharon Hayes
Jay Hill
Gar KnutsonDerek Lee
Val Meredith
Bob Mills
George S. RideoutSvend J. Robinson
Bernard St-Laurent
Myron Thompson
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepolo

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair: Albina Guarnieri**Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles CacciaMary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Patrick Gagnon
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(21)

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**Sheila Finestone
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: Michel Guimond

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes
Pierre Brien
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye
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
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk
Ed Harper

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 Label

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 Tremblay

Representing the Senate:
 The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus
 Peter Bosa
 Consiglio Di Nino
 Mira Spivak
 Peter Stollery

Don Boudria
 Marlene Catterall
 Ken Epp
 Mac Harb
 François Langlois
 René Laurin

John Loney
 Rey D. Pagtakhan
 Carolyn Parrish
 Bob Ringma
 Ray Speaker
 Paul Zed

(21)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. 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

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 12, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Forestry	
Mr. Wood	3705
Hamilton East	
Miss Grey	3705
Douglas Kenny	
Mr. McWhinney	3705
The Judiciary	
Mr. Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	3706
Veterans	
Mrs. Wayne	3706
Education	
Mr. Allmand	3706
Official Languages	
Mr. Arseneault	3706
The Member for Ottawa—Vanier	
Mr. Marchand	3706
Human Rights	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	3707
Trade Missions	
Mr. Discepola	3707
Quebec Referendum	
Ms. Catterall	3707
Bloc Québécois	
Mr. Duceppe	3707
Young Offenders	
Mr. Hart	3708
Newfoundland	
Mr. Byrne	3708
Newfoundland	
Mrs. Hickey	3708

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Federal-Provincial Relations	
Mr. Gauthier	3708
Mr. Dion	3708
Mr. Gauthier	3708
Mr. Dion	3708
Mr. Gauthier	3709
Mr. Dion	3709
Mr. Bellehumeur	3709
Mr. Dion	3709
Mr. Bellehumeur	3709
Mr. Dion	3709
The Constitution	
Mr. Manning	3709
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3709
Mr. Manning	3710
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3710

Mr. Manning	3710
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3710
Kenworth Plant	
Mr. Mercier	3710
Mr. Young	3710
Mr. Mercier	3711
Mr. Young	3711
Justice	
Miss Grey	3711
Mr. Rock	3711
Miss Grey	3711
Mr. Rock	3711
Railway Safety	
Mr. Dubé	3711
Mr. Anderson	3712
Mr. Dubé	3712
Mr. Anderson	3712
Justice	
Mr. Ramsay	3712
Mr. Rock	3712
Mr. Ramsay	3712
Mr. Rock	3712
Official Languages	
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	3713
Mrs. Robillard	3713
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	3713
Mrs. Robillard	3713
Taxation	
Mr. Culbert	3713
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	3713
The Environment	
Mr. Forseth	3713
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3713
Mr. Forseth	3714
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3714
AIDS Control	
Mr. Ménard	3714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3714
Mr. Ménard	3714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	3714
Human Rights	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	3714
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3714
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	3714
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3714
Health	
Mr. Caccia	3715
Mr. Volpe	3715
Irving Whale	
Mrs. Guay	3715
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3715
Mrs. Guay	3715
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3715

Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	3715
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	3715
Mr. Solberg	3716
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	3716
International Conference on AIDS	
Mr. Robinson	3716
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	3716
Endangered Species	
Mr. Adams	3716
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3716
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	3716
Point of Order	
Motion of hon. member for Kootenay East	
Mr. Abbott	3717
Mr. Boudria	3717
The Speaker	3718
The Late Joe Flynn	
Mr. English	3718
Mr. Plamondon	3719
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	3719
Business of the House	
Mr. Tremblay (Rosemont)	3719

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	3719
Committees of the House	
Finance	
Ms. Whelan	3719
Criminal Code	
Bill C-46. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3719
Mr. Rock	3719
Oath of Allegiance to the Flag of Canada Act	
Bill C-302. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3719
Mrs. Chamberlain	3719
Criminal Code	
Bill C-303. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3719
Mr. Mitchell	3719
Criminal Code	
Bill C-304. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3720
Mr. Robinson	3720
Criminal Code	
Bill C-305. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3720
Mr. Robinson	3720
National Refugee Awareness Day Act	
Bill C-306. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3720
Mr. Nunez	3720

Petitions	
Bill C-205	
Mr. Speller	3720
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Speller	3720
Abortion	
Mr. Speller	3721
Human Rights	
Mrs. Gaffney	3721
Impaired Driving	
Mrs. Gaffney	3721
Justice	
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	3721
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	3721
Alcohol Consumption	
Mr. Szabo	3721
Bill C-205	
Mr. Bodnar	3721
Testing of Explosives	
Mr. Rocheleau	3721
Human Rights	
Mr. Harris	3721
Bill C-205	
Mr. Harris	3721
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Harris	3722
Abortion	
Mrs. Ur	3722
AIDS	
Mrs. Terrana	3722
Employment Insurance Act	
Mr. Crête	3722
Age of Consent	
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	3722
Bill C-205	
Mrs. Brushett	3722
AIDS	
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	3722
Mr. Flis	3722
Dredging Operations	
Mr. Bellehumeur	3722
Health	
Mr. Robinson	3722
Strait of Georgia	
Mr. Robinson	3723
Human Rights	
Mr. Robinson	3723
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Robinson	3723
Gasoline Prices	
Mr. Robinson	3723
Newfoundland Education	
Mr. McWhinney	3723
AIDS	
Mr. McCormick	3723
Child Labour	
Mr. Nunez	3723
Bill C-205	
Mr. Johnston	3723
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Lee	3723
Gasoline Prices	
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	3724

Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	3724
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Zed	3724

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Oceans Act	
Bill C-26. Consideration resumed at report stage	3724
Mr. Plamondon	3724
Division on Motion No. 67 deferred	3728
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	3729
Motions Nos. 76, 78, 80, 82 and 88	3729
Mr. McWhinney	3729
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	3730
Mr. Lefebvre	3730
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	3732
Mr. Rocheleau	3732
Mr. Lebel	3733
Mr. Dubé	3734
Division on Motion No. 76 deferred	3735
Division on Motion No. 88 deferred	3736
Motions Nos. 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86 and 87	3736
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	3736
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	3736
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	3736
Mr. McWhinney	3736
Mr. Gouk	3737
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	3738
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	3739
Division on Motion No. 77 deferred	3740
Motion No. 1 agreed to on division: Yeas, 162; Nays, 40	3741
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 40; Nays, 162	3742
(Motions Nos. 5, 22, 33, 38, 42, 43, 49, 57 to 64, 65, 72, 74, 75, 89 and 91 agreed to.)	3743
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 30; Nays, 172	3743
Motion No. 8 negatived on division: Yeas, 71; Nays, 132	3744
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 132; Nays, 71	3746
Motion No. 29 agreed to on division: Yeas, 157; Nays, 46	3747
Motion No. 84 negatived on division: Yeas, 46; Nays, 157	3748

Motion No. 55 agreed to	3749
Motion No. 69 negatived on division: Yeas, 77; Nays, 126	3749
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	3750
Motion No. 77 negatived on division: Yeas, 36; Nays, 167.	3750
Motion for concurrence	3751
Mr. Mifflin	3751

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-35. Motion for second reading	3751
Mr. Gagliano	3751
Mr. Ménard	3754
Mr. Johnston	3756
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)	3757

Nuclear Safety and Control Act

Bill C-23. Motion for second reading	3757
Mr. Gagliano	3757
Mrs. Cowling	3757
Mr. Canuel	3759
Mr. Stinson	3762
Mr. Caccia	3763
Mr. Strahl	3764
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)	3767

Regulations Act

Bill C-25. Motion for second reading	3767
Mr. Gagliano	3767
Mr. Zed	3767
Mr. Lebel	3769
Mr. Harris	3773
Division on motion deferred	3775

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Quebec Bridge	
Mr. Dubé	3775
Mr. MacDonald	3775
Hollinger Inc.	
Mr. Solomon	3776
Mr. Bodnar	3777

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

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

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

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

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