



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 069 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, September 18, 1996

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

Effective September 20, 1996, the Appendix previously contained in the Wednesday edition of Hansard will instead appear in the Friday edition.

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, September 18, 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 Nanaimo—Cowichan.

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

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

THE LATE STÉPHAN BRODEUR

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House has resumed sitting but there is one person missing from our Brome—Missisquoi team.

One month ago, my assistant Stéphan Brodeur died of cardiac arrest. He was 32 years old. He was working in my riding but was supposed to move to our Ottawa office in September. A tireless worker, party man and team player who was always cheerful, Stéphan left us much too soon.

I join with the whole Brome—Missisquoi team, his family and friends and Benoît Corbeil in paying him the posthumous tribute he deserves.

On behalf of all members of this House and of all Canadians you served so well, I wish to pay homage to you, Stéphan.

* * *

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S PERFORMING ARTS AWARDS

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois wishes to congratulate the winners of this year's Governor General's Performing Arts Awards.

Among those honoured for their contribution to Canadian and Quebec culture were songwriter Luc Plamondon, folk singer and songwriter Joni Mitchell, film director Michel Brault, costume

designer and teacher François Barbeau, actor-director Martha Henry, and choreographer Grant Strate.

The remarkable career of each of these winners shows not only their huge talent but also the extraordinary creativity that drives our performers.

The Bloc Québécois commends in particular Mr. Plamondon's decision to donate his prize money to a bursary for young artists who want to write musical comedies or improve their skills in this area.

* * *

[*English*]

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY PIPE BAND

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, winning a world championship is an amazing feat. Winning two in a row is unprecedented, but that is what Burnaby's Simon Fraser University Pipe Band did recently at the elite world competition in Glasgow, Scotland.

I ask that all members of this House join with me in congratulating each of the band members for their outstanding achievement and first class representation of Canada, with special mention to 13-year old Arran Campbell, the youngest musician ever to compete at the world's.

Pipers: pipe major Terry Lee, pipe sergeant Jack Lee, manager Rob MacNeil, Alan Bevan, Dani Brin, Allan Campbell, Colin Clansey, Darran Forrest, Dave Hicks, David Hilder, Shaunna Hilder, Anthony Kerr, James MacHattie, Robert MacLeod, Bruce McIntosh, Bonnie McKain, Derrek Milloy, Pat Napper, and Adam Quinn.

Drummers: lead drummer Reid Maxwell, Brent Anderson, Blair Brown, Arran Campbell, Callum Hannah, Samantha Hanna, Scott MacNeil, Kathy MacPherson, Andre Tessier, John Nichol, Colin Nicol, and Christine Rickson.

Canada is proud of these world champions.

* * *

AFRICA

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has disappointed the international community again by deciding not to send any ministerial representation to the

S. O. 31

UN's review of the new agenda for Africa, a UN program that past Canadian governments played an instrumental role in establishing.

At the same time that they are distancing themselves from the UN action, the Liberals have decided to take a leading role instead in the Global Coalition for Africa, a private, undemocratic, unaccountable, American dominated organization linked to the World Bank's structural adjustment program and the global corporate agenda, both of which are at the root of so many of Africa's problems.

So much for the Liberal rhetoric on the UN. They love to parade the UN when it declares Canada to have the highest standard of living in the world, but sit on their hands when the UN tries to do something for those in sub-saharan Africa who have the lowest standard of living in world.

* * *

THE LATE SAMUEL VICTOR RAILTON

Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my predecessors, Dr. Samuel Victor Railton, Liberal member of Parliament for the riding of Welland who passed away this summer on July 23 in his 91st year. I was privileged to know Vic and his first wife Ruth and their family.

During his seven years as a parliamentarian, Dr. Railton was deputy whip, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and chair of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, serving with distinction in every capacity.

Vic Railton was a member of Parliament who regularly brought the concerns and achievements of his Welland constituency to this House. His *Hansard* record shows numerous excellent interventions on the issues of energy policy, veterans affairs, industry policy, health, welfare, social security and the very important St. Lawrence Seaway.

• (1405)

Doctor Railton's maiden address to the House of Commons was made during that great emotional debate on the abolition of capital punishment and illustrates a man with great personal convictions and principles. He said: "I do not think members of Parliament should vote in any way except for that in which they believe—we must stand up for our personal principles, no matter how they may be received".

Vic Railton served his country in peace and in war as a kind family physician, a talented surgeon and finally, as a dedicated parliamentarian. Canada has benefited from this hard working conscientious servant to the public. All of us—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming—French River.

THE LATE ARNOLD PETERS

Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Timiskaming mourns today the death of one of its most distinguished citizens, Mr. Arnold Peters, who devoted over 20 years of his life to public service as MP for Timiskaming. Not only did Arnold Peters serve the riding of Timiskaming in the House of Commons from 1957 to 1980, but he was first and foremost a grassroots politician and a people's person.

As the present MP for Timiskaming—French River, I wish to express my personal appreciation for the valuable service and selfless dedication he provided to the citizens of Timiskaming. He will be sadly missed. On behalf of all the constituents of Timiskaming—French River and all my colleagues in the House of Commons, I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to his family and friends.

* * *

[Translation]

NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell this House that the Service d'entraide Basse-Ville is celebrating 25 years of community work in my riding.

The record of this not for profit organization is simply remarkable. In 25 years, volunteers have distributed approximately three million pieces of clothing, cooked hundreds of thousands of meals, and repaired, remodelled and patched all sorts of things.

Hundreds of organizations like this one can be found in my riding. This level of involvement reflects how generous the community is, of course, but also, and more importantly, how extensive the needs are.

The government absolutely must reconsider the restrictions recently imposed by Human Resources Canada on socioeconomic organizations. Hiring personnel to support the work of volunteers will be extremely difficult in the future, as these organizations will be denied access to HRC programs because of the new criteria. This is yet another sign of this government's insensitivity.

* * *

[English]

FISHERIES

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague the fisheries minister has announced in St. John's a limited food fishery for Newfoundland and Labrador and for the lower north shore of Quebec.

I welcome that announcement. A food fishery has long been an integral part of the Newfoundland way of life and a staple of our diet, which explains why we are so much smarter than you mere mortals.

At the same time I applaud the minister's caution. He says it is going to be a limited fishery, closely monitored and that abuses will not be tolerated, which is exactly as it should be.

We cannot lose sight of the overall objective here, which is the reopening of a commercial fishery, the economic mainstay of the people of coastal communities.

* * *

LIBERAL GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Fraser Institute will be releasing a study calculating the cost of regulation on businesses and families in this country.

Although we will have to wait until tomorrow for the exact figures, allow me to whet members' appetites. If the Liberals were to eliminate government red tape, every Canadian family would have thousands of dollars more to spend on the things they need. More often than not, government red tape is nothing more than a hidden tax.

The choice is clear. The Liberal government will continue to burden us with its big government vision of the country and its tax and regulate policies. The Reform Party is committed to giving Canadians a smaller, more efficient government and to slashing job-killing red tape.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to draw the attention of the House to the fact that last week Dr. Maxwell Yalden, Canada's chief human rights commissioner, was elected to the UN human rights committee.

This UN committee is a select body of independent experts that monitors implementation of the international convention on civil and political rights, one of the central pillars of the international human rights system.

Dr. Yalden's election in the face of strong competition reflects both his strong personal credentials as a candidate and international respect for Canada's leadership on human rights issues.

● (1410)

Dr. Yalden has extensive experience in the field of human rights both in Canada and abroad. I believe he will make an outstanding contribution to the work of the UN human rights committee. The presence of a Canadian expert in this important body represents another contribution by Canada to the promotion of international

S. O. 31

human rights, an issue which is at the heart of Canada's foreign policy agenda.

I hope that you will join me in offering Dr. Yalden congratulations.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer I spent a lot of time talking and working with many of the companies and businesses in my riding of Etobicoke—Lakeshore. Their message was clear: Our local economy has shown encouraging signs of sustainable recovery and economic growth and we must continue to work together.

By providing programs designed to improve infrastructure, support youth initiatives and enhance access to information and high technology, this government is assisting key sectors of the economy to create a climate that encourages job creation.

My constituents are taking advantage of expanding Canadian exports, better training for youth, the greater emphasis being placed on our innovative technological expertise. These partnerships will not only create more jobs for the people of Etobicoke—Lakeshore, but will contribute to the strong economic growth taking place in Canada.

* * *

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S PERFORMING ARTS AWARDS

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House to offer my sincere congratulations on behalf of all my colleagues to Mr. Luc Plamondon, one of three Quebec recipients of the 1996 Governor General's Performing Arts Award.

[*Translation*]

At the press conference where the Governor General's Performing Arts Awards were announced, Luc Plamondon commented that he looked on this award he was about to receive as an attempt to bring Canada's two solitudes closer together.

Like him, we feel that bringing the French Canadian and English Canadian communities of this country closer together will, needless to say, promote the preservation and development of our cultural identity as Canadians.

We share this vision of cultural development in Canada and are striving to promote the talents of all Canadian artists who are a credit to this country.

* * *

THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development will be tabled in this House today. This

Oral Questions

public body, set up in 1988, truly reflects the traditional values that make Quebecers and Canadians proud.

However, since March 1996, when it was announced that Mr. Broadbent, the president of the Centre, would leave at the end of his term, on September 1, 1996, the government has not found the time to appoint a full time successor, preferring to give to the new chairperson of the board, Maureen O'Neil, the additional responsibility of serving as acting president for a period of three months. Moreover, five of the thirteen positions on the board are vacant, pending a government decision.

This obvious laxness truly shows how little this government cares about the protection of human rights and democracy. What is the government waiting for to fill these positions?

* * *

[English]

TOBACCO

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the one-year anniversary of the Supreme Court decision that shot down the ban on tobacco advertising. Tragically it also marks the one-hundred thousandth death from smoking related illnesses since the 1993 election.

Smoking is the leading cause of preventable death in Canada and kills over 42,000 people per year. This government has lowered cigarette taxes, allowed tobacco companies to advertise and has produced a 29 per cent increase in smoking rates among our youth. There are over 6.5 million smokers in this country. The government's legacy to Canadians is inaction on legislation which has committed thousands of children to a lifetime of addiction and illness.

Taxpayers, health care workers, parents and teachers demand that this government institute effective measures to decrease tobacco consumption in Canada.

The cost of inaction is the pain, suffering and premature death of children in this country.

* * *

NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR YOUTH

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today over 100 Canadians from all regions and backgrounds will arrive in Ottawa to take part in the National Conference for Youth hosted by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The conference, entitled "Taking Responsibility in the New Economy: Challenges and Choices", is about challenging employers, labour, educators, governments, youth serving organizations and youth themselves to define their roles in the new economy. It is

also about identifying the choices these stakeholders can make to improve our prospects for the future.

• (1415)

To achieve this, we have invited young people from as far away as Vancouver and St. John's, from Yellowknife to Ste. Julie. We have invited representatives from the high tech sector, agriculture, mining, the learning community, labour, youth service organizations, all working together to devise a plan of action that will allow all Canadians to participate fully in the new economy. It will allow Canada to lead the way into the 21st century.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in reaction to the ADQ proposal to impose a 10-year moratorium on sovereignty, Bernard Landry said yesterday that a moratorium could not be imposed on the destiny of a people.

Earlier this week, Quebec's three central labour bodies got together to state their position regarding the socio-economic summit that will take place this fall. The theme of their campaign is that jobs are the priority.

It is clear that no one in Quebec, except the nostalgic and the power mongers of the PQ, wants to hear about these issues. The destiny of a people, Mr. Landry, is to be able to live, to develop and to prosper as a community, in the dignity that employment provides.

Your sovereignty project is outdated, Mr. Landry. Concentrate on employment; after all, this is the reason why Quebecers are paying your salary.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

THE SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister had some rather harsh and somewhat critical comments to make on the Somalia inquiry. He accused it of "grilling public servants as if they were almost criminals". Those are the exact words of the Prime Minister. He also complained of the slowness of the process, and its cost.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Can he explain why he has criticized the inquiry so harshly, considering that all it is doing is seeking to cast some light on the behaviour of the Armed Forces in Somalia and the role of General Boyle in the cover up?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we want to find out the truth, and that is precisely the reason we set up such an inquiry. We want the results as soon as possible.

Oral Questions

Why? Because the Armed Forces and the Department of Defence are somewhat on hold, as long as the inquiry is still going on. We would like to have the inquiry's conclusions as promptly as possible, so we may take the appropriate remedial action.

This commission was set up in order to determine what happened during the former government's involvement in the Somalia operation. We are most anxious to find out whether changes need to be made in the command process in order to avoid a repetition of such incidents.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is particularly surprising to hear from the Prime Minister's lips that the army is on hold until the results of the inquiry come out. There was one way to solve that: change the chief of defence staff, and that is what he was asked to do.

Instead of attacking the commission, could the Prime Minister admit that, if its work is taking too long and is costing too much, is precisely the fault of the Armed Forces and their commander, whose exact role in the cover up is not yet clear?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are going to wait for the Commission report. Let us allow it to finish its work. The sooner we get the report, the better it will be for everyone, for we will then be able to react accordingly. That is what I want, that is what this House wants, and I am sure it is also what the Armed Forces and the Canadian public want as well.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister not trying to discredit the commission with what he had to say about it yesterday?

• (1420)

Is he not trying to discredit the commission in order to justify keeping the general and the minister in their positions? Is he not indeed trying to discredit the commission in order to serve his own ends?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has been in his portfolio for three years. Yesterday I indicated that I had decided very early on in this administration to have a minister of defence who would remain in his position for a long time, in order for there to be an authority in place capable of making decisions.

I must apologize for saying in the House that there had been six ministers in nine years under the Conservatives. I was wrong, there were 17. Under the circumstances, I feel that the minister's job is a very difficult one.

He is working under even more difficult circumstances than his predecessors, because we are obliged, in the interests of good administration and deficit reduction, to reduce defence spending, to reduce staff and to reduce the number of bases.

The minister has accomplished all of those difficult tasks, and now he, like all the rest of us, is awaiting the commission's report, which we hope to see as soon as possible in order to take the required action.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. On a number of occasions in recent months, the official opposition has called for the Somalia commission, whose work will continue for a long while yet, to table an interim report after it has finished looking into the allegations of cover-up by top army brass.

If the Prime Minister finds that it is taking too long, as he said yesterday, why does he not ask the commissioners to quickly produce and make public an interim report on the cover-up operations so that everyone, himself included, can draw the appropriate conclusions?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference for this inquiry are well known. They are well established. The commission is to issue a report when it concludes its deliberations.

Those are the terms of reference given to the commission and those are the terms of reference with which the commission is comfortable. I ask the hon. members to await the conclusions of the commissioners.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is the Prime Minister who thinks that it is taking too long, it is the government who decides on the mandate. If he wants to have results and be able clean things up quickly and restore the credibility of the armed forces, why does he not ask for an interim report on the cover-up operation? Why does he not act quickly?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again members of the opposition are prejudging testimony and coming to conclusions about the evidence that has been presented to the inquiry. That is not the way the inquiry process works and that is not the way Canadian justice works.

I hope the hon. member will do everyone a favour and wait for the report to be issued by the commissioners so that everyone's testimony and all the facts can be judged in a clear cool light.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what can come out through the old process of word association.

Yesterday I asked the Prime Minister about cover up at the Somalia inquiry and for some reason he started talking immediately about the Watergate affair in the United States, a Freudian slip.

Oral Questions

You may wish to check whether the tapes of yesterday's question period were erased. Surely the Prime Minister did not mean that the tampering and political interference at the Somalia inquiry had reached Watergate proportions.

What precisely was the Prime Minister trying to say when he drew some parallel between his handling of the Somalia inquiry and the Watergate affair?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess the leader of the third party needs a new speech writer.

I said earlier in French that we instituted the commission because we wanted to get to the bottom of the Somalia affair and receive recommendations so that we can change what has to be changed. When we were in opposition we did ask for a commission like that. We established that commission and we would like to have the report as quickly as possible.

• (1425)

The leader of the third party yesterday asked if we wanted to have the report before the election. I would be delighted to have the report tomorrow so we could act. We are not trying to cover up anything. We instituted the inquiry and we want the result in the shortest term possible so that we can have a report.

To please the party of the Leader of the Opposition, who wanted to have it before the election, I do not know when I will have an election. If I were him I would not hope for a quick election.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's comments on the Somalia inquiry have been contradictory and confusing and they are again today.

Yesterday the Prime Minister told the House he did not meet General Boyle until he appointed him chief of the defence staff. Yet his communications director told the *Globe and Mail* that the Prime Minister actually conducted the job interview.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, Monday the Prime Minister said the Somalia inquiry would be allowed to do its work without political interference. Yesterday, however, the Prime Minister took a shot at the inquiry by saying it was too slow, too expensive and too hard on witnesses.

Will the Prime Minister explain these contradictions? Did the Prime Minister not know who General Boyle was until he was appointed or did he conduct the job interview? Is the inquiry independent or is the government telling it through the Prime Minister that it is too slow, too expensive and too hard on witnesses?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course I knew of Mr. Boyle because I had studied the files of many candidates and I had some recommendations. But I did not know him personally.

When he came I interviewed him, but I knew a lot about him and it was rather good. But I had not met him. Sometimes we know a lot about candidates in many fields without meeting them. I do that regularly in appointments. Because we receive recommendations and we name somebody, that does not mean that we had a beer with the guy the day before. That means that we looked at his cv, the recommendation, the abilities and we made a decision.

After I met General Boyle—he was on a short list—and I knew at that moment that he could fill the bill. Let him do his job. When the inquiry is done we will have the results. The sooner the better because yesterday the leader of the third party was afraid that the report would come after the election, so he should ask them to do it as fast as possible to have it before the election.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's handling of the Somalia inquiry and Somalia affair is symptomatic of the government's management of a lot of other things.

National defence is a \$10 billion department. Its work is vital to the national interest. Its international peacekeeping is a source of pride for all Canadians, yet for three years under this government its affairs have been mismanaged and its reputation has been allowed to deteriorate with no end in sight.

Do not the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces and the Canadian public deserve something better?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they really deserve the support of the third party for the very good job they are doing today in the former Yugoslavia, the job they are doing today in Haiti and in other places in the world. They are doing a good job.

It is because I have a lot of respect for them that I decided it was not to be a revolving door for the political leadership of that department. I gave them an experienced politician and a good administrator to do the job, to stay there and do what is needed to have the most modern armed force available that is possible at this moment.

* * *

[Translation]

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Youth unemployment has reached disastrous proportions. If we consider both those who are unemployed and those who left the

labour market, many because they were discouraged, today at least 479,000 young people in Canada between the ages of 15 and 24 are unemployed.

• (1430)

How can the Prime Minister say he is satisfied with his performance on creating jobs when he knows perfectly well only one out of two young people has a job?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no one will ever be satisfied with the situation of the unemployed in this country, whether we are talking about the young or not so young, as long as anyone remains unemployed.

The hon. member surely recognizes the efforts deployed, not only by the Government of Canada but by other levels of government and the private sector. This summer, for instance, about 60,000 young people across the country were hired thanks to the efforts of the Government of Canada. Furthermore, and I think this is worthy of mention, when we consider the efforts deployed by the private sector in partnership with governments and youth organizations, I think we will realize that although this is a major challenge, some progress has already been made, and even young people have admitted as much.

Of course, much remains to be done, but we are not the only country where youth unemployment is a major problem.

In fact, the hon. member is probably aware that this week here in Ottawa, we organized a conference on all aspects of the problems facing young people in Canada.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today there are 25,000 fewer young people employed than when this government came to power, and meanwhile the number of young people has increased.

What kind of hope can the Prime Minister give hundreds of thousands of unemployed young Canadians and Quebecers, when it is a fact that he himself excluded funds targeted to young people from negotiations on manpower policy transfers to the provincial governments which, as he himself has admitted, work more efficiently, preferring to spread funding around his government's employment programs for purely political purposes?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we seriously want to help young Quebecers and young Canadians across the country to find jobs, we must create a climate of stability within our economy.

If anyone is aware of the problems facing young people in the Montreal region, for instance, where we know the unemployment rate is very high, it is certainly the hon. member opposite. But we must all be aware of our responsibilities. If we want the private sector to play its role, which should always be to create jobs, we

Oral Questions

should provide the right kind of economic climate, and we should listen to young people like Mario Dumont, who know what has to be done in this country.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of National Defence talked about fairness. Let us explore that today.

Colonel Haswell has been charged. Corporal Purnelle has been charged. However, General Boyle receives preferential treatment after admitting that he lied to military police and that he broke the spirit of the Access to Information Act. Canadians are saying quite clearly that he should be fired.

General Boyle has admitted responsibility. Why will the minister not hold him accountable?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only has the hon. member and his colleagues shown contempt for the inquiry by continually reflecting on evidence at the commission, but today he goes further. He is reflecting on the military justice system. He is bringing forward the names of individuals who are now subject to certain processes within the department and within the armed forces. He is using their names and bringing them to the floor of the House of Commons.

This is something that must not be done. I am surprised at that. The hon. member, as a former employee of the armed forces, should know better than to do that in a public way. It shows contempt of the entire judicial process.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the only contempt is shown by the hon. Minister of National Defence.

It is interesting to note that the minister uses the shield of the Somalia inquiry when it is convenient to the minister. In other words, to protect his own sorry butt.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hart: Our armed forces personnel—

• (1435)

The Speaker: I am sure the House is used to colloquial statements, however, I wish we could stay away from the human anatomy in question period.

Mr. Hart: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I would like to continue.

Our armed forces personnel know what it means to accept responsibility. It means that you are held accountable. Yesterday

Oral Questions

the Prime Minister referred to the Watergate incident. In Watergate people were fired, people were charged and people resigned.

When will the Prime Minister fire the Minister of National Defence?

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must get his jokes from the same barber his leader uses.

We have here a group of people in opposition who congratulated the government when it established the inquiry. They do not want to do the decent thing and wait for the inquiry to do its work, to report and then make judgments.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. On Monday, the Prime Minister used the government's practice of tendering contracts to justify the fact that Quebec was not getting its fair share of federal spending on goods and services. I will remind him that a \$2 billion contract for the manufacture of armoured vehicles was awarded in Ontario without any call for tenders.

In light of what he said on Monday, how can the Prime Minister justify his defence minister's decision not to require GM, of London, Ontario, to call for tenders from subcontractors, knowing that Oerlikon, of Saint-Jean, Quebec, could then have put in a bid?

[English]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as members know, about a year ago we announced one of the purchases which was outlined in the white paper for armoured personnel carriers. This was a solely directed contract to General Motors Diesel Division in London, Ontario. Negotiations are taking place right now between the government and General Motors under the auspices of my colleague the minister for government services.

There has been some concern about the nature of the work and how much of it will be done in Canada. A question has arisen with respect to the capability of a company in Quebec. Because of the concerns that the government and General Motors had, those matters were referred to an independent third party who has made a report.

The negotiations are between General Motors and the government. This is a commercial, contractual relationship which I am sure will stand great scrutiny.

[Translation]

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister tells us that an independent consulting firm was indeed hired to provide an independent opinion. The firm he is referring to is KPMG. The minister is not even through reviewing KPMG's report but he is already announcing that GM will be the sole contractor. It is clear that the report was only commissioned to buy some time.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, by stubbornly refusing to let the construction of the turrets be put to tender, he is actually depriving Quebec of another contract, worth more than \$600 million, resulting in approximately 145 quality jobs being lost to Delco, in California.

[English]

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I did not quite catch the name of the company to which the member is referring. Is he still referring to the armoured personnel contract or is he referring to the search and rescue helicopter contract?

One thing the hon. member and his colleagues in opposition conveniently forget is that much of the industry of Canada's military infrastructure is located in Quebec. The proportion of work that goes to the industries in Quebec is actually higher than the percentage of population of Quebec versus the nation as a whole.

• (1440)

While it may be true that in certain contracts work is not of a proportion that is acceptable to the hon. member, when we look at all of it, at the work that goes to Bombardier, to Marconi, to Oerlikon, Quebec does very well.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I spent more than 36 years in the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Canadian Armed Forces. I worked for many commanders and I commanded a flight, a squadron, a school, and a base, so I know something of leadership.

In fact, I commanded the Canadian Forces Officers Candidate School whose duty it was to determine the potential leadership capabilities of the candidates who went through.

My gut feel and a massive amount of input from service friends tell me that the present senior leadership in the armed forces is doing tremendous damage to that force.

Oral Questions

Why can the Prime Minister not see this, recognize it and take action by removing the Minister of National Defence and the chief of the defence staff?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the hon. member. He had a distinguished career in the armed forces. However, even he has to acknowledge—he has been a member of the defence committee, he participated in the deliberations that led up to the white paper, he knows despite what he said today—that we have revitalized the leadership of the forces; that we have re-engineered the department, that we are saving money; that we are bringing business methods into play to save the taxpayers' money.

The leadership we are bringing forward now is a new generation that reflects the norms and values of Canadian society today. I am sorry the hon. member is uncomfortable with that.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister said that if generals in the service did not like what was going on, they were free to leave.

It appears that those who espouse the values of truth, duty and valour are to get out, while those who say “mea culpa but I'm not responsible” are not only retained but protected.

Why does the Prime Minister not take action to put the leadership that is required back in the Canadian Armed Forces?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is leadership to deal with a department that over the years of the cold war unfortunately had developed administrative practices that needed to be streamlined, that had an officer corps that became too large for its needs.

We all agree on these things. I have heard the hon. member say them at committee.

We have shown leadership in setting up the inquiry to deal with the very unfortunate events that happened in Somalia. We will continue to show leadership. In fact the chief of the defence staff today outlined his vision of leadership for the 21st century for the forces.

I have met with many of the senior leaders of the forces in the last number of weeks. Despite the problems that are really wrenching at the very heart of the armed forces, they see light at the end of the tunnel. They see that improvements have been made so that they can meet the challenges of the years ahead.

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at a press conference yesterday, the Minister of Justice announced his intention to amend the Criminal Code to keep dangerous offenders in prison longer and keep a closer eye on them after their release. This is quite normal for those who have already been found guilty of a crime.

However, and this is my question to the minister: Does the minister confirm that, under his proposal, an individual who has been acquitted of or has never even been tried for a crime could still be ordered by the court to submit to supervision by police or correctional authorities and even to wear an electronic monitoring device?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, punishment in the criminal law and certainly in the Criminal Code is reserved for those who have been convicted of crime, and that has remained the same both before and after the bill I tabled yesterday.

The hon. member will see in the bill that we have added a section which builds on the jurisdiction already in the code in section 810.1. That provides the court with jurisdiction on the application of a provincial attorney general to order that anyone, where there is a reasonable basis to fear that he or she may commit a very serious indictable offence, may be restrained by court order in a manner consistent with public safety.

• (1445)

Just that sort of jurisdiction was confirmed as constitutional and valid in a judgment of the Ontario courts last year. We are building on that to make the streets safer and above all to fulfil our red book commitment from 1993 to bring in solid and meaningful legislation to deal with high risk offenders.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question. But, since he is talking about this provision, can he assure the House that this provision does not violate the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, since at first sight it seems to fly in the face of one of our basic legal principles, namely the presumption of innocence?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I respect the hon. member's commitment to the charter of rights and to individual freedoms.

Oral Questions

I urge him to look carefully at the provisions of the legislation we tabled yesterday. I have every confidence that every part of that bill is completely consistent with the charter. In fact, I so certified it before I tabled the legislation.

The measures to deal with high risk offenders invest the sentencing judge with authority to impose conditions as part of the sentence which is a regular orthodox exercise of the criminal law power. The other provisions have to do with preventing crime. That is at the heart of this legislation. We are taking steps to prevent crime before it happens by identifying those who are at the highest risk of reoffending and giving the courts and the system power to intervene, to impose conditions and supervision to keep our families, our children and our communities safe. That is what this legislation is about.

* * *

ARCTIC COUNCIL

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq, Lib.):

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

Mr. Speaker, in August the minister announced that this fall Canada was to launch a much awaited new initiative, the Arctic Council, which comprises eight circumpolar countries.

Given the leadership role of Canada in this important initiative for Canada's northern population and for all of Canada, can the minister inform this House when he will act to establish this very important vehicle for co-operation on the environment, economic and other critical issues facing the circumpolar north?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm that tomorrow Canada will play host to the inaugural meeting of the Arctic Council. In so doing, I want to pay tribute to the work of the hon. member and the Secretary of State for Youth and Training, Ambassador Simon and many other Canadians, particularly northern Canadians and the representatives, both government and non-government, of the other countries who have worked together over the past two years to bring together a brand new international organization to deal with the issues of the people of the north.

In particular, I would like to point out that perhaps for the first time in the history of international organizations, leaders of the governments, ministers of the respective governments, will be sitting down in full partnership with the indigenous people of the north so that they can work together to solve the problems of environment, trade and industry. It is an example we hope will provide an important lesson for the development of international organizations in the years ahead.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after 13 years of Liberal-Tory rule, we find that federal taxes in Canada have gone up \$4,000 per taxpayer.

Despite the fact that the Liberal government promised twice in the last few years that it would get rid of the GST on books in this country, we find that the finance minister now says that he cannot afford to do it. Frankly, Canadians cannot afford this finance minister.

Can the finance minister tell Canadians why he has \$159 million to fund flags, propaganda and movies through the Department of Canadian Heritage while he reneges on yet another promise and doubles the GST on reading in Atlantic Canada?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our position on the tax on books today is exactly what I expressed yesterday. The member is one day behind the NDP, maybe 20 years behind the NDP.

The fact is that the removal of the tax on books would cost \$140 million. The decision that has to be taken is, is that the best use of \$140 million or in fact are there other uses to which that money should be put. At the same time, given that those who wish to remove the tax on books are people who basically want to promote literacy, a view that all of us in this House share, then the debate we have to have is whether that in fact is the best way to promote literacy. Under those circumstances we are certainly open to examining the possibilities.

• (1450)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the question is: What is the Prime Minister's word worth? He promised in writing to the Don't Tax Reading Coalition that he would remove the GST on books.

When the Prime Minister appears before his bank machine, how does he rationalize this latest Liberal cop out?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should tell you what the real issue is. The real issue is whether the government's revenues are going to increase. Because of increased economic activity they are in fact doing so.

The issue is what did the new government do after it took over from a previous government that increased taxes 39 times? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we did not in our first, second or third budget, not once did we increase personal income taxes. That is our view.

Why is it that the Reform Party, which has so much difficulty talking about increases in government revenues, in its first budget suggestion talks about increasing government revenues by over \$26 billion?

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of International Trade.

Today we learned, once again through the media, that negotiations on free trade between Canada and Chile have reached an impasse, after nine months of talks.

Can the minister tell us if the cancellation of the visit that the Chilean president, Mr. Frei, was scheduled to make in early October is somehow related to the deadlock in the negotiations on a free trade agreement between Canada and Chile?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be pleased to know that the negotiations with Chile have not reached an impasse. The eight series of negotiations were completed last weekend and the parties have gone off for further consultations.

I am hopeful that we can bring the negotiations to a very quick conclusion and bring about this agreement in the near future. In fact, they have been going at a very strong pace. In the case of Mexico it took us some 16 months and in the case of Israel almost two years to get to the point of signing an agreement. Yet in nine short months we have come a long way and there are but very few issues for us to resolve.

When that is done I would expect that the postponed visit of President Frei will be put on again. I know that President Frei is looking forward to coming to Canada and looking forward to a free trade agreement that will help give Canadian companies access to the market in Chile.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister refers to previous agreements. Canada recently signed a free trade agreement with Israel. This agreement was signed in secret. The same thing is happening again with Chile.

Could the minister at least pledge greater transparency before signing a free trade agreement with Chile or with any other country?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the agreement with Israel will be brought before this House and there will be every opportunity to consider every aspect of it in a very short period of time, as there will in the case of the agreement with Chile. Both of those agreements will help to increase our exports and our opportunity for market access.

Oral Questions

TRANSPORT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when you are flying in a plane at 30,000 feet and the engine fails, passengers on board a Canadian airline will find little comfort in the fact that the minister's department examined the paperwork, not the actual aircraft, when issuing a certificate of air worthiness.

How can the Minister of Transport guarantee the safety of the Canadian public when his department inspects paperwork instead of inspecting aeroplanes?

• (1455)

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the safety audit that identified the two deficiencies is part of established procedures that are going on and are well understood within the entire airline industry.

We expect that all airlines will meet the highest safety standards and it is our job to ensure that they do. Until such time as that happens and the concerns of the minister are met, the minister is not prepared to risk the safety of the travelling public.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary offers words of reassurance but those words do not square with the facts. The facts are that when any airline's planes take off in Canada for the first time, they have not been inspected by Transport Canada. It only inspects the airline's paperwork.

I again ask the parliamentary secretary: How can he guarantee the safety of the Canadian public when his department only inspects the paperwork, not the plane?

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refuses to accept the fact that there are procedures in place where the paperwork entails that the maintenance individuals in charge of that aircraft are the ones responsible to ensure the safety of that aircraft.

In the case of WestJet of which he is speaking, it is a responsible airline. WestJet is working diligently to meet all of the requirements that are being put down by the Minister of Transport. Unfortunately yes, the travelling public were a bit inconvenienced in their flight plans, but the majority of WestJet passengers I am sure would agree that it is better to deal with any deficiencies in the aircraft on the ground and not at 40,000 feet.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Oral Questions

The United States is currently taxing Canadian seniors on social security benefits. Many of these seniors are trying to survive on less than subsistence income and would not be taxed if this income was earned in Canada.

Can the minister tell the House and seniors what steps he is taking to alleviate this hardship?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has shown a great deal of concern for the plight of a considerable number of low income Canadians who have been affected by this move taken by the United States.

Indeed members within our own party and members on both sides of the House have expressed the same concern. The member is absolutely right. There are a considerable number of low income Canadians who have suddenly found themselves without any possibility of adjustment, without any possibility of appeal and are in a very serious financial condition as a result of this action taken by the U.S. administration.

I have raised this matter with the secretary of the treasury and our officials have worked on it throughout the summer. I will be seeing the secretary of the treasury in the not too distant future and I intend to raise this issue.

I am delighted by the support from the House on this particular issue.

* * *

[Translation]

LOBSTER FISHERY

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Over the last two weeks, Chaleur Bay Micmacs have been fishing lobster without Fisheries and Oceans permits, more than two months after the end of the regular fishing season.

Given that the minister has a mandate to conserve and manage the resource, what does he intend to do to fulfil his obligations in the contentious area of Chaleur Bay so that the lobster are protected?

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is now making every effort to get the aboriginals and the commercial fishermen together, so that they can sit down, talk and reach an agreement in order to resolve this dispute, which leaves the commercial fishermen feeling targeted because the aboriginals are fishing, while the aboriginals are exercising what they claim is their right to fish for subsistence and ceremonial purposes.

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before the last election the agriculture minister promised to hold a plebiscite on grain marketing and the Canadian Wheat Board. That is now a broken promise. He is still doing behind the scenes surveys. The Angus Reid group tells us they conducted a survey on behalf of his department, but the minister's office refuses to give us the results of the survey.

• (1500)

When will the minister uncover the results of this survey? More important, when will he hold a true and open plebiscite? His lack of action is hurting the prairie economy and is still a broken promise.

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I see little point in formally releasing a partial and preliminary document which the opposition and the media already have. That strikes me as a bit redundant.

The hon. gentleman and people in the Reform Party keep pressing us to move ahead with the automatic implementation of the report of the western grain marketing panel. On Monday of this week the member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia on CBC radio said this: "There are certain things in the panel's recommendations that I think are terrible". The member from Moose Jaw on the same program said: "I would say from the numbers that we've got generally there have been more who support the wheat board as a single desk seller for wheat and barley". The member from Moose Jaw—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. It concerns the continuing cuts to the CBC.

Despite promises made in the Liberal red book during the last election, the government is proceeding with a further cut of some \$190 million to the CBC budget. This will result in a 35 to 40 per cent reduction in both TV and radio services and a loss of some 2,500 jobs.

How can the minister possibly expect the CBC to fulfil its parliamentary mandate as a public broadcaster with these massive cuts to its budget?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the cuts that were announced in last February's budget were \$123 million, not the figure quoted by the member.

Unfortunately those cuts were announced on top of the previous cuts which total a very difficult circumstance for the CBC. The total package of cuts will result in reductions of about 23 per cent.

Over the last three years one of the things we have had to do as a government is to cut very significantly. We have had to let 40,000 people go across the public service. We have had to cut in ministries and we have had to cut across departments.

The CBC management and board have been working very hard to ensure that in the face of very difficult circumstances they can continue to occupy a very unique niche in the marketplace.

Unlike certain members of the opposition who are calling for the privatization of the CBC, I believe that the CBC has a very important public role to play. We are still investing almost a billion dollars of taxpayers' money in the CBC.

* * *

TRADE

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Since the Helms-Burton bill in the United States is very prominent in the news these days and its adverse effect on Canadian business, and as Canada opposes the Helms-Burton bill, does this mean that we are soft on Cuba? Does it mean that we endorse the Castro administration?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that is an important question.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs and I have said on numerous occasions, for a great number of years we have been exercising efforts to bring about a more open and democratic system in Cuba, to bring about economic reforms and respect for human rights.

Unlike the United States, we have preferred a policy of engagement, as opposed to isolation, which quite frankly has not worked in the 30 years it has been in place.

The purpose of our opposition to Helms-Burton is simply to protect the right to have a Canadian trade policy and to have Canadian companies able to rely on that when they are doing business with Cuba.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of a delegation of senators from Belgium's Socialist Party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[Translation]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour and the pleasure to table, in both official languages, the first report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association.

This is the report by the official delegation that represented Canada at the third annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly's Political Committee, held in Moscow from April 9 to 12.

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to table, in both official languages, the second report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association which represented Canada at the 1996 spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly (NATO Parliamentarians) held in Athens, Greece, May 16 to 20, 1996.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-324, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (entertainment expenses).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is aimed toward lowering our national deficit to some degree by amending the Income Tax Act. It will do so by eliminating the part of the act which includes entertainment as a tax deductible expense.

Routine Proceedings

Tax loopholes cost the public treasury an estimated \$36 billion a year. As it stands, the Income Tax Act includes provisions that allow business people to write off meals or corporate boxes in sport stadiums as entertainment expenses.

When the Liberal government lowered meal and entertainment expenses to 50 per cent from 80 per cent deductible there were cries from the restaurant industry that business would drop drastically, affecting its many employees. There is hardly a mark on that sector. I believe that this bill will have a similar outcome on stadium owners.

The net result, however, will be considerable revenue, a positive outcome for the government and a feeling of equity for the vast majority of Canadians who are not able to take advantage of these corporate perks and should not have to foot the bill for them.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have 15 petitions from over 1,000 Canadians in B.C., Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland which say that abolishing the opportunity for prisoners serving life sentences of 15 years or more to apply for a judicial review of their parole eligibility will only serve to increase both human and economic costs of the criminal justice system and increase fear and misconceptions about crime among the Canadian public.

• (1510)

Therefore, the petitioners call on Parliament to oppose the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code or the restriction of prisoners access to just and fair procedures as well as to launch a concerted public education campaign to promote the need for more responsible and humane criminal justice approaches to enhance the safety of all Canadians.

BILL C-205

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present from Nepean and area communities which bears some 70 signatures.

The petitioners bring to our attention that Canadian law does not prohibit convicted criminals from profiting financially from writing books and setting up 1-900 numbers, producing videos, et cetera.

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.

TRADE

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 600 individuals.

The petitioners call on Parliament to look at the fact that the CITT concluded that the dumping and subsidizing of Italian pasta did not cause material injury to Canadian pasta manufacturers and duties are no longer being collected.

They request that the Special Import Measures Act examine the CITT criteria for determining material injury and consider the U.S. model. They petition Parliament to ensure that the Canadian pasta manufacturers have a level playing field for fair market competition in our own country.

CANADIAN PEACEKEEPING MEDAL

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and honour to present two petitions to the House which have been duly certified by the clerk of petitions.

The first one is on behalf of 25 Canadians residing in beautiful British Columbia. The petitioners humbly pray and call on Parliament to honour and recognize their Canadian peacekeepers in the form of a Canadian peacekeeping medal.

BILL C-205

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on behalf of 44 constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding areas.

The petitioners pray that Parliament 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.

[Translation]

GENITAL MUTILATION

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition calling for the adoption of my bill C-277, renumbered C-235, on female genital mutilation. Fifty-seven persons from British Columbia have taken the initiative of circulating and signing a petition in support of a measure to protect women and young girls.

Let us hope that all of the members of this House will bow to their wishes and vote in favour of making genital mutilation a criminal act. I hope that certain amendments will be made to the bill on genital mutilation the government is preparing to pass.

[English]

BILL C-205

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have before me two petitions, one signed by 26 people from my riding and the other one signed by 27 people, calling on Parliament to enact Bill C-205.

Currently Canadian law does not stop convicted criminals from profiting financially from their crimes. Presently a convicted criminal can make money by writing a book and these petitioners ask that this be stopped.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have petitions with over 250 signatures from Manitobans who support the amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation.

These signatures include people from all age groups who firmly believe that discrimination on any basis should not and cannot be tolerated.

BILL C-205

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions containing over 5,000 signatures from people from across Canada who point out, as others have today, that Canadian law does not prohibit convicted criminals from profiting financially by selling their stories, videos or copyrighting videos or in other ways profiting from the crimes they have committed.

The petitioners call on Parliament to enact Bill C-205, which I introduced, at the earliest opportunity. The third hour of debate will be next Tuesday whereupon there will be a vote on the principle next Tuesday evening, I hope.

The petitioners ask that this bill be enacted as quickly as possible.

HELMS-BURTON BILL

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present to the House two petitions signed by residents of York North.

The first petition is about the Helms-Burton law. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that the Cuban liberty and democratic solidarity act attempts to impose American domestic policy on other sovereign countries and, therefore, violates international law.

• (1515)

The petitioners further draw to the attention of the House that Canadians' interests, rights and businesses must be defended with strength and vigour.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners therefore call upon Parliament to pursue all avenues available to ensure the rights of Canadians are protected.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition draws to the attention of the House the important role small businesses play in our economy. The petitioners call upon Parliament to continue to create a healthy environment for small businesses to ensure they have access to the financing they need and to help them explore and capitalize on new opportunities.

COAST GUARD

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by many Manitobans. They are concerned that the Liberal government is on the verge of drastically reducing coast guard services on the major lakes in Manitoba, with Lake Winnipeg being the 10th largest lake in the world. They are concerned this reduction plan includes decommissioning the *Namao* and *Avocet*, the only two coast guard ships on the lake.

They call on Parliament to direct the Government of Canada, especially the Ministers of Transport and Fisheries and Oceans, to reaffirm the preservation and maintenance of coast guard services on the lakes in the province of Manitoba so as to ensure that public safety and protection will remain a top priority.

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honoured to rise today to draw the attention of the House on behalf of many of the constituents in my own riding and around the lower mainland to the following: That, Canadian law does not prohibit convicted criminals from profiting financially by writing books, setting up 1-900 lines, producing videos.

The petitioners pray that Parliament 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.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition on the Young Offenders Act that is signed by 440 constituents in my area.

This is based on an incident where two young alleged thieves were caught breaking into cars in a parking lot. They tried to run down a witness. They did not conceal their names from the police. They were quite free to give them because they knew they could not be prosecuted because of their ages. Because of this, the petitioners request that the Young Offenders Act either be abolished or revised so that the rights of ordinary citizens come ahead of the rights of young offenders of this sort.

Routine Proceedings

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to present a petition from 60 citizens in my riding, mainly from the villages of O'Leary, Bloomfield, Ellerslie and Alberton.

These 60 petitioners are very concerned with the inadequacies of the sentencing practices concerning individuals convicted of impaired driving charges. They are also concerned that Canada must embrace a philosophy of zero tolerance toward individuals who drive while impaired by alcohol or drugs.

These petitioners would like that very serious consideration be given to the bill that is coming up shortly for a vote.

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from my constituents which draws the attention of the House to the following: That there are profound inadequacies in the sentencing practices concerning individuals convicted of impaired driving charges; and that Canada must embrace a philosophy of zero tolerance toward individuals who drive while impaired by alcohol or drugs.

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

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two different petitions to present today, the first one dealing with criminals benefiting from criminal activity.

The petitioners are petitioning that Parliament 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. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my second petition has to do with drunk drivers. The petitioners pray and request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code that would ensure the sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired does reflect both the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward this crime.

• (1520)

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I too would like to table a petition with

several hundred names on it, most of them from the constituency of Beaver River but some from Edmonton and perhaps Edmonton Southeast and other cities.

Resulting from a murder this spring in the town of Bonnyville, these people are very concerned that there be stricter penalties for young offenders who commit crimes causing bodily harm or death. These individuals should be held in custody pending their court hearing. Young offenders 16 years and older who take the law into their own hands and cause death should be charged and treated as adults and tried in adult court without the consent of judges.

Therefore these petitioners pray and request that Parliament please make amendments and stiffer penalties to the Young Offenders Act.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and privilege to present three petitions to the House today, two on behalf of the esteemed member for Edmonton Southeast.

The first petition is signed by 33 petitioners who pray and request that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or any other federal legislation that will provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

THE JUDICIARY

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition signed by 47 petitioners asks and prays that we conduct a full public inquiry into the relationship between lending institutions and the judiciary and to enact legislation restricting the appointment of judges with ties to credit granting institutions. The idea is that there is some sort of collusion between the judiciary and credit granting institutions which has resulted in the fact that credit granting institutions are never ever taken to task.

PENSIONS

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is signed by 80 petitioners mostly from Edmonton Southwest, many of whom are associated with CARP, the Canadian Association of Retired Persons. The petitioners bring to the attention of this House and request that Parliament take the necessary measures to ensure that Canadian citizens who are recipients of American pensions are not penalized. This flows from the change in legislation in the United States whereby recipients of U.S. pensions in Canada have 25 per cent of the money that is due to them held back.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my first petition comes from Nepean, Ontario.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

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

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

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

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one's ability and specifically, that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of alcoholic beverages to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure under Standing Order 36 to table a petition on behalf of my constituents of Bruce—Grey.

This summer I received several thousand signatures with regard to gas pricing. The petitioners feel that gas pricing practices by petroleum companies rob communities of economic activity and tourism.

The operative clause in this petition states: "Be it resolved that we request the federal government to require the fuel industry to become accountable for the prices charged for their products and if price gouging or policies against the public interest are discovered, that the companies be required to roll back prices to a justifiable level".

DENTAL BENEFITS

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my pleasure to present a petition from my constituents of London—Middlesex.

Relative to the possible taxation of dental benefits, these petitioners note that this has been a topic of discussion for the past two or three years. They are pleased that the government has seen fit not to tax such dental benefits. They call on Parliament and this government to forgo such consideration on a permanent basis and that we do not tax dental benefits.

• (1525)

PROFITS FROM CRIME

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today. The first is from constituents who draw to the attention of Parliament that there is currently no legislation prohibiting a convicted criminal from profiting from his crime through the publication of books, articles, videos or the establishment of a 1-900 number. They call upon Parliament to approve Bill C-205 now before the House which would enact such legislation.

HEMP

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, draws to the attention of Parliament that industrial quality hemp is not a psychoactive product and therefore should be transferred from the jurisdiction of the health minister to the minister of agriculture.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions here today. One of them is a sanctity of human life petition. The petitioners pray and call on Parliament to ensure that assisted suicide or euthanasia is not allowed in our country and should not be allowed in the future.

WARTIME MERCHANT NAVY

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the merchant marine. The petitioners call upon Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to those enjoyed by veterans of Canada's World War II armed services. I am sure many of us have had to deal with those veterans in our offices.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is another sanctity of life petition. It says that whereas human life at the preborn stage is not protected in Canadian society, the petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code. Mr. Speaker, there have been many cases in the news that have highlighted that issue over the summer.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a very important matter to ask the government House leader when I can expect an answer to my question on the order paper No. Q-4.

A little bit of history is in order here. The question was first placed on notice on February 27, 1996 and I requested an answer

Supply

from the government within 45 days. As of today, 204 days have passed. This same question was on the order paper for 71 days before the government prorogued the House in the last session. This has become a very serious matter. It is a total of 275 days that the government has had to prepare a response.

The answer to this question is a matter of public safety, specifically regarding the unsafe storage and theft of firearms from police and military armouries.

On May 29, 1996 the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader responded to my previous point of order saying we could expect him to provide us with the information very soon. Mr. Speaker, 104 days have passed since the parliamentary secretary promised the information very soon. This is now bordering on the absurd. My question is: How long do my constituents and I still have to wait?

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is right. There has not been an answer yet to his question.

I think he would recognize that the question which was asked was one that required some detailed information from a wide variety of sources. I am sorry to say that we do not have the question available. We will have it as soon as it is available. I am sure he would realize that the very scarce resources available in the departments for these kinds of matters involving very specific questions, which is what in fact has been raised by my colleague, just do not make it possible to make the information as forthcoming as he would like it to be. In order to make it accurate, we are doing the very best we can.

I know that does not satisfy him in terms of an answer but that is the best answer I can offer my colleague.

The Deputy Speaker: Would the parliamentary secretary please indicate what he is going to do with the other questions on the order paper.

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

• (1530)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. 5 in the name of the hon. member from Nanaimo.

That a Humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, notes, minutes of meetings, reports, documents and other communications between Canada and the United States as they relate to the 1995 changes of the Canada-U.S. Tax Treaty.

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, the documents requested are protected from disclosure under paragraphs 13(1)(a) and 15(1)(g) of the Access to Information Act. Therefore I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

I also ask that the other notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan is not in the Chamber. Does the parliamentary secretary wish, in the absence of the member, to have it transferred for debate or should we put it off to a time when he is here?

Mr. Zed: Transferred for debate.

(Transferred for debate.)

The Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

SUPPLY

ALOTTED DAY—MAIN ESTIMATES

The House proceeded to consideration of the motions concerning adoption of the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed as usual to the consideration of the motion to concur in the main estimates for 1996-97 and the appropriation bill in relation thereto. In the light of recent practices, do the hon. members agree that this bill should now be distributed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

CONCURRENCE IN PARLIAMENT—SENATE VOTE NO. 1

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$40,713,000 under Parliament—Senate—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day. Today this House will consider the motion to concur in the main estimates for the current fiscal year.

Under the Constitution, as members know, Parliament must approve all spending from the government's consolidated revenue fund. Today, we, as members of the House of Commons of Canada, are continuing this honourable tradition as we debate the main estimates for 1996-97.

Supply

We also have before us at least two motions to oppose specific items contained within these estimates. Consequently, the government has on the table a similar number of motions to reinstate opposed items.

Since the main estimates were presented on March 8, 1996, members have had opportunities to present their views and concerns to the standing committees of the House. Today all parties have an opportunity to participate in the final review of these estimates.

Some members will recall the frustration that all parties expressed in the House when the full supply debate took place last year. This frustration resulted in all-party support for the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to undertake a comprehensive review of the business of supply.

In support of the work of committee members, I have made improved reporting to Parliament a priority for the Treasury Board Secretariat. We have initiated the improved reporting to Parliament project, or IRPP, so that we can work more closely with the committee and other parliamentarians.

We are proposing changes to split the information now provided in part III of the estimates into two distinct documents: a departmental expenditure plan which will deal with the proposed expenditures for the next three years and be tabled in the spring and a fall performance report which will account to Parliament on what has been achieved.

[*Translation*]

Why are we doing this Mr. Speaker? There are two overarching reasons. First, this government promised in the red book that it would restore public confidence in government institutions and, specifically, in the role played by Parliament.

• (1535)

Without the right information at the right time, Parliament cannot perform its proper function. Second, this government believes that to get government right, we must engage Parliament in a meaningful discussion of government priorities, plans and performance. The government realizes that it is not just cabinet ministers and bureaucrats who may shape the future of Canada.

Before I outline our plans and proposals for improving such information, I would like to describe how we have arrived at this point. The process we followed reflects the care we have taken to ensure that these proposals truly represent the needs of parliamentarians and other users. Before we developed our proposals, six departments and agencies presented their Part III documents in a new format.

These documents were tabled in the House in March of this year as part of a pilot project. An evaluation of the pilot documents

showed broad support for replacing Part III with separate planning and performance information documents to be tabled at different times of the year.

Extensive consultations with nine House standing committees, the Senate Finance Committee, academics, the media, the auditor general and others confirmed support for this approach. I would like to thank the hon. member for St. Boniface for his continuing efforts to bring about changes to the way the House reviews estimates.

As a result of these consultations, the procedure and house affairs committee recommended that 16 departments and agencies table performance reports this fall as a pilot project. The report containing this recommendation was unanimously adopted. The pilot performance reports will provide Parliament with succinct, meaningful, results-oriented information in the fall, when Parliament can consider that information more fully.

[*English*]

These performance reports will allow parliamentarians to focus on the results expected from government programs and the results those programs actually achieved. This focus should in turn lead to more meaningful parliamentary discussion of longer term government plans and priorities. The pilot performance reports will be tabled in October in conjunction with my report on improving results measurement and accountability.

The 16 companion expenditure planning documents incorporating the Outlook document will be tabled as part of the estimates project in the spring. Departments not participating in this round of pilots will be able to improve their spring 1997 part III documents by incorporating many of the improvements tested last spring. The 16 pilot departments will also table in year update reports which will alert Parliament to significant changes in planned expenditures or program delivery.

The IRPP is working with departments and the House to improve electronic distribution of pilot documents which may include using the Internet. If an evaluation of the 16 fall performance reports is positive, the government may ask Parliament to require the tabling of separate spring planning and fall performance reports for all departments and agencies to begin in the following year.

If the House adopts these changes, I am optimistic that they will help the committee deal with the remaining part of its mandate which is improving the processes by which the House and its committees consider and dispose of the estimates.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

I am confident that our efforts to improve the quality of expenditure and performance information will make Parliamentarians

Supply

ry debate more meaningful. This will be, I hope at least, another important contribution to a more accountable government.

Unfortunately, we are not yet at the point of changing our procedures for supply. Today, we must follow the usual process. But before this House addresses the opposed item before us, I would like to provide the overall context for the 1996-97 main estimates.

The main estimates represent the results of a number of initiatives by this government designed to put Canada on the right track—to reduce the budget deficit and to more clearly define the role of the Government of Canada. When I tabled the estimates in March, I described the process of program Review, which has contributed so strongly to “getting government right.” I also stressed that “getting government right” means modernizing federal programs and services to meet the needs of Canadians, as citizens and clients, today and in the future.

The steps we have taken recognize that the effects of globalization and technological change, fiscal pressures, and the evolution of Canadian society require us to simplify and streamline. These days, it is fashionable to talk about fiscal responsibility and the need to reduce spending at all levels of government. While it is not difficult simply to cut spending without regard for the consequences, it requires great care to meet necessary fiscal targets while ensuring that government policy supports the priorities of Canadian society.

In asking the House to concur in the appropriation bill, I would like to remind members that the Estimates we are considering today reflect the care taken to reduce spending and, at the same time, to target that spending on what is most important. For example, we have reduced direct support to industry in favour of policies that will stimulate growth and jobs. We have reduced costs by transferring the air navigation System and airports to not-for-profit corporations. We have taken steps to reduce subsidies to Canada Post and to Via Rail. We have reduced defence spending by \$200 million in 1997-98 and by another \$600 million in 1998-99. These are just a few examples of the actions we have taken to meet our fiscal responsibilities.

[*English*]

The impact of these changes is significant. In 1994-95 program review yielded savings of \$3.9 billion which will grow to \$7.2 billion annually by 1997-98. The 1996 budget announced further annual savings of \$2 billion for 1998-99.

This year's main estimates call for \$157 billion in planned budgetary expenditures compared to \$164 billion last year.

I believe that the record shows that we are succeeding in meeting our goals but we cannot rest on these achievements. Getting government right is an ongoing process. We will continue to use

the principles of program review to seek further opportunities to improve.

In closing, I ask members of the House to support our request for full supply. These estimates reflect appropriate action to meet our fiscal targets while establishing a role for the government that is right for the times.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether we are at questions and comments on the speech of the President of the Treasury Board.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member. He is quite right. I forgot all about this during the summer. It is now time for questions and comments.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the President of the Treasury Board. What he said raises many questions.

Apparently the government has established a system to control expenditures and to improve budgetary preparations and consultations, and is well on its way to providing satisfactory program evaluation. The newspapers, however, are still full of examples of poor expenditure control, and I would like to quote a few.

For instance, millions of dollars are lost annually because the system for issuing paycheques at the Department of National Defence does not work properly. Will the situation be remedied this year? Will the controls that have been put in place be able to correct this situation?

The other point I would like to make is that in many departments, especially at the senior executive level, the same structures still exist that were there before the government started reducing subsidies to industry.

The President of the Treasury Board mentioned the fact that these subsidies had been reduced, and industry, provided everyone is treated the same, is all for it. Has the government embarked on the requisite downsizing at the level of deputy ministers, consulting services and the bureaucracy, considering that, although there is no more money for subsidies, people are still being paid to run programs that no longer exist or are no longer operational? Has anything been done about this?

There is one more sector that intrigues me a great deal, and that is tax expenditures. Last year we saw a document that gave an overview of tax expenditures entitled “Tax expenditures 1995”. I would like to quote a few examples from this document, where it says there is no information available on the subject. It means the government is unable to indicate the impact of these tax expenditures, which makes it look pretty silly. Here are some examples.

By the way, these are not mere details. These are important issues that are connected with tax fairness. For instance, deferred capital gains or transfers between spouses. They cannot tell us the real impact of this measure.

Non-taxation of certain non-monetary benefits. Here again, they cannot tell us a thing.

Taxation of realized capital gains. Imagine all the capital gains that have been realized, and they are unable to evaluate the impact of such a measure.

I will quote just a few more, before concluding. The non-taxation of incomes of Indians on reserves. Today, they cannot indicate the impact of this situation.

Non-taxation of donations and bequests. I will conclude with an item that will be a contentious issue in future debates, the fact that the Senate refuses to be accountable for its budget to the House of Commons. Some nerve. The members of a non-elected House who are not accountable to the public for the results of their work are actually saying they do not have to account for their budget. Will this \$43 million really be used for practical purposes? Is there no duplication of the work done by members of the House of Commons? Have some practices not become obsolete?

These are the kind of questions the government should answer. Especially on this point, I would appreciate the opinion of the President of the Treasury Board who has shown a concern for genuine expenditure control. I think the government should set an example in this respect for the Canadian public.

Mr. Massé: Mr. Speaker, the three points listed by my hon. colleague are important and deserve a closer look.

There are unfortunately cases in which government funds were not used properly. It is obvious that, in some departments—as the auditor general himself discovers each year—government funds could, in certain cases, be used in much better ways.

• (1550)

What is important in a business with total expenditures of \$157 billion is that we must be able to implement controls at two levels.

First, at the macroeconomic level, where members can control the policies themselves and ensure that the money allocated by Parliament to implement certain policies is used to attain the real objectives of these policies. Most of the time, Parliament exercises control primarily by allocating the money needed to implement certain policies and, as I pointed out in my speech, this process is now undergoing extensive reforms.

Treasury Board also has a responsibility to ensure that departments follow the proper procedures in specific cases so that money is spent in accordance with regulations and with the provisions of the Financial Administration Act.

Supply

We must remain vigilant in these areas because each year every department develops new ways of doing things and some of their new procedures are not suitable and therefore result in inappropriate expenditures.

This role of reviewing examples in every government department, which is shared by the auditor general and the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, must have the full support of Treasury Board, and it does. Whenever new procedures or ways of doing things to reduce the misappropriation of funds are brought to our attention, we implement them.

The second point mentioned by the hon. member is that certain departments still have not made in-depth changes and there is a possibility that, while some subsidy programs may have been considerably reduced or even abolished, the person-years required to deliver these programs have not been subject to the same kind of cuts.

This is why we have a system whereby every department must, each year, submit to Treasury Board a plan for delivering their plan of action. This means that, each year, Treasury Board's five deputy ministers review how the various departments intend to bring changes to their structure, to the way they use their person years, to their programs and to the implementation of these programs, so as to better reach their objectives.

Today, in my speech, I indicated that we also intend to conduct a performance analysis and that we have already conducted a number of pilot projects in this regard. The idea is to review the budget, not the way we currently do it when we allocate funds, but by obliging departments to submit a report on their use of funds and on the extent to which their objectives are met, with, where possible, some quantitative measurement of departmental performance. My colleague was very clear in making that point and we are trying to improve service delivery and evaluation measures.

The third point mentioned concerns the impacts of tax expenditures which are not measured sometimes. Obviously, evaluation issues are always very difficult. They are difficult because there are a lot of results that cannot be examined or that cannot be quantified.

For example, the impact of certain expenditures on the health and general welfare of Canadians is impossible to measure sometimes. We can measure the impact of certain specific actions, but it is sometimes difficult to measure the impact of preventive measures, for example, because we have altered a situation and it then becomes extremely difficult to measure exactly what the results would have been without these preventive measures.

• (1555)

There are methodological problems. Each year we try to have quantitative measures that are more accurate, but it is obvious that we still have work to do in some areas. I can assure my colleague that the Treasury Board understands perfectly well that there are

Supply

still a lot of improvements to be made and is working towards making these improvements.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to ask the President of Treasury Board, since he is the one to handle the cabinet's big budget, if he does not sometimes have to act like a bad government to be able to distribute the money. I would like to give the example of the commercial investment credit.

A number of farmers from the vast Eastern Townships region have complained to my office—justifiably, I think—that, two or three years later, the revenue department wants to recover, with heavy interest charges, the 10 per cent, the credit to which they were entitled and which ended on January 1, 1994, which they used in good faith for purchases prior to that date.

As the President of Treasury Board, how could he explain that these directives have gone solely to the Sherbrooke regional office?

Mr. Massé: Mr. Speaker, you will understand that it is not easy for me to have a detailed knowledge of all the applications of all the Treasury Board directives in the 24 or so federal government departments. With respect to this question, I shall look into the example given by my hon. colleague and see whether it is possible to solve the difficulties he refers to.

[*English*]

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek the unanimous consent of the House to table the third report of the finance committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the third report of the finance committee, dealing with taxable Canadian property.

I would be very remiss if I did not pay credit to members from all parties on our finance committee who worked so hard to do this report, and particularly to the staff of the House of Commons who under very great difficulties have made today's report possible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform you that the official opposition has tabled a dissenting report recommending that the government take steps to prevent trust funds from transferring money abroad, like the \$2 billion funds that recently left the country tax-free. Instead, the

Liberal majority attacked the auditor general's credibility and, instead of closing the door, threw it wide open so more funds could leave the country.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—MAIN ESTIMATES

The House resumed consideration of the motions for concurrence in the Main Estimates.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to oppose the motion to concur in the main estimates. The Reform Party has argued that, since the Senate refused to defend its budget before the committee on government operations, we should not approve its budget. I think this position is quite defensible. The members of the Senate were not elected but appointed for partisan reasons.

• (1600)

Let us look at the latest appointments to the Senate: a former executive of the Liberal Party of Canada and a former minister of agriculture.

For the past three years, the Liberals have been looking for a way to regain control of the upper House because they were dealt a devastating blow last June, when a bill aimed at preventing the privatization of Pearson airport died in the Senate, voted down by people who were not elected. Now I have seen it all! In this day and age, in a democracy that brags about being one of the most active, the most efficient in the world, the unelected House of Parliament killed a bill in which hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake. This will cost money to taxpayers, regardless of the solution. All of us, elected members of this House, could only watch the other place make the decision instead of us. These non-elected people made the decision.

Quebecers and Canadians are tired of this situation. The senators added insult to injury by not appearing before the Standing Committee on Government Operations to justify the need for such funds. This alone is sufficient reason for opposing at least the allocation of these funds.

However, we must go further in our review of the situation. In Quebec, the legislative council was abolished 30 years ago, after it was realized that non-elected houses no longer reflected the current reality.

We went to the public. I personally tabled a motion in the House which is supported by all Bloc members and by other members of the opposition. Our petition on this issue is receiving strong support, certainly in Quebec, whether people are staunch or soft federalists, or whether they are sovereignists or independentists.

Everyone is fed up with the Senate. We get this support because, ultimately, people want two things from us: that we focus on jobs and that we put an end to all this useless spending. The Senate is a political example; it is an important symbol, which we must absolutely target. We must abolish a house that is no longer representative of Canada.

Let us not forget that the Senate was originally established to represent the regions. Senators were appointed to represent regions. I invite you to visit your constituents and systematically ask them this question: Which senator represents you in the Senate? What is his name. I am not asking you to have them tell you that person's responsibilities, just their name. The response rate will be shocking, because the senators have never assumed this responsibility of regional representation. Not at all.

Nowadays, senators are appointed in the following manner: the Prime Minister chooses someone he has decided to reward politically. He calls them up and says: "You should buy yourself a piece of property; you need something worth \$4,000 in such and such an area. This is the condition you have to meet to become a senator". Often, the only time people hear about their senator is when he goes to the registry office to check that the property he has just bought has in fact been registered. The rest of the time, he is not often seen.

I also heard this criticism of the Senate from all those I met last year during the protest over employment insurance reform. They said to us: "If it were at least equal, if everyone at least had to contribute equally". But it was during these same months, if you recall, we saw the senators asleep on television. They are paid, just as we are, but they were seen sleeping on television during the throne speech.

If the claim is that their role is one of decorum, let them at least perform this role, but even that is beyond them.

I therefore think it important that the government be given a very clear message, that citizens from throughout Quebec and from Canada, whatever their province or territory, tell their MP that they think the senators have outlived their usefulness, that they are not representative. We think that the Canada of today must look closely at all government programs, as the President of the Treasury Board was saying. And the first target should be the Senate, because its budget, the direct expenditure budget—I am not talking about all the incidental expenditures, for example, the expenses assumed by the House of Commons, which in fact are incurred by the senators, but the direct budget—is around \$43 million.

• (1605)

A figure of \$43 million a year out of the overall budget does not seem astronomical, but it means that our system can still afford today to pay out expenses amounting to half a million dollars, per riding, per senator, for a useless role.

Supply

The other function of a senator was to see to better laws. When the Senate was created it was said that the members of the House of Commons would need people with more education, who would be able to put the finishing touch to pieces of legislation, to finalize them. It might have been true 125 years ago. Today with the kind of members we have, the research departments, the assistants, legislative or otherwise, it is not necessary any more. We have everything we need and, in this respect, the senator no longer has a role.

Since nature abhors a vacuum, the Senate has developed a new role for itself. It has become the representative of all organized lobbies in Canada. In this sense, it is highly detrimental to democracy.

It seems to me that the study of this year's estimates provides the perfect opportunity to give a clear message to the government, to give a clear message to Canadians, to give a clear message to Quebecers, to the effect that yes, indeed, we are really going to deal with useless expenditures, we are committed to tackling useless symbols.

We could also talk about lieutenant governors in Canada. They cost money. They cost eight million dollars a year. People see them about twice a year.

It has been said that in our system, in our beautiful country as the federalists call Canada, there are still many things that are unacceptable. These are only two symbols, but the one I would like to draw your attention to is the whole issue of the Senate.

I find it interesting that so many members want to speak to this motion. All speakers of the official opposition will split their time to make sure as many members as possible have the opportunity to speak and convey the message they received from their constituents. During the summer, a period we consider to be quiet, we have seen people sign thousands of petitions asking for the abolition of the Senate.

I have visited many corner stores and met people sharing my political opinion and some with a different opinion, but they all agreed on this point. Members of senior citizens' clubs, employees in companies, representatives from chambers of commerce and community workers all agreed that we should send a clear message to the government saying that the Senate must be abolished.

In short, we have an institution which is outdated and too expensive, which has an inflated opinion of its lobbying function and which is a patronage haven. For all those reasons, it seems to me we absolutely must oppose this specific item if the Senate's expenditures are included in the government's overall expenditures. It is like a first step, a first signal, but I think that before long, when we reach the point where we have to deal with the substance of this issue and vote on the motion I tabled asking the government to abolish the Senate, then each member of the House will have to see if his constituents think, and if he feels in his heart and soul,

Supply

that the Senate is an institution that must go on or if it is one we can no longer afford, one that no longer contributes to democracy.

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for his spirited and passionate speech pointing out the unnecessary spending the other institution can entail.

I would also like the hon. member to talk about his private member's bill to limit the amounts available to senators and to tell us about the petitions he is receiving from people who want to express their opposition to the Senate.

• (1610)

Perhaps, at the same time, other colleagues may also want to sign this petition, so that his bill can receive more support. Increasingly, Canadians are wondering whether the Senate is really an institution that has outlived its purpose or whether it ought to undergo major reform.

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's comments remind me of something that was discussed a few years ago, namely an equitable and equal Senate. One thing is for certain: today's Senate is inequitable and unequal.

Inequitable because senators are appointed for partisan reasons and do not have a mandate from the people. Unequal because representation is totally inconsistent with the role originally intended for the Senate. For these reasons, but especially because of the unnecessary spending, because we saw some senators dozing off on television, I think the Senate should be abolished. This may sound like grandstanding but, as we know, in practice the Senate's role is much more often to represent big business and the banks.

Who are the campaign chairs or co-chairs for the major parties? Senator Hervieux-Payette, and Senator Nolin for the Tories. All the old parties that have appointed senators are using them as political organizers. This makes a mockery of democracy. This is something we should get rid of. That is why there is popular movement to abolish the Senate.

You may tell me that this will not eliminate Canada's deficit, but people expect their members of Parliament to make symbolic gestures to show we are willing to cut at all levels and not always on the backs of the same people.

I expect the third hour of debate on my motion to abolish the Senate to take place in October, probably in the second half. Until then, I would like my campaign to pick up speed and to collect even more signatures for my petition. I hope we can convince a majority of members that most Canadians are clearly in favour of abolishing the Senate in its present form.

We want the public to support us. I will table petitions signed by thousands of people, as will the hon. members for Frontenac and Champlain. Altogether, I think we have collected between 20,000 and 25,000 signatures so far. I think this clearly shows what the people want.

In Quebec, people clearly told us that they want to get rid of this institution; they feel that it is unnecessary, that it costs too much for no good reason. They are tired of having to pay the salaries of people without mandates, whom they are unable to get rid of until they reach the age of 75. To add insult to injury, some of them are even appointed Lieutenant Governor of Canada after having slapped Quebec in the face.

This kind of situation is unacceptable and that is why we must reject the government's estimates, especially the money allocated to the Senate, because it is a blot on Canadian democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I mentioned that all members of the Bloc Québécois, including myself, will be sharing their time, each of us therefore speaking for 10 minutes.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank my hon. colleague. As he indicated, he is sharing his speaking time. Therefore, the hon. member for Frontenac has the floor.

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to participate in this debate of particular significance to several of my colleagues and to myself, of course. And I will not even mention how pleased some of my constituents from Frontenac will be when they read what I have to say.

• (1615)

Today's debate plunges us into what I would venture to describe as parliamentary nonsense and political burlesque. I could go on and on about how futile I find the role the Senate plays, or rather, should be playing.

First, I would like to thank the many senators who are following this debate, either from their offices or from the gallery, this afternoon. In this regard, I would like to read you at this time, if I may, a few lines from the March 1995 issue of the *Reader's Digest* (French edition), on page 31, under the title "Très chers sénateurs" or "Dear Senators". I will just make a few remarks, particularly regarding their salary.

"I think all Canadians should know how much it costs to keep the Upper House here, in Ottawa. On top of a \$64,000 sessional allowance, a \$30,000 research allowance, a \$20,000 allowance for office expenses, and a tax-free expense allowance of over \$10,000, senators receive benefits of a totally different nature". I will spare you the details.

Canadians should also know that senators must be very fit. Of course, they are only allowed to sit until the age of 75 nowadays,

whereas they used to sit for life. “To keep in shape, to maintain their physical condition, senators have at their disposal a gym which is fully equipped, including climbing simulators, stationary bicycles, bodybuilding equipment, free weights, and I could go on, as well as an aerobics room, with instructors. Only one thing is missing in these state-of-the-art facilities, the senators themselves. One senator only is a regular at the gym: Colin Kenny from Ontario”.

In 1991, the then auditor general, Kenneth Dye, dared to take a look at the Upper House. Not to worry, Mr. Speaker, for to audit the senators’ expenses, the auditor general had to get the authorization, not of the Prime Minister, but of the senators themselves. This is incredible. Of course, after much negotiation I presume, he obtained the authorization to audit the books.

In concluding, I also invite the Canadians who wish to know more on the subject or to voice their opinion about it to call a toll-free number that I will now give. Canadians who wish to call the senators’ office can dial 1-800-267-7362.

Before coming in, I made sure to get the list of Quebec senators. There are 24 of them and, of those 24, there is one independent senator, who was appointed by Mr. Mulroney and who represents the Senate division of de La Salle. There is only one independent senator on my list, Marcel Prud’homme, who, incidentally, closely follows the proceedings of the House of Commons. There are, of course, several other senators from the Liberal and Conservative ranks.

This summer, when I went around asking my constituents to sign the petition to abolish the Senate, I would often ask them to name a few senators.

• (1620)

To be sure, the senator who represents my riding is a total stranger. I am referring to the Senate division of—you see, Mr. Speaker, I am a member of Parliament and I have already forgotten—oh yes, Kennebec and the senator is Guy Charbonneau, who is from the Trois-Rivières area.

Seriously, I was not able to find anyone who could name more than one senator. The best known senator this summer appeared to be Thérèse Lavoie-Roux, since her name came up a few times in the news.

So, as far as Quebecers and Canadians are concerned, senators are total strangers. And this is costing us a fortune. The figure of \$43 million has been mentioned, but I think the real figure would more likely be \$65 million a year.

There are asbestos mines in my riding. France is about to ban this product on its soil. The French decision has been known for two and a half months already. Up till now, except for a few

Supply

diplomatic notes, the federal government has not spent a nickel to defend some 2,000 jobs directly related to the mining industry. The banning of asbestos by France will have a disastrous impact on my area and on the Asbestos area.

If we can spend \$65 million to maintain 101 jobs, almost for life, for political friends, could we not find \$2, \$3 or \$4 million to promote the use of asbestos and to counter the French decision to ban asbestos on its soil?

Several ministers of this government have travelled across the great region of the Eastern Townships and the asbestos area, saying that they would take that matter up with their colleague responsible for international trade or with their colleague responsible for natural resources. However, nothing has happened and yet the French decision will get implemented in two or three months from now, on January 1 next.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking you, which means could we use to try to make this government understand that it should help us abolish the Senate? You are going to tell me that this would require unanimous consent and that senators would have to accept their demise. How could we do it?

I will give you the recipe. First, we should stop immediately appointing new senators. One of them, Jean-Louis Roux, just resigned. He headed for Quebec City with a slight raise. He now has \$94,000, a chauffeur and a nice limousine, and he can also appear on the stage. That is what we call double dipping.

At least, there is a vacancy following the departure of the former senator Jean-Louis Roux. Let us not appoint a new senator to replace him. We would have at least one vacancy, which will save us over \$100,000, with all the expenses related to this job.

As soon as some of the senators reach 65 years of age—

An hon. member: Seventy-five.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): Seventy-five years of age, yes, thank you for reminding me, let us not appoint new ones.

At some point, there will be no senators left, although when we reviewed the list earlier on, we realized that the government, especially the current prime minister, has been generous. I noticed that some senators have been appointed until 2023. Can you imagine, until 2023. As you know, job security, even in the civil service—as I look at the table clerks, is a thing of the past. It does not exist any more. But we still appoint senators until 2023. That is simple awful, as you will agree.

• (1625)

An hon. member: Quebec will be sovereign before that.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): I hope that Quebec will indeed become sovereign before that.

Supply

I am telling you, in my riding, the best known senator is Thérèse Lavoie-Roux, and the senator who has just resigned has also become quite famous, Jean-Louis Roux. But of course he is not responsible for the fame he has acquired, because it is our good old Prime Minister who did not deign to consult, as is the tradition, his counterpart in Quebec in order to arrive at an agreement on an appointment.

I see here, for example, Marie-P. Poulin, who was appointed until the year 2020. This is terrible.

Of course, while our fellow citizens have to tighten their belts, while both spouses often have to work, while everybody in a household has to work, in Quebec, an education-employer sectoral round table was set up to ask employers not to work students too hard, because it has a negative impact on their studies. In many households, 14, 15 or 16-year olds must work to help their parents. But here, in the House of Commons, we appoint senators who profit from the system.

Only this week, I read about a poll done in Great Britain. According to this poll, 52 per cent of the respondents said they were in favour of the abolition of the monarchy; 52 per cent of British respondents said that, while here, in Canada, we have a very British system with a representative of the same Queen who is also costing us a fortune. And all provinces, even the smallest ones, must have a lieutenant governor who is the Queen's representative.

So do you not think that the time has come to put an end to this scandalous waste of public funds? While we are unable to find, at Treasury Board, \$3 or \$4 million to help save 2,000 jobs in the asbestos mines, we will spend—and I do say spend—needlessly, without getting anything in return, \$65 million this year to sustain the Senate. It is a shame. It is outrageous.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, of course, I want to congratulate my colleague from Frontenac for his speech and for giving his voters a chance to express themselves through the petition which is being circulated in his riding.

I would like to ask him a double question. He talked about the senators' involvement in regional issues. On the asbestos issue particularly, the hon. member, like the people from the industry, must have a lot of work to do, and, normally, there should be a senator from the area to help them in their efforts.

During the three years he has been here, did the hon. member see the senator for his area work on an issue of direct regional interest? We do not see those people very often around here. Maybe things are different in his riding. I would like to have his opinion on the subject.

You know, we do not see the senators very often. Of course, there are the two or three we regularly meet in the corridors, like Senator

Rivest and Senator Prud'homme. As for the others, we do not see them very often.

The second part of my question is this: Since there is currently a debate on the question in his riding, is it true that his voters think that the Senate should be reformed? What do the people he talked to about Senate reform think? I would also hear his views on that.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Témiscamingue should know that the percentage of success in these tests is very low. If I could, I would ask my colleague from Témiscamingue to give me the name of his Senate division and the name of his senator. I would be willing to bet \$10 that he does not know.

• (1630)

In response to his first question, I can tell the hon. member that the senator who represents the division of Kennebec is Guy Charbonneau, who, until recently, was Speaker of the Senate. If he visited the riding of Frontenac, he did it very quietly since we never heard about such a visit. I have never seen the name of our senator mentioned in the newspapers, yet I read them from cover to cover. Even worse, at a press conference held six months ago, I did the test with reporters from the asbestos region and none of them could name the senator who represents us. Yet they all knew the names of the Speaker of the House of Commons and his three assistants. That was good, at least.

The second question is this: Has the senator for our senatorial designation ever tried to do anything about important issues in his designation? To my knowledge, we have never had the slightest assistance from our senator, never.

This afternoon, we were visited by a group of Belgian senators. In Belgium, the senators are elected. In the United States, they are as well.

When we were trying to bring about a major constitutional reform, which was blocked by a few people—I can still remember the feather—we wanted to have a Triple E Senate, which meant equal, among other things. In Quebec we have 24 for a population of seven million, whereas in Prince Edward Island they have three for a population smaller than that of Sherbrooke; four MPs, four senators, they are overrepresented or we are underrepresented. In any event, looking at the results, there is no big difference. But, if senators were elected, I would be in favour.

I remember very clearly a senator saying to me on the way out of the parliamentary restaurant last spring: "As far as I am concerned, the day we are required to campaign to get elected is the day I quit the Senate". That might be a good way to weed out some of them, and it would get results.

My colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup was again telling us just now in his speech about the television news clip that showed four senators sleeping soundly. Is that not shocking? I remember when television was introduced in the British Parliament and the camera panned the House and showed one MP with his eyes shut; he lost his seat.

Some hon. members: Ha, ha.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): You are right to laugh. He lost his seat.

I understand that it is not funny for Senator Prud'Homme, who, I agree, is an excellent senator. It is sad for him, but a number of our constituents remind us, and rightly so, of the news program where they saw senators sleeping. There is no more than one throne speech every two years. He could have gone to bed a bit earlier the night before—

Some hon. members: Ha, ha.

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac): —because he had to work the next day.

Now, we wanted a triple E Senate. Efficient, not asleep on the job. When I used to hire people to work on our farm, if I had found the guy I was paying to clear stones asleep on the job, he would not have worked for long.

Thank you for your kind attention, and long live a triple E Senate, maybe.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time is well and truly up.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster.

I am pleased to initiate the first motion to amend the main estimates. My motion, seconded by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, will amend vote 1. It proposes that vote 1, in the amount of \$40,713,000 under Parliament—Payments to the Senate, program expenditures in the 1996-97 main estimates, be reduced by \$10 million.

• (1635)

I would like to give some background to that motion. It goes back to the government operations committee. Last March I moved a motion in committee that we invite the Senate to come before the committee to examine the estimates of the Senate. We debated that motion and the vote was relatively close. The Bloc and the Reform voted in favour and the Liberals were split. However, it went through committee.

In order to send a letter to the Senate there has to be unanimous consent of this House, which we got. The letter went to the

Supply

Senate inviting it to come before the government operations committee to basically go over the estimates for the \$40 million for the Senate. This was not an untoward request. Any business, household, this House or any other institution has to justify how they are going to spend money. All we were asking was for the Senate to come forward and justify how it was going to spend the \$40 million.

However, the senators ignored that request. Subsequently I sent a letter to Senator Kenny, the head of the Senate finance committee, which was also ignored. We asked for a conference between this House and the Senate to discuss these issues. That was ignored. We simply have heard nothing.

My point is that if the senators refuse to come before the committee to justify their expenses, there has to be a reason. What is the reason? The reason could be that they figure they are way over there and that they should not have to justify their expenses, or perhaps they do not want people looking into the estimates because there are areas that they do not want to or cannot explain. I would suggest that could well be the case.

In 1991 the auditor general looked into the accounting process within the Senate. Unfortunately it was a bit of a horror show. This request, which originated from Reform, also has the backing of the auditor general's accounting into the Senate. In 1991 he basically found that it is an inefficient and poorly managed institution. There has been plenty of time, five years, for the Senate to address the concerns of the auditor general and to come before the Canadian public. It was an excellent opportunity to come before the committee and say: "Okay. We are open and above board. The auditor general said there were some major concerns, but we are quite willing to come before the Canadian public and justify our expenses". That did not happen.

I would like to go through some of the points because they are significant in that some areas, including travel and how the accounts are processed, really leave a lot of room for concern for the Canadian public. I will go through a number of these points but I will not belabour them.

These are from the auditor general's report: "The Financial Administration Act does not apply to the Senate. Therefore the usual accountability mechanisms simply do not apply". Another point: "The Senate has neither formally nor informally delegated clear responsibility to management, nor has it made it clear what it will hold management accountable for". Basically, it is a very loose relationship within the Senate management team. Again: "The Senate does not adequately report on its administrative, financial or human resource management performance and does not possess significant information to enable it to do so systematically". Again, it is a very loose system of managing the support staff within the Senate.

Supply

● (1640)

The public reporting provided by individual committees does not reflect all expenditures and does not provide detailed information on expenditures, so we have a number of committees basically out on the loose. Their expenditures are not recorded correctly. This is simply not the way to run a business.

If that is the way things were going in this House, we would clean up our act. However, because it is the Senate, apparently it can do whatever it likes. That is the appearance and that is what has Canadians' backs up. They feel that group refuses to be accountable for its actions and refuses to come forward and have its books audited.

To continue with the auditor general's points, basic facts about Senate administration such as organizational structure, operational goals, plans and performance are not published. Amounts reported in the public accounts are incomplete and do not give sufficient information to determine whether the expenses incurred were for "the service of the Senate as required by the Parliament of Canada Act".

Senators are incurring expenses and those expenses cannot be back traced to show that they are related to Senate business. It is really getting to the point of being bizarre. Surely there must be some points. We have the Parliament of Canada Act, yet the senators refuse to abide by it.

I could go on and on. Anybody can pick up the 1991 auditor general's report on the Senate. Auditor General Kenneth Dye went into great detail on some of the areas that need to be tightened up.

The auditor general's report is long and scathing and it notes many areas of possible abuse. That is the point and that is the reason I moved the motion in committee to have the Senate come before our committee.

We have a Liberal government across the way. Before the last election the Liberals took the position: "Elected representatives must be permitted more influence on decisions regarding expenditure priorities. This will require their meaningful involvement in the process before government's actual spending estimates are formally prepared". I would like to ask members across the way how much input they had on the estimates going to the Senate. I would venture to say that it was very little, which is unfortunate.

Talk of Senate reform has gone on for years. My colleagues from the Bloc are advocating abolition of the Senate. My Reform colleagues do not advocate abolition; we feel the Senate has to be reformed. It is an institution that can work and can work very well. However, it cannot work in its present form.

In 1991 the current Prime Minister told the House of Commons: "Reform of the Senate is extremely important. I believe in it. There is nothing sacrosanct about the present division of powers. We must look for a division of powers that best serves the interests of all the people, all the Canadian people". This is from our current Prime Minister. If this quote is accurate, I would expect that Liberals across the way and Reformers would all want to have a Senate that works, that is not a patronage haven for the old boys and the old girls, but an institution that works.

I will return to the American and the Australian examples because their Senates work. In each case, oddball goofy legislation does not go through the lower house because they know it will never go through the upper house. Those are Senates that work. Unfortunately some of that legislation goes through this House and lands on a Senate that is ineffective and inactive.

● (1645)

I would like to sum up with the issue of accountability. We have a vote this evening on the estimates of the Senate. I challenge members on the government side. They do not know what they are voting for in the estimates for the Senate. They cannot because other than lump sums, the Senate committees have failed to come before us to justify exactly what the expenditures are.

Are government members going to vote as they are told or are they going to question these estimates? If they are going to question them, why are they not putting more pressure on the senators to come before the government operations committee to bring forward their reasons why some of the travel budgets, some of the staffing and some of the accounting procedures are so out of whack?

I sum up with the analogy of the dinosaur and where I see the Senate right now. A group of dinosaurs are sitting on the edge of the swamp. They can either carry on there and in a hundred million years we will find them as a lump of coal, or they can turn around and back up. Others will say the dinosaurs are gone anyway.

The point is that the Senate has an opportunity right now to come into the 20th and 21st centuries and not become dinosaurs but become part of an institution that really works, an institution that this country is crying for. We need the two Houses to work well together and right now they are not. Right now we have a lower House that moves through the legislation and the upper House that is just rubber stamping it.

My last point is that we must have accountability. The Senate has refused to be accountable. My motion to reduce the estimates by \$10 million stands and I move that motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to ask a question of my colleague from the third party. The hon.

Supply

member mentioned that the senators have refused to come before the committee to account for the funds they received.

I have two questions for him. First does he believe that the Senate could justify what it receives considering its present political relevance? Secondly, since my colleague compared senators to dinosaurs, my question is the following: If a majority of Canadians were in favour of the abolition of the Senate since dinosaurs have disappeared, should the Senate be abolished to make way for a new political vision? Otherwise, what would be the solution?

[*English*]

Mr. Gilmour: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the questions. If I understood the question on relevance correctly I believe it is relevant to have the senators come before the committee. What is quite relevant is the fact that the Senate is being handed a blank cheque for \$40 million of Canadian taxpayers' money. There has to be accountability and that is the whole reason for the motion.

On the second point the difference between the views of the Bloc and Reform of the Senate is whether the Senate should be abolished, as the Bloc is basically moving toward, and the Reform view that it needs to be brought into the 20th and 21st century as a tripartite E Senate.

I used the analogy of the dinosaurs. If the senators keep going the way they are going with no reforms they will join the dinosaurs. If members wandered into the Senate these days they might think they are mired in a swamp a hundred million years ago.

I hope I have answered my colleague's questions and if there are any more I would be delighted to answer them.

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am in great sympathy with the motion from my colleague from the third party.

• (1650)

I point out to the House that what is at issue is not just accountability, which is key to the issue, but also that the Senate would like the country to believe it is a house equal in authority to the House of Commons.

The reality is that there is only one highest authority in this land and that is this House of Commons which is responsible to every aspect of the land. It is the ultimate chamber of accountability. The Senate must be subject to that because it is not elected as are we in the House of Commons.

I strongly endorse the motion put forward by the member for the third party, even though he is a political opponent. He is right. He is on the right track. Accountability from the Senate will make a responsible Senate and the Senate can therefore contribute materially to this nation in a very responsible way.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of speaking to my colleague's motion to reduce the estimates of the Senate by some \$10 million.

The member for Comox—Alberni spoke very eloquently regarding the Senate. He gave us a lot of facts and he also told about the unaccountability of the Senate. I too will touch on the unaccountability but I want to talk a little about some principles and some attitudes as well as accountability with regard to this matter.

First of all, whose money are we talking about? If we look at the estimates, it says \$40.700-some for the Senate. Someone might say that this is the Senate's money. It is not the Senate's money. It is Canadians' money because these are taxpayers' dollars. Some of that money is yours and mine and the other 29 million Canadians who support the Senate through their tax contributions.

We are talking about reducing spending by the Senate by \$10 million in this motion. That \$10 million is not the Senate's dollars. We are not taking \$10 million from the Senate. What we are doing is talking about how we are going to spend \$10 million of taxpayers' money.

In Kindersley—Lloydminster, if someone is speaking to a group or to an individual and wants to draw a laugh, start talking about the Senate. That is the esteem in which the Senate is held by average Canadians. We are spending \$40 million for something about which Canadians do not think very highly. The attitude of Canadians is that the Senate, in the form in which it now exists, is not a very good investment.

I can guarantee that if someone surveyed Canadians from one end of this country to another and if they had any criticism of this motion, they would say that they are not reducing the Senate's spending by enough. Ten million dollars is pretty modest. After all, that is our money and we think it could be put to better use.

I think of my own riding of Kindersley—Lloydminster. How could that money be used in Kindersley—Lloydminster? Because of health care funding cuts, hospital have been closed in the Kindersley—Lloydminster constituency. It means that while there are still some good health care facilities available, some people might not get there on time. Lives may actually be lost because of the health care cuts experienced in Kindersley—Lloydminster.

I also have a stretch of the Yellowhead highway that goes through my constituency near Lloydminster and also near Saskatoon. A lot of that highway is still two-way traffic. It is one of the major transportation arteries across this country. Funding in part to upgrade that highway is a federal responsibility. There has been talk and commitments of upgrading the Yellowhead highway.

I know the constituents in the Lloydminster area would much rather see this \$10 million go into highway construction on the Yellowhead than see an unaccountable Senate spending those dollars on what we know not.

Supply

The concern of Canadians is why would they fund something for which they have no respect? Our concern should be then, what do we do about it? Immediately, what we can do is reduce their funding. There are some longer term things that need to be done. My colleague from Comox—Alberni has touched on that.

Certainly he has tried to initiate some accountability from the Senate and I appreciate his endeavour. He requested the Senate to appear before this House and account for how those dollars are spent. It was not a very threatening request. It was fairly civil and fairly reasonable, in fact very reasonable and very important. It was an opportunity for the Senate to justify the way it has been spending tax dollars but it ignored his request. That tells us a bit about the attitude of the Senate itself. Canadians' attitude may not be good toward the Senate but it is reciprocated by the Senate, which has a very low opinion of Canadians and of its role in accounting for the money that it spends.

• (1655)

There is a difference between this House and the other place. In this House we are held accountable. We can hold one another accountable in debates and so on and how we vote on legislation, but there is that accountability that comes at election time.

One of our colleagues actually wrote a letter to the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* which is published in today's edition and it is absolutely wrong. This member for Saskatoon—Humboldt said: "In June I spoke in the House of Commons in opposition to a Reform Party motion aimed at the destruction of the Canadian Wheat Board". People who read *Hansard* could look there and they would not find one word by one Reformer who ever called or indicated any aim of ours to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. We talked about reforms to the board, improving the board and the long term viability of the board but in no case did we ever talk about the destruction of the board. In fact we said that is not what we want to accomplish.

The member for Saskatoon—Humboldt can be held accountable. We can talk to her constituents and they have an opportunity at the next election not to vote for her if she was wrong on this issue, which she was, and in other areas in which she may be wrong.

That is not the case with senators. They are not accountable. They are patronage appointments. Once they have that seat in the other place they are pretty comfortable. They can pretty well do whatever they want. They can make statements that are rather ridiculous like the statement made by the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt and nobody can challenge them. Canadians have no way

to hold them accountable. They do not have to be answerable for their actions, for their words and for their deeds.

Everyone in this House would agree that is not a very healthy situation. We need to bring more accountability to the Senate. Perhaps if we vote them \$10 million less of Canadian taxpayers' dollars to spend it will wake them up. Some of my Bloc colleagues have been talking about them sleeping. Sometimes when you take some money out of your back pocket it wakes you up if you are sleeping and that is what this motion intends to do.

We have on record Liberal promises to the effect that the Liberal Party, if it was in government, would reform the Senate. There are more broken promises. We have a promise from the Prime Minister that he is committed to an elected Senate. He has not kept that promise which is one of many that the Liberals have broken. We wonder how much longer Canadians will let the Liberals get away with making promises that they have absolutely no intention of fulfilling.

We do not even need a constitutional change to invite the provinces to elect senators. We have already had one elected Senator in this place, Senator Stan Waters, who has since passed away. He was elected by the people of Alberta and the then prime minister appointed an elected person to the Senate. It seems funny to appoint an elected person, but because of our Constitution that is the only way it can be done. A long term project would be to fix that process.

As the House knows, I am a committed supporter of the triple E concept. I want to see an elected, an effective and an equal Senate. It is certainly very important to the people of Saskatchewan. For the Liberals, as I said, who promised an elected Senate we just have to look at the record. Since they took office in the fall of 1993 they have appointed 18 Senators and most of them for a very partisan activity.

It is very interesting for me because I am the agriculture critic that one of the senators is Eugene Whelan who has a long history of being involved in agriculture. He was appointed on August 9. It would be great to have someone who is a voice for agriculture in the Senate if they were accountable. If farmers could say: "We want you to vote this way and if you don't, we don't want you in the Senate any more". Of course Mr. Whelan is in there until he is 75 years of age. The farmers have no way of removing Mr. Whelan from the Senate should he not represent their interests in the Senate.

Mr. Whelan is from Ontario and so he should be representing the interests of Ontario farmers; the corn producers, soybean producers and the milk producers. However, Mr. Whelan can just support the Liberal agenda no matter whether it is good for the farmers of Ontario or not. That is extremely unfortunate. I do really think that when one makes a promise it is extremely important to keep it.

Supply

• (1700)

We talked about the attitude of Canadians toward the Senate. Canadians have an attitude toward us in this place as well. We had better be on our toes and perform for Canadians, or the attitude or esteem they hold us in may not be much better than the attitude or esteem they have for the Senate. The one way to build up people's confidence and trust is to keep one's promises.

In the red book the Liberals criticized the Conservative practice of choosing political friends when making thousands of appointments to boards, commissions and agencies that cabinet is required by law to carry out. They also campaigned on integrity in government, patronage appointments and lack of accountability in the Senate. They have clearly broken these promises.

I quote from the Prime Minister. In October 1990 in the province of Alberta, out west where there is real call for Senate reform, he spoke to the federal Liberal Party and said that in two years the Liberal government would make it elected. Obviously the Liberals were in opposition then so we have to understand that he meant two years after the Liberals formed the government. I think that is fair to say.

Let us look at when the Liberals formed the government. It was in October 1993. A little simple math tells us that two years later would be October 1995, which is almost one year ago, and this promise has not been kept. There is not even the slightest indication in the throne speech that the Prime Minister intended to keep his promise. There have been no words from members on the other side that the Liberals intended to keep this promise. What are we to conclude but that he never meant it. It is another broken promise.

In 1991 the Prime Minister changed a bit. He said that he would propose a 2E and a 1R Senate: elected, effective and representative of the regions. This is not what we called for but it is an improvement. We would look for the Liberals to do what they usually do, and that is a half-baked job. They have not even done that.

It is time to conclude my presentation. I certainly support the motion to reduce spending in the Senate by a mere \$10 million. I could have supported more. To wake senators up perhaps we need to make them a bit hungry. If they were a bit hungry they would not be going to sleep over there. In fact they might be a little more interested in reforming themselves. They might be a little more interested in coming over here and accounting for tax dollars they are spending, which would make Canadians feel a whole lot better.

Mr. John Harvard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we should set the record straight. In 1992 the Reform Party had an opportunity to support major Senate change in the Charlottetown accord. Of course the Reform Party campaigned against it. So much for the Reform Party's credibility on that issue.

On the motion brought forward by the hon. member, our friends opposite are mixing two issues. One is the issue of Senate accountability and the other is the issue of the future of the Senate. I do not think there is anyone in the House of Commons who does not want major change when it comes to the Senate. I certainly want major change. I am not even too sure whether we should have a bicameral legislature.

The other issue—and the member should not be mixing the two—is the issue of accountability. I would be much more impressed if the hon. member, a number of months ago, had simply walked down the halls of Parliament to the Senate, presented himself to the Senate's finance committee, and demanded a change in the way the Senate accounts to Parliament and to the Canadian people. When he did what he did in trying to force the Senate's hand through the committee on government operations, it looked like grandstanding. It looked like he was trying to put on a show.

For all intents and purposes the other place is autonomous and separate from this Chamber. If we want greater accountability from the other place, which is what I want, we have to follow proper procedures. This motion and what the hon. member tried to do in the last few months only get the senators' hackles up. If we want to do this properly and with credibility, we go to the Senate and force it to hold a hearing to deal with this question. We should not do it the way the hon. member has tried to do it. It simply does not have credibility and will not work. It has been shown that in the last few months his attempts have fallen flat. He got absolutely nowhere with senators because they have their pride whether or not it is wrongly placed. Those are my comments.

• (1705)

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Winnipeg St. James for his comments. My colleague followed the proper procedure. He was not grandstanding, which is proven by the fact that the House gave unanimous consent. Members of the Liberal party supported what he was trying to do. Unanimous consent is the consent of the NDP, Bloc, Liberal and Reform. All agreed that the Senate should be held more accountable. The member for Comox—Alberni met in a very respectable way with Senator Kenney to request that type of co-operation, and they thumbed their noses at a very responsible approach.

The member mentioned the Charlottetown accord and said that Reform refused its opportunity to support Senate reform. He must have a very short memory. He probably does not recall some of the changes called for in the Charlottetown accord regarding the Senate. It was actually kind of a racist approach to Senate reform. If I remember correctly, Senate seats were based on heritage, ethnic origin. There had to be so many francophone senators and

Supply

the majority of them had to vote for legislation that affected language and culture. Talk about pulling scabs off wounds inflicted hundreds of years ago.

Anyone who supported the Charlottetown accord and the type of Senate reform that it was calling for would have done a terrible disservice to Canada. Canadians supported Reform's opposition to the Charlottetown accord by voting against it and by voting against the judgment of the Liberals and Conservatives who tried to impose this terrible piece of legislation on Canadians.

I applaud Canadians. I am very disappointed in the member for suggesting that anyone should stoop to supporting to Charlottetown accord.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke opened his speech by stating the reason he was making his points was that the federal government had responsibility for reconstructing a road in his constituency. Could the hon. member give the House a yes or no reply to the question whether he is in agreement with the Reform party's budget published last year, which said the federal government should get out of the business of road construction and turn it over to the private sector so that the general public could pay for the road through tollgates?

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not pay very much attention to what Reformers have been saying about roads. If he had done so, he would realize why we did so very well in the Labrador byelection when we talked about a road that needed to be built in that part of Canada for which the Liberals had absolutely no regard and almost lost the byelection over. Reform had zero votes in 1993 and almost won the byelection in 1995.

I take some solace in the fact that Reform listens to Canadians and knows where they want to spend dollars. Reform does not support spending where the federal government does not belong. We stand by our budget. We stand by spending money for federal infrastructure where the federal government is required to play a role.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to members of the House today on the subject of full supply of the estimates for fiscal year 1996-97. This year the main estimates total \$157 billion, a reduction of \$7.2 billion compared to the 1995-96 main estimates.

Of the \$157 billion, \$111.7 billion or 71 per cent represents statutory payments authorized by Parliament in previous years. The government is seeking approval to spend the remaining \$45.3 billion for programs that rely on annual appropriations.

To improve the information available to parliamentarians on the main estimates and their relationships to the budget, this year the

government introduced a new document entitled "Program Expenditure Detail: A Profile of Departmental Spending". This new document, while not formally constituting part of the estimates, combines federal program spending details previously presented in both part I of the estimates and the budget. Presenting spending information on a basis consistent with the expenditure plan contained in the budget provides parliamentarians with a bridge between the budget document and other estimate documents.

• (1710)

The government has maintained its resolve to reduce program spending. In 1996-97 program spending including public debt charges is \$109 billion or \$5.4 billion less than the 1995-96 main estimates. This is an important achievement. It demonstrates that the government's program review continues to have a significant impact on the level of program expenditure requirements.

If we examine the composition of spending, it is evident that most sectors of government show a decrease in planned program spending compared to the 1995-96 levels. In the estimates we categorize program spending in 10 sectors. Expenditures on social programs represent the largest component of program spending at 46 per cent.

Social sector major transfers to persons which include veterans pensions and allowances, unemployment insurance and elderly benefits constitute 34 per cent of this amount. The remaining 12 per cent is allocated to social programs directed primarily at employment, health and housing initiatives, programs that benefit aboriginal peoples, and immigration and citizenship programs.

Direct program expenditures for 1996-97 in the social sector are \$13.2 billion or 2.4 per cent less than in 1995-96. Reductions in direct program expenditures in the social area have been facilitated by clarification of core mandates of the social program departments, a key element of the program review process.

I will provide the House with a few examples of adjustments departments in the social sector are making to serve Canadians better with declining resources.

Health Canada is achieving spending reductions by maximizing efficiencies, refocusing its programs and implementing cost recovery initiatives, more specifically to shift the burden of paying for some services away from the general taxpayer to industry clients that benefit most directly from them. These were introduced for some health protection services.

In addition, efficiency measures are being undertaken by consolidating food inspection services in Health Canada with those of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans into a single food agency.

Another department in the social sector implementing innovative approaches while reducing program spending is Human Resource Development Canada. HRDC's program spending will decrease by \$419 million in 1996-97. Yet HRDC will continue to develop further its services orientation with an increased emphasis on responding to the needs of specific communities and on management by results.

To illustrate this, over the next years a new service delivery network will combine offices, kiosks, electronic online services and community partnerships to integrate the department's services and improve access for our clients. Programs and services will reflect local priorities and offer more points of service through the application of new technologies.

The heritage and cultural program sector is important to all of us. It supports the growth and development of Canadian culture and life, the nation's linguistic duality, its diverse multicultural heritage, and the preservation of parks and historic sites. Expenditures in this sector amount to \$2.5 billion in 1996-97 or approximately 5 per cent of the total direct program spending.

• (1715)

The main estimates in this sector have also decreased. For example, planned spending for the Department of Canadian Heritage in 1996-97 will decline by 4.4 per cent relative to the 1995-96 level.

Many are aware of the significant changes which are occurring in the natural resource based program sector. This sector, which accounts for 5 per cent of direct program spending, supports sustainable development to maximize economic benefits while protecting and enhancing the quality of our environment.

For example, in agricultural programs we are moving in partnership with the provinces from commodity based agricultural subsidies to a whole farm safety net focusing on income stabilization rather than income support.

Costs are also being reduced in the natural resource based programs by addressing overlap and duplication. Consolidation of activities, such as the merging of the Canadian coast guard fleet with that of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans delivers services more efficiently to clients.

In the industrial, regional and scientific technological sector program orientation has been altered significantly. Our objective in this sector is to foster economic growth and job creation through measures that stimulate private sector investment across Canada, encourage regional development and promote a stronger science and technology capability in Canada. Program expenditures of \$3.6 billion will shift from direct business subsidies to more active business support measures. The focus of federal

Supply

regional agencies will be on community based economic development and improving access by small and medium sized enterprises to commercial financing. Any remaining direct contribution programs will be fully repayable.

As a result of the major restructuring initiatives which are under way in the transportation sector, transportation programs will spend \$400 million less in 1996-97 than in 1995-96. Program expenditures of \$1.9 billion will be redirected from operating and subsidizing specific elements of the transportation infrastructure to focusing on policy development and ensuring standards for safety and security. Furthermore, commercialization of many services is being implemented to increase effectiveness in the transportation sector and to enhance responsiveness to local needs.

The general government services sector includes departments and agencies which provide central services in support of operations of government. It also includes, under the department of finance, transfer payments to the provinces and territories which are paid pursuant to the federal-provincial transfer payment program.

Although transfer payments are not part of the direct program expenditures which have been the focus of my remarks, these transfer payments to other levels of government like social sector transfer payments to persons described earlier, are part of the total program spending.

Major transfers to all levels of government include the Canada health and social transfers, transfers to territorial governments, fiscal equalization payments and other major transfers such as statutory subsidies and grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities. In 1996-97, major transfers to other levels of government will total approximately \$29.1 billion.

To return to direct program expenditures, the government services sector has rethought how it delivers services in order to increase efficiency and cost effectiveness. For example, the Department of Public Works and Government Services contains three special operation agencies: the Canada Communication Group, Consulting and Audit Canada and the Translation Bureau, which are financed on a revenue dependent basis. The net spending of the Department of Public Works and Government Services will decrease by \$98 million in 1996-97 as the department continues to explore ways to streamline operations and reduce costs.

• (1720)

I would like to conclude my remarks in support of a full supply by noting that the government will continue to use innovative approaches, new technologies and organizational reforms because of the positive results it is achieving in all sectors. The government is improving efficiency, reducing costs and making programs more responsive to the needs of Canadians.

Supply

I trust that members will support our request for full supply in the 1996-97 main estimates. We are on the right track of fiscal responsibility combined with a better program and service delivery for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the speech by the hon. member for Bruce—Grey, but I think he did not spend enough time on a number of important aspects of votes, which are basically unnecessary expenditures.

Last week we read in the newspapers about the pay system at the Department of National Defence, which is after all pretty fundamental and basic and which should work properly. It seems that some \$40 million were wasted because of a lack of modernization in a department that has certainly not lacked for funding during the past 20 years. It has always received enough money, in generous and significant amounts. During the last few years there were cutbacks and bases were closed in the regions, but as far as the bureaucracy is concerned, are we not seeing a situation where, when we look at the votes, there is a tendency to slowly but surely starve the regional branches of a department, while those at the decision-making level, in the bureaucracy, at the deputy minister level whom we see around here in Ottawa, have been able to survive quite easily?

I have another question for the hon. member regarding the Senate votes. Does it seem reasonable and normal to you that a non-elected House, after the Standing Committee on Government Operations, whose meetings you attend regularly, adopted a resolution, should say: "Sorry, we will not come and defend our budget, we do not have to, we are above that sort of thing"? Does this position on the part of the senators seem normal to you? Excuse me, I ask this question through you, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can comment on the other place, but at the outset let me make this point clear. The government intends to make its operations very efficient and effective. It intends to be a leaner organization. When we get interventions from members of the opposition or the auditor general we will try to do the best we can to make the system better.

Earlier an hon. member of the Bloc Québécois asked a similar question of my minister. He responded to the first part with regard to the department when he said that information will be forthcoming.

Treasury Board was established to review spending of departments and agencies in accordance with the Financial Administration Act. In the case of the institutions of Parliament such as the House of Commons and the Senate, Treasury Board does not perform a review of spending plans but agrees to table before the

House for consideration their main estimates and supplementary estimates. It is a customary courtesy that we perform.

Questions regarding the detailed spending plans of the Senate which are approved annually by Parliament should be referred to the chair of the Senate committee on the internal economy.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for his excellent speech and the excellent job he is doing as parliamentary secretary to the minister.

• (1725)

I would like to ask him, in his position as parliamentary secretary, whether he is happy with the performance of the Government of Canada as now being the leader in the world in economic development and its prospects for the future. Is the hon. member happy to be a parliamentary secretary in a government that now leads Japan, the United States, England, Germany, France and all the other countries?

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member from Gander for his excellent intervention. He is one of those gentleman who I have admired since being here.

One is never satisfied with what is happening. We are always trying to do better. If we are a team and want to be number one most of the time, we always have to watch our backs because number two is coming up.

This House and all its members, not only on the government side but on the opposition side, by working together for Canadians who have such great resources both in human and in natural resources, once we focus on what we do as a country and a government, once we look after our young people, our young pages here, our people who will come up with the ideas, once we stop the infighting and once we have opportunity for everybody within our communities, we will continue to be the best country in the world. I thank my friend from Gander for asking that question.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the member for the riding of Saint-Hubert and on behalf of my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois, I would like to say that we are opposed to the motion by the President of Treasury Board on Vote 1, in the amount of \$40,713,000 under the heading Parliament—Senate being concurred in.

The Bloc has always maintained its opposition to the very existence of the upper House. We believe that it is not only an anachronism but useless. It is particularly outrageous in this day and age to ask taxpayers to sink millions in such an institution, when the economy is on the verge of collapse, unemployment is dangerously high, and services to the public are being drastically reduced.

In a time of budgetary restraint, when Canada's total debt is over \$500 billion, and when the government is constantly asking people to tighten their belt, it is unacceptable to give 104 senators a \$40 million budget.

Over and above a \$64,000 annual salary, a \$30,000 research allowance, a further \$20,000 for their office expenses, and a tax free expense allowance of more than \$10,000, senators enjoy other benefits very difficult to justify.

The main duty of the Senate is to study bills coming from the House of Commons and pass them. The role of the Senate duplicates that of House, nothing more, nothing less. Sir John A. Macdonald, when defining the role of the second House, called it a "House of reflection". I must admit that in times of budget cuts, I find that reflection to be very expensive.

Former senator Chaput-Rolland once said that this other House was simply a large dormitory. Please do not misunderstand me; I have nothing against the senators. It is the institution itself we must question. As far as we are concerned, this institution is nothing but a club of venerable old partisans whose only purpose is to reward friends of the party in power.

When we read the Confederation debates, we see that the Fathers of Confederation thought the other House was very important. Both Macdonald and Cartier wanted it to be a forum for reflection that would curtail what they called "the excesses of democracy". It is logical, a Senate which is not elected but appointed does not have to abide by the principles of democracy. On one of the walls in the upper House, we can see Cicero's maxim which states: "The role of nobility is to counter the instability of the people."

● (1730)

Therefore, members of the other House are supposed to control the elected members of Parliament. In fact, the very existence of the Senate is a remnant of elitism which, in a way, runs counter to legitimate democracy.

Since members of that House are appointed by the Prime Minister, it would be absurd to think they would add a reasonable and moderating influence to any legislation proposed by the House of Commons, without any kind of partisanship.

Seats in the Upper House have always been filled by friends of the party in power. It is a well-known fact, senators are chosen for their political allegiance and their long record of service.

When former Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau was in office, 81 senators were appointed, 71 of whom were of Liberal persuasion. When former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was in office, he appointed 42 senators, 41 of whom were Conservatives. Since September 15, 1994, the current Prime Minister has appointed 17 senators, of course all good Liberal supporters.

Supply

Consequently, the institution is in no way representative of Quebec and Canadian people. Members of that House are at the most representatives of the prime minister who appoints them. Even though the Upper House has impressive powers and the institution is protected in some way by the Constitution of Canada, it does not play a very significant role in the federal regime as we know it today.

As everyone knows, the Upper House of Parliament was created by the 1867 Constitution Act to defend regional interests in the country and to contribute to political stability by acting as a counterbalance to the House of Commons. However, it was realized very quickly that this mandate was incompatible with the objectives of a centralizing government. In fact, very early in our history, it became obvious that the provinces themselves were promoting their own interests.

Even Senator Peter Bosa said in an article that was published in the *Canadian Parliamentary Review* in 1982 that the Upper House did not really represent the regions. He said, and I quote: "The belief that the Senate does not really represent the regions is, I think, justified".

While the bicameral system still prevails at the federal level, all the provinces where this type of institution existed have considered it wise to simply abolish it. That was the case of the province of Quebec, which abolished the legislative council in 1968. Quebec is no worse off since abolishing this institution.

Countries such as New Zealand, Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Spain, to name but a few, have a political system based on a single representative assembly, not two as in the case of Canada.

I realize that a constitutional amendment is required to abolish the Upper House. More specifically, under section 41 of the 1982 Constitution Act, such a change requires not only the unanimous approval of the House of Commons and of the provincial legislatures, but also the approval of the Upper House itself. Moreover, the current constitutional status quo plays in favour of maintaining this institution, even though polls show that the public supports its abolition.

According to a Gallup poll conducted in 1993, 54 per cent of Canadians are in favour of abolishing the Senate. In Quebec, the results are more conclusive since 68 per cent of Quebecers support such a measure. Quebecers and Canadians are very clear on this issue.

For the Bloc, which not only promotes the interests of Quebec but also the democratic values of Canadians, the contradiction between the arm's length relationship expected of a House of sober second thought and the partisanship actually displayed by that House is reason enough to oppose any funds that may be allocated to that institution.

Supply

• (1735)

Moreover, since the Upper House does not have to be accountable for its financial management, what are Canadians to do to get a clear idea of how the public funds allocated to the other place have been used? Quebec and Canadian taxpayers are entitled to know how public funds are used. After all, taxpayers are those providing the money allocated to that House.

Yet, we had to wait up till 1991 before a historical first audit of the administration of the other House was ever made. The Auditor General of Canada thus tabled a report in which we found that the Financial Administration Act and the accountability mechanisms do not apply to the other House. So, how can Quebec and Canadian taxpayers be satisfied that the expenditures of that Parliamentary institution are managed efficiently?

If my memory serves me well, my colleague for Terrebonne told us recently in the House of Commons about a senator who allowed himself the luxury of having his office renovated in order to get a better view, and this for a mere \$100,000. In any case, the auditor general put forward in his report 27 recommendations to deal with the flaws in the administrative management of the other place. However, since the release of that report in March 1991, strangely enough, the Upper House has not been subjected to further audits.

In my opinion, it is high time this government understood that sound management of public administration must begin with a careful and above all efficient use of taxpayers' money.

Since the Upper House does not contribute at all to the working of our modern democracy, I find it useless to allocate \$40 million every year to that institution.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on the outrageous symbol the Senate has become, given our current political and economic situation.

There is obviously something repugnant in the fact that senators refuse to appear to justify their budgetary votes. These people are not elected, they are not accountable to anybody except their friends who have appointed them, and they refuse to appear before the elected representatives to justify their operating expenditures and the total budget allocated to them.

When we talk about the Senate as a whole, the expenditures we are talking about today are only the vote of \$43 million allocated to the Senate, but there is more. We know other costs are paid in part by the House or result from the presence of senators here. So, the actual costs are much higher. We are talking here of an average of at least \$500,000 for each senator.

Do you think that, in the current context, we can really afford to waste tens of millions of dollars year in and year out? Just imagine what that adds up to over a period of 20 years. It is more than a billion for these people.

We can conclude that, after 25 years of constant deficits, the amount that has been spent on senators and their operating expenditures tops a billion dollars. We figure that a few billion dollars of the debt are due to this political institution, which has totally outlived its purpose and which has no tie to any serious political process that could yield some concrete results.

What do they do? That is the question the people in my region keep asking me. What do they do? Not much. They come here for a few days of rest, they get their pay cheque and then go back where they came from. I recently read in a newspaper: "We contacted the senator at his home"—in Fort Lauderdale, I think it was. Fort Lauderdale. Indeed, they had contacted him at his home. It is really something else to live outside the country when you sit in the Senate of Canada.

• (1740)

I would like these people to account for their actions and to explain why we should set aside some budgetary votes to pay for their operating expenditures. I hope their travel expenses do not include their trips between Canada and the United States.

Do they have any legitimacy? I said earlier that these people are appointed by the Prime Minister or his office and that sometimes, depending on the circumstances, the appointment can be seen as some kind of reward. Anyone can be appointed, a minister we want to get rid of, someone we want to keep out of the way, or a friend who did us a few favours. These people are being rewarded for services rendered.

When you do a Prime Minister or someone who could some day become Prime Minister a favour, it is like buying a 6-49 ticket: if you are lucky, some day, you could win a seat in the Senate. If you are young, you can hit the jackpot, because you get appointed until you reach 75 years of age. And at 75, you are not left in the lurch, there is a pension plan for senators. Do not worry, you are entitled to a gold-plated pension, a nice little cushion.

We can laugh about it, but at some point it no longer makes any sense and somebody has to put a stop to it. I know that a votable motion concerning the abolition of the Senate will be put before the House in the near future. I cannot wait to see it. I look at my colleagues in this House, especially the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi, who will vote on this issue and will surely support our position. He will not have any choice. I know his constituents. Some of my relatives live in his riding. These people want to sign the petition which is being circulated in my riding to have the Senate abolished. I am asking him to circulate the same petition in

his riding. While he is getting people to sign it, he will get to know his constituents better and try to convince them. I wish him good luck.

In short, my colleague talked about a poll where 68 per cent of the respondents said, in 1993, that they were in favour of the abolition of the Senate. Just think about what that percentage is today when cuts are made in social programs, in unemployment insurance, when the economic situation is very bad. Listen, the number of people in favour of the Senate's abolition cannot double because it would exceed 100 per cent, but I am convinced it is higher now.

In my riding, I started a petition with my colleague of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup no more than a week ago. We sent it to a number of organizations, and answers have started to come in. I am even thinking of hiring another staff member in my office to handle the petitions because there are so many of them. We got close to one thousand signatures in a few days. Think about it. To get so many signatures in just a few days is significant. Most members who tried it in their riding found out readily that the people are spontaneously in favour of the Senate's abolition.

And there is something else I would like to add. Not only the senators do not do much here, but they do not do much either in their region. Normally, most senators are appointed for an area or represent a region.

In the three years I have been a member of Parliament and have followed various matters very closely, I do not recall having worked with a senator who represents us. In fact, there is one who comes from our region, but he does not represent a specific area, just the province of Quebec. When there was heated debate in the Senate on such things as the GST and free trade, Prime Minister Mulroney, a Conservative, who did not have the support of the majority in the Senate, used his power to appoint additional senators. The senator from our region is one of those new senators. There is probably another senator on the list who is supposed to represent us; our region must be grouped together with other regions, but nobody knows who the senators are. We do not see them. They are not working on any issues. They are not there, they are not active, they are nothing but ghosts. They are not even there.

I am sure there are people from Abitibi—Témiscamingue watching us. If somebody somewhere remembers a matter about which a senator actually did something, call and tell us. We would really like to know. However, I am sure the phone is not about to start ringing because we have not seen any senators regularly.

By the way, if you want to sign the petition and you do not know where to find it, you can call our office at 1-800-567-6433 and we will be happy to send it to you. You can then circulate it in your area.

Supply

Some of my colleagues talked about the process. Not only is it outrageous to waste money, but look at how inflexible our political system is. Despite the obvious will of the people, particularly in Quebec, to see the Senate abolished, and even if the House of Commons were to vote in favour of abolishing the Senate, which I hope it will soon, the senators themselves would also have to say yes for the Senate to be abolished.

• (1745)

We are therefore giving them a veto, as it were, over their future, and do you think that in the end they will agree to disappear of their own accord? The only way that will happen is if there is so much pressure that they are forced to resign, because it is embarrassing to be a senator and they can no longer show their face. They will have the option of joining our other colleague in Fort Lauderdale. That is one possibility, but, that aside, for those of them who want to live in Quebec and in Canada, it will be difficult explaining to people that they are taking money from the federal government to sit in the Senate.

This shows clearly how far they have gone to protect themselves. It proves one thing, which is that these people were probably worried about being criticized one day and having their future hang in the balance.

This being the case, what we can hope for is more support. I urge people, particularly those in my riding, in my region, to add their voices and their signatures to the petition that is circulating and that will be tabled here in the House, particularly around the third hour of debate that remains on a motion by the Bloc Québécois to have the Senate abolished. That is one thing we can do, something concrete. The more signatures we get, the more it will show that we have the support of the public.

Now, there are people who would like to reform the Senate, make a few adjustments, fix it up. That, too, has serious limitations, because I am not sure that the public wants to see another political level added. Take the case of Quebec, where people are already voting in municipal, provincial and federal elections. And school boards are elected as well, I almost forgot about that. More and more, people are talking about decentralization, but we do not know exactly what is going to happen. Probably, when decentralization comes, there will be some accountability. We can therefore assume people will exercise their franchise at a more local level, but in any case above the municipal level.

Are we going to add, on top of all that, a level of elected representatives in Ottawa who will monitor other elected representatives? Our best monitors are the public. When these people get sick and tired of having us around, after four years they can wield their pencils and turf us out.

In fact, if we look at the last election, they exercised that right brilliantly and quickly changed the colour and perspective of Parliament. So I think they are capable of looking after their own

Supply

interests. Citizens are informed and follow the debates and the major issues. The media are there to pass the information on.

The concept of having a committee of elders, even if they were to be elected, is something I am not sure the public would accept. In fact, we are working very hard to get rid of a whole political level. And we certainly would not want to add another one with the Senate.

That being said, I am personally not very keen on this debate. It is also a fact that some provinces would like to take advantage of this debate to make all provinces equal in Canada. However, Quebec will never tolerate having only one-tenth of the representation in a Canadian parliamentary forum, when it has one quarter of the population. In Quebec, that would not get much support.

When there were discussions on proposals by western Canada for Senate reform, Quebec Liberals did not support those proposals.

As I said earlier, it would be interesting to see in the weeks to come—because this fall, this will be a much discussed issue—what the attitude will be of members opposite. Liberal members who tell us about the need for efficient and effective management, for cutting waste and unnecessary spending, and I see some members here in the House who have said so many times, who do so in committee and who attack all fiscal expenditures and the rest, they will have to prove they mean what they say.

Now, those people may mean what they say about making an effort and tightening their belts, but they are not even called to account. Sure, they will make cuts in places where they have friends, friends they appointed, and it may hurt them a little. We call that cutting the fat. That will not hurt anyone.

Besides, these people are not penniless. They are paid for services rendered. I do not think this will dramatically affect the financial situation of the people who are there. It will not cause a major social tragedy. There will be no need to set up committees of therapists or psychologists to help people cope with the shock of losing a job with the Senate. So there will be no serious damage.

● (1750)

Consider that between now and the year 2000, between 250 and 300 million dollars will be wasted. Will this be stopped? We say yes. We say it must stop. I hope members opposite will have the courage to act accordingly, including the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi.

[*English*]

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some degree of attentiveness to the member's arguments that he was putting forth in his speech. There are a few questions I

would like him to answer based on what he was telling me, which of course does not conform with Reform Party policy.

He talked about wanting to abolishing the Senate. That is fine. However when we take a look at what the Bloc's sister party is saying in the province of Quebec and indeed what the Bloc Quebecois is saying, it is that they will not respect the rule of law regardless of what the court decides for example in the Bertrand case; that the rule of law can be ignored, thrown out the window by a political party such as the Bloc Quebecois and its sister party, the Parti Quebecois in Quebec.

The Senate has been as we know a chamber of sober second thought. The reason we have a chamber of sober second thought is that periodically, maybe once in a hundred years, there are times when we need a check and a balance on the headstrong attitudes of people who are elected to office. That time is perhaps now when we see what is happening here in this House by a party of separatists who want to break up the country and by a party in Quebec which is in government yet has stated quite clearly and quite succinctly that it will ignore the courts and the rule of law in this country.

The Minister of Justice has stood in this House repeatedly and told us how important it is in a democracy. Surely the need for a Senate to guarantee that sober second thought is important in a democracy rather than abolishing it and allowing a party headstrong, without real commitment to democracy to go ahead and do what it thinks is right. I would like the hon. member's opinion on the sober second thought versus the abolishment.

Another point I was concerned about is the waste of money and of course we as Reformers are concerned about wasting money. He was quite critical of the cost. He mentioned the pensions and everything else that we pay for members in the other place.

I think back to about a year ago when the government introduced a gold plated pension plan, which Reformers objected to. Reformers felt that we could not participate in it because there are so many thousands of Canadians out there who have practically no money at all, who are virtually destitute. Yet this government felt it more important to give themselves a gold plated pension plan rather than looking after the seniors and the poor people, but that is another argument.

My point is that the Bloc Quebecois members voted for the gold plated pension plan to be paid for by Canadians while they want to leave the country. I found that a bit confusing. They want to leave but they want us to pay for them after they have left. To me that would seem to be a tremendous waste of money. Canadians would have to pay a pension to separatists after they had left the country.

I would like the member to comment on the waste of money on pensions to MPs, especially separatist MPs, versus money paid to pensions in the other place. Also, I am serious when I ask about

sober second thought. It may only be once in a hundred years that we need that sober second thought, but perhaps this is the time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Brien: Mr. Speaker, as caucus chairman, I might have told the hon. member that he was out of order, but I can understand that great tolerance is shown.

• (1755)

I find that somewhat regrettable. Reform members always talk about members' pensions. This issue seems to bother them quite a lot; it seems to be their main concern. I do not know if it is because they have financial worries, but there are many other problems which have to be examined. It is somewhat regrettable that their analysis is so simplistic.

I would like to come back to a comment made by the hon. member, in particular with regard to respect for the law. Of course, he toed the same line as the Minister of Justice, saying that sovereignists have no respect for the law, that they would not abide by the law or the Constitution.

What I want to point out is that, as one involved in politics, my primary concern is respecting the will of the people, respecting the democratic will. That is what democracy is all about. As well, when that opinion is voiced in a consultation like a referendum, I think that respecting democratic will ought to be the primary concern. And so it was. In the last referendum, 49.5 per cent of people said they wanted sovereignty. Yet no one said: "Let us go ahead anyway, because 49.5 per cent is enough". Everyone said: "No, we did not succeed and will have to work harder to try to win next time". Not only will we try, but we will win next time.

That is what respecting the democratic will of the people is all about. I am pleased to see that we even seem to be gaining supporters from the other side.

As politicians, our first concern must be to respect the will of the people. As for abolition of the Senate, that we will not do, because it is impossible, the law does not allow it. Since the law does not allow it, let us not change the situation. If the law does not allow it, and the will of the people is something different, let us change the laws to reflect the will of the people, particularly if that will is expressed in democratic consultations held within the rules. That is what we sovereignists are doing.

I would like to tell the hon. Reform member that he should be consistent. He is so concerned by public finances that, instead of wanting to bolster the Senate, improve its powers, he should instead rally around a position that is far closer to current reality and to what people want, which is to demand, and what is more to ensure, that the government will be forced to vote for the disappearance of an institution that is useless, out of date, and very costly.

Supply

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity this evening to talk about the main estimates.

I would like to begin my comments by clearly and unequivocally stating that I support the government in its spending estimates. I also support the adoption of the full estimates. I reject all of the amendments that have been placed on the Order Paper by the opposition.

I support the Prime Minister, the finance minister and indeed all of the cabinet. I believe and the Canadian people have demonstrated in poll after poll they understand that we have demonstrated sound fiscal management of this nation over the past three years. That is reflected in poll after poll where we hear Canadians saying very clearly that they have confidence in the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party but have very little confidence in those parties which sit opposite in this House.

There is a very clear reason for that. It is because the Liberal government clearly understands that it has a dual responsibility in government. It understands that it has a fiscal responsibility. It understands that it is necessary to make sure that there is full value for every tax dollar that is spent and that Canadians have an efficient government and one that is operating like a business although understanding that it is not a business.

Besides the fiscal responsibility, this government understands that it has a social responsibility. We collectively have a social obligation to each other in society. We have operated in this nation for well over 50 years with a collective understanding that we will not allow individual Canadians to fall below a certain level.

When people go to a hospital in this country the first question they are asked is not how much money they have or what is their insurance plan. They are asked: "How are you ill and how can we help"?

• (1800)

We have people in this country who need social support from the government. This government is determined that it will adhere to that social responsibility in addition to its fiscal responsibility.

The sound management of our country has worked well. It has led to good economic fundamentals which have led to economic growth, which has increased job creation, all while maintaining those critical support programs for Canadians.

I would like to spend a few minutes looking at the responsibilities the government has undertaken, both fiscally as well as on the social side. The Minister of Finance in his last three budgets has clearly demonstrated sound fiscal management.

Supply

We have taken the nation from a deficit of approximately 6.4 per cent of GDP and as we promised in this fiscal year we will have reduced that amount to 3 per cent of GDP. The minister in his last budget went beyond that and indicated it will be 2 per cent of GDP in the following fiscal year.

Percentages can sometimes be difficult to grasp. To put it in dollar terms, the finance minister will be reducing the deficit by some \$25 billion. Even more important than the actual amount of the deficit reduction has been what has been done in terms of borrowing needs, the actual amount the government must borrow from the markets, the amount on which is incurred additional interest costs. When the government came to power it was borrowing almost \$30 billion annually. By the next fiscal year it will be reduced to \$6 billion. It will be the lowest level of borrowing by a federal government in almost 30 years. That is the key. If borrowing is reduced, interest costs will be reduced. If interest costs are reduced then financial resources are available to use in other critical areas. The government has done that well.

The government has done a good job of reducing expenditures. The program review undertaken by the President of the Treasury Board shows a \$14 billion expenditure reduction. The government has gone from a program expenditure of 16 per cent of GDP down to 12 per cent. That 12 per cent figure is the best a federal government has done since World War II. Since World War II it has done as good or better than any other government in taking control of its program expenditures.

When we look at the cumulative effect of the finance minister's three budgets and the cumulative effect on the 1998-99 budget period, it will be collective savings of \$28.9 billion. That is a government that is committed to sound fiscal management and committed to keeping its expenditures under control.

The size of government has been reduced. The size of the civil service has been reduced. We are making sure that government does things right, prudently and efficiently.

We made another major change from previous governments with absolutely no increases in personal income tax. Compare that to what the finance minister mentioned during question period, the 39 tax increases in the previous government's regime.

We do not have sound fiscal management just for the sake of it. The interest is not just simply to keep individuals on Bay Street, Wall Street or Tokyo or London markets happy. That is not the motive for sound fiscal management. The motive is to create an environment in which jobs can be created. Sound fiscal management is allowing things to happen because we have been able to see strong economic fundamentals exist in this country. These strong economic fundamentals are allowing the private sector to do what it does best and that is create jobs. It is working.

• (1805)

The unemployment rate has dropped from 11.1 per cent to 9.3 per cent and 650,000 new jobs have been created. Is it enough? Is it something to which we just say great and rest? Obviously not. There is much more work to be done on the job creation side. Good and substantial progress has been made. It is coming about because of sound management by the government. Those economic fundamentals that I speak of are familiar to us all but I would like to enunciate some of them because it is important.

Interest rates are low. They have dropped almost four points in the last year. Indeed, for the first time in a long time, short term interest rates are actually below those of the Americans. That has a real and important impact on Canadians. If there is a three point decrease in interest rates and a person's \$100,000 mortgage comes up for renewal, that means a saving of about \$3,000 a year in after tax dollars. That is putting money back into the hands of Canadians. It is stimulating consumer demand and creating jobs.

Inflation is at its lowest sustained level in 30 years. It is a strong economic fundamental that is encouraging people to invest in Canada, to invest in jobs.

Canadian exports have increased by 40 per cent in the last three years. The government has worked hard in that area, on the whole Team Canada approach where the Prime Minister has gone abroad and helped sell Canadian business. Through the Team Canada approach, almost \$20 billion in new trade contracts have been put together.

As I mentioned earlier in continuing with economic fundamentals, the reduction of the deficit and, most important, the reduction of borrowing needs means that the government is no longer crowding out the private sector for much needed investment capital. All these economic fundamentals are leading to job creation. Six hundred and fifty thousand-plus jobs is the net increase since the government took office.

The Liberal government also understands that there are times when it is necessary to directly intervene in critical areas of the economy to help with job creation and with employment. In the last budgetary cycle and since, there have been some good examples of the targeting of resources to areas where they are needed and where they will have the best impact.

In the last budget the finance minister announced a \$315 million investment in youth employment, an area of critical importance, an area of critical need. The government has recognized it and has responded to it.

High technology is a growth area in Canada. It is an area that is capable of creating jobs in large numbers. The government has invested in the high technology area.

The Minister of Industry announced a \$150 million fund which will grow to \$250 million to help support growth in the high tech area. It is not simply government throwing the money at the high tech area. It is being done in partnership with the private sector, with a sharing of risk and a sharing of reward on those things that are successful. There has been a \$50 million investment in the Business Development Bank of Canada to assist in the high tech field, again to support emerging growth industries that can help create jobs.

I mentioned one of the fundamentals. The export area is an area of growth and an area of job creation. The last budget had a \$50 million increase in the money available to EDC to help firms that are exporting.

Over the three years of the government, important investments have been made. The infrastructure program was widely accepted across the land. It has helped not only create short term jobs, but also long term jobs by putting in place the infrastructure that is needed for the development of industry that is needed for the development of long term jobs. That has taken place as part of this infrastructure program.

• (1810)

There has been other assistance for job creation. The Minister of Human Resources Development has put together a \$300 million transitional fund which is meant to help areas of high unemployment with economic development and job creation. It is a specific need, and a specific action has been taken to meet that need.

We have seen the five employment tools brought out as part of the employment insurance reform which will help individual Canadians in obtaining employment and helping them to be reintegrated into the workforce.

The government has always understood that one of the engines of the economy, one of the things that drives job creation, drives economic growth, puts the people back to work, particularly in an area like mine of Parry Sound—Muskoka, is the support of the small business sector. It is the engine that drives the economy. It is where new jobs are being created in the Canada of 1996 and well on into the 21st century.

Many things have been done to help in that area. A major thing has been working to increase the access to capital for these businesses, not simply by saying that government can be the lender to all businesses, but by working with the private sector to insist that it provides additional capital to the small business men and women, the entrepreneurs who are out there.

Supply

Over the last two years through the work of the industry department and in particular the industry committee, a number of tools have been developed with the chartered banks: a code of conduct that governs the relationship between a bank and the small business person; an alternative dispute resolution system; a mediation process when there are disputes; an ombudsman in each of the banks; an industry ombudsman that can deal with problems that cannot be dealt with within the organization.

Most important, the banks have agreed to provide Parliament quarterly with their small business lending statistics. Then we can evaluate. We will know it is not just words we hear that these codes of conduct mean something. We can actually see what their lending is to small businessmen and women in this country. We can react when we do not believe it is happening the way it should.

These are important tools. Progress is being made. Much yet needs to be done in terms of access to capital but progress is being made and we are working to help small businessmen and women.

There are some direct things we have been able to do in that respect as a government. The amount of money available to the Business Development Bank of Canada this past year has been increased from \$3 billion to \$15 billion. There is the small business loan program, a government guaranteed loan program, which the chartered banks and others administer. That has been increased from \$4 billion to \$12 billion, again to allow more access to the small business sector.

The Minister of Industry began the community investment plan. Communities will be allowed to bring together the small business people in their areas with individuals who have investment capital. The two will be brought together in partnership to help their individual communities grow.

Recently I had an opportunity to work with both the chartered banks and the community futures organizations. They have entered into a program that will see \$2 million flow from the chartered banks to community futures in rural Canada, rural Ontario. This will provide more capital at the higher risk end. Small businessmen and women who are having difficulty accessing capital can go to the community futures and be able to borrow.

Obviously we have worked hard in the area of small business to provide it with the tools it needs to create jobs in our communities.

It is not just a matter of fiscal management, it is not just a matter of getting the economic fundamentals right. All of that is important in government, but we also have to remember our social responsibility, and this government lives up to that very much.

Look at some of the expenditure figures from the last budget: OAS, \$21.9 billion; employment insurance, \$13.8 billion; CHST,

Supply

\$26.9 billion; veterans affairs, \$1.8 billion. This is a government that cares about individual Canadians.

• (1815)

In conclusion, when evaluating whether or not these things have worked for Canada, when you evaluate whether this government has done a good job for Canada it is simply a matter of asking some questions. Is the unemployment rate down? Yes it is. Are more Canadians working today than three years ago? Yes there are. Has the deficit been reduced in the last three years? Yes it has. Are expenditures down? Yes they are. Are interest rates down? Indeed they are, by more than three points. Are exports up? Yes, 40%. Has our tourism deficit been reduced? Absolutely, by more than \$3 million. The best question to ask, and it has been asked three years in a row by the United Nations, is Canada the best country in the world? Absolutely, it is the best country in the world. We have made good progress as a government. There is still much to be done and we are committed as a government to doing it.

Our government's actions and performance has been one of strong actions, hard work and most of all, as I just indicated, one of accomplishments.

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague from Parry Sound—Muskoka tried to praise the government for its good management, comparing the running of the government to that of a major corporation or any business doing well in the private sector.

I would like him to tell us how he can make such a comparison in view of certain careless mistakes on the part of the government and certain measures it did not take when it could have. We realize that, in the private sector, decisions are made every day to ensure that each department of a particular company is financially viable, that the business turns a profit, and that every penny which can be saved is.

The most recent example is CP Rail, which has just been privatized. We noticed that, as soon as it was privatized, CP Rail took all the least profitable parts of its system to form one company, which is going to try to make the eastern system more profitable. This company is giving itself three years to succeed.

This is the kind of management you find in the private sector. Has the government done the same thing with the Senate since 1867? How can the government claim it has taken the necessary steps to reduce expenditures to the bare minimum, and that it has gotten rid of the non-profitable parts of its enterprise?

How can the member justify a propaganda campaign such as was undertaken concerning the Canadian flag? Is this ongoing \$23 million expenditure justifiable under the broad principles of good management referred to by the member?

Could the hon. member tell me which large and well managed company, which large Canadian, Quebec or Ontario company would keep 104 directors who, most of the time, are asleep at their desk, and that we pay presumably to check decisions already made by other directors?

Always from the point of view of sound management, would a single profitable company behave in such a fashion? Yet, that is what the government is doing with the Senate. Today, we are being asked to approve a \$50 to 60 million budget, for a single year, to support 104 senators who no longer have anything to do regarding the profitability of the large Canadian company called Parliament.

Could the hon. member tell me that sound management principles apply in the case of the Senate? How can the hon. member reconcile this ignorance of Parliament for an obsolete institution which should be done away with as soon as possible? I would like the hon. member to answer that question.

• (1820)

[English]

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify a number of points the hon. member made.

In terms of comparing the government to a business, I said very clearly that the government had to operate in a businesslike manner but at the same time understand that it was not a business.

We undertake things in the House not to make a profit. We support medicare not to make a profit. We support Canadian over age 65 not to make a profit. We make sure there is an EI system not to make a profit but because government understands it has a social responsibility and acts collectively on behalf of all Canadians. It is important to understand that.

We talked a bit about fiscal management. What is the fiscal management of the government? I will remind the hon. member of a \$25 billion reduction in the deficit and collective savings of \$28.9 billion. That is fiscal management.

The hon. member talked about propaganda. I want to tell all members in the House and everyone watching television that having pride in Canada, being patriotic about the country, understanding its history or living day by day with a love of the country in one's heart is not propaganda. It is being a good Canadian. I am proud of the country and the Canadians who live in it.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the member's long speech on anything other than the other place, which is the motion we are supposed to be debating at the moment. We are debating the estimates and the motion pertaining to the other place at the moment. We will vote on the larger issue of the estimates later today.

Supply

Many Canadian feel the other place is largely superfluous and perhaps is a waste of money. If we have to listen to more speeches like we have from the member, Canadians will start thinking that this House is superfluous. There was nothing but unabashed promotion of what the government thinks it has accomplished for Canadians.

I remember jobs, jobs, jobs as being the cry during the last election. We all remember that. Unemployment is barely less than 10 per cent today and families need more and more part-time jobs, several jobs. It is more difficult for them to make ends meet. They feel more and more pressed as their standard of living is getting squeezed. These are the real facts being published in the tons of paper emanating from government offices. When we look at the fine print we find that Canadians are not enjoying greater prosperity and they do not have all these jobs the government promised.

When we take a look at the deficit we see that it is coming down, but the point is that the deficit has come down strictly because tax revenues have gone up. A \$25 billion reduction is exactly the amount of additional revenue the government is getting from the Canadian taxpayer, and government members stand and say what a wonderful job of management of the deficit they are doing.

A month from now the Minister of Finance will have an announcement saying our new target is 1 per cent of GDP. He will not say that it will come down because we will squeeze even more taxes out of Canadians. He will talk about the fact that he has not raised taxes. That is wonderful but he does not say he is eliminating tax deductions for seniors. He proposed in his last budget that the first \$1,000 of pension income which used to be tax free would no longer be tax free. That sounds like a tax increase to me.

• (1825)

Mr. Strahl: It is a grab.

Mr. Williams: Seniors who have been entitled to an exemption of around \$3,000 to \$4,000, to reduce their tax bill because they are over 65, will have that tax deduction eliminated. That seems to me to be an increase. Why does the hon. member feel he can stand and tell Canadians that everything is coming up roses when they feel things are getting bad out there?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I differ with the hon. member's interpretation of things. If we look at pollster after pollster who talks to Canadians, they come back each and every time and demonstrate confidence not only in the government but in the Prime Minister. The member is right that more work needs to be done, but 650,000 new jobs were created.

He went on to talk about nothing being done on the deficit. Indeed the deficit is coming down by \$25 billion. Then he said that we cannot count new revenue coming in; that is not allowed. He

ought to talk to the finance critic in his party who puts together its budgetary plan which calls for over \$20 billion of new revenue to come into the government.

Maybe he would want to talk to his finance critic if he does not accept the fact that economic growth is one of the ways to bring down the deficit. Perhaps he wants to be like all the other Reformers who feel the only way to do it is to slash and burn and take away from the most needy Canadians. A balanced approach does things: economic growth along with sound fiscal management.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you clear up the matter of what is under debate right now? Reformers have made the point that they believe we are confined to a debate on the Senate. Is that correct? Or, are they wrong again?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The member has put the Chair in a strait-jacket. Suffice it to say I will not rule on right or wrong.

The debate is open in its fullness on the estimates. Correctly a notice of opposition was put forward by the Reform Party with regard to the other place. Other notices of motions have been put on the order paper with regard to other departments. However this debate, which could last until 10 p.m. this evening, is on the fullness of the estimates. I hope that answers the question.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that you are not caught in a strait-jacket. That would be unfortunate.

It will be difficult to top the bombastic statements we just endured from the other side. Maybe I am capable of it. We will see as the debate goes on.

I want to talk about the other place somewhat. The issue today is a good one. I saw it starting today in a press conference. Today was the day the Senate was asked to appear before the House some time before the end of this sitting day to explain itself, to account for the money it is spending.

On May 9 the member for Comox—Alberni, when on the Standing Committee on Government Operations, sent a letter asking the Senate for an accounting of how it was spending its money. It was not an absurd request. It is a public body and has a \$40 million budget. It is spending taxpayers' dollars and we think we should be entitled to see how it is spent.

• (1830)

The Senate says it is not going to respond to the letter. Not only that, it is not going to respond to any demands by the House of Commons. It answers to no one, which is not entirely true. It does

Supply

answer to someone and it does dance to a tune, but it dances to the party tune of the Liberal Party of Canada.

I was in the House when the Prime Minister stood and said: "I will appoint people to the Senate and the people I appoint will be good Liberals who will do as they are told". The senators answer to no one publicly. They answer behind the scenes to the man who sits over at that desk, and that is a shame.

There are people in Canada, especially in the west—I will not speak for all of Canada; I do not claim to have omniscience. People in most parts of Canada have said for a long time that we need some Senate reform and if there is going to be a Senate, it should be accountable. It should be through election so that if the senators are not doing their jobs of representing their home provinces or regions, they can be yanked out of office. As Mr. Manning Senior, the former senator, said in times past: "It is a place of protocol, Geritol and alcohol". Is that true? I hope not, but if it were, the senators should be accountable. They should be accountable. They should be able to be pulled back through an election but that cannot happen.

Senators should have some job to do. Does anybody really know what the job of the Senate is? We in this place know that the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod traipses in here once in a while. He hammers on the door and we traipse there, they traipse here, but does anybody really know what they do?

I suppose senators do some effective work but we cannot know because we cannot look at the budget. They will not explain where they spend their money. They will not tell us. They just send us the bill and we just sign the cheque. That is unacceptable.

This is not just a Reform Party issue. In 1926 there was a study published entitled "The Unreformed Senate of Canada", by Robert MacKay. I do not think anybody here was involved in writing this. Here is what was said some 70 years ago:

The House of Lords still represents an important class in the community; the American Senate, even before it was elected directly by the people of the various states, represented the states—the Canadian Senate as a House of Parliament represents nothing. The Senate—is a bribery fund in the hands of the Government, and paddock for the 'Old Wheel Horse' of the Party, nor on its present footing, can it ever be anything else—

Probably on no other public question in Canada has there been such unanimity of opinion as on that of the necessity for Senate reform.

People were saying that 70 years ago. Maybe some people define Canadianism as not being American.

The other common thread we seem to be hearing often on the Senate in answer to the question "do you respect the Senate" is that they do not. This answer comes from all Canadians whether they are from Quebec—the members sitting here—from the west

or from Atlantic Canada. The reason is the Senate does not give them a chance to respect it.

As we are talking about the estimates tonight, the Senate will not account for the money it is spending. We are coming up to an election year. It is possible that an election will be held in the spring of 1997, the fall of 1997, who knows? As we gear up toward that election, what is the Senate spending its money on? I have some suspicions.

I see prominent members of the Senate appointed to prominent positions on the Liberal campaign team. They seem to be chief fundraisers, chief message boys, chief organizers, chief election readiness people. I saw a similar thing happen. I was an observer at the PC convention—I do not want to pick only on Liberals—but their chief organizers were from the Senate. Why? Because the taxpayer pays the bills.

• (1835)

Senators travel the country, they do not have to account to anybody, they do not have to show up, they do not have to sit on a committee. They do not have to do anything. All they have to do is answer to the person in the chair over there, the leader of the government. That is all they have to answer to.

There are limits on spending for political parties. There are limits on how much we can raise and spend on advertising, all that kind of stuff, but there are no limits on what is being spent indirectly through the Senate. That is unfortunate and there seems to be no thirst or willingness on the part of the government—and there is complicity in this, of course—to force the Senate to come forward.

We do not have to give these people the money. We could force them to come forward. Maybe they are spending it wisely. I have my doubts but at least we could come forward and debate that if we could see it but we cannot see it.

I have a quote from the auditor general in 1991. He said: "Frequently senators and senior management do not know whether operations are achieving their intended purposes or are being carried out in an economical and efficient manner". This is from our auditor general, a neutral person, who says that they do not even know in the Senate whether they are spending their money wisely or efficiently. All of this would be a moot point—maybe I am a snarky Reformer with a bad attitude—if that were true.

In 1990 the Prime Minister said: "The Liberal government in two years will make the Senate elected". That promise is gone. In 1991 the Prime Minister said it again. It is in Hansard. What has he done so far? He has appointed 14 people to the Senate. The headlines in the paper read: "Chrétien Senate plums make Mulrooney look like a piker" and "The PM's sad slide on the Senate".

The Senate should be elected. More than that, it should be accountable. It should have to account for the money it spends. I should have to out of my member's budget; this House should have to; the Speaker in the Chair should have to; all of us should have to account for public funds. The fact that the Senate will not account for it and will not report back is an indictment in and of itself.

It is an unfortunate development. I wish the senators had listened to the committee and I wish we did not have to have this debate. Unfortunately somebody has to call the Senate on the carpet. If the Reform Party is the one to do it, I am happy to raise the issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the comments made by my colleague from Fraser Valley East, I have a question for him regarding his party's platform with regard to the Senate, since what we are hearing on this issue is less and less clear: Does the platform of the Reform Party of Canada still include an elected, equal and effective Senate where each province would have the same number of senators chosen by the people?

In this respect, I would like to know, in view of the great disparity of population between provinces, and I will raise this again when I deal with the substance of the motion, how would electing senators make them more effective? In my opinion, the more equal the Senate becomes, and if it is totally equal as the Reform Party has been suggesting so far—total equality among the ten provinces—the more likely it will be for its effectiveness to be zilch. The Senate will be able to block a piece of legislation for 20 or 30 days, that is all; as far as money bills, supply bills, and allotment of public moneys are concerned, we would still be in the same situation.

Is the triple E Senate a concept which is still defensible in view of the analysis conducted by our colleagues from the Reform Party?

[*English*]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, certainly the hon. member has identified the party's platform on the triple E Senate. The triple E Senate of course has always been the first of our principles in our published papers. We do believe in what we call a triple E Senate, which is equal numbers from each of the provinces, elected and effective. In other words, it needs a job to do, something that senators can put their teeth into.

• (1840)

Our argument on the Senate has always been that the Senate's job originally was to represent the regions. Here we have representation by population. Quebec is well represented in numbers here with the Bloc. I do not always agree with their politics, but in numbers it is represented according to population.

Supply

The Senate on the other hand represents each province with an equal number. What we have said is that by doing that, a message is sent. For example, in this place where Quebec has 75 seats, it has a significant influence on the House of Commons. It is a very dominating force. It has a lot of influence and people in key figures. It is able to influence matters in the House of Commons very well. However, to protect the outlying regions, say a weakly populated province like Prince Edward Island or Saskatchewan, which are not well represented numberwise, the Senate would represent those provinces in the other place, in the Senate itself.

By doing that, there is a balance. In the House of Commons, there is rep by pop. Rep by pop allows people to know that they have as much say as any other one person in the province through their representative here. To protect the regions and to protect the provinces that do not have huge populations, something else is needed. We say that that something else should be a Senate.

What could a Senate like that do? The arguments go back and forth. Our current Prime Minister said in 1991 that "the regions of Canada need to be more involved in decision making and policy making at the national level to meet the hopes and dreams of those who live in the west and the Atlantic", and that "a reformed Senate is essential. It must be a Senate that is elected, effective and equitable", as he called it. "Such a Senate should have the power to examine appointments to important federal institutions and agencies".

What that means is there is consensus that the Senate needs a job. One of the things it should do is approve of important appointments to federal institutions and agencies. If, instead of the wife of the current defence minister being in charge of patronage appointments—that is her job—would it not be something if we had a Senate including the province of Quebec that would be able to say: "On the appointment to the CRTC, we in Quebec have a real problem with this person, what they have done, what their academic record is, what they stand for and what they have been doing".

Someone could step in at that stage and say: "I am going to put the kibosh on this. I will stop this now". So could people from B.C. So could have Alberta during the national energy program. So could have people from Manitoba when the F-18 contract was hived off. There could be a check and a balance in there.

As the Prime Minister said, that would be a good job for the Senate. Its job now is not that. Its job right now is election readiness. That is its job right now. It is a place where all kinds of people who are on the organizational shelf of the Liberal Party have been plugged into the key positions. Taxpayers are paying the bills; we do not know how much. Senators travel the country at taxpayers' expense. They do whatever they want. Nobody knows because they are not accountable to anybody. The only one they are accountable to is the Prime Minister.

Supply

That is not right. As the Prime Minister himself has been saying for some years now, that is a lousy way to run an upper house. The upper house needs to be reformed. It needed to be reformed said Mr. MacKay in 1926. It needed to be accountable said the auditor general in 1991.

In 1991 the Prime Minister said that a reformed Senate is essential. Why? "To meet the hopes and dreams of those living in the west and in the Atlantic regions, a reformed Senate is essential". That is the Prime Minister. I wish he would go back and read some of his old speeches. I wonder if he realizes the impact that this status quo stuff is having on British Columbia.

• (1845)

When I hear promises being made and then not delivered on I wonder if that is part of what makes Quebecers so angry. They were promised distinct society in the Constitution and it was not delivered. That is a broken promise. Would that not make Quebecers angry?

From our perspective in the west we were promised Senate reform. The Prime Minister promised that within two years an elected Senate would be in place. He did not deliver. In 1991 he said it has to happen. If we are going to keep the hopes and aspirations of the west and Atlantic Canada we have to do something to provide an elected Senate. He did not deliver on that. In the west what are we supposed to take from that? Was he saying what he thought we wanted to hear during the election campaign? Did he really sincerely believe it and then find out there was too much pressure from within his party or other regions that he could not deliver?

I do not know what goes on behind closed doors. But I do know that in British Columbia the support for the Senate in its current form is approaching zero. It is seen as a waste of money. That is what we are trying to address here today.

If we could address some of those concerns and say to the people of British Columbia that the budget is like so, the travel budget is like this, and office budgets and so on, then we could say it looks like it is all in order and above board. But when we get the auditor general saying they are inefficient and have no accountability for the way they spend their money I cannot guarantee to the taxpayers of B.C. that their money is being well spent.

Certainly at a political level when somebody says, including the current Prime Minister, that it is not effective, I am not going to argue with him. I agree. The message it sends, both on accountability and the reform of the political institution itself, is it just does not matter and we do not care what you say, or what the people in B.C. think, or Quebec or any other region. If that message is consistently hammered home by the Prime Minister leading up to the next election I do not suppose he will be surprised when he

comes out to British Columbia to find a less than hearty welcome from people who are expecting some changes.

The old poem says that a promise made is a debt unpaid. It is from Robert Service. I think that is true for most of us. For example, I promised to opt out of the MP pension plan. I did not do it because I want to live a life of poverty when I grow old. I did it because I promised to do it during the election campaign. I promised also to fly economy class, not that I like my legs shoved up around my chin. However I made a promise to try and save a few dollars. I promised to move into the office of my predecessor and make no changes to the furniture. As a matter of fact I used the same phones and everything he had so it would not cost any money. Those were promises made and I have kept them.

I also promised to treat tax dollars as funds held in trust on behalf of the taxpayers. I can go back in the next election and say that I have kept my promises and I am willing to do it again because I will be running again in the next election.

• (1850)

I do not know what we are supposed to read into the fact that the Prime Minister will not keep his promise. What Reform reads into it, of course, is that the Prime Minister is using this for expediency. He is not really interested in Senate reform. He is not really interested in accountability. He is not interested in saving a few dollars. And he is not really interested in doing better than the treading of water that we have seen for three years.

I heard the hon. member from the Liberal Party say that he was proud of the employment rate that is pushing 10 per cent. I am not happy with that. The government has taken \$25 billion or more out of the economy and I am not happy with that.

I am not happy that whenever the heritage minister seems to be in a pickle the finance minister can come up with another \$150 million to try to get her out of that bind.

I am not happy that the budget is going to be balanced at some indefinite date off in the future. I want to see a date where we can look forward to some tax relief. There are no promises of tax relief and there never will be unless the government makes a promise, lays out the plan and then follows through. Following through means when you give your word on something. That is a promise and it will happen.

We had the GST promise which set this in motion but can we take them at their word? So far we have not seen any action on the GST. The GST that the government will be placing on reading material in Atlantic Canada will double once this new agreement comes into place.

What did the Prime Minister promise? What did the finance minister promise when he was in opposition? There will be no tax

on reading material. Next month it will be 15 per cent on reading material. It is no wonder people are cynical.

The Senate in the example we are trying to deal with today is numero uno on many people's books of why they feel so cynical about Parliament and the way it is run. There is no accountability. I believe the government wants us to put up a fuss over this item. That is why this particular item on the main estimates has been challenged by Reform. We think that Canadians deserve an accounting for the money that is being spent on their behalf.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I will entertain one other question if there should be one to the hon. member. I would ask the co-operation of the House. If members from each party participating in this debate would indicate to the Chair by way of a message to the side later as to whether they are going to be speaking for 20 minutes or will be splitting their time allocation with a colleague it would be appreciated.

I interrupted the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. I believed that they were splitting their time. It was not the case in this instance so I allowed more time for questions or comments. There would be approximately four minutes remaining in that block of time.

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to comment and to reply to the member for Fraser Valley East. I was so enthralled with his speech that I ran here from my office just to ask this question. It is good to see the hon. member has not lost his step or his form since June. I congratulate him on his elevation to whip for his party.

The GST seems to be an issue that comes back time and time again. The hon. member may not be aware of this but in the province of Ontario the premier, the day before he was elected, made a very solemn commitment to the people of the province of Ontario in the same way that we made the same commitment toward replacing the GST.

The hon. member talks about words and I tend to perhaps fall into the category of those cynical voters who want to make sure they see something in writing and what they saw was replace the GST.

• (1855)

What a lot of people forget, and perhaps this is one of the reasons the Reform Party has yet to make any inroads in Ontario, which may not happen for some time, is the recognition that the province of Ontario and its premier is committed and on record to harmonize which is exactly what the government has committed to do.

I spent some time over the summer dealing with a number of constituents. We had four public forums. I was amazed and overtaken by the amount of goodwill, by the number of plaudits

Supply

and by the amount of concern and support for the last budget presented by the Minister of Finance. People from all across the political spectrum, people from all backgrounds and all incomes were very supportive of the budget in a way that I have not seen before.

How would the hon. member suggest we can at one time bring down the deficit, we can address the financial problems this country currently faces and yet at the same time somehow throw away or cast fate into the wind with respect to raising revenues, in particular the GST? Perhaps the hon. member can refresh my memory since he seems to have so much to offer as to whether we actually got into the question of the elimination of the GST or does he remember reading, as most of my constituents did, replace the GST.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member for Ontario wants to hear the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I am going to give it to him.

I know what the red book said. It said replace the GST. Canadians all know why the member from Hamilton had to resign. It was going to be scrapped, turfed, abolished, done away with, or whatever phrase was used. The Prime Minister said: "This thing will be gone, eliminated, trashed". I know it was in print but I also know it was on television and that is why the member had to resign.

For ourselves, from the Reform Party's perspective, our words during the last election were consistent with our printed material and our public pronouncements. What we said was that it was at that time not feasible to eliminate the GST but what we had at that time was our zero in three plan to eliminate the deficit and then reduce and eliminate the GST.

We realized during the election campaign that we could not promise to eliminate the GST at that time. We were upfront about that. I know in my own case in my riding the Liberal candidate said he would lie down on the railroad tracks and he was going to fall on his sword and commit hara-kiri and what all he would not have done because "you can count on me, that GST is gone". It was a little embarrassing for me to stand up and say: "The Reform Party can't make that promise because it is not the truth" and so we did not promise that.

I ran on it and probably lost votes because it is easy to say: "Let's get rid of it". On campaign issues I like to try to tell the truth. I am sure the member for Ontario did as well during the campaign. Not every politician does. However, on Senate reform and on accountability, I am only reading back to him the words of his leader. Those words said that Senate should be elected, it should be accountable, it should be effective, it should represent the west and the Atlantic region and to follow up with the auditor general's comments, it should be in whatever form it is efficient and accountable for the taxpayers' dollars.

Supply

I stand by those words and I will campaign on those words.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997.

The session has just begun once again and I must tell you at the outset that, as the member of Parliament for Brome—Missisquoi, and like many other members in the House, I took advantage of the summer months to travel a little around my riding and its municipalities to meet people and discuss with them the problems that concern them.

• (1900)

I think it is somewhat the role of a member of Parliament to come to the House and to show the colours of the people he represents, that is, to relate their concerns and to ensure the government responds to these concerns, and that is what the government is doing.

I will say first of all that the main concern of people is employment. We hear about “job creation” everywhere. Employment is the main concern of people. I would say the second one is taxes. People have had it, they are sick and tired of taxes.

The third concern is paperwork, bureaucracy. The next one is duplication. I will come back, in relation to the main estimates, to what we are doing as a government to deal with these issues.

The public also wants public administration, at the federal as well as the provincial level, to be closer to the people. I am listing these concerns in the order in which they were submitted to me. Another concern is the need for Quebec’s distinctiveness to be recognized.

Before dealing specifically with the main estimates, it may be useful to look back at what the finance minister said when he tabled his budget on March 6, 1996. He stated, on behalf of his government, the principles for securing the future.

First principle for securing the future: governments created the deficit problem; now, governments must resolve it. I will come back to this later and try to demonstrate that the deficit problem is in the process of being resolved.

Second principle for securing the future, according to the estimates tabled last March for the fiscal year ending next March: we must provide hope for jobs and for growth. This is important, and it is precisely what we have heard and what elected representatives travelling around to meet their constituents have heard.

Third principle: we must be frugal in everything we do. This means spending less money. Simply put, waste is simply not tolerable.

Fourth: no new spending. We must avoid additional spending and reallocate instead. Fifth: we must always be fair and compassionate.

Those are the principles on which the finance minister’s last budget was based. In terms of the goals and objectives pursued through this budget, we were told that the government should be more responsive and that certain government activities should be more focused and affordable.

Let us look at some examples, starting with a problem I mentioned earlier, namely duplication. Here are two areas where we should try to eliminate duplication through legislation. First, agriculture. Just for food inspection, you have the Ministry of Agriculture and marketing board involved at the provincial level, in Quebec, as well as Health Canada and Agriculture Canada at the federal level. For a restaurant operating in Montreal, the City of Montreal’s department in charge of monitoring restaurants in terms of public health is also involved.

As we can see, a single place can easily be visited by four or five different inspectors for the same purpose or for similar purposes. The government has introduced a bill respecting the national food protection agency. We must look for ways to do better, to improve coordination by avoiding duplication. That is what the people want and how they expect us to run the country.

• (1905)

Here is another example. We can talk about revenues. As you know, taxes are collected at about every level. At the federal level, there are all kinds of taxes, including customs duties. At the federal level, taxes are collected in several areas.

It is the same thing at the provincial level. That is why the government proposed the Canada revenue commission. I think the vast majority of Quebec citizens, who are part of Canada, would prefer not having to fill out two income tax returns. So it would be nice if both levels of government could come to some sort of agreement and establish a common, efficient mechanism for collecting taxes without resorting to a war of flags.

If they could agree, for example, that the federal Deputy Minister of Revenue and his Quebec counterpart would sit on this or that commission, people could send their money to one place and part of this money would go to the federal government while another part would go to Quebec. What we want is something simple and effective. I think this is important.

We said earlier that we must also keep a sense of fairness and compassion in all this. In this regard, I would remind the House that, as far as social programs are concerned, the Minister of Finance has given the provinces guarantees that cash transfers would never fall below a certain level in the next few years. So, under the new Canada social transfer for health and social programs, the federal government has made a commitment until the year 2003. For example, in 1999-2000, it will give the

provinces \$25.1 billion, which should rise to \$27.4 billion by 2002-2003.

This is important, because there are poor people in our society, as we recently saw on the news, especially in Quebec, where the cuts hurt. It is hard to understand—and the federal government's generosity is not in question—but it is hard to understand how some people do not have access to basic health care.

I mentioned earlier the importance of these transfers, whether it is money or tax points, in the health, education and welfare sectors. The federal government will continue to fulfill its obligations, as it undertook to do in the last budget speech.

Another issue which I want to discuss and which people have raised is that of job creation. If I refer to the main estimates in relation to job creation, it is because of the student summer employment program. You will recall that such a program was announced and the monies earmarked for young Canadians were increased from \$60 million to \$120 million.

I should tell you that, for the young people whom I met this summer, not just in Brome—Missisquoi but in other ridings too, this initiative worked perfectly well. Let me give you an example. Thanks to this program, and every member in this House can do the same, I arranged for a group of some 30 young students from Brome—Missisquoi to work in other Canadian cities. Five were from Cowansville and went to work in Victoria, B.-C. Similarly, five students from Victoria came to work in Brome—Missisquoi. The same arrangement was made for students from other cities in my riding, who went to work in Edmonton, Prince Edward Island and three ridings in Ontario.

• (1910)

These young people found this to be an extraordinary experience. It was a learning experience, and I will get back to this later on, to learn or become more proficient in the other official language. It was an experience to live with a family and to develop a better understanding the other Canadian culture. This is important. Then there was the work experience.

It is a fact that students have difficulty making ends meet. They struggle with increasing tuition fees and maintenance expenses. The program's first goal is perhaps to make sure that they get a summer job. This is for our generation of tomorrow.

Employment, as this example shows, is very important. With regard to job creation, I would like to deal with another small issue, that of research and development. In Canada, the government is currently spending, one way or another, some \$7 billion on research and development, \$2 billion in tax credits for corporations

Supply

doing research and development and \$5 billion in federal programs or federal agencies, whether in agriculture, in research centres or the National Research Centre, and so on.

There again, in order to do better, the government announced early in the summer the creation of a committee that will report on how to better commercialize the findings of research and development. That too generates employment.

All along, however, we must keep in mind the need to restore fiscal order. That is being done. When the Liberal government came to power, the federal deficit stood at \$42 billion for 1993-94. A year later, it had gone down to \$37.5 billion, and down to \$32.7 billion the year after. In 1996-97, according to the Minister of Finance's budget speech, the deficit will have been reduced to \$24.3 billion, and will get down to \$17 billion in 1997-98. Thus, the deficit will have gone down from \$42 to \$17 billion. Over the last few years, we will have seen the annual deficit decrease by at least \$7 billion every year.

As you can see, at that rate, we should get very quickly to a zero deficit situation and see what we can do when we have a zero deficit.

Another tool that is very useful to the members of this House is the public accounts committee. This is an important House committee that reviews the operations of various departments and hears from senior civil servants and deputy ministers who have to explain how they manage public funds.

Let me give you two examples where the committee, made up of a majority of government members, but chaired by an opposition member and with representatives from every party of this House, reviewed last year's budget, based on the auditor general's report. At one point, we realized that in the maritimes, about a hundred million dollars were spent on transportation. We were told quite plainly that subsidies under the program amounted to about 50 per cent of all transportation costs. Some people told us that they found out the bills were "boosted" or "inflated", that is how they put it, but the civil servants who manage the program said: "Checking the bills is not part of our job description. It is not part of our duties. We only issue cheques for 50 per cent of the total amount".

I think elected members of Parliament have to ensure that such things do not happen again. Let me give you another example.

When we looked at the moving expenditures for civil servants, we realized that the total amount for all departments put together exceeded something like \$100 million dollars a year. That is how much the federal government has to pay to move civil servants from one end of the country to the other, from one province to another, from one city to another, and so on.

Supply

• (1915)

When I talk about moving civil servants, I mean moving their furniture, their dining room sets, their bedroom sets, etc. It is a lot of money. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts has examined these matters so that these things do not happen again. All that under the guidance of the auditor general. This is the role members of this House have to play.

I could give other examples, but I just added the concept of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to the concept of sound management exercised by the present government. Sound management in terms of deficit reduction and in terms of expenditure review.

I realized something a few weeks ago. There was a meeting of public accounts committee representatives. The federal government is not the only one that has a public accounts committee. Every province is supposed to have a public accounts committee chaired by an opposition member to examine expenditures and management in a somewhat independent fashion.

Do you know there is one province in Canada that does not have such a committee with the same characteristics as the ones that exist at the federal level and in the other provinces? That province is Quebec. Quebec does not have a public accounts committee.

I take this opportunity to salute the courage and the open-mindedness of the two Quebec representatives at that national meeting, Mr. Baril, MNA for Arthabasca, and Mr. Chagnon, MNA for Westmount—Saint-Louis, who both said in front of their colleagues from the rest of the country that it would be important for Quebec to have a public accounts committee, particularly today.

There is an important example in all this. I will take the example of the heritage department. When we talk about the Main Estimates, yes there is a large budget for the heritage department, and part of that budget is set aside for official languages. This is important.

After visiting the students in Brome—Missisquoi, who travelled to various parts of the country this summer, I saw how important it was for students, families, everyone, that children, this future generation in the making, be able, if they wish, to learn our country's second language.

In this regard, the official languages program that provides assistance for French as a second language in the other provinces, and for English as a second language in Quebec, is a very good thing. It is important to ensure that our francophone communities outside Quebec, the one million francophones outside Quebec, can count on the federal government as they do.

And does Quebec get its fair share in all this? Yes, it does. The federal system is much more than a large book of account. In

addition to a mathematical fair share, it must be remembered that Quebec benefits from a fair share that is difficult to quantify. NAFTA, the G-7, Canadian influence within the G-7, and the Commonwealth are also important and cannot be assigned a dollar value.

Mr. Landry claimed that the Quebec economy did not represent 20 per cent of the Canadian economy. In fact, Quebec's gross domestic product constitutes 22.4 per cent of Canada's gross domestic product.

I would like to add that Quebec receives much more than its fair share. Quebec was responsible for 21.4 per cent of federal government revenues, but was the beneficiary, in 1994, of 24.5 per cent of federal government spending.

• (1920)

In all this, there is a good place for Quebec. In all this, the government must go ahead and pass the main estimates, and I can tell you that I will be voting in favour.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened to most of my colleague's speech. He talked about jobs. I would like him to give us his views about the surplus in the unemployment insurance fund. At the present time, in the financial statements, in the government's allocations, there is a surplus in the unemployment insurance fund that compensates for the deficit, but basically, this fund is 100 per cent financed by employers and employees and they have no control on its use.

I do not know if he is aware that a vast segment of the population is presently without a job and is often composed of people who do not have specialized training, who need jobs that require their skills but that are not necessarily jobs created by the new economy.

It is all fine and well to talk about the new economy. It is true that people who have adequate training get jobs more easily, but there are also all the people who are to some extent the victims of these technological changes. Does the hon. member feel that there is some willingness on the part of the government? Will anything be said somewhere and fast so we can put these people back to work?

I have another question for him. As a member of Parliament from Quebec, as someone who has to travel in his riding in Quebec, does he find that his constituents want the Senate to continue as before, to continue to spend about \$40 million year after year, without its members being elected, with them being appointed almost for life, or at least until the age of 75, without being accountable, and being able, for example, to kill bills like the one on Pearson airport—a move that was a slap in the face to the government, because that bill had been passed by the government and was killed by a House that was not elected by the government?

Supply

Does he intend to do something so that, in controlling spending, we deal with this symbol, the Senate, and find a way to avoid funding such an outdated organization?

Mr. Paradis: Mr. Speaker, if I understood correctly, the first point had to do with the UI fund surplus, the need for jobs, and the new economy. Those are the words my colleague used earlier.

As for the Quebec economy, we are having a hard time these days. Let me give you an example. The other day, I was walking on Rue de la Montagne in downtown Montreal, between Maisonneuve and Sherbrooke Streets. You should try it. Every second door was a boarded-up shop or restaurant. The economy is dying. But, as Mr. Dumont said, there is something really simple that could be done. Economic prosperity cannot be founded on uncertainty.

The former leader of the Bloc Québécois, who is now in Quebec City, is holding a sword of Damocles above our heads. Will a referendum be held in one, two or three years? How reassuring can it be for an investor to be told: "We do not know what will happen in one, two or three years"? This makes no sense. What we need is a truce. Mr. Dumont is absolutely right. We need a truce that would last at least 10 years. As members of the Bloc Québécois, you should speak to your former leader and ask him to call a truce so that the Quebec economy can pick up again.

• (1925)

If Mr. Bouchard had seen former U.S. President Harry Truman's desk, he would have read the sign saying, "The buck stops here".

My colleague's second question concerns the Senate. It is a totally legitimate question on cost effectiveness, but we must keep in mind that we are debating the main estimates. If we wanted to do something else like abolishing the Senate, we would need a constitutional amendment. The Senate is in the Constitution. I am asked if people in Brome—Missisquoi and in other ridings would like—Indeed, some would, but we would still need a constitutional amendment. This is not something that can be done through the main estimates, because our institutions must be able to operate.

Mr. Plamondon: Stop appointing them.

Mr. Paradis: Not only the people of Brome—Missisquoi— The hon. member for Bellechasse was on the same committee as I was the other day and we had a chance to discuss this.

But we should get rid of this mental block. As you know, Mr. Bouchard attended the first ministers' conference. The first thing he said was: "No discussion whatsoever on constitutional amendments". In the meantime, our friends here, our colleagues, are saying the Senate should perhaps be abolished, but this would require a constitutional amendment. Mr. Bouchard does not even want to broach the subject, so I have trouble understanding whether

or not he continues to issue orders from Quebec City. This is something I have trouble understanding.

[*English*]

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as usual we heard a very positive speech from the member on the government side about how things are coming up roses right across the country. He told us about the problems on Sherbrooke Street in Montreal. I think I am quoting him properly when he said that at every second door a restaurant or a retail store was closed down.

Do members remember the old slogan jobs, jobs, jobs? Yet every second business on that street in Montreal, which is a major shopping street if I am correct, is closed down and one family in four in Montreal is on government assistance.

This government is supposed to be the federal government that governs the people on Sherbrooke Street in Montreal, on Jasper Avenue in Edmonton, and on Perron Street in St. Albert, which is my constituency. The member said that in order for the government to do its job it wants a truce from the Bloc Québécois and the separatists in Quebec. Its job is to govern.

I would like to know from the hon. member from Brome—Missisquoi when the Liberal government will start governing and representing the people on Sherbrooke Street in Montreal, Quebec. When will it start delivering on the old cliché of jobs, jobs, jobs that it promised to the people of Quebec, to the people of Edmonton, and to the people in my riding of St. Albert?

The government said it would deliver. It did not say give us a truce from the separatist and we will see if we can deliver. We are still waiting. When will it deliver?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paradis: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is true—and I cited Montreal, and the stretch of de la Montagne street between Maisonneuve and Sherbrooke in particular, as an example—that every second business is closed down, but let me tell you about Brome—Missisquoi.

In terms of jobs, there are two main areas around the two largest cities of the riding, the first one being the Cowansville—Bromont area, which is doing well, with its IBM plant, General Electric, research and development facilities and so forth.

• (1930)

At the other end of my riding is Magog, with its textile industry and plans for a 20,000-foot expansion in that industry and another 20,000-foot expansion in the plastics industry. That is the situation in Brome—Missisquoi in a nutshell. That is what is going on in this riding where, must I remind the hon. member for St. Albert, the population is made up of 20 per cent anglophones and 80 per cent

Supply

francophones and we are all living in perfect harmony, somewhat shielded from the winds of separation.

I have the honour of representing the riding of Brome—Missisquoi in this Parliament, while Pierre Paradis, a relative of mine, represents the same riding at the Quebec National Assembly.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Albert will surely have the opportunity to speak after the member for Richelieu, with whom I will share my time.

The issue of a second House in Canada is not something new; it goes back to 1774. That year, the pyramid was started from the top, in the sense that institutions were established for the British North America of the time. In 1774, only institutions approved by a legislative council were set up. Our structures were rather simple, with a governor representing the Crown and a legislative council appointed by the governor.

This was a bit of a family compact. There was little discussion when laws were passed and budgets approved. When democratic movements called for an elected house to represent the population and have a say in the government of the colony of the time, many voiced their opposition to the idea.

In the end, rather significant support from the United Empire Loyalists led to our country's having elected houses. But do you know what happened at the same time? Canada was divided in two: Upper Canada and Lower Canada, to make sure that French Canadians would never succeed in passing their laws and in imposing them on the rest of the country.

Today, as we try to get our powers back and to govern ourselves, we meet with strong objections and are told that we cannot do that. Two hundred years ago, they would not let the majority govern in this country. The pendulum has swung back.

So, in 1791, the Constitutional Act amended the Quebec Act to create the Houses of Assembly. We still did not have a responsible government. However, we had an elected House of Assembly, with an extremely restricted role to play, and the legislative council was maintained in both Upper Canada and Lower Canada. While the Constitutional Act of 1791 was in force, this legislative council, whose members were appointed by the governor, systematically opposed every decision made by the House of Assembly. The elected representatives had little success in imposing their final decisions during the period from 1791 to 1838, at which time the Special Act was passed to suspend the Constitutional Act of 1791, following the Patriots' Rebellion in 1837.

The Union Act of 1840 maintained the legislative council and an elected House, of course, but the legislative council could oppose, under any circumstances, all the decisions made by the elected

representatives of the population. For 16 years, the members of this legislative council would be appointed by the governor and could do everything they pleased to oppose the decisions of the elected representatives.

In 1858, a timid but still significant reform was initiated, with the election of the members of the legislative council, although vested rights were maintained. Those who had been appointed before the 1856 act, which provided for the election of the legislative council members, were able to keep their seats, but had to sit next to members who were elected on a rotational basis.

• (1935)

It must have been strange to have an elected member and a member appointed for life sitting side by side in the same House. It is as if my colleague, the hon. member for Shefford, was there for life and I had to go back to the voters every four years, I would not be too amused.

Change had begun, and with it government instability and the decision of the elite, not the public, to change the form of government. These were the people known as the Fathers of Confederation, the grand term used to describe those who decided that there would be a federal government in Canada's future. There was never any desire to consult the public about this.

A great Liberal, Antoine-Aimé Dorion, proposed in the House of Assembly in Parliament, here in Ottawa, that a referendum be held on the change in Canada's constitutional status in 1867. This highly democratic proposal to let the public decide on the future status of Canada was defeated. The changes proposed by a small elite were adopted. In Quebec, numerous county and municipal councils opposed the constitutional change, sensing the trap into which we were heading. By letting go of our equal representation in the Parliament of the United Canada, that is, from an institutional point of view, we were saddled with a lame duck. At the beginning we had a third of the seats in the Senate and the House of Commons, but today we no longer even guaranteed a quarter of the seats.

In the next election, Quebec will have only 75 members out of 301, which is below the critical threshold of 25 per cent representation which has always been one of Quebec's traditional demands.

Perhaps I may, oh irony of ironies, quote Senator Jean-Claude Rivest, who represents the district of Stadacona. Speaking before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, he said that 25 per cent was the minimum, was the critical mass Quebec needed in the House of Commons. This 25 per cent will be lost in the next election.

In 1867, they talked about what they would do with these institutions. When I say: "they", I am referring to the Fathers of Confederation. There were other constitutions in the past. There

was the Constitution of Great Britain and there was a tendency to refer to the Constitution of Great Britain, the United Kingdom.

The first preamble to the British North America Act, 1867, forms the basis of all provisions dealing with the Senate in our institutions. I will read it to you:

Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a Constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

A constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom provides for two Houses of Parliament. In the United Kingdom, as in this country, there is a House of Commons, but also an upper House, the House of Lords. We wanted to establish one as well. I am not an agriculture critic but we have our own little lords.

So we established another House, the Senate. This House has the same powers the House of Lords had at the time: the power to fully obstruct decisions of the House of Commons. This was in 1867, when the House of Lords systematically opposed all bills that would give back to Ireland its institutions, which had been suspended for many years.

In any case, one would have to be totally lacking in political vision to be oblivious to the fact that someday, the other House, the Canadian Senate, which was not elected and was not accountable to any one would obstruct major legislation. We saw it happen during this Parliament.

Earlier, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup referred to the bill concerning Pearson Airport. The bill was defeated in the Senate. An important bill on electoral boundaries readjustment, Bill C-69, on which the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs worked for weeks on end, was never passed and died on the Order Paper in the Senate.

• (1940)

There is something odd about an unelected house coming to tell us how to get ourselves elected.

We cannot, of course, as Bloc members and sovereignists, subscribe to the Reform proposals, which will perhaps be useful to a Canada in which Quebec is not represented, but we certainly cannot subscribe to a Senate which would be elected, effective and equal. If there were any equality, it would have to be between the two nations, the two founding peoples, not one between provinces. And what would an elected Senate mean? It would mean another House with popular legitimacy which would act as a buffer between the provincial and federal governments. If there is one thing we do not need right now, it is that.

Supply

The hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi has just said that a constitutional amendment is needed to abolish the Senate. Of course we need a constitutional amendment; it is the 7-50 rule which applies: 7 provinces representing 50 per cent of the Canadian population. Let the other provinces reach agreement among themselves to abolish the Senate and we will probably be rid of it.

I would like to close with an acknowledgment that, of course, there are some good people sitting in the other House. It is not my intention to discredit those who are there, but rather to state that, in 1996, the existence of a House of this nature is no longer justified. The best way to see it abolished quickly is to hit it where it hurts the most, in the pocket book, by choking off its operating funds, and then there is a good chance that it will fall on its own sword.

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the comments of the Bloc Québécois member. I found it very interesting to hear the hon. member, as well as those who preceded him, talk about the future and about his plan for the Senate, that is, not to have another House.

I found it rather interesting to see that, perhaps for the first time, the Bloc Québécois is in full agreement with the third party, the Reform Party.

I know well the fate of francophones outside Quebec, because when I was younger, in high school, we studied two or three historians, Guy Frégault, Séguin and Brunet, who were always talking about the underrepresentation of Quebecers in the House of Commons when it came to seat allocation and distribution.

I find what the hon. member just said very interesting, and perhaps he can easily answer this fundamental question for me: if we let the Senate go or abolish it, what good will come of it for Quebecers who have to deal with demographic pressures for which Canada is not to blame, but which your province, our neighbour, has to bear?

As your former leader explained it well, the issue of not having enough children could have an impact on the strength of your population. Is the rest of the country to blame for a decrease in the population of Quebec? If that is the case, as it was said, would abolishing the Senate not boil down to affecting or decreasing the importance of Quebec in this House and in this Parliament?

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, in the Upper House, the Senate, Quebec has a constitutional guarantee of 24 seats. Unlike any other province, Quebec counts 24 senate ridings.

• (1945)

In 1867, Quebec was divided into 24 ridings. A thing to remember, a small anomaly of which I will remind my colleague, the member for Ontario: in 1912, Quebec borders were altered by

Supply

adding to it the Ungava area. Quebec borders were changed, but the Senate map was not. All of northern Quebec is not represented in the Senate. Today we are asked if Quebec would be less represented? Probably over a third of it is not represented at the moment. I cannot see where the problem is.

As far as the problem of demographics is concerned, I have trouble putting it in context. With regard to procreation, I would be more inclined to trust the members of this House, especially my colleague from Témiscamingue, who recently had a little Félix, than the members in the other House. I fail to see the connection.

Mr. McTeague: Congratulations!

Mr. Langlois: I am wondering too. The member for Ontario, who is also very vigorous and represents around 250,000 people, must feel very frustrated these days knowing that he will have to face the electorate and justify his policies and the fact that the promise to abolish the GST has not been fulfilled; he might have a hard time.

There are people roughly his age in the other place, they are there until they turn 75, without being held accountable to anyone. It is incredible. There is something wrong somewhere. We all will have to go home. In your riding of Stormont—Dundas, maybe it will not be so difficult, Mr. Speaker, but in Bellechasse it might be harder, we will see.

In any case, we will return, we will all take the plunge without any guarantee whatsoever to see what seat will be occupied. The 206 members who were replaced in this House all know what it means to have no job security.

I went to the other House earlier. What a nice sunset I saw. It was the darkness in that room that struck me the most; sometimes the darkness is in the minds. They speak about a House of sober second thought, but it looked more like a dormitory.

We will be sitting until ten this evening. Over there, they are not sitting at all. Evening debates are rare enough because the number of days are limited.

Section 31 of the British North America Act of 1867 states that a senator loses his seat do you know when? When he or she is absent from sittings during two consecutive sessions. That means a senator who was a member of the Senate in 1993, at the beginning of the 35th Parliament, and who has not yet been present in that House, still has two more years to attend at least one sitting in order to keep his seat.

If we did that here, if we were absent from this House, our constituents would quickly boot us out. We would be subject to procedures much harsher than impeachment, the newspapers would

demand our resignation, would require that we either sit or quit and return our salaries. In the other place they can do that, but not here. It is time to abolish that institution.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have happy to participate in this debate. Since I was elected in 1984, two political parties in this House have come out in favour of abolishing the Senate. Among the Tories who were elected in Quebec, at a famous meeting in Laval, 92 per cent of 800 delegates, including at least 10 from every riding in Quebec, voted in favour of abolishing the Senate. But the Liberals, even those elected in Quebec, never had the courage to make this decision.

Of course, as my colleague pointed out, our saying that the Senate should be abolished does not mean we do not respect its members. On the contrary, I know some eminent senators. I am surprised, however, that these people have accepted this job, if it can be called a job, or this political reward.

But I am not here to judge them. I want to talk about the institution itself, what Senator Prud'homme called a relic of colonialism, before he himself was appointed to the Senate by former Prime Minister Mulroney for services rendered. Since he is sitting in the gallery, he could even confirm what I am saying with a nod of his head.

One of my colleagues who is now in the Senate was talking about the great dormitory and the hon. sleepyheads. Ms. Chaput-Rolland was also appointed to the Senate and she suddenly discovered the virtues of its appropriations, I suppose.

We may look at it from every angle, but no one can justify the existence of such an undemocratic institution.

• (1950)

This is the most undemocratic institution in the western world. It is incredible. There is no other such senate in the whole world. Appointments to the Senate are made by the Prime Minister as political rewards. My colleague, the Liberal member for Brome—Missisquoi, indicated earlier that the Senate could be abolished but that a constitutional amendment is required to do so. There is simple way around this. Just stop making appointments; in time, there will be no one left. It is that simple, no big deal.

But no, in the past year, the Prime Minister has been appointing his friends: Sharon Carstairs, who worked with him to make the Meech Lake accord fail; Mr. Whelan, the former Minister of Agriculture and a good friend of the Prime Minister in the Trudeau government; Céline Hervieux-Payette, the candidate from Montreal who was defeated three times in Laval. They did not know what to do with her, so they appointed her the Senate to get rid of her. And the list of patronage appointments goes on.

Supply

At least the Conservatives had the decency to consult the provincial premiers. In those days, Bourassa was the one getting rid of his dead wood by shipping it to Ottawa.

Thinking back on Senate appointments, it is appalling to be spending approximately \$60 million on this relic of colonialism, as Mr. Prud'homme called it, without even considering eliminating it when cuts are being made everywhere else.

You know, as early as 1920, Mackenzie King was talking about Senate reform, but nothing came of it. The only reform the Senate ever underwent took place in 1975, when Mr. Pearson decided, with great courage, that senators were to retire at age 75. Those who were appointed before 1975 are still in the Senate. I believe that Senator Olson is 94 years old now, and he is still there. He still gets his salary. But let us not make a judgment on age either. Elderly people can serve their country very well. The problem is not the people sitting in the Senate, but the institution itself.

Let me also point out that, originally, as the hon. member explained earlier, this institution was meant to act as a brake to the zeal of the elected members. Since this was the first responsible government, there was a danger that its elected members might try to change everything. So, the Senate was established. Later, the existence of this Senate was justified by saying it would act as the defender of the interests of the various regions. Since Canada had become a large country with its ten provinces, the Senate was to offset the House of Commons, where the central provinces could wield much power.

Such were the historical justifications. However, our political customs have since changed, our democracy is now extremely well structured, and we have other ways and means to put pressure on elected representatives. For example, would my constituents go to the Senate to complain about something? Never. People are now extremely well organized, whether it is seniors or union members, and they have a platform to voice their claims and to reach their objectives.

This is not to mention the federal-provincial conferences, which the provinces use to impede the centralizing power of the federal government or to have a say in its decisions. And then we also now have a very aggressive press, which is quick to react if the government somehow exaggerates in terms of its legislation or behaviour. We also have the royal commissions we set up regularly.

So, as you see, nowadays, the power of the regions and of individuals is taking a new form and does not involve the Senate, which is supposed to offset the House of Commons, should it become too strong.

So, the Senate only exists on a structural basis. In reality, it serves absolutely no purpose. Who, among our constituents, would say: "I will complain to my senator"? Less than 0.1 per cent of the people of Canada know the name of their own senator.

• (1955)

What is the purpose of the Senate? Individuals and interest groups do not consider the Senate as an appropriate body to receive their claims and offset a piece of legislation. They are not structured that way.

Think of all the energy spent every year to question the very existence of the Senate and it never gets us anywhere. Reform would not change anything. It would only create another kind of problem. For instance, if the Senate were elected, we would have 24 senators from Quebec who would claim to speak on behalf of Quebecers, while 75 members of Parliament would say the same.

What would the provincial government think of an elected Senate existing alongside elected members of Parliament, and how would it negotiate with the federal government? Would it have to go through the elected Senate or would it have to deal with both the federal government and the Senate? What would happen if the Senate and the government were of different political stripes? Can you imagine the mess we would have with an elected Senate?

The solution is to abolish the Senate. Three or four provinces had a Senate, which they abolished. By abolishing its Senate in 1968, did Quebec lose ground in terms of meeting the expectations of the people is concerned? Did it lose ground with regard to its institutions? Not at all. Were the regions affected by the abolition of the Quebec Senate. Not at all. Is new legislation any worse because there is no Senate to improve upon it? Not at all. So, we have every right to demand a stop to this utter waste of money.

Given the current economic situation, there is no reason to spend between 50 and 60 million dollars on an outdated Senate. It does not make any sense. We could also talk about the position of governor general, or the positions of lieutenant governors, which are another shameful waste of money.

We are asked to renew the Senate appropriation, so why not make the proper decision once and for all and cut off its budget. We will then have the chance to see if the senators will be zealous enough to keep coming here to sit or sleep in the Senate.

[*English*]

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in sitting here listening to the debate tonight, there is such a contrast in opinions about the Senate in this House that I think the average person is wondering what is going on here.

It is absolutely amazing that members of the separatist party are in this House talking about the future of the Parliament of Canada and the Senate when on a daily basis they talk about leaving the country. I fail to see what their interest is in the future of how this institution is set up. It is a conflict in philosophy.

Supply

At the same time, the Liberals on the other side defend the Senate institution which everyone in Canada knows is unaccountable, ineffective and unelected. It is basically a rubber stamp for the government of the day, if it happens to be the majority in the Senate. The Liberals of course seized that opportunity as vacancies became available and appointed their people to Senate positions. I was going to call it a wonderland, and perhaps it is, but it is probably one of the plushiest patronage appointments the Liberals and Tories could ever dream up in this institution.

It is very timely that the Reform Party is sitting in this Parliament. Down at the other end of the hall we have an institution that basically serves little or no purpose in this country except to rubber stamp the government's bills.

The Reformers came to this Parliament, beginning with the member for Beaver River, and began talking about a triple E Senate: equal, elected and effective. That rings a fairly common sense idea to most Canadians. Why should someone represent the people who is not elected by the people, they ask? Why should someone be in a position of senator without really having much to do, being basically ineffective? Why is the Senate so unaccountable? It comes to Parliament and asks for \$40 million to run its operations. We ask what it is for and the Senate says that we do not really need to know, that it would just like the \$40 million.

• (2000)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I hate to interrupt but there are only five minutes of questions and comments. Perhaps the member has a succinct question to put to his colleague. Otherwise I will give the floor to the next member.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we can make comments and ask questions. I have a question for the hon. member from the separatist party who just spoke.

He is a parliamentarian. If his party is so bound and determined to leave this country, why is there such a tremendous interest in abolishing part of the institution of Canada? Why do those members have this interest if they simply want to leave anyway?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The answer is very simple: we pay 25 per cent. We represent 25 per cent of the population and we pay for this dormitory, this nursery, this utterly useless place. As long as we stay within the federation, we will pay our \$30 billion in taxes every year and we do have a say in the way that money is spent.

I am surprised every time somebody here, in the House of Commons, questions the legitimacy of this party and of its

members who were democratically elected. I received 70 per cent of the votes in my riding, which means that 70 per cent of those who voted shared our party's position.

What is my party's position? It is different from that of other parties, obviously, because we are advocating a new kind of relationship with the rest of Canada based on two founding peoples with two strong governments bound by economic ties only.

The Liberals are advocating the 1982 Constitution, the Conservative Party is advocating constitutional amendments for the distinct society clause based on the principles contained in the Meech Lake accord, and the Reform Party has a different vision of the future of the two peoples because it is looking at issues such as official languages. Each party in the House has different ideas and has the right to express them.

Each time we rise in this House to talk about financial issues that concerns Quebecers as well as Canadians, we are asked why we, who want to destroy Canada, should have the right to express our views. We do not want to destroy Canada, we want to build Quebec. We want to build a country and we want to have friendly relations with the rest of Canada, we want to have economic ties as would any majority in the world. That is the goal of the Bloc Quebecois.

When we call for the abolition of the Senate, we defend Quebec's higher interests. That is why we were elected. We were sent here to promote Quebec's sovereignty and we are doing it democratically. We have the right to do it and I am sick and tired of hearing people question the sacred right of a people to choose its own destiny every time we rise in this House.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in this debate.

[*English*]

With reference to the motion brought forward in opposition to the funding of the other place, I should remind colleagues that we have a longstanding tradition that both Houses of Parliament work independently to fulfil the important work entrusted to both Houses. Both Houses actively review important legislation and policies in their work as parliamentarians. Both have processes in place for the approval of expenditures of funds.

I would argue that hon. members of the third party had an excellent opportunity to participate in the reform of the other House but chose to oppose the Charlottetown accord.

I would vehemently argue that the motion of the third party simply tinkers at the fringes, tinkers at the edges. Those members have chosen to attack the other place in such a manner that they are

unable to defend themselves. I would therefore argue that this is yet another example of the third party's opportunistic approach.

• (2005)

[*Translation*]

It is quite simply meanspirited.

[*English*]

Rather than deal in a meaningful rational kind of way with change, rather than look at the reasons why one might go about changing an institution and bring forward hard data and rational arguments, they play politics. Cut a bit here, cut a bit there. That is the approach of Reformers. They do not know where they are going, so why in the world would they know what to do with the other House?

The parliamentary system needs a chamber of second thought to pass good legislation. Perhaps it needs to be changed. Yes, I would agree and so would they, but what is being proposed is not change. What is being proposed is to use another House as a target to try to enhance their imminent electoral defeat. That is what they are trying to do. They are trying to deflect. They do not know what they are doing so they are thrashing about trying to find an issue. That is what is happening.

Parliamentarians in the other House come from all backgrounds. We know many of them. They have much experience and a great deal of knowledge in many fields. Some of them would embarrass members of the third party in terms of what it is that they know about Parliament, about democracy, and about the Houses in which we sit and serve. They bring a great deal of wisdom and a wealth of information to various committees and discussions held throughout the dominion.

[*Translation*]

But they want to grandstand. That is what they want to do because they have no plan. They spoke about the deficit and the debt. That did not work, because Canadians did not believe them. They spoke about violence in society and proposed extreme measures that would have solved absolutely nothing. So what do they do? They try to find a target, something to bring them back to life. We cannot revive a political party that is so feeble.

[*English*]

I am surprised members of the third party did not congratulate and commend the government for its performance and fiscal management. They know the government took a hard line on deficit reduction. They know the government is meeting and exceeding its targets. It is keeping its promises in the red book. They know interest rates have declined. They know inflation is at the lowest sustained level in 30 years. They know that as a result of job creation efforts on the part of government and the private sector close to 700,000 new jobs have been created since November 1993. They know Canada is projected to have the highest employment growth of any G-7 country, but they refuse to accept it.

Supply

[*Translation*]

They know very well that the government has made enormous progress in a number of areas. I have mentioned them: interest rates, inflation, reducing the deficit, the debt, job creation. They know that the vast majority of Canadians feel that the government has been very successful. They know it, but they do not want to admit it.

[*English*]

They know we have a great deal to be proud of as Canadians. They know we should be applauding what we have as a nation, what we have as citizens.

I will spend some time discussing some of the many changes we in government have implemented. The main estimates for 1996-97 represent the results of a number of initiatives by the government designed to reduce the budget deficit while providing the services Canadians need. It is a challenge to reduce what is spent and provide equal or better services.

[*Translation*]

The federal government's goal was to clarify its role and its responsibilities in order to make the federation more effective. It wanted to follow up on the public's call for better and more accessible government.

This means modernizing federal programs and services so that they better meet the needs of Canadians as citizens and as clients, today and in the future.

• (2010)

[*English*]

As pointed out by the President of the Treasury Board, this year's main estimates show \$157 billion in planned budgetary expenditures compared with \$164 billion last year, a difference of \$7 billion.

The government has set clear priorities to guide the process of deficit and therefore debt reduction. It has articulated the roles of the national government thereby identifying areas where it is uniquely positioned to best serve Canadians.

This improves on the traditional techniques of modernizing public administration practices through doing more with less or through across the board cuts. These approaches have been replaced by more strategic choices about what programs and services should be treated as priorities and how best to deliver them.

The House will recall that the federal government launched program review and sector specific policy reviews to assess all policies and programs. It will also recall that the chief achievement or program review will be structural changes to the business of government, for example withdrawing from programs providing direct financial support to industry and not renewing resource sector regional development agreements when they expire while

Supply

maintaining a presence in areas such as international trade, science and technology.

It will address overlap and duplication by consolidating activities to make program delivery more efficient and effective, for example merging the Canadian Coast Guard fleet with that of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

Federal spending has been refocused to meet changing priorities. Departmental spending devoted to economic programs will decline significantly between 1994-95 and 1998-99, reflecting the shift in the government's role from providing direct support to business to setting framework policies.

Therefore it should be completely and totally evident from these initiatives that the government is acting responsibly. It is reducing spending while putting priority on programs which are the real business of the federal government and are delivered in a cost effective manner.

For this reason members of the House should concur with the government's request for full supply.

[*Translation*]

By the way, I am absolutely astonished, I would even say appalled, by the motion of the Bloc Québécois member for Richmond—Wolfe who proposes to cancel the grants and contributions under Heritage Canada. Do you realize this means the hon. member is actually proposing to cancel subsidies to francophone communities outside Quebec? Yes, to cancel subsidies to francophone communities outside Quebec.

I would have expected this kind of gesture or initiative from the Reform Party, perhaps, but not from the Bloc. Someone must have failed to consider the consequences.

The hon. member also wants the government to stop subsidizing programs for native communities, which are included in this budget. Imagine. That is what he suggested. I think it is appalling.

He wants to do away with bursaries for athletes in amateur sport, with exchange programs for students and all multicultural programs. This motion hits at francophones outside Quebec, native people and participants in multicultural programs. Unlike the Bloc Québécois, which seems to have no compunction about abandoning these programs, we will never abandon the multicultural aspect of our country. We will never abandon Canada's francophone and Acadian communities. Never.

An hon. member: There will not be any 25 years from now.

Mr. Duhamel: I just heard someone say there will not be any 25 years from now. Well, 20 years ago someone came and told us we were dead ducks, and one of those dead ducks is speaking here in

the House of Commons. He has children who speak French and will have grandchildren who speak it as well.

• (2015)

Now, would you please stop saying we are going to disappear? We will never disappear, never.

[*English*]

Finally, I want to talk about a project that is particularly important to me entitled "Improved Reporting to Parliament". The government made a commitment to restore public confidence in government institutions and specifically the role played by Parliament. Without the right information at the right time, Parliament cannot perform its proper function. Furthermore, in order to get government right, we must engage Parliament in a meaningful dialogue of government plans, priorities and performance. In order to have an informed dialogue, parliamentarians need good information.

We are improving the information. We are in the process of piloting new documents. Later this fall we will table 16 pilot performance reports. These reports, supported by the members of my committee, which is an all-party committee and not the people who are yelling in this House tonight. They are being co-operative. They recognize the importance of this project.

These reports will provide Parliament with succinct, meaningful, results oriented information. They will allow parliamentarians to focus on the results expected from government programs and the results those programs actually achieve.

Furthermore in the spring complementary departmental expenditure planning documents will be tabled as part of the estimates process.

Overall improvements to reporting will allow committees to improve the processes by which estimates are considered and disposed of. I am confident that improved information will make parliamentary debate more meaningful and make an important contribution to overall government accountability.

I am delighted to chair this all-party interparliamentary committee. I have received a great deal of co-operation from all of the members who are part of it and I am most appreciative.

[*Translation*]

In concluding, I want to say that I support this proposal by the government and am rather shocked by the proposals made by the opposition. If the two political parties on the other side of the House continue to react the way they did this evening, they will stay where they are for a long time.

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to what our Liberal colleague over there had to

say on this subject. I find it curious that this evening we are discussing the money to be allocated to the Senate, yet this hon. member refuses, not surprisingly, to speak of the Senate.

It is in the culture of the two old parties in Canada, the Liberals and the Conservatives, to hope that one day, if they are really good and have worked hard—and we know what that means if a person is in a large national political body, that they have served their party well—they can hope to fulfil their dream of finishing out their days in the Senate.

What does that involve? Finishing out one's days in the Senate means that one has all the benefits. Let me explain some of those benefits to you. I have had the opportunity of travelling in Canada and elsewhere with a joint committee. A joint committee is a committee made up of MPs and senators. I have seen how that works here in Canada.

First of all, senators have the title of "honourable", becoming honourable when they are appointed, and thus a rung above the members of the House of Commons. Travelling with them, I have heard a Canadian colonel on one occasion announce "senators first". People who have not been elected, who were appointed by the Prime Minister, who are there until the age of 75. They can be 35 when they are appointed, or 40, and will sit as senators until they reach 75. And whom do they represent? No one.

• (2020)

Last summer, I was in England at a symposium where 25 nations were represented. You know, when we speak of Canada while abroad, we describe ourselves as a great country, an ultrademocratic country, the most democratic in the world. When we tell people that we have a second House, made up of unelected members who are there to the age of 75, they are amazed. They just do not understand. Appointed? For what reason? For various reasons.

The Liberal caucus, which meets weekly, is made up of MPs and senators. When they are preparing fund raising campaigns for this party, who are the ones with the time and the contacts for rounding up all the money this party needs to operate? The senators primarily. They have nothing else to do, so they become the bagmen for the two old parties.

This is a vicious circle. You will note that the Liberals are talking about all manner of things this evening except the Senate, because in their heart of hearts they hope, one day, to be appointed to it, if their leader so decides. Imagine the advantage of not having to run in elections. No longer any need to be present in the riding. Imagine all the advantages of being in the Senate.

We in the Bloc Québécois say, and I think my colleague has said it clearly: "No taxation without representation". As long as the Bloc Québécois remains in Ottawa, we are entitled to our opinions. What we are calling for is abolition, pure and simple. Why? Because we cannot agree. We have not for 35 years.

Supply

When I was a student at the University of Ottawa and the Senate was being discussed, there was a chapter this long in our book on the Canadian Senate. I remember that the Senate was described as a kind of British hybrid in Canada. Why was it called a senate? Because we are in North America, and there is a senate in the United States.

You know, when we are travelling we find that no one knows the Senate is appointed. People just do not know. And that is the question I would like to ask my colleague.

We are still in a federal system, with two levels of government. To lighten the federal structure, not to mention the tax burden on Canadians and Quebecers, would now not be the time to abolish the Senate?

Mr. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments.

He started by saying: "I listened with some interest to what my colleague had to say". I would have rather that he had listened with great interest.

He seems to believe that I want to become a senator. Frankly, I have not spent much time dreaming about it. Certainly not. I do not think so. While I was listening to him, and I did carefully, I seemed to detect a trace of jealousy. When someone says "senators first", I do not have a problem. If someone was to tell my colleagues "you first", I would not have a problem with that. I will not feel put down if I go through the door behind others, in the middle of the pack or anywhere else, I have no problem with that. Frankly, some people have quite a complex.

Personally, I like to see senators go first in front of me. I have no problem with that.

Another thing, you know, what I find really shocking, and I am not kidding any more, I said in my speech that I was ready to talk about Senate reform, and this is why I have been following the debate with a certain interest. But this is not a reform. They are playing politics to try to attract some attention. This is not serious, cutting.

Why not say: This is what I propose?

Mr. Plamondon: We propose to abolish it.

Mr. Duhamel: Yes. Come up with a clear proposal.

Mr. Plamondon: Will abolition do, yes or no?

Mr. Duhamel: Abolition, abolition.

• (2025)

Dear friends, come up with a proposal in due form. I am asking you to come up with a proposal in due form abolishing the Senate. Do it tomorrow morning, I am looking forward to it.

*Supply**[English]*

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Three minutes.

Mr. Harris: Let me make a comment and ask a question. “I think my gold plated pension is okay”, says the hon. member for St. Boniface. The member talked about performance reports. Let me give him a performance report and then I will get to my question.

Here is a Liberal performance report. Early next month the national debt is going to reach \$600 billion. Performance: The Liberals contributed fully two-thirds to that debt. The Liberals contributed about two-thirds to raising the interest payment on that debt to an astounding \$48 billion. Performance: The Liberal government has driven the national debt up by \$100 billion since it took over in 1993. Soon the Prime Minister will be known all across this country as the \$600 billion man.

Does the member for St. Boniface really believe that this Parliament should give the Senate \$40 million with no question asked? Does he believe that is the proper and accountable thing to do?

Mr. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my colleague should rise and make a few comments. They are as profound as they normally are. We contributed supposedly two-thirds to the debt. Frankly, he is very poor in mathematics or he is really trying to be very misleading because that is totally inaccurate.

I received on my desk today an analysis of some of the statistics that Reform uses when trying to scare the Canadian population about violence in society. It was deplorable. I will give an example. Reformers took a crime rate that was used at one time by Statistics Canada before Ontario was involved. Ontario then became involved and they took that first figure and compared it to the whole of Canada proving that there had been 1,000 and some-per cent increase. They would be great in finance. These kinds of statements are deplorable.

Reformers are down to 7 per cent or 8 per cent in the polls because Canadians do not believe them any more. They make outlandish statements that one cannot even add up. They make absolutely misleading statements that people no longer believe. They were at 20 per cent, went down to 14 per cent, now at 7 per cent and I suspect they will be at 2 per cent pretty soon. I do not know how one can get below 0 per cent, but if it is possible for a political party to get below 0 per cent I am betting it is going to be the Reform Party. I believe this party will be the first party to attain that noble goal. That is what Reformers deserve with that kind of rhetoric, those kinds of misleading statements, the poor research, the exaggeration and the bluster.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I was not sure exactly what it was I missed about this place over the last several months but I am giving a new definition to wonderful Wednesday.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, you are right, there are some things about this House that we can miss over the summer. I certainly enjoyed the peace and quiet of the country back in Morinville, Alberta. It was just wonderful. We are now back into the fray and debating the estimates.

I have a couple of points. The previous speaker, the member for St. Boniface, takes pride in his accomplishments. It is a real accomplishment that he has been able, through the chairmanship of his committee, to provide a pilot project that would give new information to Parliament. We hope it is going to provide better and more useful information to this House.

• (2030)

The point unfortunately is that once we have this new and improved information and once we are able to see how the government intends to spend the money and we make recommendations to reduce that amount, we are absolutely and totally stonewalled by the members of the government because they say: “Confidence is the order of the day. There is nothing that we can do. Whatever they say they want has to be voted through”.

That is the shame about this House, not the other one, this House: the fact that the democratic will of this House is thwarted because the Prime Minister says that confidence applies to the estimates. Therefore any backbencher in the government who wishes to oppose, challenge, reduce or change any figure in these estimates had better think twice. They would not want to be back out in the hustings trying to get re-elected because the government might fall because of one backbencher. They are not prepared to stand up to the Prime Minister.

As a result, the estimates as tabled by the President of the Treasury Board are rammed through this House without any change of any kind being tolerated, regardless of whether or not we get new and improved information courtesy of the member for St. Boniface. It is not to detract from his work which is real and serious work. It is to say that in this House the democratic principle of representation of the people who sent us here to talk about these estimates and to act upon these estimates only allows us to talk about these estimates. That is most important.

Of course, there is the other house. I was quite surprised at the two members of the Bloc Québécois. The member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley talked about challenging their legitimacy to sit in this House. I thought they would blow a gasket. Their blood pressure went up. The rhetoric got hot and I thought they would stomp right out. Very sensitive they were to the challenges to their legitimacy.

Supply

The other House is well and truly entrenched in our Constitution as a legitimate part of this Parliament, albeit unelected, yes. Nonetheless it is part of our Constitution; it is entrenched and has a place in this Parliament. Does the Bloc have a place in this Parliament? That is a serious question and that is why when one questions their legitimacy to sit in this House, Bloc members get so hot under the collar that we have to stand back. Members know how it is.

Anyway, there is the other House. We heard the member for St. Boniface. If they make us an offer, we are prepared to debate the issue.

There was an article in the August 5, 1996 Edmonton *Sun*. The headline is "PM's sad slide on the Senate". I will read from it:

Back in October 1990, the then opposition leader had a vision for the Senate, one he promised to enact. At the time of this momentous disclosure the Prime Minister was addressing 400 delegates at the annual general meeting of the Alberta branch of the federal Liberal Party.

He was speaking to his own converted people. Going on, he said:

Saying it was only the presence of Liberal senators that made the chamber of second thought effective at all, he went on to vow that "The Liberal government in two years will make it elected".

It is now nearly six years later, and the Senate is more a palace of patronage than ever. And as far as we know, the Prime Minister has never uttered the words "elected" and "Senate" in the same sentence since he was elected in 1993.

Talk about promises, talk about the red book. They enact the promises. The Prime Minister stood up in 1990 and said: "I want to see an elected Senate because they have almost stopped the GST from being rammed through against Canadians' will". That is why we need a House of sober second thought. It is to ensure that Canadians are represented. What they want is what they get. When they do not want the GST, they do not want the GST.

• (2035)

The Senate had its finest day in years. The senators were on television every night as they stomped out of the chamber. Of course the Liberal majority frustrated the will of the Tory government in this chamber until the Prime Minister of the day said: "I will fix that. I will appoint a bunch of my cronies to outnumber your cronies and then we will get what I want through that chamber because it is not elected". That is hardly democracy.

I asked the Library of Parliament for some background on the other place and they were kind enough to give me a paper that they had prepared for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association 30th Canadian regional conference in New Brunswick in August 1990. I will quote from that paper.

On page 2 on the powers of the Senate it states: "The powers of the Senate, which have not been amended since 1867 except with regard to the amendment of the Constitution, are impressive on paper. In formal terms the Senate comes immediately after the Queen and before the House of Commons in the list of components of the Canadian Parliament. For a law to pass it must be agreed to by the Senate. If a bill passed by the House of Commons is amended in the Senate the amendment must in turn be approved by the Commons failing which the entire text will die on the Order Paper.

"Supremacy was conceded to the Commons only in the terms of financial initiatives. Money bills have been subject to dispute since Confederation. In the United Kingdom under the Parliament Act of 1911 it is up to the Speaker of the Commons to certify bills as money bills but no such procedure exists in Canada. It is generally accepted that tax bills, bills of supply and bills of appropriation fall into this category and that such bills may only be introduced in the House but must pass both chambers".

It continues on page 3, where the paper prepared quotes from a book by Mr. Robert A. Mackay, *The Unreformed Senate of Canada* revised edition 1963, pages 94 and 95 and it states: "The Senate cannot be said to have abused its powers over money bills. It must be recognized that whatever its legal powers, it has not the same political authority as the Commons and that accordingly on money matters the commons has a clear priority and that the Senate's responsibility and rights are secondary". They are secondary.

I read those quotes because a committee of this House asked the Senate to appear before the House of Commons committee, which has supremacy on money matters clearly and obviously, to tell this House why we should give the Senate \$43 million to carry on its business and it refused.

This House has supremacy, clearly, obviously and distinctly. We are elected by Canadians. We represent Canadians from coast to coast. We, the House of Commons, are the ones who have the power to tax Canadians and we are the ones who have the authority to decide how that money is to be spent. The other place, which is secondary and subordinate to this House on money matters, has refused to appear before us to explain why it needs it. Yet the Prime Minister, his government and his backbenchers later on tonight, I can guarantee it, will vote the Senate every nickel that it has asked for without one question being answered as to why it needs the money and how it is going to spend it.

That is an affront to the people who sit in this House. It is an affront to Canadians who have to pay taxes that we will give the other place \$43 million even though it says: "Put it in your face. We are not going to show up and answer your questions as to why we need the money". It is an affront.

Supply

Let me say no more about the other place until it is reformed.

• (2040)

On a broader scale, members have heard me talk about the fact that the Prime Minister asks and the Prime Minister gets as far as the estimates are concerned. Whatever we say in this House is of no matter.

Last year the Reform Party put up quite a fight on the estimates. As a result of that fight the government said that it would create a subcommittee of the procedure and House affairs committee on the business of supply to see what could be done to reform this process. I did not think it would be a long, drawn out and complicated affair but unfortunately I have to advise that the subcommittee is still in existence. It has still to file its final report, and here we are 15 months from the time the committee was created.

We have heard the witnesses. We have listened to the people who put the current procedures in place as to why they put them in place and how they feel it is not delivering what they had anticipated. I hoped we would have reported back to the House before now, that we would be discussing these estimates under an amended procedure based on the work of the subcommittee on the business of supply, but it is not to be.

As the Reform Party critic for the Treasury Board, as a gesture of goodwill, we allowed the old process to prevail today. However, we feel this government has no desire to move and to amend the business of supply. We have been absolutely stonewalled about changing and reducing these estimates regardless of how legitimate our arguments are. Be assured that next year when the estimates are presented to the House the Reform Party will vigorously defend to the best of its ability its right to challenge the government to ensure that Canadians become fully aware of the charade that goes on here once every year, and also when we have the supplementary estimates.

It is just a done deal before we even vote because confidence is called by the Prime Minister and they on the other side all fall into line and say: "What the Prime Minister wants, the Prime Minister gets". This is regardless of what the people think, the people who sent them here. Regardless of what they think, what the Prime Minister wants, the Prime Minister gets.

We have heard the stories of responsible management, downsizing, efficiency and so on. What is the government doing? I am sure Canadians are not really aware what it is doing.

Look at some of the numbers: Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation has an increase in budget of 69 per cent. Its budget is going from \$10 million last year to \$17 million this year, an increase of 69.3 per cent. We have heard the speeches. They have been wonderful and glorious speeches about how the Liberals are cutting

the budget and about how the deficit is coming down through their hard work.

Here is something else: The Canadian Museum of Civilization. I am sure we create a lot of jobs down there. It has an increase in its budget of 21 per cent from \$38 million to \$46 million.

The Canadian Museum of Nature has a 37 per cent increase in budget, from \$18 million to \$24 million. They must create a lot of jobs in museums these days.

The National Gallery of Canada has a budgetary increase of 20 per cent, from \$27 million to \$33 million. More museums: The National Museum of Science and Technology has an increase of 33 per cent, from \$15 million to \$20 million. There is no end.

Remember how critical the Reform Party has been of the minister of heritage and her flagrant and spendthrift waste, waving flags courtesy of the taxpayer. Everyone knows the story.

Status of Women, Office of the Co-ordinator has an increase of 222 per cent, from \$4 million to \$15 million. All these areas are under the control of the Deputy Prime Minister, that newly elected, wonderful member from Hamilton East who is also the Minister of Canadian Heritage. I am sure she is doing her bit to cut the size of government. Right?

• (2045)

Mr. Epp: Oh yes.

Mr. Williams: Right.

Let us talk about the Minister of Finance. He is the one who is prudent and tight with the dollars. He says he is wrestling the deficit down. There was increase in the Department of Finance of 19.1 per cent from \$49 billion to \$59 billion, largely because the debt is going up and up. It will be \$100 billion more during the life of this government using an 8 per cent rate. That is another \$8 billion each and every year out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

The largest transfer program in the history of Canada is the transfer from the poor taxpayers, the downtrodden, hardworking Canadian taxpayer and it is going to the moneylenders, the bankers, the investors, the overseas people who are buying our bonds. The largest transfer program in the history of Canada is the \$50 billion to the rich financiers around the world.

Is that fiscal management? Is that prudent management? Is that sound management? Is that what the Liberals tell the people at election time? No, they say jobs, jobs, jobs and the unemployment rate is stuck at 10 per cent. The next time around it will be jobs, jobs, jobs and the unemployment rate will be stuck at 10 per cent. Not a single word will be said about the fact that the interest costs on the debt has gone up 10, 20, 30 and 40 per cent. It is now \$50 billion and by the turn of the century that will be \$60 billion.

We heard the member for St. Boniface talk about how the coast guard and the department of fisheries were working closely to reduce costs. At fisheries and oceans the increase is 15.7 per cent from \$775 million to \$896 million.

At Indian affairs, that wonderful department that creates all these jobs, has an increase of 6.2 per cent from \$4.9 billion to \$5.2 billion. The Federal Court of Canada has an increase of 60 per cent from \$19 million to \$31 million. It is all here.

Is that fiscal management? No. Is there prudent management? No. Help themselves to the taxpayers money? Absolutely yes. Absolutely yes because every nickel has come down on the deficit as being from increased tax revenues. There has been no reduction in unemployment to speak of. They have helped themselves to the money from the working people by refusing to reduce the unemployment insurance premiums. Now the government has a \$6 billion slush fund that the Minister of Finance is using to say: "I have met my deficit target".

High unemployment insurance premiums kill jobs. We know the Minister of Finance is sitting on top of a slush fund so he can say he has met his target. He is putting people out of work because UI premiums are too high. Let that message be put out. Let the message go out to Canadians that this is irresponsible management. The government refuses to allow the a legitimate expression of all members as to what they think of these estimates. That has to change in this House and the way they are appointed and elected down the hall. That House has to change too.

There is no end to the improvements that the Reform Party could and will make.

• (2050)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to what the hon. member from the Reform Party had to say and, while he was speaking, I was thinking how lucky Quebec voters are to have members of the Bloc Quebecois representing them here in this House. How lucky they are and how lucky we in the Bloc are to be able to come to this House to defend Quebec's interests and share our views with members of the other parties. Our views are often different from theirs because we are linguistically and culturally different.

In 1968, the Government of Quebec was led by Daniel Johnson Senior. There is a big difference between the father and the son. I can tell you that the father was a great premier. So the then Premier of Quebec, Daniel Johnson, abolished the legislative assembly, which was equivalent to the federal Senate. Believe it or not, Quebec has continued to function since then. We realized that we

Supply

did not need two Houses in Quebec. If this works for every province, why would it not work for the central government? This would resolve an enduring situation that has been deteriorating for a long time. We have talked about reforming the Senate for a long time. We now see that it is impossible to reform because we cannot agree on anything.

The Reform Party favours an elected Senate. It would not be so bad, at least, if senators were elected. But what is the advantage of having two Houses of Parliament?

We are a middle power with a population of 27 or 28 million. Every Canadian province has its own government. There are governments in all 10 provinces and in the territories. We have a central government, municipal governments and school boards. Why not do away with the Senate?

In my school days, we were told that the Senate was a Canadian creation modelled on the House of Lords. It was decided at the time to copy the British parliamentary system. The title of lord is hereditary. In the Canadian system, it was decided to appoint senators. It may have been a good thing at the time, not knowing how educated the members of the Lower House would be, to have slightly more educated people sitting for a longer period in the Upper House. But what good is it today?

One thing matters: those who represent the people must be elected. This prompts me to ask this question: Would Canada not do better with just one House instead of reforming a Senate that is beyond reform?

There was talk about reform in 1970 and again in 1975 and 1978. When I was in school, we kept hearing about all these plans to reform the Senate, but no agreement was ever reached. As a result, the Senate remains the same and carries on.

I think that not to abolish the Senate at this time is to show lack of respect for Canadian voters, who work hard to send people to represent them in this place. These representatives work hard, very hard. We all know how expensive it is to run a Parliament. The Senate alone costs \$43 million per year at the lowest estimate and \$65 million, when everything is taken into account. What a saving this would be: \$65 million. With this money, we could afford to build one or two hospitals per year in Canada, and these would be much more useful than a Senate.

Nowadays money must be invested where it will be profitable. A Senate is not a profitable investment. All a Senate does is give the Prime Minister in office an excuse to appoint his friends, to reward those who have served the party well. So, instead of wasting our time stubbornly insisting on reforming an archaic institution, why not just abolish the Senate?

Supply

• (2055)

[English]

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, one notes that when the members from the Bloc talk about legitimacy they get very sensitive about the issue. I think it is because they feel quite sensitive themselves about being here and wondering about the legitimacy of why they are here in the first place or how they can stay here.

I believe I talked about this earlier on this evening. There is a need sometimes for the house of sober second thought, as the other Chamber is currently considered at this point in time. I have reasons for saying that. Let us take a look at a couple of situations.

A couple of years ago the GST created a furore in this House. The prime minister of the day used his majority to ram that legislation through this House before sending it down the hall to the other House for the sober second thought. The opposition party had the majority down there at that time. There was tremendous animosity around the country and this hated tax was not to be introduced.

The prime minister of the day used a very small quirk of the Constitution which had never been used before to change the majority down the hall to guarantee passage of his hated legislation. If that had been an elected Chamber, a Chamber where all the regions were properly represented and could not be tampered with by the prime minister of the day then or today, we would not have to tell Canadians that we would scrap the GST. The Deputy Prime Minister would not have had to put her seat on the line because she would not have had to make an election promise that she would scrap the GST. There is a very real reason for that House.

The other reason, as I said, is that sometimes we get a little headstrong in here and sometimes we get carried away. No better example is down the road in the province of Quebec, in the city of Quebec and the legislature of Quebec where the premier of the day says: "I don't care about the rule of law. I don't care what the court says about whether my actions are legal or illegal or whether they are legitimate or illegitimate. I get what I want". We need a second House to ensure that democracy is protected in this country. Even if it only pops up every so many years it is very important.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words. I want to share my time with the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

First, as far as the Bloc is concerned, it was not very long ago when its members stood in this House and praised the Senate. It was not very long ago when they were suggesting that perhaps the Senate was the only place that could protect the people from the legislation of the Tories, for example, the old age pension cuts and the GST.

What was the last piece of legislation that the Bloc stood in the House and supported that involved massive tax changes? What was it? Was it a bill from the government? Was it a bill from this Chamber? No, it was not. It started with the letter *S*. The letter *S* denotes the Senate. The Bloc stood in this Chamber and fell over backward. They tripped over one another to praise the Senate and all the work it had done on this massive tax change that was called S-9. They praised the committee system of the Senate. It was a massive, sweeping tax change. It was probably the biggest tax change we have had in about 20 years.

• (2100)

Why? Because the Bloc said: "This is a wonderful bill coming from the Senate. What it does is reduce taxes as it relates to the United States. We represent the people of Quebec who like the United States. Therefore, we are all in favour of what the Senate is doing".

They fell over backwards. In fact, they were kissing cousins with the Reform Party. They were hugging one another. They stood up, both of them, praising this legislation, a bill with an *s* on the front. It did not have a *c*, which means Commons; it had an *s*, which stands for the Senate. It came from the Senate. It originated from the Senate banking committee and they stood as one, the Bloc and the Reform Party. They praised it and they praised it and they praised it. Now the Bloc stands today and says that they are asleep in the Senate.

An hon. member: They are.

Mr. Baker: The Reform Party of course says that it is a waste of money. The Reform Party says everything is a waste of money. I was looking at their alternative to these estimates. I was looking a moment ago at what they regarded as being a waste of money in health care, page 24.

What do Reformers say about health care in Canada being a waste of money? They say: "Medicare in which everyone receives everything health care professionals wanted to deliver is not only intolerably expensive, it is undesirable for other reasons. Consumers should be allowed to stay outside the publicly funded system completely if that is their wish, or to supplement publicly funded care with additional privately funded care if that is their wish". A waste of money.

Then the Reformers went on to say that roads and bridges were a waste of money. Let us see. They say on page 14 of their budget: "Typically, physical infrastructure refers to traditional features like highways, ports, railways and airports. Given our current fiscal climate however, governments are ill equipped to spend money on such improvements. In Canada this saving can be done by privatizing aviation, privatizing airports". Then number two, "allowing private sector companies to build and maintain roads and bridges".

Supply

Imagine the cost of driving the Alaska highway if that were the case with the Reform Party in power.

Then the Reformers went on to say on page 46 that unemployment insurance was a waste of money. They suggested an incredible thing. They suggested that the premiums not be reduced.

Mr. Harvard: Not reduced.

Mr. Baker: No. "Don't reduce the premiums", they said, "until all the deficit is taken care of, until a new fund has been built up". In other words, sock it to the employers, sock it to the employees. They said that after all this has been done, then they could pass on some savings to the employees and the employers. With the Reform Party everything is a waste of money.

What are we debating here today? We are debating to concur in the main estimates for the year ending March 31, 1997. For what country? To listen to the Bloc and the Reform, boy, what country do members think they are thinking about?

An hon. member: Burundi.

Mr. Baker: Let us take the G-7. Could it be Italy? Its growth rate is 1.2 per cent minus, no, not Italy. Is it France? Let us come up a little further now at 2 per cent, no. Is it the U.K. at 1.5 per cent? That is not what we are debating. Is it Germany at .8 per cent? No. Is it the great country of Japan? No. We are not even close to the top in economic performance. Oh no, it is not Japan. Is it the United States at 3.4 per cent? No, it is not. What country is it that we are doing the estimates on? Could it be that it is the country that has been judged by the OECD as being the richest country today in economic growth of all of the G-7 countries, the country of Canada? Is that what we are talking about today?

• (2105)

These figures are not from an organization in downtown Toronto or downtown Montreal. Where do these figures come from? Hon. members from the Reform and the Bloc should visit the parliamentary library and pick up the OECD Economic Outlook. Twenty-seven countries in the world whose job is to do what? They are representatives of 27 governments of the industrialized democracies of the world who discuss and attempt to co-ordinate their economic and social policies. What do they say? They say that Canada since the fall of 1993—what happened then? Wow, is that not a coincidence? Since the fall of 1993 to the beginning of 1996, for those three years Canada had the strongest employment growth of all of the G-7 countries. They did not stop there. Then they said for the year 1997 in terms of economic growth, Canada is projected to rank first among the G-7 countries.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: Say that again.

Mr. Baker: That deserves repeating. We have to repeat it, Mr. Speaker, because we are dealing with estimates of that country called Canada. Who has been the leader of that country, judged to be the most progressive nation in the world today, that the Bloc and Reform are saying here today is an absolute disaster? We are led by the most successful Prime Minister, the greatest Prime Minister this country has ever had and he will lead us into 1998 and beyond.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat embarrassed by comments made in this House. The member who just spoke said that Canada is the richest country and that it enjoys a very high rate of economic growth. However, the member seems to overlook another Canadian reality.

There is no reason to brag when one looks at all the shameful cuts made to social assistance and to unemployment insurance, and when one considers that one out of five children does not have enough to eat. I am somewhat embarrassed by such comments, because I think the economic reality is not that pretty.

I feel like we are in a school yard during recess and that we are discussing whether we could cut \$40 million and give this very amount to sectors that have suffered these shameful cuts.

I wish to call to order the member who boasts about playing a role in a flourishing Canadian economy.

I wonder about that. Canada is no longer the country it used to be. The federal government keeps making cuts in transfer payments to the provinces. It gives the provinces the responsibility of maintaining a social safety net, while it no longer has the means to send—Quebecers pay \$30 billion in taxes and they receive less and less.

To use a popular expression, this is nothing to write home about.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is why I mentioned right at the very beginning of my comments how incredible it was that the Bloc turned around and heaped such praise on the Senate and the banking committee for all of those changes that gave the big tax cuts to the big multinationals in the United States and in Canada. Some people agree with that. It is a legitimate way of looking at things, the way the world is going with globalization and so on.

• (2110)

I was shocked that the Bloc members would stand in this Chamber on behalf of those poor people they purport to represent and approve en masse the biggest tax cut to the wealthiest people in North America that we have seen in this century. And they are supposed to be the official opposition. There was no examination at all by the official opposition except for some members on this side

Supply

of the House. No, we did not vote against the legislation but we used our privilege and our positions in this great democratic party that we represent to question the actions of the Bloc and the Reform Party who welcomed those cuts for the rich so much.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls earlier in his presentation quoted from the document that is known in these circles as the “Taxpayers Budget” released by the Reform Party a couple of years ago, it reminded me of the day I brought home a shiny brochure of a nice new car. I put it down on the kitchen table and my wife went ballistic. I asked: “What is the matter, dear?” She said: “I know it is only a brochure on the table today, but it is going to be in the driveway tomorrow”.

That is exactly what we will see with the taxpayers budget. It is on his desk today and it is going to be in their red book tomorrow, because it is a pathfinder. It is where the Liberals get their direction.

Where did we get the \$600 billion debt? We all acknowledge the fact that we have a wonderful country. But we have a sacred trust to pass this wonderful country on to our children and their children and their children in at least as good a shape as we got it. How can we do that if we give them a legacy of \$600 billion of debt, if 40 per cent of every dollar taken in by the federal government goes to pay interest on the debt, money that we have already spent? Our generation has enjoyed the benefit. If we do not make the tough decisions that the Liberals will make because they are forced to by the Reform Party, we will never get our House in order. If we had not kept the Liberals’ feet to the fire there would not even be a sniff of a chance that we would be as far down the road as we are today.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, it still has not sunk in to the Reformers that since the fall of 1993 Canada has become the fastest growing economy of all of the G-7 countries. We have done that and will maintain that. But we will also maintain our commitment to senior citizens and we will maintain our health care system.

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a hard act to follow.

These days it is fashionable to talk about fiscal responsibility and the need to reduce spending at all levels of government. While it is not difficult simply to cut spending without regard for the consequences, it requires great care to meet necessary fiscal targets while ensuring that the government policies support the priorities of Canadian society.

In asking the House to concur with the appropriation bill, I would like to remind members that the estimates we have considered effecting today are taken to reduce program spending and at

the same time to target spending on what is most important to the Canadian public.

For example, we have reduced direct support to industry in favour of policies that will stimulate growth and jobs. We have reduced costs by transferring the air navigation system and airports to not for profit corporations. We have taken steps to reduce subsidies to Canada Post and to VIA Rail. We have reduced defence spending by \$200 million in 1997-98 and another \$600 million in 1998-99. These are just a few examples of the actions we have taken to meet our fiscal responsibilities.

● (2115)

Under program reduction, many costs in services have been cut to the Canadian people. But one program brought in over the last three years was the infrastructure program. In Quebec alone, there were more than 2,400 projects. That brought in a total of more than \$2 billion to the Quebec economy, resulting in more than 29,000 jobs.

In my province of Nova Scotia, there were more than 316 projects, which brought more than \$200 million to the economy and more than 4,000 direct jobs. This is significant and it is particularly significant in the east, not only in Quebec but in Nova Scotia where the infrastructure is antiquated and much in need of a boost.

I would remind the House that this year’s estimates are a vital component of that program spending regardless of the program cuts, and this year’s estimates alone call for \$157 billion in planned budgetary spending compared with \$164 billion last year. This is a significant reduction while at the same time serving the Canadian people in programs they desire.

That intent and the reality has been that we wish to secure our nation’s financial future, and that has been done that through serious, very methodical but very fair cuts, and through very serious methodical consideration of what the Canadian people want, while at the same time investing in the future which is the future of our youth.

When we went to the Canadian people looking for a mandate to govern the country, we set targets as a government and we set goals. The first goal was to reduce the deficit. When we took power in 1993, members will know that the deficit was around \$42 billion a year. That is nearly 6 per cent of gross domestic product which had a very negative impact on the economy.

It was mandatory that we set responsible, credible financial targets that we could meet. For the first time in many years, the government has been credible. It has written the plan and it has followed through. There is confidence from the Canadian people.

The goal is that by the end of the fiscal year 1996-97, we will be at that real target of 3 per cent of GDP in deficit reduction and be around an annual deficit of \$24 billion.

This is extremely important as we vote tonight on estimates that will pay for program spending over the next few months. What it has done is send a message to the Canadian people and to the world markets that the Canadian government is a very credible, very realistic government.

What it has done is bring inflation under control and interest rates down. Short term interest rates have declined by more than 3 percentage points since March 1995, which has brought the debt charges down. We are paying less money out on debt servicing as well.

We have also provided cost competitiveness in this country. This is the best it has been for the Canadian public for more than 45 years. That is a significant component of the Canadian economy.

We also have the largest trade surplus that we have had in decades. It is this trade surplus that sets Canadians in the front on the world stage. We can manufacture, we can market and deliver those goods competitively throughout the world. This is a very vital and a very important component of the overall economy.

As well, by reducing the deficit we have reduced our foreign dependency on dollars to simply manage the economy on a day to day basis. That alone is a significant part of the stability in our financial segment and of presenting ourselves as a great leader among the G-7 nations.

The economy has generated more than 650,000 jobs over the past three years. That is also important because it is not the government that is creating the jobs, but it is government policies that are allowing the private sector to create the jobs.

• (2120)

It seems to me that the government has focused on the goals it set. It has delivered on what was offered to the Canadian public. The job is not all done but it will continue.

It seems to me that the reason the Reform Party put this motion to abolish the other place is because the government has set the goals financially and has been responsible fiscally and it has no argument on the financial front and so we now have to take a new debate and put it in place. The government has spoiled Reform's platform because it has delivered and provided a credible, fiscally responsible and socially responsible government.

I say to the members of this House that the opposition parties had plenty of opportunity through the Meech Lake accord, through the Charlottetown accord, for which both parties expressed their distaste and their opposition. However, they had the opposition at that time to deal with the other place. It would have provided an opportunity for restructuring and for looking at some of these issues that we are looking at here in the government. The government has been about restructuring for three years, about program

Supply

cuts, program spending and it is dealing with it in a realistic manner. It will have the opportunity again to deal with the other place.

It is my belief that every member in the other place probably would look for restructuring as well because as this century closes and we move into the 21st century time is moving so rapidly with so many changes that it is imperative that every institution in all parts of society must come forward and look at restructuring in order to keep pace with the rapid changes.

Over the summer months I did a survey in my constituency and throughout Nova Scotia. I made the statement that the government had set a strategy at the outset of reducing the deficit, keeping inflation at a manageable level and lowering interest rates to generate a fiscally responsible climate so that the private sector might come forward and the entrepreneurs flourish in creating jobs and developing that very competitive economy. That strategy was set by this government in 1993. I asked my constituents: "Are you in favour of the government strategy?".

I would like to tell the House tonight that in those questionnaires that came back to me through the summer months more than 97 per cent of respondents indicated they were in favour of the government's financial strategy and their policies and that we should proceed in that direction.

The public is in favour of this fiscal strategy, of the program cuts that the government has made. They are not all perfect but they are done fairly and equitably across the country. I have suffered them as many members have in their ridings, but the public is aware of how difficult it is.

I believe that this is why we are debating the other place tonight. It is because the government has followed through on its financial commitments and delivered a responsible government. It is my belief that in fiscal year 1997-98 the size of the debt in relation to Canada's economy will decline. It will be the first time in many years that the economy will grow faster than the debt and deficit.

I believe we have answered the challenge from the opposition parties as the Government of Canada. We have fulfilled our promises. We have set the stage and have been responsible financially. The passing of the estimates tonight will support what Canadians believe, that what we are doing is appropriate for them. Because we have become responsible fiscally, we have stolen the platform from the opposition. That is why they would rather debate the other House. The time has come to restructure the other House as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to my Liberal colleague's speech. However, I would still like to say that I find the Liberals have drifted away from what liberalism and the philosophy of liberalism are advocating in this government. I will explain.

Supply

• (2125)

This government has made cuts, it had to, everyone agrees. Everyone elected to this House realizes and understands that the size of government has to be reduced. We have an accumulated deficit of \$600 billion. It is so large that it is difficult to calculate.

In the past, the philosophy of the Liberal Party was always to redistribute the wealth. This was where its strength lay and what in fact made the difference between our society and that of the United States. Here in Canada, we believed that the wealth should be redistributed.

Let us look at what this government has done since it came to power. What has it done? First of all, it has reformed unemployment insurance, now known as employment insurance, but this is really just semantics. It has reformed unemployment insurance to the detriment of the unemployed and of workers, who will now receive much less. They will now have to work many more hours to qualify for the insurance they are paying for, despite the fact there are surpluses in the fund. That is one thing the government has done.

Second, they have cut provincial government subsidies. The Minister of Finance has very cleverly offloaded the deficit on the provinces. That is what he has done. The provinces cannot do this because they are another level of government. The minister was clever, but he must be denounced. Less money for welfare, less money for families.

Finally, who pays? Low wage earners, the middle class, and the most defenceless are the ones who will pay and who always pay. We know that the philosophy of this big party which governs the country was to redistribute wealth. At the moment they have forgotten about that. It is far easier for them to tax the poor than to go looking for the money where it really is, so that is what they do.

The government lacks courage. I see them looking into their book and not saying much. They know I am telling the truth. It is a government lacking in courage. They have made cuts, and everyone agrees that cuts had to be made, but they have not cut where they ought to have. They have cut back on the budgets for the poor, the low wage earners. I find that a great pity.

A program was announced in the red book—remember the red book?—about creating daycare centres. They have forgotten about that.

Before asking my question, I would like to speak of the infrastructure program. That was a good program, one of the few

good ones, maybe the only one, they brought in. You will recall that this is a joint program with the provincial and municipal governments, so there are three levels working together, each one contributing a third.

In my riding, there is no money left. The question I am asking the hon. member is whether we ought not to bring back this program, as soon as possible, in order to create short term employment?

[English]

Mrs. Brushett: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks where is our liberalism and are we not defenders of liberalism. I would say that yes, indeed we are and part of the restructuring that we have done is to secure Canada's financial future and the future for our youth.

When we talk about infrastructure and the past, the program costs over the past two and a half years totalled \$6 billion: one-third for municipal, one-third for provincial and one-third for federal. Ladies and gentlemen, do you know that \$2 billion—

• (2130)

The Deputy Speaker: I would ask the hon. member to address her comments to the Chair, not to ladies and gentlemen. Unfortunately that term cannot be used in the House.

Mrs. Brushett: Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House, I would like each one of you to be aware that \$2 billion—

The Deputy Speaker: I am going to stop the hon. member each time she does not address her remarks to the Chair and if she continues to do it I am going to recognize someone else.

Mrs. Brushett: Mr. Speaker, \$2 billion of the \$6 billion went to the province of Quebec. That is the point. We have shared in that liberalism. It is my hope that the infrastructure program will be part of the next platform of the government. The hon. member believes it is very valuable in the province of Quebec. I know that province quite well myself. I have many friends there.

It is important because of the antiquated infrastructure that exists. It is the same in the province of Nova Scotia and the eastern region. There is much need to build basic infrastructure, sewage treatment plants, water systems for industry, preventing sewage from going into the Bay of Fundy and into our oceans. We have advocated this for many years but it has never been done. It is extremely important as we move into the 21st century that we have another infrastructure program.

Supply

[Translation]

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure as a parliamentarian to take part in this vigorous debate this evening in order to reject a proposal to renew a \$40 million budget for the Senate and demand its abolition.

My colleague pointed out earlier that the Bloc Québécois is intervening specifically on the motion to renew a \$40 million budget for the Senate and not on other budgets allocated to various programs. We could have intervened just as well on the amount of \$25 million set aside for social housing, which is clearly inadequate, or on the amount of \$15 million to be extended for the status of women, which is also clearly inadequate. However, when \$40 million is spent like that, \$40 million to produce duplication and overlap, and you know that duplication and overlap have always signalled the call to arms for the Bloc Québécois.

It is no secret that the people of Quebec are fed up with the Senate and have been for a long time. It is a fact that a broad consensus existed in Quebec on the abolition of the Senate when the Charlottetown talks were being held, but this consensus was reached well before that time, as early as 1980.

During the referendum year of 1980, federalist politicians, without sovereignist leanings, I may add, were already demanding, as expressed by Claude Ryan in his beige paper, the abolition of the upper House. My point is that this is not just a quirk of the big, bad separatists.

The position of Quebecers on the subject has not changed since 1980, on the contrary. Barely two weeks ago, a petition was circulated in my riding and all other ridings in Quebec in support of the motion of my colleague from Rivière-du-Loup, which will demand the abolition of the Senate, no less.

The text of the petition is quite clear, and the reasons introduced to support abolition of the Senate are as follows: Whereas the Senate consists of non-elected members who are not accountable for their actions; whereas the Senate refuses to be accountable for its expenditures to committees of the House of Commons; whereas the Senate does not fulfil its representational mandate; whereas the Senate duplicates the work done by members of the House of Commons; whereas the Senate—and finally, it is necessary to ensure there are parliamentary institutions.

Four hundred senators who are not elected share a budget of about \$40 million, at a time when cuts are being made everywhere. That is why today the Bloc intervenes specifically on the appropriations allocated to the Senate. Although the petition has not been publicized in any way, it has already attracted hundreds of signatures in my riding that will be added to thousands more from other ridings and tabled by the hon. member for Rivière-du-Loup here in this House.

● (2135)

I sincerely believe that, in Quebec, my fellow citizens strongly desire the Senate's disappearance. More than two years ago my colleague from Richelieu gave us a very interesting historical background on that institution. I think it deserves to be quickly restated.

My colleague said that the other House is a leftover from colonial times, that it was created to protect the wealthy landowners against the more populist endeavours of the elected members, our predecessors. The proof is that, at the time, senators had to be worth at least \$15,000. Do we realize how much that was at the time? Obviously only rich people had that much money. They were protecting the interests of their wealthy citizens, a practice which has not yet disappeared, far from it, although it is now under a new guise.

Of course the role of senators has changed, but nevertheless they are no longer needed. As with many other institutions, the theoretical role and reality are very far apart. The wealthy landowners have been replaced by faithful political lackeys. All sorts of abuses have been noted and publicized. There is no need to come back on that. The work done by members of that House has a lot more to do with the political agenda of the major parties than with fundamental research. The Senate has become the tool used by the government to avoid contradicting itself publicly and preserving its reputation when it realizes that it has made a mistake. It is now a very discrete and reliable tool, used by elected members of the main parties.

A very good example of this is the process used for the bill on electoral boundaries, where the party in office benefitted greatly from this redistribution of representation. It was so blatant that several members condemned this practice in the House.

Recently we were also able to see how undemocratic was the Senate. Last June, we could read in all the newspapers that the Senate had refused to pass the bill on the Pearson airport. There is no better example of what the Senate is and what power it has. How can we accept that people who are not elected, who are not accountable to the people, can decide on their own authority to reject a bill that was seriously examined and debated for several hours here in the House?

Even though I was opposed to the bill in question, the fact remains that I am shocked to see people who were appointed for political services rendered either to the Conservatives or to the Liberals—it often boils down to the same thing—people who are not accountable to anyone, giving themselves the rights to decide the future of the biggest airport in Canada.

How do the members of the party in office, the members of the same party that made sure to get a majority in the Senate, feel today, knowing that even some of the people they appointed to be their standard bearers in the other House helped defeat a bill that a vast majority of them in this House were in favour of? How do they feel knowing that, instead of proposing amendments, the other House rejected the bill outright? That is not very flattering for the Liberal deputation. This is ridiculous. Some elected representatives

Supply

bring in a bill, which is later rejected by a group of non-elected representatives called senators. This is the best example of what is so absurd about the Senate and the best reason to call immediately for its abolition.

Whether they like it or not, Quebecers are paying for an institution that they do not support any more. The costs are very high, at \$43 million, and there might also be some other expenses related to the senators' functions. In 1995-96, the budget is set at \$42 million.

• (2140)

In the supply motion debated today, the amount shown is \$40 million. Unemployment benefits were reduced to allow the government to save on the backs of the unemployed. Single mothers living under the poverty line could see their welfare benefits reduced because provinces are receiving less from the federal government.

Young people, looking for a first job are suffering from the absence of a job creation policy. The elderly could see their pensions cut.

Can you imagine the frustration felt by all these people who know that huge amounts, to the tune of \$40 million, are spent year after year on an institution that lives off the fat of the land, an institution that does not serve any more its initial vocation and that these people have not wanted any more for a long time now. Since 1980, the people of Quebec have pronounced themselves in favour of the abolition of the Senate. That being, some wonder why our fellow citizens drop out, why that have become so bitter with regard to the politicians.

Far from approving these supplies of \$40 million for the Senate, the Bloc Québécois is asking for its abolition pure and simple because the Senate has lost its *raison d'être*. We have to modernize our institutions, but the Senate is an outdated institution. Its *raison d'être* is no more justifiable with people suffering cut after cut in social assistance, in unemployment insurance, in youth programs, women's programs, day care centres and so on. These \$40 million are used to make duplication and overlapping.

When will this government have the courage to abolish that institution serving only partisan purposes? Today in this House, I am calling for its abolition pure and simple. Let us allocate money to programs aimed at helping women, at creating more day care places. I am waiting for this government to take the right decision at last.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this evening in dealing with the main estimates I have had an opportunity to listen to a number of members discuss the Senate. The Reform Party has spent a lot of time outlining its policy of an elected Senate and each and every speaker from the Bloc Qué-

cois has used this aspect of the estimate to say that the Senate should be abolished because it has outlived its time.

As all members know, there has been a lot of work done over the years on reforming the Senate. Even as this place has to reform itself from time to time, there are things that can be done to improve it.

The member indicated that the Senate killed the Pearson bill and was it not awful that this unelected, unaccountable body can kill a bill. The bill was stopped but the government can still bring back a further bill if it wishes to pursue it further.

I want to ask the member a question about accountability. Notwithstanding that she has suggested that the Senate should be abolished, she mentioned that it is an unaccountable body. She knows that there are 104 Senators which is about one-third the number of members of Parliament. That means that each senator effectively represents somewhere in the neighbourhood of about 300,000 people. It also means that if they were elected and were accountable the way the member suggested they should be, then they would have to run in ridings three times larger than the member's own riding. In addition, they would have to have some kind of constituency facility and a bureaucracy within the constituency to be able to serve their electors.

Then there is the problem of how we rationalize the responsibilities of an elected senator and an elected member of Parliament. Who do the constituents go to?

It is very easy to reach conclusions to abolish, reform or elect the Senate. But none of the impacts of making bodies such as the Senate accountable have been thought through. What would be the implications to the whole system?

• (2145)

The Canadian Parliament has three parts: this Chamber of the House; the Senate; and Her Majesty the Queen as represented by the Governor General. The Senate is an integral part of Canada. It is very clear that the position of the Bloc—and I hope the member will comment on this—has nothing to do with fiscal responsibility but very much to do with the need to break up Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I never said in my comments that senators should be accountable to the electorate. When I say that they are accountable, I do not mean they are accountable to the public, because they are not elected representatives. I never meant to say senators should be elected by the people.

What we are demanding is actually the abolition of the Senate, pure and simple. I cannot figure out how the member could draw these conclusions. The abolition of the Senate is what we want. I do not want an elected Senate.

I think these \$40 million for the Senate is just money thrown out the window. What the Senate does is nothing but duplication and overlap. After bills are discussed here, there are debated once

more, which delays the passage of some of them. An appointment to the Senate is a kind of old age security for deserving friends of the Liberals or the Conservatives. In these days of fiscal restraint, when we cut different programs for the young, for women and for the destitute, it may be a good idea to consider areas where there is some fat to pare.

Senators are not accountable to the people and they are not elected by the population, but I repeat for the sake of the hon. member that I do not want senators to be elected by the population. What I want is the abolition of the Senate in order to get these \$40 million back and use them in areas where they are badly needed. Quebec is not the only province subjected to federal cuts. That is why we should turn to areas where cuts can be made.

What do we need the senators for, nowadays? To pass bills that have already been passed by this House? I do not see the rationale. I am pretty sure many people in Quebec and Canada are in full agreement with the Bloc Québécois position, which is the abolition of the Senate, pure and simple.

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you have the pleasure of hearing me as the last speaker tonight. I will try to be interesting for you, Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues and also for all those who are watching us on television.

I believe it would be worth recalling the motion on which will have to vote in a few minutes. It reads as follows: "The President of the Treasury Board requests that the House concur in Vote 1, in the amount of \$40,713,000 under Parliament—Senate—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997."

Forty million dollars, and we should add to that a few more millions provided for services offered by different departments and other federal agencies to maintain that honourable and noble institution. In fact, the exact amount of the funds granted to the Senate will be close to \$55 or \$60 million at the end of the year.

Before granting such an amount of money to an institution like the Senate, we must ask ourselves what purpose it serves. We must ask ourselves what the Fathers of Confederation had in mind in 1867 when they created a Parliament with two Houses. During those 22 years, the senators had to debate 18 bills from the House of Commons, which did not received royal assent either.

● (2150)

More than 125 years ago, the Fathers of Confederation thought it was a good idea to have these two assemblies, one of which is non elective, namely the Senate. But it would be interesting to look at the Senate's record since the birth of our federation. I examined the list of interventions made by the Senate from 1867 to 1996, the last year for which statistics are available.

Supply

Let us round the numbers off and take the period from 1867 to 1900. In the first 33 years, the Senate proposed amendments to House of Commons bills which never received royal assent. There were 105 bills during the Senate's first 33 years of existence.

During the next 25 years, from 1900 to 1925, there was a slight decrease. The Senate proposed amendments to 93 bills which never received royal assent. That gives us a cumulative total of 198.

From 1926 to 1963, that is during the next 37 years, the work of senators decreased even more. They proposed amendments to 49 House of Commons bills which, after having been passed in the Senate, did not receive royal assent. So from 1867 to 1963, a period of 96 years, the Senate made a grand total of 247 interventions with regard to bills presented in the House of Commons.

Starting in 1963 there was a period of lethargy that lasted 11 years during which the Senate did not propose any amendments to House of Commons bills. It is probably during this 11 year period that senators fell into a deep coma that they are still having great difficulty getting out of.

Then suddenly, from 1975 to 1996, that is during the past 22 years, the work started again. During those 22 years, the senators had to debate 18 bills from the House of Commons, which did not received royal assent either.

Overall, during its 129 years of existence, the Senate had to examine 265 bills from the House of Commons that never received royal assent, which means these bills were discussed in the Senate but never became law. So, with 265 bills in 129 years, for an average of 2 bills a year, I can understand that the senators fall asleep and can not stay awake even in front of television cameras.

Now, lets look at the bills that were introduced in the House of Commons, amended in the Senate and received royal assent. I went back to 1960 only. In the 22 years from 1960 to 1982, 35 bills were amended in the Senate, sent back to the House of Commons and received royal assent.

In the following 14 years, from 1982 to 1996, the Senate recommended amendments to 30 bills that were later adopted by the House of Commons.

● (2155)

In all, from 1960 to 1996, for the 36 years of statistics that I noted down there were 65 bills. This is just short of 1.8 bills a year or less than two bills annually. At such a pace, one can hardly stay awake and justify a salary. This is why those people do not feel the need to go before the public and account for what they do.

It would be embarrassing to show such a record to their employer, the taxpayers who pay the salaries of the senators. It

Supply

would really be embarrassing to face taxpayers and say: “My friends, this is the work we have done in 129 years on bills introduced in the House of Commons which did not receive the royal assent and other bills introduced in the Commons which we managed to amend and which were then passed by the House of Commons”.

No wonder there is a temptation to reform the other place. Since 1960 only, 52 bills on the Senate have been introduced in this House to modify its role or its functioning or even to abolish it.

Those 52 bills aimed at abolishing the Senate. Stanley Knowles, an honorary member of this House, alone has attempted 18 times—between 1964 and 1981—through motions presented in this House and through private bills, to have the Senate abolished.

Despite all these attempts, it has never been possible to make any significant changes to the operations of the Senate or to its very existence.

Its role was understandable at the time of the creation of the federation, in 1867 and in 1900. The Senate was seen as a sort of chamber of sober second thought. Its members calmly considered the legislation, free from public pressure. This was understandable in 1867, but the role of the Senate today is far different because of the practical limits on its powers.

Is what is called in English “double checking” or in Quebecois “double vérification” still necessary nowadays? The primary role of the Senate was to double check the laws passed by the House to ensure that the first chamber had not made any mistake, had not made serious mistakes for the taxpayers, and it was the role of the Senate to correct any mistake or to propose amendments to bills.

But nowadays, given the modern means of communication, television, the Internet, it is no longer possible to pass laws expeditiously without arousing among people increasing interest, which leads the lobbying groups to come and tell the government it is making a mistake or is being unfair towards a certain segment of society. This is why we no longer need this double checking institution.

In the five provinces that used to have a Senate, this type of political institution has been abolished. That was the case in Quebec in 1968. Quebec was the last province to abolish the Senate, and it did so because this institution was no longer needed. The same thing could be true for the Canadian Senate.

When, in 1968, the legislative council was abolished in Quebec, if it had not been commented in the media, we would still not know that it was done away with, because we went on passing laws, and the same thing is true in the four other provinces where the legislative council was abolished.

Nobody complained that laws had become unfair or less equitable for the people. We now have a public that is better informed and

members of Parliament that are better prepared. Nowadays, with the political and legislative systems we have, members are able to get all the information they need.

I do not believe it to be necessary to spend between \$50 and \$60 million a year to keep an institution that does not double check, to all intents and purposes, but mostly acts as a place where some friends of the party in power are sent as a reward for services rendered—and when their senator’s earnings are not enough, they are appointed as lieutenant governor. Fortunately, there are only ten positions of lieutenant governor. Otherwise, there would not have been enough of them for all the senators interested in a new job.

For these reasons, we think it would be improper to support appropriation for an institution which does not have our confidence and which we would like to see not only changed, but abolished outright.

[English]

The Speaker: We have about 60 seconds. That means a 30-second question and a 30-second answer.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Senate, as the member knows, also provides an important opportunity for women to be represented in the Parliament of Canada. One member I can recall very specifically, whom the hon. member may want to comment on, is the Senator from Etobicoke, Joan Neiman. Although no longer a senator, while in the other place she chaired a wonderful committee dealing with euthanasia.

I wonder if the member would comment on the value that women in the Senate contribute to the Parliament of Canada.

[Translation]

Mr. Laurin: Mr. Speaker, it is not the presence of the Senate that allowed women to sit in the House of Commons because, for decades, the Senate, in its wisdom, never introduced legislation suggesting to the House of Commons that it give women the right to vote and to sit in the House.

If there are women in the House today, in increasing numbers, it is because women took matters into their own hands, because women are better informed and they have made their case. No Senate allowed women to reach the status they have nowadays.

[English]

The Speaker: It being 10 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply. The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 120)

YEAS

Members

Allcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Byrne
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gaffney
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
Malhi
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Miffiin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Paradis
Peters
Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Serré
Sheridan

Allmand
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bakopanos
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collins
Copps
Crawford
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagliano
Gerrard
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Payne
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons

St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Zed—141

Supply

Steckle
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Young

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bélisle
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Davault
Debien
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Jennings
Kerpan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Loubier
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith
Morrison
Paré
Ramsay
Robinson
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (North Vancouver)

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie
Bridgman
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Frazer
Gauthier
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harris
Hayes
Hoepfner
Johnston
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Mayfield
Ménard
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Plamondon
Ringma
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Silye
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams—86

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Canuel
Collenette
Dhaliwal
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)

Barnes
Chan
Cullen
Jacob
MacDonald
Marchand
O'Reilly
Pomerleau

● (2230)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Supply

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that on vote 10 under Canadian Heritage, vote 1 under Treasury Board, vote 5 under Treasury Board and vote 15 under Treasury Board and the concurrence to the main estimates, that a question be deemed to have been put, that a recorded division be deemed to have been requested, with the result of the vote taken on vote 1 being applied to the motions I just read.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of \$404,461,000 under Canadian Heritage—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. The next question is on Motion No. 3.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$69,989,000 under Treasury Board—Secretariat—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. The next question is on Motion No. 4.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$450,000,000 under Treasury Board—Secretariat—Government contingencies, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. The next question is on Motion No. 5.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$10,000,000 under Treasury Board—Secretariat—Training assistance, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Supply

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN MAIN ESTIMATES

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1997, except any vote disposed of earlier today and less the amount voted in Interim Supply, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Massé moved that Bill C-56, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997, be read the first time.

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

Mr. Massé moved that Bill C-56, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the main estimates vote 1 taken earlier this day to the motion now before the House.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.*]

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Kilgour in the chair.)

The Chairman: Order. House in committee to consider Bill C-56, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1997.

(Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.)

On Clause 6:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Chairman, did you read clause 2? I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board if the bill is consistent with those from previous years?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the bill is indeed consistent with those from previous years.

• (2235)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall Clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clause 6 agreed to.)

(Schedule agreed to.)

(Clause 1 agreed to.)

(Preamble agreed to.)

(Title agreed to.)

(Bill reported.)

Mr. Massé moved that the bill be concurred in at report stage.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.
[Translation]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.]

(Motion agreed to.)

The Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Massé moved that Bill C-56 be read a third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

[Translation]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote on the previous motion to the motion now before the House.

[English]

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 120.]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from September 17 consideration of Bill C-45, an act to amend the Criminal Code (judicial review of parole ineligibility) and another act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division at the report stage of Bill C-45.

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to Motions Nos. 3 and 5. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions Nos. 2, 4 and 6. A negative vote on Motion No. 1 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 2.

• (2240)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that the 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 this motion.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded as voting for Motion No. 1.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid there is no unanimous consent on this. We are going to have to vote on this one.

The Speaker: We will be voting on this motion.

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

(Division No. 121)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Bélisle
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Caron
Clancy
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Loubier
Milliken
Paré
Robinson
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rosemont) —49

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête
Davialt
Debien
Dubé
Dumas
Finestone
Gauthier
Guay
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Ménard
Nunez
Plamondon
Rocheleau
St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)

NAYS

Members

Abлонczy
Anawak
Arseneault
Augustine
Baker
Beaumier

Alcock
Anderson
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
Bakopanos
Bélair

Bélanger
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Collins
Copp
Crawford
Cummins
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Frazer
Gaffney
Galloway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Guarnieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jennings
Karygiannis
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
Malhi
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Paradis
Peters
Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Ringma
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré
Sheridan
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Terrana
Thompson
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams
Zed—175

Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bridgman
Brushett
Byrne
Campbell
Chamberlain
Cohen
Comuzzi
Cowling
Culbert
Dingwall
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finlay
Fontana
Fry
Gagliano
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Churchill)
Harris
Harvard
Hickey
Hoeppner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Johnston
Kerpan
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Payne
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd
Silye
Speaker
Steckle
Stinson
Szabo
Thalheimer
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
White (North Vancouver)
Young

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Barnes
Canuel	Chan
Collenette	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Jacob
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau

• (2245)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3 and 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 4 and 6.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 122)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Brien
Caccia	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Clancy
Crête	Dalphondu-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Finestone
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier
Godin	Guay
Guimond	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Ménard
Milliken	Nunez
Paré	Plamondon
Robinson	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont) —53	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Arseneault
 Augustine
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bertrand
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonin
 Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Brown (Oakville—Milton)
 Bryden
 Calder
 Catterall
 Chan
 Collins
 Copps
 Crawford
 Cummins
 Discepolo
 Duhamel
 Easter
 English
 Fewchuk
 Flis
 Frazer
 Gaffney
 Galloway
 Gilmour
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grose
 Guarnieri
 Hanrahan
 Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
 Harper (Simcoe Centre)
 Hart
 Hayes
 Hill (MacLeod)
 Hopkins
 Ianno
 Irwin
 Jennings
 Karygiannis
 Keys
 Kraft Sloan
 LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
 Lincoln
 Malhi
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Mayfield
 McCormick
 McKinnon
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Mitchell
 Murphy
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
 Paradis
 Peters
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Essex—Kent)
 Proud
 Reed
 Ringma
 Robichaud
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
 Serré
 Sheridan
 Solberg
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Strahl
 Terrana
 Thompson

Anderson
 Assadourian
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
 Bakopanos
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bethel
 Blaikie
 Bodnar
 Boudria
 Bridgman
 Brushett
 Byrne
 Campbell
 Chamberlain
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Cowling
 Culbert
 Dingwall
 Dromisky
 Dupuy
 Eggleton
 Epp
 Finlay
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gagliano
 Gerrard
 Godfrey
 Gouk
 Grey (Beaver River)
 Grubel
 Hanger
 Harb
 Harper (Churchill)
 Harris
 Harvard
 Hickey
 Hoepfner
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jackson
 Johnston
 Kerpan
 Kirkby
 Lastewka
 Lee
 MacAulay
 Maloney
 Marleau
 Massé
 McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
 McWhinney
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 Pagtakhan
 Payne
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Ramsay
 Richardson
 Ringuette-Maltais
 Robillard
 Schmidt
 Scott (Skeena)
 Shepherd
 Silye
 Speaker
 Steckle
 Stinson
 Szabo
 Thalheimer
 Torsney

Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan
 White (North Vancouver)
 Young

Valeri
 Verran
 Wells
 White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
 Williams
 Zed—172

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
 Canuel
 Collette
 Dhaliwal
 Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
 MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
 Mercier
 Picard (Drummond)

Barnes
 Chan
 Cullen
 Jacob
 MacDonald
 Marchand
 O'Reilly
 Pomerleau

• (2255)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 4 and 6 lost.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 123)

YEAS

Members

Alcock
 Anderson
 Assadourian
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)
 Bakopanos
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bethel
 Blaikie
 Bodnar
 Boudria
 Brushett
 Byrne
 Calder
 Catterall
 Chan
 Cohen
 Comuzzi
 Cowling
 Culbert
 Dingwall
 Dromisky
 Dupuy
 Eggleton

Anawak
 Arseneault
 Augustine
 Baker
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bertrand
 Bevilacqua
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonin
 Brown (Oakville—Milton)
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Campbell
 Chamberlain
 Clancy
 Collins
 Copps
 Crawford
 DeVillers
 Discepolo
 Duhamel
 Easter
 English

Fewchuk
Fontana
Gaffney
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harper (Churchill)
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keys
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
Malhi
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien (Labrador)
Pagtakhan
Payne
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Ringuette-Maltais
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Steckle
Szabo
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Young

Finlay
Fry
Gagliano
Gerrard
Goodale
Grose
Harb
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Lastewka
Lee
MacAulay
Maloney
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McWhinney
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
Paradis
Peters
Pettigrew
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Serré
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Zed—138

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bélisle
Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bridgman
Caron
Crête

Bachand
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins

Government Orders

Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Deshaies
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour
Gouk
Grubel
Guimond
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart
Hill (Macleod)
Jennings
Kerpan
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Loubier
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunez
Plamondon
Ringma
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Silye
Speaker
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
White (Fraser Valley West/Ouest)
Williams—87

Daviault
Debien
Dubé
Dumas
Epp
Frazer
Gauthier
Godin
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West/Ouest)
Harris
Hayes
Hoeppner
Johnston
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Shefford)
Mayfield
Ménard
Milliken
Morrison
Paré
Ramsay
Robinson
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
St-Laurent
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Canuel
Collenette
Dhaliwal
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)

Barnes
Chan
Cullen
Jacob
MacDonald
Marchand
O'Reilly
Pomerleau

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being 11.05 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11.05 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**

**(Effective September 20, 1996, the Appendix previously contained in the
Wednesday edition of Hansard will instead appear in the Friday edition.)**

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. CHUCK STRAHL

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ind.
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.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
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.
Hoepfner, 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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
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	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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
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.

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.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane—Superior	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville	Ind. Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville—Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton—Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay—Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York—Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Middlesex	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
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.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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
Dalphoné—Guirald, 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.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond—Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonnette	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville—Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
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	Saint-Henri—Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon—Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris—Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina—Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina—Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley—Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw—Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert—Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords—Meadow Lake	NDP
YUKON (1)		
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of September 18th, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Claude Bachand
John Finlay

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

Associate Members

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

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

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

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Lyle Vanelief

Vice-Chairmen: Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon

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

Associate Members

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

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Gaston Leroux
Pat O'Brien

Jim Abbott Jack Iyerak Anawak	Guy H. Arseneault Mauril Bélanger	Hugh Hanrahan Jean-Paul Marchand	Janko Perić Beth Phinney	(11)
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand Jan Brown John Bryden	Simon de Jong Pierre de Savoye Stan Dromisky	John English Rey D. Pagtakhan Louis Plamondon	Georgette Sheridan Monte Solberg
---	--	---	-------------------------------------

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE SPECIAL
IMPORT MEASURES ACT (SIMA)**

Chairman: Ronald J. Duhamel

Herb Grubel Yvan Loubier Brent St. Denis Susan Whelan (5)

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

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

Gerry Byrne Harold Culbert Ted McWhinney Mike Scott (11)
René Canuel John Cummins Lawrence D. O'Brien Harry Verran

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Ron Fewchuk Jean Payne Paul Steckle
Vic Althouse Fred Mifflin Roger Simmons Elsie Wayne

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English**

Sarkis Assadourian Jesse Flis Bob Mills Charlie Penson (15)
Colleen Beaumier David Iftody Lee Morrison Benoît Sauvageau
Michel Dupuy Francis G. LeBlanc Philippe Paré Bob Speller

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Maud Debien Jean H. Leroux Ted McWhinney
Leon E. Benoit Jack Frazer John Loney Val Meredith
Jag Bhaduria Beryl Gaffney Ron MacDonald Rey D. Pagtakhan
Bill Blaikie John Godfrey Gurbax Singh Malhi Janko Perić
David Chatters Herb Grubel Keith Martin 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 Keith Martin (5)

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 Hayes

Grant Hill
John Murphy

Andy Scott
Georgette Sheridan

Paul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice Dumas
Laurent Lavigne

Keith Martin
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal Ménard

Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

Chairman: **John O'Reilly**

Sharon Hayes
Réal Ménard

Pat O'Brien
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur
Joseph Volpe

(9)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: **Maurizio Bevilacqua**

Vice-Chairs: **Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde**

Warren Allmand
Christiane Gagnon
Daphne Jennings

Dale Johnston
Ian McClelland
Larry McCormick

Robert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien
George Proud

Geoff Regan
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit
Bonnie Brown

Jan Brown
Gerry Byrne
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling

Paul DeVillers
Wayne Easter
Jim Gouk
Herb Grubel

Réal Ménard
Maria Minna
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair:****Albina Guarnieri**

Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles Caccia

Mary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Patrick Gagnon
Michel Guimond

Ghislain Lebel
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim Peterson

Roger 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)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair: Mary Clancy****Vice-Chairmen:****Robert Bertrand
Jean H. Leroux**

George S. Baker
John Cannis

Jack Frazer
Jim Hart

Jean-Marc Jacob
John O'Reilly

John Richardson
Bob Wood

(11)

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie
Pierre de Savoye

Jesse Flis
Gar Knutson
John Maloney

Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Pat O'Brien

Bob Ringma
Svend J. Robinson
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES**Chairman: Andy Mitchell****Vice-Chairmen:****René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer**

Réginald Bélair
Marlene Cowling
Bernard Deshaies

Monique Guay
Bonnie Hickey
Jay Hill

David Iftody
Julian Reed
Benoît Serré

Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl
Bob Wood

(15)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Leon E. Benoit

Roy Cullen
John Finlay

Roger Gallaway
John Solomon

Brent St. Denis
Derek Wells

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**Chairman: Paul Zed****Vice-Chairs:****Marlene Catterall
François Langlois**

Don Boudria
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Jack Frazer

Mac Harb
René Laurin
John Loney

Peter Milliken
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

Ray Speaker
Chuck Strahl

(14)

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken Epp
Ron Fewchuk

Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen Harper
Dick Harris

Jim Hart
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel Stinson

Suzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams

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. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 18, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Late Stéphan Brodeur	
Mr. Paradis	4335
Governor General's Performing Arts Awards	
Mr. de Savoye	4335
Simon Fraser University Pipe Band	
Mr. Forseth	4335
Africa	
Mr. Blaikie	4335
The Late Samuel Victor Railton	
Mr. Maloney	4336
The Late Arnold Peters	
Mr. Serré	4336
Not for Profit Organizations	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	4336
Fisheries	
Mr. Simmons	4336
Liberal Government Policies	
Mrs. Ablonczy	4337
Human Rights	
Ms. Beaumier	4337
The Economy	
Ms. Augustine	4337
Governor General's Performing Arts Awards	
Mrs. Bakopanos	4337
The International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development	
Mr. Paré	4337
Tobacco	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	4338
National Conference for Youth	
Mr. Bevilacqua	4338
Quebec Sovereignty	
Mr. Patry	4338

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Somalia Inquiry	
Mr. Gauthier	4338
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4338
Mr. Gauthier	4339
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4339
Mr. Gauthier	4339
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4339
Mr. Brien	4339
Mr. Collenette	4339
Mr. Brien	4339
Mr. Collenette	4339
Mr. Manning	4339
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4340
Mr. Manning	4340

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4340
Mr. Manning	4340
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	4340
Youth Unemployment	
Mrs. Lalonde	4340
Mr. Young	4341
Mrs. Lalonde	4341
Mr. Young	4341
National Defence	
Mr. Hart	4341
Mr. Collenette	4341
Mr. Hart	4341
Mr. Collenette	4342
Government Contracts	
Mr. Bachand	4342
Mr. Collenette	4342
Mr. Bachand	4342
Mr. Collenette	4342
Department of National Defence	
Mr. Frazer	4342
Mr. Collenette	4343
Mr. Frazer	4343
Mr. Collenette	4343
Criminal Code	
Mr. Bellehumeur	4343
Mr. Rock	4343
Mr. Bellehumeur	4343
Mr. Rock	4343
Arctic Council	
Mr. Anawak	4344
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	4344
Goods and Services Tax	
Mr. Solberg	4344
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4344
Mr. Solberg	4344
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4344
International Trade	
Mr. Sauvageau	4345
Mr. Eggleton	4345
Mr. Sauvageau	4345
Mr. Eggleton	4345
Transport	
Mr. Gouk	4345
Mr. Keyes	4345
Mr. Gouk	4345
Mr. Keyes	4345
Taxation	
Mr. Shepherd	4345
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	4346
Lobster Fishery	
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	4346
Mr. Robichaud	4346
Agriculture	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	4346

Mr. Goodale	4346
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. de Jong	4346
Ms. Copps	4347
Trade	
Mrs. Brushett	4347
Mr. Eggleton	4347
Presence in the Gallery	
The Speaker	4347

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	4347
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Mrs. Bakopanos	4347
Income Tax Act	
Bill C-324. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	4347
Mr. Karygiannis	4347
Petitions	
Criminal Code	
Mr. Allmand	4348
Bill C-205	
Mrs. Gaffney	4348
Trade	
Ms. Augustine	4348
Canadian Peacekeeping Medal	
Mr. Frazer	4348
Bill C-205	
Mr. Frazer	4348
Genital Mutilation	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	4348
Bill C-205	
Mr. Penson	4349
Human Rights	
Mr. Duhamel	4349
Bill C-205	
Mr. Wappel	4349
Helms-Burton Bill	
Mr. Bevilacqua	4349
Small Business	
Mr. Bevilacqua	4349
Coast Guard	
Mr. Blaikie	4349
Profits from Crime	
Mrs. Hayes	4349
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. Ringma	4349
Impaired Driving	
Mr. McGuire	4350
Ms. Skoke	4350
Profits from Crime	
Mr. Steckle	4350
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Steckle	4350
Young Offenders Act	
Miss Grey	4350
Human Rights	
Mr. McClelland	4350

The Judiciary	
Mr. McClelland	4350
Pensions	
Mr. McClelland	4350
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	4350
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	4351
Gasoline Prices	
Mr. Jackson	4351
Dental Benefits	
Mr. O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	4351
Profits from Crime	
Ms. Catterall	4351
Hemp	
Ms. Catterall	4351
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Strahl	4351
Wartime Merchant Navy	
Mr. Strahl	4351
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Strahl	4351
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Breitzkreuz	4351
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Zed	4352

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply	
Alotted Day—Main Estimates	
Concurrence in Parliament—Senate Vote No. 1	
Mr. Massé	4352
Motion No. 1	4352
Mr. Crête	4354
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	4356

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Finance	
Mr. Peterson	4356
Mr. Loubier	4356

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply	
Alotted Day—Main Estimates	
Mr. Crête	4356
Mr. Deshaies	4358
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	4358
Mr. Brien	4360
Mr. Gilmour	4361
Mr. Deshaies	4362
Mr. Bryden	4363
Mr. Hermanson	4363
Mr. Harvard	4365
Mr. Baker	4366
Mr. Jackson	4366
Mr. Crête	4368
Mr. Baker	4368
Mrs. Venne	4368
Mr. Brien	4370
Mr. Williams	4372

Mr. Mitchell	4373
Mr. Laurin	4376
Mr. Williams	4376
Mr. Strahl	4377
Mr. Langlois	4379
Mr. McTeague	4381
Mr. Paradis	4382
Mr. Crête	4384
Mr. Williams	4385
Mr. Langlois	4386
Mr. McTeague	4387
Mr. Plamondon	4388
Mr. Harris	4389
Mr. Duhamel	4390
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	4392
Mr. Harris	4394
Mr. Williams	4394
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	4397
Mr. Baker	4398
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	4399
Mr. McClelland	4400
Mrs. Brushett	4400
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	4401
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	4403
Mr. Szabo	4404
Mr. Laurin	4405
Mr. Szabo	4406
Motion No. 1 agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4407
Mr. Massé	4408
Motion No. 2	4408
Motion No. 2 agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4408
Mr. Massé	4408
Motion No. 3	4408
Motion No. 3 agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4408
Mr. Massé	4408

Motion No. 4	4408
Motion No. 4 agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4408
Mr. Massé	4408
Motion No. 5	4408
Motion No. 5 agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4409
Concurrence in Main Estimates	
Mr. Massé	4409
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4409
Bill C-56. Motion for first reading deemed adopted	4409
Bill C-56. Motion for second reading	4409
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Kilgour in the chair.) ...	4409
(Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.)	4409
Mr. Duceppe	4409
Mr. Massé	4409
(Clause 6 agreed to.)	4409
(Schedule agreed to.)	4409
(Clause 1 agreed to.)	4409
(Preamble agreed to.)	4409
(Title agreed to.)	4409
(Bill reported.)	4409
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4410
Bill C-56. Motion for third reading	4410
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 141; Nays, 86	4410

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code

Bill C-45. Consideration resumed of report stage	4410
Motion No. 1 negatived on division: Yeas, 49; Nays, 175	4410
Motion No. 2 negatived on division: Yeas, 53; Nays, 172	4411
Mr. Rock	4412
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 138; Nays, 87	4412

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

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

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

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

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