



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 120 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, December 13, 1996**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, December 13, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY ACT

The House resumed, from December 12, 1996, consideration of Bill C-60, an act to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend other Acts as a consequence, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of motions in Group No. 6.

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before us seeks to establish an agency that will have a number of powers and responsibilities regarding the food industry.

As you know, in Quebec, we already have a body, namely the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, that assumes all the powers and responsibilities necessary in any state to ensure the public has access to food that meets modern safety and quality standards, and does so in a cost effective way.

This morning, I speak on behalf of the Bloc Québécois primarily to make sure the agency to be established will satisfy the probity criteria that Canadians and Quebecers should expect.

This is why the Bloc Québécois proposed a series of amendments and, this morning, we are debating the sixth group of these amendments. I will now discuss them.

The first one deals with clause 12, lines 28 and 29, on page 4 of the bill. The amendment that we propose provides that the agency is exempt from the application of section 7 and subsection 69(3) of the Public Service Staff Relations Act. It also states that, for the purposes of paragraph 92(1)(b) of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, the agency is deemed to be designated pursuant to subsection 92(4) of that act.

Why do we propose this amendment? Because, in its current form, the agency would be a "separate employer" under the Public

Service Staff Relations Act, which means that some employees would lose vested rights.

The purpose of this act is not to take anything away from public servants, but to ensure a better integration of functions currently being fulfilled by three different bodies.

This amendment is also in response to a request from the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada. Given the parliamentary procedure, should the amendment we discussed in previous days be adopted, it would obviate the need for this particular amendment.

I should point out that PIPS agrees with the view expressed by the Public Service Alliance of Canada, except that it is asking that the bill be amended to allow it to negotiate a number of issues that are important to its members.

Again, the purpose of the bill is not to wrong public servants, but to better serve the public from coast to coast.

If the government does not vote in favour of the amendments being proposed by the Bloc Québécois, the result will be that bargaining agents for the agency's future unionized employees will not be able to continue to bargain in a certain number of areas. These areas are as follows: organization of the public service, assignment of duties to positions within the agency, and classification, appointment, evaluation, promotion, demotion, transfer, lay-off, and release of employees for other than disciplinary reasons.

You can see, the whole House can see, that important rights, substantial protection that is there for the majority of employees under the Public Service Employment Act will no longer apply to agency employees when the initial two-year transition period comes to an end.

This is a situation that must be drawn to the attention of this House. It was incumbent on the Bloc Québécois to condemn this situation because, I repeat, the law must not be used, directly or indirectly, to tamper with the rights of public servants.

• (1010)

We also have another amendment. The agency is deemed to be included in the definition of "federal undertaking" in section 2 of the Canada Labour Code, and that that act applies, with such modifications as the circumstances require, to the agency and its employees.

*Government Orders*

We are proposing this additional amendment because, in its present form, the agency will be a separate employer as defined in the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

I would also remind members that we are introducing this amendment at the request of the Public Service Alliance of Canada. With respect to the alliance, the government unfortunately did not take into account the legislative positions put forward by the unions during consultations held by the government to determine the agency's status. Workers whose positions must be transferred to the new agency would lose benefits negotiated or integrated with the National Joint Council. They would thus lose any benefits they had under the work force adjustment directive. They would also lose their protection with respect to staffing and classification.

You will understand that, in order to resolve this situation, and at the same time allow it to improve conditions for its members, the alliance is therefore asking that the government designate the agency as covered by the Canada Labour Code. The Bloc Québécois, through its amendment, is backing the alliance's request because it is a reasonable one. It meets these criteria: that bills passed should be for, not against, improving the well-being of public servants.

I hope the House will also be receptive to this amendment, which is so obviously justified, as you can see.

In the few minutes I have left, I will move on to another amendment in the same block, this one affecting clause 13, lines 30 to 34. This amendment follows on, of course, from the previous one by the Professional Institute of the Public Service, which also recommended this one to us.

More specifically, the employees of the agency are to be appointed pursuant to the Public Service Employment Act, and not, under the Public Service Staff Relations Act, as the bill reads at present.

We are bringing in this new amendment because, as it stands at present—again we must remember that the agency will be a separate employer under the Public Service Staff Relations Act and employees must not lose vested rights.

What the Professional Institute of the Public Service is calling for is along the same lines as the Alliance, except that the latter also wants to amend the bill in a way that would allow it to negotiate a number of important matters for its members.

Again, if our amendment were not supported by this House, there are a number of important matters which could no longer be negotiated by the agency on behalf of its future unionized staff.

In short, once again the situation is worthy of the attention of this House, and we are pointing it out because we believe proper protection is in the best interests of future employees.

I know my time is very nearly up, so I will conclude by bringing to the attention of members that, generally speaking, this bill rather freely opens the door to possible political appointments to the board and staff of this agency. It would be regrettable, you will agree, if we were to end up with a bill which might tempt a political party in power to take advantage of a number of openings to exercise what is generally called patronage.

• (1015)

When human beings are involved there is always the risk of human weaknesses, which is why I feel it is the duty of this House to ensure that such patronage could not be possible, by quite simply making the appropriate changes to the bill to prevent any possibility of political appointments by the party in power.

[English]

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief on group No. 6. This group of amendments deals with the staffing of the agency. It would make contracting and privatization of inspection services very difficult.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House some of the concerns we heard about this aspect of the bill in committee from people in the food processing industry.

Currently there is a tremendous amount of food inspection in some parts of the food processing industry. Maybe this is the wrong term to use, but we could almost say that there is overkill with respect to inspection. I was talking to the manager of a meat processing facility who said that the federal government insists that 28 inspectors be on site to do the inspection of meat in that facility. He told me that a facility of the same size in the United States that processes the same amount of food would require three federal inspectors. Perhaps three is not enough, but I would think that 28 is far too many.

I also talked to someone in the food processing business who said that the more federal inspectors there are looking over employees' shoulders the less diligence there is to ensure they are processing safe and healthy food. It is really not their responsibility to ensure the food is of good quality and safe for human consumption. There is an inspector looking over their shoulder every step of the way. If anything is not properly inspected it is not the responsibility of the employees of the processing plant. The focus is on the inspectors who have failed to do their job.

Many processing plants hire their own inspectors. They feel it is important to have their own inspectors on site to ensure quality

*Government Orders*

control and to ensure that a healthy product is being put on the shelves for Canadians to eat. Therefore, in some cases there is duplication.

Bill C-60 would move employees from three departments into one federal food inspection agency. Those employees are guaranteed two years of employment whether they are needed or not. This draws attention to the fact that the government is not looking at taxpayers' concerns. It is only looking at maintaining the bureaucracy at its present size. It is totally ruling out any possibility of privatization or downsizing of inspection services within the guidelines that are required to ensure safe and healthy food for Canadians. I point that out to the House as another glaring omission or failure of the Liberal government, one of many that has come to the attention of Canadians.

We oppose motion No. 14 in group No. 6 because we think it will make contracting out or privatizing of inspection services in the future very difficult. Several of these motions are unnecessary, such as motions Nos. 15, 16 and 17.

We support motion No. 18. It would give the standing committee the power to review the agency's appointment process. My Bloc colleague reiterated what I said before in this debate. Patronage is a problem which needs to be addressed.

Finally, we oppose motion No. 36. It requires the government to develop a code of conduct for the agency's employees before the bill comes into force. While that is not a bad thing, we do not believe it is necessary in this piece of legislation.

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues asked me to speak to Bill C-60, I looked at the bill and at the work done by our research group.

I was struck particularly by the motions in group 6, by what my colleagues had said earlier, and also by the fact that we cannot deny our past. I am a former member of the labour movement and proud of it. I worked for the CNTU for 20 years. Every time the Liberal government introduces a bill like this one, I think it clearly contradicts what the red book says about creating jobs, jobs, jobs, and also what the ministers are saying today.

These ministers often claim they are the workers' friend. They keep telling us they are on the workers' side. This bill shows once again, as I said this week, that with friends like these, workers do not need enemies. The message is clear.

When we talk about vested rights in the labour movement and when we talk about bargaining power and negotiating on equal terms, these are important concepts. However, we do not find them

in this bill. On the contrary, the government wants to axe vested rights. It wants to axe bargaining power. It wants to axe working conditions.

I think this is the logic of a lunatic. What is the point? What is the point of telling federal employees today to do something else, to give up some of their working conditions? These people are getting poorer and poorer. They are losing their jobs. They are often forced to get together in groups and bid on jobs from the government. In the end, we are seeing a loss of jobs and a loss of working conditions. All this means there is less money in the system. It does not take long to find out why the system is in such bad shape.

That is exactly what will happen when the food inspection agency is established under Bill C-60. You can hear the agency saying: "I am different from other employers. I am a separate employer. I do not want to be subject to the Public Service Staff Relations Act". Really? And so what happens? Workers lose and are worse off than they were before.

In my riding there are several abattoirs where a number of veterinarians and inspectors for Health Canada and Agriculture Canada are employed. Later on, these people are going to come in my office and tell me: "Mr. Bachand, we are losing our terms and conditions of employment. What can you do for us?" They are lucky to have a member from the Bloc Quebecois who is prepared to listen. There have been several instances where the government intervened and people wanted to see their Liberal members, but found the door locked or were met by the police.

We never call the police, not for federal employees, not for the employees at the Saint-Jean military base and not for the Agriculture Canada employees at Saint-Jean. We invite them in and we listen to them. These people know that, if a Liberal member were sitting in the chair of the member for Saint-Jean, they would not be listened to carefully.

That is one reason we try to defend them as best we can. I think there are more important things to do than for them to say they are making progress, that there is a party line and that they are obliged to do what the minister says. "You know, everyone must make an effort". We hear this regularly from federal members and ministers.

Finally, along with the agency comes a whole patronage haven. Think about it: the governor in council appoints the president, who appoints the executive vice-president. Names are already being proposed, and the agency has not yet even been set up. Soon, we will know in advance who will be on the agency's board of directors.

Naturally, if the governor in council makes the appointments, it will not be on the basis of competence. It will most likely be on the

*Government Orders*

basis of colour. Blue will be put to one side in order to intensify the red. This is what is likely to happen.

The Liberals' palette of colours is very limited: it is red, red, red. In all likelihood, we will end up with a president appointed by the governor in council, that is, cabinet—a red president and a red vice-president. And the rest follows. Then there is an advisory board. The bill provides, furthermore, that the president will choose the employees.

● (1025)

Once again, the red chain forms. The president and the vice-president are appointed by cabinet. When the president goes to hire, what will the first question be: What party do you belong to? Competence is being set aside along with working conditions. The aims of the Bloc Québécois' amendments are to bring this bill a little more into line and make it a little less arbitrary.

It is also the aim of the unions to put an end to employer tyranny. In this case, the employer is the federal government, and things are going even further. The public service is being set aside so that now appointments will be almost political.

Therefore, the amendments proposed by the Bloc are essential. I would ask the Liberal ministers and members on the other side of the House to better co-ordinate their words and their actions. We in the Bloc are fed up with hearing them say: "We are the workers' good friends". However, in action, in the legislative agenda and in fact, they are not the workers' friends. The very opposite is true.

I think the workers' friends are on this side of the House, and not the other, and this is why we are making amendments that will add an element of civility to the inspection and that will ensure the agency is not appointed by the governor in council and cabinet. We do not want the agency to be all red. We want a competent agency, which is the reason for the amendments by the Bloc Québécois. I hope the government will listen to reason on this bill.

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members who are surprised to see me speak on this issue, I should point out that there are several reasons for my doing so, particularly the fact that, as a child, I lived next door to a slaughterhouse. As was customary at the time, during the summer, the doors were open and the work was performed in front of us kids. We would watch operations with great curiosity, sometimes with awe and other feelings I will not get into. It was a small operation and, in those days, the workers cared about the health of their customers, their fellow citizens.

Times have changed and, today, slaughterhouses are fairly large operations owned by very large corporations that may or may not be as acutely aware of their impact on public health today and in the future.

First of all, we could look at why the federal government had to get involved when Quebec had already taken its responsibilities. There is a certain sensitivity because of what was called the tainted meat scandal, which set off a public scare that lasted several months. It is clear that, over this whole issue of ensuring meat quality and making sure it is properly handled, there is, in Quebec, a sensitivity that could certainly be described as distinct and which explains why this issue is important to the Bloc.

We have every reason to be extremely concerned when we see in Group No. 6—and that is why we are proposing amendments to the contrary—that the agency is excluded from the Public Service of Canada Act and that the regulations under which the independence of inspectors used to be guaranteed will be twisted around and, contrary to what our colleagues are saying, they are very likely to be strongly profit-driven.

● (1030)

Inspections in any area, be it occupational health and safety or public health, require that those who conduct them on our behalf be assured they are totally and completely free to do what they have to do when stocks must be rejected or when meat or any by-product that does not meet quality requirements must be destroyed. As a result, someone who is hired for a fixed term of service and does not have the full protection that a collective agreement should provide in this respect would be likely to give in to direct and indirect pressure.

This is a very serious matter. Because it is debated at the end of the session, some people may think it is a minor matter. It is not. Just think of the tragedy that struck England. I am not suggesting that is the way we are headed, I am simply saying that the quality of the job done in inspecting meat and of the procedures used in slaughterhouses is closely linked to health and that health is not an area in which we can afford to take chances.

I hope members opposite will vote with us to guarantee this indispensable independence for those who conduct inspections. This means that inspectors cannot be removed, or be the object of monetary or other forms of pressure. Their work is already difficult because of a possible self-censorship in these hard times.

Therefore, it is extremely important that the amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois be accepted, that common sense prevail, and that members opposite realize that, while it may not have affected the other provinces, Quebec—perhaps because of its history and even culture—went through a particular experience with the issue of raw milk cheese, which is why we would like to have control over the inspection of meat but, if this is not possible, we want to at least make sure inspectors can enjoy such independence. In our opinion, this implies that they be protected by iron-clad collective agreements.

*Government Orders*

Members of this House should realize that this is clearly a case where it would be a definite asset to have job security, grievance rights, and the guarantee of working without being hassled. This is a plus that must be protected by the party in office, otherwise it will be responsible for the major inconveniences that could result. Since we would be the ones paying for these inconveniences, we urge the party in office to support our agreements.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to the Bloc Québécois's amendments to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency Act, because the Liberals seem to have nothing to say about this bill.

• (1035)

Why is this? Because they have a short term vision. They are prepared to set aside Canada's reputation in the food inspection sector in order to be able to appoint their friends to the good positions and to control the entire staffing process. Since this government is unable to create jobs, it feels it must at least find some way of hiring its friends and dispensing a bit of patronage.

That is why the Liberals have nothing to say today. Nobody is rising to speak on the Liberal majority side. We do not hear a peep out of them. We do not know whether they have anything to say in defence of their bill.

I would also like to say that, in the area of food inspection, it is very important that the people who will be working for the proposed agency be completely free of all forms of influence.

There are large companies that are major stakeholders in the food sector and that are in a position to influence political parties, so it is very important to ensure that the agency will be independent. When inspectors do their rounds and make decisions, they must be able to do so with full knowledge of the facts and without undue influence.

The way political parties are funded in Canada, with large companies like Canada Packers being allowed to make contributions of \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$50,000, when the time comes to declare a facility unsanitary, the telephones may well start ringing.

If the agency is not independent of the government because its president has been appointed by the government, there is a chance that inspectors may be prevented from doing their work properly. There will be the same kind of difficulties as in the past.

It is already very difficult in the present context to do this work. I recognize the quality of the people working in this difficult field. Some things have important economic impacts. Let us get our act together now so as not to add the additional burden of political partisanship that the government's bill is paving the way for. When

the time comes to make appointments to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, some difficult choices will be compounded by having to consider the political affiliation of candidates.

We have already seen this sort of thing with other boards, in other sectors such as immigration, and parole. A number of years ago, people were appointed to positions simply because of their political affiliation. This always creates problems, because sometimes the calibre of decisions made is adversely affected.

Let us recall some things that have happened in the past. It would perhaps be a good thing for the government to look into the Bloc Québécois amendment to clause 93 more thoroughly. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the act from coming into force until a code of conduct and ethics to govern the appointment of employees by the Agency has been prepared jointly by the unions and the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food. In this way, the rules of the game would be very clear and public, and no political interference with the appointment of employees would be possible.

The objective is to do away, for once and for all, with the patronage which could very easily set in within this agency, given the pyramid of appointments set out in the bill. I believe that the appointments set out in the bill for the management of the agency make this bill sufficiently partisan already. Now they want to take away the employees' present autonomy and independence which help build Canada's reputation in the area of food inspection.

Although inspectors may sometimes be perceived as a little inflexible, they are gaining a reputation for quality and honesty. The government is taking a backward step by sacrificing, not necessarily to privatization, but also by trying to lay a path to enable it to appoint people just about everywhere.

If the act is adopted as it stands, I predict that Canada's food inspection system will have taken on a new image before 10 years have passed. Things will be like they used to be before with the harbourmaster appointments. Food inspection appointments will be the same. We will see a return to the old system, where everybody in the agency changes when the government changes.

• (1040)

This kind of situation is entirely inappropriate in an area like food inspection, where we need some degree of independence and a reputation for quality. Decisions must be made sensibly and objectively, not based on the political affiliation of the appointee.

In a way, this would be very insulting to those who have performed these duties in the past. The bill provides no guarantee that incumbents who have performed their duties for 10, 15 or 20 years with the utmost competence will keep their positions. A choice will be made, and since there are no objective criteria, we have no guarantee that in the process, this will not be an occasion to

*Government Orders*

settle old grievances, as has been known to happen in the past in certain organizations.

Granted, this could also be an opportunity to get rid of people who are perhaps less qualified, but some very competent people could be ousted as well. In the inspection field, someone who does his job conscientiously, as well as his immediate superiors, may be subject to all kinds of pressure. If he has job security, if he has a guarantee that his job will not be on the line whenever he makes a decision, he will do a much better job and stand up for the consumer, for those who in the end will purchase the products.

In my opinion, this bill to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is based on a principle that may be attractive to federalists, and I am referring to the fact that instead of the three intervenors we had in the past, the government finally decided to keep only one, but it overlooked one thing. The provinces already have their own food inspection systems. And as we saw in the case of raw milk cheese, there are also a number of cultural differences between the various parts of Canada.

I mentioned another example connected with food inspection, when a disease is found in a herd of cattle or sheep or whatever. In the past, and this applied to sheep, all animals liable to contract the disease were slaughtered. This worked very well in Quebec, where herds of sheep consist of around 200 or 300 head. The practice, the regulations were changed a year and a half ago, following representations by producers in western Canada. This is understandable, because they have thousands of animals in each herd.

However, now they use quarantine. If a producer has 200 or 300 animals, putting them in quarantine is the equivalent of killing his business. Is there no way to give the provinces jurisdiction in such cases, because respecting the jurisdiction of the provinces would make for an inspection system that would reflect local economic conditions.

The same applies to the fisheries. There is no single rule that works for all Canada-wide systems. We have always found that "wall to wall" does not give satisfactory results. Now, when you add the variable—the possibility of political patronage, political influence in decisions—the regulations and the operating standards will become very malleable. This cannot be if we are to ensure that food is properly inspected in Canada in the future.

Let us return to the underlying principles. Yes, let us try to reduce the number of people involved. Yes, let us respect provincial jurisdiction. However, most importantly, let us give those who have to do the job room to manoeuvre, enough autonomy to make the right choices and to stand up to business when they have to intervene so that, in the end, in five or ten years, Quebec's and Canada's food inspection system will continue to be recognized

internationally as one of the best in the world. In a world where the scope of exports continues to grow, we must avoid running the risk of crises or harming our producers in a few years' time.

The winners are the producers and the consumers if inspectors are autonomous in their decisions. I invite the Liberal majority, which is silent this morning, to listen to our arguments and to accept these amendments, particularly the one I was defending.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the speeches by my hon. colleagues with great interest. It is becoming clear to me that this is an issue of great concern to all members of the official opposition, the Bloc Québécois, whether they come from a rural riding or an urban riding on the island of Montreal, like the hon. member sitting next to me. This is an issue of great concern not only to the people of Quebec, but also to everyone in English Canada.

● (1045)

As far as I am concerned, this is a bill I followed closely because, as you probably know, the riding of Berthier—Montcalm is a major producer of poultry, quails, ducks and pork. There are therefore many slaughterhouses in our riding and this industry is very important for the riding.

Just recently, in my capacity as the federal member for my riding, I have had to fight quite hard to keep some slaughterhouses open and particularly to have the one in Saint-Esprit reopened. I am sure that you will see no objection to my saluting at this time the people who have fought to have this slaughterhouse reopened and I thank them because, as a result, 120 jobs were created and investments amounting to some \$7 million were made in the riding of Berthier—Montcalm, all of this thanks to the support of the community, the investors and the pork producers of the Lanaudière region.

That being said, I gave these figures to show how important this industry is, in Quebec in particular, because Quebec is a major processor of raw material, be it the raw milk we have heard about on the hill, poultry or pork. It is therefore very important to us to have a bill dealing specifically with this industry, that meets the specific, or distinct, needs of Quebecers. There too lies our distinctiveness.

Unfortunately, I must say that Bill C-60 before us this morning does not meet these objectives. I think this bill will not meet the government's objective of facilitating the development of this industry. Worse yet, it does not give any guarantee concerning the whole inspection process. When there is no guarantee, one may be less tempted to invest money. If the changes made to the rules of the game are not very clear initially, investors will start asking questions, especially in Quebec.

*Government Orders*

Again in this area, Quebec is a distinct society, since we already have a complete food inspection organization. The Government of Quebec unified this whole field. If the Government of Canada had followed through with the resolutions that were passed here in this House, it would have done something about this. The government, and especially the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister, often remind us that a resolution was passed in this House to recognize Quebec's distinctiveness. We in the opposition say that this resolution was nothing but a smoke screen, that it gives Quebec no additional jurisdiction and means nothing to Quebecers.

The subject matter of this bill is really quite mundane. Food inspection is not nearly as important as constitutional matters—which does not mean it is not important. This bill should have reflected the government's resolution recognizing Quebec's distinctiveness, if it meant something, but it does not mean anything. There is nothing in it to prove otherwise. This resolution does not mean anything. Had it meant something, the bill we are studying this morning would have contained a whole chapter specifically for Quebec, as our distinctiveness extends to the food inspection area. But the government did not do anything because the resolution it adopted does not mean anything, and we will have to remember that.

That being said, the group of amendments introduced by the Bloc Québécois is aimed at preventing patronage. Unfortunately, "patronage" and "Liberal" seem to be synonymous. After condemning the Conservatives during the 1993 election campaign, what are the Liberals doing today? The exact same thing.

• (1050)

Perhaps the only difference—one must render unto Caesar what belongs to Caesar—is that they may be doing it more intelligently than the Conservatives. They hide what they are doing. They work behind the scene. They give themselves nice little tailor-made laws to disguise patronage. This is a case in point. Listen to this: the government reserves the option to appoint the vice-chairman and the 12 people who will sit on the committee. It is the government that will decide who to appoint according to criteria about which we know nothing so far.

Furthermore, nothing in the bill guarantees that the current inspectors, who are doing a good job and seeing to the quality of products offered to consumers, will be hired by the agency. If they contribute to the coffers of the Liberal Party, maybe they will have a better chance of working for the agency. This is what the government is doing under the cover of law to ease their conscience. But one needs to review this in detail in order to understand.

We, in the Bloc Québécois, are open in the way we collect the funds for our election campaigns, in the way we get our funding—

since it is public funding, we are open, we show our books, we have nothing to hide—and we would like the government to do the same in its laws regarding staffing in order to avoid patronage and especially to force them to honour some of the commitments in the famous red book.

During the 1993 election campaign—you may not remember it, Mr. Speaker, the government may not remember it either—there were promises of transparency, integrity, ethics, non partisan politics, appointments according to predetermined criteria, should the Liberals form the next government.

Today, we are giving them the opportunity to be consistent for the first time in three years—it should not be too much to ask—and support the amendments we are proposing since in fact the thrust of these amendments is transparency. I am referring to Motions Nos 18 and 36 moved by Bloc Québécois agriculture critic, the member for Frontenac, seconded by a member who has his constituents' interests at heart, I mean the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

It might be worth reading them so that people who are listening can see that what we are proposing makes sense, and that the Liberal government is breaking another one of its election promises, in terms of transparency this time. We are asking the government to include the following requirement in the bill:

One year after the Agency is established, the President shall provide, for study, to such committee of the House of commons as is designated or established to consider agricultural matters, a detailed report respecting the criteria used in making appointments under subsection (1).

We want the government to clearly state the criteria used to hire employees. We want a level playing field for everyone, be it a member of the Liberal Party of Canada or not. Is this clear enough, is it not?

I believe the Liberal government should support this amendment. I believe the government opposite will pass this amendment, if it wants to follow through on its famous red book's promise of transparency. No doubt it slipped their mind. I am sure the government simply forgot to include such a provision, as it happens sometimes at the last minute when bills are being prepared. We are giving them the opportunity to keep their own election promises by supporting this amendment.

The other amendment is similar. Its purpose is the same: equal opportunity for everybody who might want a job in the agency and all the inspectors or employees already working for that department.

• (1055)

I see my time is up. It goes by so fast. I will speak to the other groups later on because, as I said earlier, this is a subject of great concern for me, given its importance for my constituents.

*S. O. 31**[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** The questions on the motions in Group No. 6 are deemed to have been put, in accordance with the order made yesterday.

Accordingly, the House may proceed with the debate on Group No. 7. Motions Nos. 19 and 20 are deemed to have been moved and seconded.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there are three or four minutes remaining before statements by members. This means I will rise again after oral question period, but I want to start dealing with the amendments moved by the Bloc Québécois on clause 16, which in fact is Group No. 7 of amendments to Bill C-60.

As my colleagues have been saying since we started our speeches, we see there is a guiding principle behind this bill, which is the establishment of an iron-clad patronage system. We will be able to show this also with clause 16, which will ensure the creation of an agency that will have lost all its credibility even before it is set up. People will not trust the work done by the employees of this agency. Who will be the real losers in this bad decision based only on political partisanship? It will be the people in general, because, if we do not trust the work done by the agency's employees, we will not trust the inspection and this will have disastrous consequences.

The real question we must ask at this stage is whether the Bloc Québécois' concern I just mentioned is also a concern among the people.

Let me say that I am very proud of my colleagues from different ridings, urban ones, such as the hon. member for Mercier, who just spoke to this bill, semi-urban ones, such as my colleague from Saint-Jean, or rural ones like my own. I am thinking more specifically of the hon. member for Richelieu, who is known to be close to his constituents. If there is a member in this House whom we can say is close to people, it is the member for Richelieu.

You are indicating that my time is running out, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude and resume after question period.

But allow me finish what I was saying in praise of the member for Richelieu. I was saying he is close to people, he is even perhaps the equivalent of the worker-priest in Montreal, a few years ago, who drove a taxi and whom we used to call "the Good Lord in a taxi". Using the example of the Montreal "Good Lord in a taxi", we could say the hon. member for Richelieu is Mr. Democracy. If a member like my colleague from Richelieu condemns this bill, it is because the whole population of Quebec is condemning it.

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** It being eleven o'clock, the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

*[English]*

### NORTHERN LIGHTS FESTIVAL

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Northern Lights Festival in Owen Sound.

The festival is a spectacular display of lights along the banks of Sydenham River in the heart of the city in celebration of Christmas and the holiday season.

This year the festival has been expanded to reach the inner harbour and now includes two ferry boats, the *Cheecheeman* and the *Nindayama*. The boats and trees along the harbour and river banks are trimmed with Christmas lights which shimmer and are reflected in the inner harbour waters.

The Northern Lights Festival is a volunteer effort that is generously supported by businesses and the people from Owen Sound and the surrounding area. It is a major tourist attraction drawing busloads of people from Bruce—Grey and all of south-western Ontario.

I congratulate all the volunteers and participants who have made this project such a success. The lights symbolize their hard work and dedication to the festival and remind us all of the true spirit of Christmas.

\* \* \*

### ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this week Canadians saw once again how the Prime Minister is compared to a box of assorted chocolates: You have no idea what you are going to get. Now it seems that the Minister of the Environment wants to be one of those assorted chocolates. His legislation may look okay, but watch out for the inside.

This past Tuesday the environment minister refused to commit to conducting a full environmental assessment of the proposed testing of U.S. plutonium in the Candu reactors even though he is required to do so under his own Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. As the law states, an environmental assessment is required if a federal authority gets involved. He said we should be cautious about plutonium but yesterday his party voted against a Reform Party bill that would ban the importation of nuclear waste into Canada.

The Prime Minister made an election promise to abolish the GST, then broke faith. The environment minister promised to

protect the environment, and then he does not act. The minister is great at introducing legislation, but then he will not use the law.

With the Reform Party, every time you open the box, you know it is a fresh start that really satisfies.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### APPOINTMENT OF LISE THIBAUT

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister appointed Lise Thibault lieutenant governor of Quebec.

A motion was passed by the Quebec National Assembly requesting more of a say in the appointment of the lieutenant governor, but the Prime Minister chose to ignore it. Once again, the Prime Minister of Canada is giving us an example of decentralized federalism at its best.

Let it be clear that the Bloc Quebecois wants the position of lieutenant governor to disappear, along with the Senate. The Bloc Quebecois regards both of these as unnecessary, expensive and outdated, a throwback to the colonial era.

These remarks concerning the function of lieutenant governor in no way reflect on the dignity and great worth of Mrs. Thibault as a person, and we welcome the appointment of a woman to that position.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, four million people use passenger rail service each year in Canada. They do so because it is fast, efficient, curtails pollution and saves jobs.

Many of these four million people have sent small cards to the government stating their wish for rail service to continue to be one of their transportation options. Today I carried about 150 pounds of these small cards to the Prime Minister's office to let him know of their interest and intent.

I note that the red book spoke of implementing an infrastructure investment program. Some railway people have produced position papers showing that high speed rail, at speeds in excess of 300 kilometres an hour, is technically feasible since Canadian companies are bidding on French and American contracts. High speed rail could also improve air quality, public safety and is economically and financially feasible.

It is time the government considered investing to bring about improvements to Canada's infrastructure and to our way of life.

*S. O. 31*

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Minister of the Environment who this week tabled legislation which will strengthen the Canadian Environmental Protection Act known as CEPA.

One of the key elements of this new legislation is a stronger emphasis on prevention, as the minister himself said, on being proactive rather than reactive when it comes to reducing pollution and controlling toxic substances.

As members know, Canada is known the world over for its natural beauty and vast green areas. Canadians do not want this reputation tarnished. The increased focus on prevention contained in the new legislation is a sign that this government is listening to the concerns of Canadians and is working to safeguard the environment.

\* \* \*

#### COM DEV INTERNATIONAL

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, through strategic investments in research and development, COM DEV International of Cambridge has established itself as an international leader in the design and production of equipment for satellite payloads. Eighty per cent of its annual revenues are from exports which demonstrates an ability to compete in the global economy. It illustrates how Canadians with vision can succeed.

• (1105)

Founded in Canada and Canadian owned, it has grown from a small start-up company to one which employs over 1,000 people with facilities in Canada, Europe and Asia. Its equipment has been chosen to fly on over 300 satellites. Its customers include NASA and all major commercial prime contractors. In 1996 alone, COM DEV created over 200 new jobs.

COM DEV is Canada's premier supplier of satellite payload equipment. This business success story needs to be recognized. COM DEV continues to boldly face the future with continued R and D, capital investment and expansion into new markets. We must all work together to help companies such as COM DEV to continue to succeed and generate economic wealth for Canada.

Merry Christmas.

\* \* \*

#### THISTLETOWN COMMUNITY BREAKFAST CLUB

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, imagine the efficiency of a program that can feed breakfast to upwards of 200 children five days a week throughout the school year at a cost of 30 cents per child per day. Imagine the tremendous loss to the

*S. O. 31*

children serviced by this program if it were to close down due to funding cuts. [English]

I would like to acknowledge the outstanding service the Thistle-town Community Breakfast Club provides to the children of Etobicoke North. The breakfast club at Greenholm Junior Public School provides a hearty breakfast for 200 children each morning before class.

The link between proper nutrition and educational performance is well documented. When children are preoccupied by hunger, they cannot concentrate on reading or arithmetic. This is a dangerous lost opportunity for both the child and for society as a whole.

Through the efforts of the small staff and committed volunteers at the Thistle-town Community Breakfast Club, children from low income families are able to start their day in a positive way with healthy food and a chance to interact with peers and volunteers who care.

Both the mission and the financial operation of this program are impressive. I fully support the efforts of the Thistle-town Community Breakfast Club. I urge those who control the funding for this essential service to continue to support this important program.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CREDIT CARDS**

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, at a press conference I attended, the Association coopérative d'économie familiale de l'Outaouais announced that more than 40 consumer associations in Quebec had just formed a coalition to ask that legislation be passed to cap credit card interest rates.

It is interesting to note how many associations have come forward in support of the Outaouais ACEF campaign and how quickly they did so. These are associations from every region of Quebec, including a large number of co-operative home economics associations, the Service budgétaire et communautaire de Jonquière, the Carrefour d'entraide Drummond, the diocese of Gatineau-Hull, Logemen'occupe and many more.

These associations support the coalition of federal members of Parliament demanding that banks and stores lower the interest rates on their credit cards.

As a member of the executive of this coalition of federal MPs and on behalf of all members of the Bloc Québécois, I want to congratulate these associations and their volunteers and to thank them for their support on this issue.

**PROPANE**

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Minister of Finance to implement a rebate program to help seniors on fixed incomes, low income individuals and families, and farmers cope with a sudden and sharp increase in the price of propane of up to 120 per cent since last August.

This program would rebate part of the huge increase in the price of propane and would be funded by the increased amount of money this government will receive through corporate taxes due to the windfall profits of the manufacturers. Furthermore, I would propose that this program have a sunset clause dated for the spring of 1997 when the supply of propane should be back to normal.

Something must be done to help these individuals who are suffering great hardship due to this huge increase in the cost of home heating.

This government claims to be the saviour of the poor and the downtrodden. Let it demonstrate compassion now by implementing such a program.

\* \* \*

**MICROCREDIT SUMMIT**

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, more than one in five people on Earth lives in poverty. That is over one billion people who are unable to provide for their own basic needs and the needs of their family.

In February 1997 parliamentarians from around the world will attend the first ever Microcredit summit in Washington, D.C. This conference has been organized to launch an important global fight against poverty.

The Microcredit summit will be the first stage in a 10-year campaign to reach 100 million of the world's poorest families by the year 2005. The goal is to provide these people with access to Microcredit for self-employment and in the process, provide the opportunity to free themselves from poverty and live with dignity.

● (1110)

This campaign targets the poor in industrialized countries and the developing countries of the third world.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Results Canada for their hard work in organizing the Microcredit summit. Their commitment to ending world poverty is truly commendable.

[Translation]

### POSTAL SERVICES

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, three postal workers came to see me, to complain that the post office would no longer deliver flyers and other mail items currently handled by part-time workers.

These workers earn a little over \$7 per hour. Most of them are single mothers, people with disabilities and immigrants, and this is their only job. If they lose it, these 10,000 workers will have to rely on unemployment insurance or social assistance.

[English]

These postal workers were supposed to be hired by the private companies that are taking over the distribution of the ad mail. Instead these companies are advertising for children nine years of age or over to take over the service. Some advertisements even read: "If you—are old enough to read this notice—". The pay would be minimal, like one-quarter of a cent per flyer delivered.

It is a sad situation which has brought much sorrow to the people losing the jobs and to their families. I hope that these jobs can be saved for the good of the workers and their families.

Happy holidays, Mr. Speaker.

\* \* \*

### PRINCIPAL PIPE ORGAN COMPANY

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the work of a company in my riding of Oxford.

The Principal Pipe Organ Company of Woodstock was asked two years ago to dismantle the Dominion Carillon in the Peace Tower. Twenty-one of the smaller bells, the keyboard and most of the remaining components were safely stored in the basement of the Confederation Building.

The company spent five weeks bringing everything back to the tower, reinstalling and adjusting the carillon. The clock was cleaned, repaired and adjusted. The Westminster chime and hour strike mechanisms and the clock movements were replaced.

Thanks to the hard work of Principal Pipe Organ we are once again able to hear the wonderful sounds of the Dominion Carillon. On behalf of all members of this House, I would like to congratulate Principal Pipe Organ for their excellent work.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

### RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, thanks in part to the pressure exerted by the official opposition, we learned yesterday that Radio Canada International was granted a last minute reprieve for another year.

Recently, in Ottawa, the Minister of Foreign Affairs addressed a group of people involved in foreign policy and in the communications and computer industries. The minister then proposed an international information strategy to allow Canada to exert a political, economic and cultural influence in the context of globalization.

The government is making the broadcast of Canadian culture and values a priority in its foreign policy. According to the minister, we must find a way to put our new technologies and expertise at the service of our country abroad, and to promote Canada throughout the world.

However, some consistency is required. If we are to keep open Canada's window on the world, it is essential to ensure the long term survival of Radio Canada International.

\* \* \*

[English]

### PRIME MINISTER

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):**

'Twas the night of the Town Hall and all through the House,  
All the Liberals cringed as Canadians groused.  
The Prime Minister stammered, then denied his own words,  
As he tried to defend the absurdly absurd.

"I never did say that," he said to the crowd,  
While the lady who asked him was gasping out loud.  
"I never said kill, or abolish or scrap",  
And the people who listened thought he had snapped.

"I have some advice" said the leader with pluck,  
"If you don't have a job, you can rely on blind luck."  
Then he screwed up his anger and foamed at the lips,  
As he blamed it on God, and on tapes and on slips.

Then out in the country there arose such a clatter,  
The Prime Minister's handlers asked: "What is the matter?"  
They pulled down the blinds, turned the lights way down low,  
Then sprang to the TV to replay the show.

And what to their wondering eyes should appear,  
But the truth, which is something they've never held dear.  
So they slumped in their chairs and they watched the assembled,  
Endure the sight of a Prime Minister as he boldly dissembled.

*Oral Questions*

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is as Prime Minister does.

\* \* \*

• (1115)

**MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING**

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every year drunk driving leaves a terrible trail of death, injury, heartbreak and destruction. On average over four people are killed every day as a result of alcohol related vehicle accidents. That is why I would like to pay tribute today to the hardworking people at Mothers Against Drunk Driving, sometimes known as MADD.

MADD's mission is to stop drunk driving and support victims of violent crime. The local MADD chapters transform individual experiences of both concerned citizens and victims into activism for the public good. These committed volunteers are brought together in pursuit of their shared goal: preventing further casualties.

One of these committed workers is Mrs. Joan Hemsworth, a special constituent of mine who is working hard to establish a MADD chapter in Perth county. I salute her for her efforts to bring the good work of MADD to Perth county. I encourage my constituents to lend their support to Joan for this worthy cause.

To all Canadians this holiday, I urge you not to drink and drive.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*Translation*]

**GOODS AND SERVICES TAX**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has had to face some sharp criticism this week, not just in the House, but also during a television broadcast, in the course of which he was questioned by members of the public. They reminded the Prime Minister that, during the last election campaign, he had promised to scrap the GST, something he denied. But the Prime Minister was seen and heard on Toronto's CFRB in August 1993 saying, and I quote: "Yes, I will scrap the GST".

Will the Deputy Prime Minister finally admit that the Prime Minister made such a statement, so that we are not forced to conclude that some look-alike played a dirty trick on him, because we all know that the Prime Minister definitely did not tell a lie?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is quoting from an interview given by the

Prime Minister on CFRB on August 26. I would like to put the quotation in context by giving it in its entirety.

[*English*]

He said: "Yes, I will abolish it, but I need the money. It is taking \$15 billion and I will have to collect another \$15 billion. So you go and sit down in a very civilized way and say to the provinces that the poor small businesses have items with federal tax, other items with provincial tax, or both, or sometimes none. So we have to clean up that mess and produce \$15 billion".

[*Translation*]

I think the member should at least be honest enough to quote the Prime Minister in context.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the most honest people are the ones capable of supplying their own answers to questions put to them, instead of relying on a finance minister who admitted to having made an honest mistake.

The Prime Minister did not conduct the last election campaign on his own. He did it with a team, which was elected with a majority, except in Quebec. The Minister of Finance admitted that it was an honest mistake; the Deputy Prime Minister resigned because she thought she had understood, along with many other people, that the Prime Minister had promised to scrap the GST, and this was the Minister of Finance's understanding as well, because he said it was an honest mistake. If that was not his understanding, there is an inconsistency, because he said it was a mistake. So, this whole business is certainly confusing.

How can the Deputy Prime Minister explain that the Minister of Finance said that it was an honest mistake, that she resigned, that everyone understood the same thing, except the Prime Minister, who claims he did not say, or did not think he said that? We would like to understand these three versions, his version, her version and the version of the gentleman who is not answering this morning.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware that, when I made the statement here in the House, I did so for the government.

• (1120)

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is an even bigger problem.

I am pleased to hear the Minister of Finance, who speaks on behalf of the government, being so honest, but those of us who took Politics 101 always understood that the Prime Minister was part of the government. He is therefore speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister if he is speaking on behalf of the government. He is therefore saying, on behalf of the Prime Minister: "It was an honest mistake". That is not what the Prime Minister is saying. The more versions we hear, the less we understand. You need a strong

*Oral Questions*

ego to be in politics. Every politician knows this, but what you really need most is a very large amount of humility.

Would the Finance Minister promise to advise the Prime Minister to show a little more humility, and above all, to have the wisdom to admit his mistake, honest or not?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat.

Here in this House—and the Prime Minister happened to be here—I was speaking for the government. When a minister speaks in the House, he does so for the government. I gave the circumstances, and I made the statement.

Once again, I think that we should look at what the Prime Minister said during the election campaign, even in the interview cited by the member. The Prime Minister said, in English:

[*English*]

We will look at other alternatives. All sorts of systems are being proposed. We wanted to take the time to sit down with the provinces. That is what we did. We wanted to listen to business people. That is what we did. We wanted to listen to citizens. That is what the Prime Minister said and that is what we did.

[*Translation*]

That is what we did. The House finance committee took two and a half years to look at 20 options. In the end, they heard from small and medium size businesses, those that create the most jobs, and we did what they wanted to do, which was to institute a process for creating a harmonized tax, which is much simpler and more effective when it comes to job creation.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we do indeed have a big problem, as my colleague, the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie has pointed out, because the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister are both members of the same government, claim to speak on behalf of the government, but are not saying the same things. We are in trouble here, it makes no sense.

During the 1993 campaign, the Prime Minister said, and I quote, “We will scrap the GST”. Yet this week he informs us that “scrap”, when translated into French, becomes “harmoniser”—harmonize.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Can he explain to us why it will cost the federal government \$1 billion to scrap the GST in the maritimes, when harmonizing it in Quebec cost him nothing?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that, when fundamental changes occur in a province or in a region of the country, it is the responsibility, the duty, of the federal government to help that province or region to adjust. We have, moreover, done just that on

many occasions for Quebec. We have done so on many occasions for the western provinces.

We made an offer to the provinces which would have sustained a loss of revenue as a result of harmonization. We offered to help those provinces. The ones eligible were the Atlantic provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The provinces which were not eligible under the criteria were Ontario, Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia. The three Atlantic provinces accepted the offer.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it really takes a lot of courage for the Minister of Finance to defend the totally undefendable position of the Prime Minister. He has my total admiration.

In another vein, we were speaking of the provinces just now. According to Quebec Minister of Finance Bernard Landry, Quebec would be entitled to \$2 billion in compensation for harmonizing its sales tax with the federal GST.

Will the Minister of Finance respond favourably to Quebec's demand for compensation, or will he give Quebecers proof that they are left footing the bill for a bad campaign promise?

• (1125)

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have already responded to the hon. member's question, and I have already responded to Mr. Landry: we have offered compensation to the provinces which sustained losses. Quebec did not. Ontario will not. The same goes for Alberta and British Columbia.

I do not think the hon. member would want me to offer compensation to provinces which did not sustain a loss. That would make no sense.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**TAXATION**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this dancing gives new meaning to the words revenue neutral. I cannot believe what I am hearing today.

“Scrap, kill and abolish the GST”. That is what the Prime Minister promised Canadians in the last election. That is he promised the House Commons in May 1994 and that is what he promised his own caucus evidently. We have the tapes and the tapes do not lie. Now we have the eye witness account and proof from the member for York South—Weston.

I ask this question once again because we still do not have an answer. Will the Prime Minister admit that he broke it and he blew it? Fess up.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every time I heard the Prime Minister deal with the question of the

*Oral Questions*

GST, he put it within the context of a government that was unable to give up \$15 billion in revenue.

The Prime Minister made it very clear it was crucial to sit down with the provinces and come up with a simplified system that would work. What the Prime Minister said was what this government did.

It put in place a House of Commons finance committee that went across the country for two and one-half years. It looked at 20 alternatives. At the end of the piece those who were creating jobs, the small and medium size business community, said to us: "We would like to see a harmonized tax. We want to see one tax auditor, one set of tax forms".

This government wants to create jobs, unlike the myth on the other side. Basically that is what the small and medium sized business community did and gave us a tax system that is going to work.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it has been proved time and time again that the tax system is not working. This minister has a nerve to try to blame this on the provinces. It is just unbelievable.

This morning this same finance minister admitted to the Press Club that the Liberals may have promised more than they could actually deliver.

The finance minister has apologized twice now. Even the Deputy Prime Minister has apologized once. What is the problem here? Can the Prime Minister not admit that he has some shortcomings? There is no great shame in that. Just say sorry.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Canadian people would like to know this. Members of the Reform Party were part of the finance committee that went across the country. They said they supported the harmonized tax. In fact Reform members said they would go beyond the harmonized tax and would tax food and drugs. We said we would not do that.

How can the Reform Party stand up in the House and criticize the harmonized sales tax when it is part and parcel of its policies?

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minority report said quite clearly that Reform would balance the budget first. That is the first sentence in that report. That is the only way that we can offer Canadians tax relief, by balancing the budget first. Any government that brags about overspending \$28 billion can hardly be proud of its accomplishments.

The Prime Minister is the only person in this country who really believes that he did not promise to scrap, kill and abolish the GST. Life must be pretty nice for the Prime Minister in his imaginary world. It truly is a magic kingdom.

The finance minister has admitted that he has made a mistake. The Deputy Prime Minister also did that. Why can the Prime

Minister not just swallow his pride and spit out his foot and simply say sorry?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as are most other industrial countries, Canada is going through fundamental economic change as a result of the technological evolution. As a result of the interdependence of global trade, as a country we are doing very well.

The House of Commons ought to be debating the fundamental issues of the day, yet what do we hear day after day? Reform Party members stand up, totally disconnected from the reality of the Canadian people and engage in personal attacks. They attack minister after minister, member after member, because they are unable to deal with the issues that concern Canadians.

Canadians want to talk about unemployment and how they can get back to work. What Canadians want to talk about is the preservation of their social programs. When will the Reform Party wake up and smell the roses and understand that Canadians want the House to deal with their problems?

\* \* \*

• (1130)

[Translation]

## CANADIAN SPACE AGENCY

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the space agency.

Obviously things are out of kilter at the space agency. The vice-president and financial comptroller was let go for doing his job, because he criticized the dubious practices of senior management of one of Canada's major research institutes. The minister is taking the word only of those primarily involved, those who are the subject of the allegations, in his inquiry where he concluded that nothing happened.

How can the minister responsible for the space agency claim that he fully investigated the allegations made by Mr. Rinaldi, the former vice-president and financial comptroller, when he did not even take the time to meet this person, who was dismissed for refusing to countenance fraud.

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the question is based on false allegations. In any case, public servants throughout the Government of Canada have lost their jobs because of budget cuts.

*Oral Questions*

Some of them, no doubt, consider it unfair that they lost their jobs. Some, including Mr. Rinaldi, have lodged a complaint against the government. The court will decide if he is right or not. I am not prepared to meet with every public servant who wants to make a complaint.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I think the minister responsible for the space agency would do well to consult his former colleague at national defence, because his scenario is strikingly similar to what he did, to the cover up, and it could end up in the same place.

Mr. Rinaldi was definitely dismissed. A year and a half ago, he filed a grievance. What did the government do? And why is Mr. Rinaldi in court? Because the government is dragging him to court to contest the arbitrator's jurisdiction. It will be a year and a half when the federal court finally decides on the jurisdiction of the grievance arbitrator. There are nevertheless limits to misleading the public, Mr. Minister. You are pretending arrogantly you do not understand—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** The hon. member knows full well she must address her remarks to the Chair.

**Mrs. Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, we know where arrogance leads, do we not? How can the minister go on protecting his former adviser, who has now become the president of the space agency, when, if he assumed his responsibilities, he would call for an outside inquiry to bring to light all these serious allegations regarding the president of the space agency and his executive vice-president, Mr. Desfossés?

[*English*]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us understand what the Bloc is asking here.

As I recall over a number of days of questions, it has asked for a public inquiry on three issues. Bloc members complain that a secretary tore up hand written notes after she had transcribed them on a typewriter.

They complain that Mr. Evans submitted a travel expense claim of \$116 when he travelled by automobile from Saint-Hubert to Ottawa, although the amount was never paid to him.

They complain of an amount of just over \$500 which was paid to a former employee of the space agency who later became employed as a political assistant in my office. When the issue was raised it was debatable. Therefore, the individual in question, out of an abundance of caution, repaid the money without any pressure other than the question having been raised.

• (1135)

These are the issues on which they wish to have a public inquiry. What is really happening here is that these people are using the House of Commons as a place in which to prosecute a claim which ought to be dealt with by the civil courts.

I do not know why they think an issue that could be raised in the courts is a one-sided issue. For my part I am quite anxious to hear the evidence presented in court and to see what the courts decide. However, in terms of the allegations that have been brought forward, there is no substance based on which I could take any other action than let the courts decide. I would encourage them to do likewise.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about GST, HST or BST, although the government might be talking about a lot of BS. The real issue here is the truth. The fundamental issue, in answer to the finance minister, is a broken promise. Maybe the Prime Minister should go visit a bank machine. It seemed to have done the trick for the Deputy Prime Minister. She admitted that the government had broken its GST promise.

The finance minister admitted in April and again this morning at the press club that the government had made a mistake with its GST promise.

I ask the government why the Prime Minister does not join with his colleagues and admit that he made a mistake when he promised Canadians he would abolish the GST?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the context in which the Prime Minister made his statements is very clear and a matter of record. They make it clear that the government was unable to give up the \$15 billion to \$18 billion of revenue.

The fundamental issue is the nature of the public debate within this House. Somebody, for whom I have an enormous amount of respect, once told me that when one enters politics and it comes down to the basic decision of what is good for the country, if there is any difference between that and what is politically right then integrity is doing what is good for the country.

My colleagues of cabinet who are here and indeed those who are in caucus know full well that at the very first cabinet meeting we had, the first thing the Prime Minister said to all of us was that in any individual instance if a choice has to be made between what is politically right and what is right for the country we will choose what is right for the country in every single instance. In cabinet, the Prime Minister has chosen to do the right thing. I will tell members right now that he is a man of great—

*Oral Questions*

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River, a supplementary.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the members opposite for that standing ovation. I appreciate it.

This is not the 1960s. The Prime Minister should quit living in the past. He should be aware that we are now in the 1990s and technology has produced something called videotapes. By now, almost every Canadian has seen those tapes. They know in what context that promise was made before and during the election campaign.

How can the Prime Minister deny the existence of the evidence? How will he continue to deny the evidence of his broken promise?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have stood in this House on behalf of the government and made a statement. That statement speaks for all of us.

If the hon. member wants to talk about contradictions, perhaps he would tell us why it is that in the most recent discovery of the need to create jobs in this country by the leader of the Reform Party and his party, he has been able to deny the fact that in 1993 in Penticton, the Reform Party brought down a program. At that time the leader of the Reform Party had no difficulty saying that it would cost jobs but jobs were not as important as cleaning up the deficit. How is the Reform Party going to deal with the fact that in its 1995 taxpayers' budget it said that the short term employment impact of spending and deficit reduction was negative but manageable? What kind of job loss is manageable? Is it 30,000? Is it 50,000? Is it 100,000?

• (1140)

How can they talk about integrity when they stand in the House of Commons and contradict every single thing they have in their own policies?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

The Minister of Human Resources Development is jubilant, every time he talks about negotiating active employment measures with the provinces and the flexibility of federalism. When confronted with the figures of his own department, which show that between 1993-94 and 1996-97, Quebec suffered major cuts totaling \$160 million in funding for active measures, the minister denies this.

Is the Deputy Prime Minister in a position to confirm whether or not the federal government proceeded with cuts of around \$160 million in all active measures in Quebec alone between 1993-94 and 1996-97?

[English]

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in questions put by the hon. member. The question she asks is at this point somewhat hypothetical. The question she asks is what will be the active measures for the province of Quebec.

She knows and the House knows that we are negotiating with the province of Quebec at this moment with respect to part II of the EI legislation. Under part II of the EI legislation we will be negotiating with the province of Quebec on active measures. When that negotiation has been completed we will be able to tell her what the amount of dollars will be that will go to the province. Until that negotiation is complete I do not think she or I or anyone else knows because we are still in the negotiation process.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member certainly did not understand the question. My question concerns all moneys spent on active employment measures between 1993-94 and 1996-97, as indicated in the department's figures.

I will to quote the Minister of Human Resources Development, who said this week: "I am always shocked by the attitude of people who like to fiddle in around with this figure or that figure".

Will the minister finally admit that his own government has been fiddling with the figures, since the additional \$800 million for active measures were drawn from the unemployment insurance fund, a procedure that actually camouflages a substantial drop in the amounts formerly spent on employment measures which came directly out of the consolidated fund?

[English]

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can understand that the member is having difficulty understanding the finances of the Department of Human Resources Development. It is for one reason. She is looking at the old programs that the province of Quebec used to have.

We have made significant changes in programs. Those significant changes, for example the EI legislation, have moved a lot of money over to active measures. An additional \$800 million is going into active measures in the next number of years. That necessitates program shifting from one area to the other.

We have also committed \$300 million for TJF. The member knows that those particular dollars have been reallocated from other funds. If she is having trouble dealing with the numbers, she

can arrange to meet with us and we will give her the numbers. The programs are different now. She is still looking at the old numbers from the old programs which have changed.

\* \* \*

### DISTINCT SOCIETY

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what we see developing here is a very disturbing trend on behalf of the Prime Minister. At the town hall meeting the other night on the national unity strategy, in order to reassure a Quebecer who is concerned about the future of Quebec in Canada, he said that if things ever got really rough he could always move out.

His solution today is a distinct society clause. In 1989 he opposed Meech Lake. He said this about the distinct society clause: "No matter how the supreme court interprets the distinct society clause, it would always make francophones or anglophones feel defrauded".

• (1145)

Why would the Prime Minister take a position on distinct society today that he once fought so vigorously against and why would he tell a Quebecer that if things get rough he can always just leave?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unlike the politics of the Reform Party, the Prime Minister is actually fighting to keep the country together.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have seen the trend. The Prime Minister has flip-flopped on the GST. He has created imaginary homeless friends. He has blamed things on acts of God. He also says that blind luck is the best job creator.

Let us have a reality check here. In 1989 the Prime Minister had the audacity to call Brian Mulroney a liar for promoting the distinct society clause. He said that Mulroney was telling the French Canadians in Quebec "it is the best thing you ever had" and after that, he turns around to English Canada and says "don't worry about it, it means nothing".

If the Prime Minister called Brian Mulroney a liar for promoting the distinct society clause, will he now admit that he is doing the same thing today?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is promoting, as he has all his life, a recognition that in this country we have two founding nations, two founding peoples, with languages, cultures and civil codes that were enshrined in the law.

What is unfortunate in the position of the Reform Party is instead of looking at where we came from, instead of understanding the reason we are where we are today is that we have a history of shared consciousness and a history of shared commitment, what

### Oral Questions

the Reform Party is trying to do with its politics of division will drive this country apart.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### KENWORTH CORPORATION

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

All the parties involved have come to an agreement on the terms and conditions for the reopening of the Kenworth plant. PACCAR, the solidarity fund, the union and the Quebec government followed through on their commitments. However, at the very last minute, the federal government has come up with new requirements which could prevent the reopening to be announced before Christmas.

In order to preserve some 900 jobs, could the Minister of Industry tell the House if he intends to follow through on the commitments made by his officials concerning the Auto Pact and the Canada-Quebec subsidiary agreement to ensure that the Kenworth plant will reopen?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are dealing quickly with this issue, but some things are still under discussion.

Since November 26, when the solidarity fund and PACCAR came to an agreement, we have acted rapidly. Right now, we are still waiting for the company to submit its business plan. We will see what has to be done as soon as we get it.

**Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, while they are thinking about it and splitting hairs, unemployed Canadians have run out of UI benefits. What we want is action.

My supplementary question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development, because the parties involved are also waiting for an agreement over the TJF.

I would like to know if the Minister of Human Resources Development intends to commit funds from his transition job program to ensure the reopening of the Kenworth plant.

[English]

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the TJF in the province of Quebec is now in full force. If the member is asking if we are willing to look at a proposal to help a particular industry or to create long term jobs I suggest that he make the proposal to human resources development and we will be more than willing to look at it.

*Oral Questions***FISHERIES**

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-62, the new fisheries act, includes a provision that fishers, fishery associations and fishing communities have been requesting for years.

• (1150)

Can the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans explain to the House how the new partnership agreement proposals in the bill will work? What is being done to ensure that all interested parties will be included as part of the consultation process?

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, partnering is a new way of doing business in the fishing industry whereby the fishers will have a greater say and a greater share in the management of the fisheries itself.

This is a responsibility they have been looking for more and more in the past. It will build on the success of our recent co-management agreements that we have had, the best example of which is the zone 19 crab agreement in Cape Breton.

I see this provision, a major improvement in Bill C-62, the new fisheries act, as a tremendous opportunity for representative organizations and the industry to have a direct voice in fisheries management to develop ways to manage the fishery more effectively and efficiently and to provide a more stable climate for long term business planning.

\* \* \*

**CUSTOMS**

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in a letter from the customs minister referencing the government's appeal of David Sawatzky's acquittal, the minister stated: "Until this matter is resolved, Revenue Canada will continue to apply sanctions such as vehicle seizures".

Is it the customs minister's opinion that her department has applied these sanctions and seizures equally on all farmers who have allegedly violated the customs and wheat board acts?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, customs administration in this country takes very seriously its responsibility to uphold several acts that are its responsibility.

In this case we have been told and we are responsible to ensure that people who export barley and wheat across our borders have the appropriate permits. We consider that the job we have done is effective and precise in fulfilling our responsibilities.

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a Saskatchewan farmer indicated he would go public with

information that Canadian Wheat Board officials made a deal with him, providing \$223,000 in selection bonuses.

Then Canada Customs filed \$165,520 worth of forfeitures against this farmer for previous grain export violations. I would like to know why the customs minister has not prosecuted this farmer and seized his vehicles with the same lightening speed used to prosecute farmers like David Sawatzky, Andy McMechan and Bill Cairns. Is this the Liberal government's idea of justice for farmers?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the responsibility that Canadian Customs officers have at our border is tremendous.

We have, in fact, the responsibility to ensure active facilitation of trade and also to ensure the safety and protection of our country. We uphold several acts that have been passed by this Parliament and we do it in a very effective and precise manner.

I suggest to the hon. member that if there are individuals who have complaints, there is a full process of appeal that we are part of. I would encourage him to support his constituents but we will uphold the acts as they have been written. We will apply our responsible actions in a fair and productive way and we take very seriously the dual role we have in Canada Customs to facilitate trade and to ensure the safety and protection of Canadians within our country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ATLANTA OLYMPIC GAMES**

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the heritage minister.

During a reception to honour the athletes who participated in the Atlanta Olympic and Paralympic Games, the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is responsible for recreation and sports, learned that the Canadian Paralympic Committee did not pay all the costs associated with the participation of our athletes in the Atlanta games. So he made the commitment to give the athletes, or their sports associations, grants in the amount of \$16,485 to cover half of the unpaid expenses.

Will the minister respond to the letter dated December 2 from her Quebec counterpart asking her to do her share and to reimburse the other half of the costs incurred by the athletes to participate in the Atlanta Paralympic Games?

• (1155)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that my department paid a large portion of the costs of the Paralympic Games for Canada, we, as the Government of Canada, will

*Oral Questions*

certainly continue to do so, but I am inviting the Quebec minister, Guy Chevrette, to join us in subsidizing 50 per cent of all the costs associated with Quebec paralympic athletes.

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the Quebec minister made a commitment to pay the first half of the costs, will the federal minister recognize that athletes who reach such a high level of performance and who represent us in the Olympic Games should not have been subjected to this kind of affront?

[English]

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the offer I am making to the minister from Quebec. Given that it is the Canadian government, I in particular, that has worked very hard to assume a large portion of the cost of the Paralympics, I am inviting the minister, who obviously has a very sincere interest in this issue, to share with me all the costs associated with the Olympic and Paralympic athletes from the province of Quebec so that we can share this on a 50:50 basis.

I am certainly willing to look at that and I hope to hear from Minister Chevrette to see whether he is really committed to this or whether he would rather, unfortunately, play politics with this issue on the floor of the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT**

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, recently the minister of agriculture was publicly criticized by a federal court judge. Justice Muldoon expressed concern that the minister would introduce changes to the Canadian Wheat Board Act while he is presiding over a charter challenge to the existing act.

Why did the minister break with proper protocol and table changes to the Canadian Wheat Board Act while the existing act is being challenged in the court?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, grain marketing in western Canada is a topic of considerable debate among farmers and others.

Farmers have made strong recommendations for changes in legislation. Farmers are anxious for those changes to come forward for their consideration and ultimate enactment by Parliament as rapidly as possible. Indeed the Reform Party has also been urging the government to move in that very direction.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I did not say this is an urgent issue but perhaps the

minister has acted irresponsibly and improperly. So I would ask the justice minister what steps he will take to redress the improper activities of the minister of agriculture, which may be seen as interference by the minister in this case.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Parliament of Canada has responsibility for introducing, considering and ultimately passing legislation. Obviously at any moment in time there can be a whole variety of litigious matters before the courts in every field.

If we were to follow the admonition of the hon. gentleman, we would never consider any piece of legislation in this country if there were matters outstanding under previous legislation at any point in time. Obviously that is a formula for stalemate. Maybe that is what the Reform Party wishes to have but as far as this government is concerned, we want to move forward into the future.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN FUR INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Recently the European Union and Canada agreed in principle to an agreement which would eliminate a threatened EU ban on Canadian fur imports. However, now the European Union council of environment ministers has rejected this draft agreement, thereby throwing the whole process up in the air.

We have waited long enough for the Europeans to get their act together. Can the parliamentary secretary tell me if the government is prepared to take this issue to the World Trade Organization so as not to leave our Canadian fur industry out in the cold?

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague is quite correct. For one year the Canadian government has been negotiating in good faith with the European commission to conclude an agreement with respect to this industry.

On December 6 we initialled an agreement, and so we were very displeased and rather annoyed when some of the European Union environment ministers made their statements.

● (1200)

However, in the last few days the Minister for International Trade has met with Sir Leon Brittan who told us once again that he fully supports the interim agreement that was signed on December 6.

If the European commission does not ratify the agreement, the Canadian government will act very quickly to initiate an action at the WTO to protect access by the Canadian fur industry to European markets.

*Routine Proceedings*

[Translation]

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Yesterday, the minister introduced in the House Bill C-79, an act amending the Indian Act. However, this same minister, last September 11, stated and I quote: "Changing the Indian Act requires very strong support".

In light of that statement, how can the Minister go ahead with his amendments, whereas I have on my desk letters from 542 aboriginal nations out of 600 in Canada that are opposing his bill? Does he not agree that he should go back to do his homework in co-operation with the aboriginals, as requested in the Erasmus-Dussault report and by most of the stakeholders in Canada?

[English]

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have not addressed the Indian Act since 1951 and we cannot continue to look at a problem only every 45 years. It has taken us two years to get to this point and the package which is before the hon. member and the committee has three processes.

The first is substance. I am prepared to turn over substantial powers to the aboriginal people, where it should be, that I now exercise and do not want. I am prepared to take those sections that they want to discuss further or which may be controversial and put them before the committee. Its members can use their imagination and move into the future.

Finally, I am prepared to make it optional. I was prepared to go further than that so that no one can ever say that the government was not prepared to transfer these powers. Now it is up to the First Nations to decide whether it wants to exercise these powers.

Most important, a process is finally in place that over a period of years will deal with substantive issues of the Indian Act and get rid of that offensive act once and for all.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

The Liberal red book promises that the government will promote fairness and opportunity and yet day after day we have more broken promises. Environment Canada is apparently unfairly bid-

ding against small private sector firms for water quality and meteorological services.

Why is the minister's huge department bidding against private firms? How can the public believe that the government is using a level playing field and being ethical when doing this questionable practice?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting how the Reform Party wants to pretend that it cares about the environment. The last time Reform asked a question was on May 17.

If we look at fresh start the only thing that comes close to mentioning the environment is the green colour. Not one word on the environment is mentioned in their fresh start campaign. Reform members have the audacity to talk about us breaking red book commitments when we have introduced the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the endangered species legislation, MMT which that party is against. We have a harmonization accord in the works with the provinces.

The government is not only keep its commitments on the environment, but also pushing the file as well.

In answer to the specific question from the hon. member, like other departments we are working within Treasury Board guidelines. We have met with the business community. We have joint ventures with those companies. It is something that is sought after. The good name of Environment Canada is very much a viable commodity.

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[Translation]

**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 five petitions.

\* \* \*

● (1205)

**INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION**

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 1995-96 annual report of the Indian Claims Commission.

*Routine Proceedings*

[English]

**HOLIDAYS ACT**

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-365, an act to amend an act respecting holidays.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill would restore the name Dominion Day to the July 1 holiday. The country founded on July 1, 1867 was not Canada but the Federal State of the Dominion of Canada, still the country's official name.

The word "dominion" has its linguistic roots in the French language and was chosen as the name for this country by the Fathers of Confederation from the 72nd Psalm: "He shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth".

It has been a mistake for this country to try and preserve its future by destroying its past and the name Dominion Day should be restored.

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

\* \* \*

**CRIMINAL CODE**

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-366, an act to amend the Criminal Code (joy riding).

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have a serious problem in this country, one that touches 160,000 Canadians a year. It is a \$1.6 billion problem and that problem is auto theft.

Our loose laws encourage people to break the law, I believe, especially in the view of young male offenders who steal over half of the cars stolen in Canada mostly to joy ride and experience the thrill at somebody else's expense.

The problem is out of control in British Columbia. In my constituency and in the city of Chilliwack, for example, auto theft is up 87 per cent this year over last year.

My bill would strengthen the provisions of section 335 of the Criminal Code, the section under which young offenders are usually charged. It prescribes a minimum and a maximum sentence in terms of a fine, a jail term and restitution to the victim. It also states that the parents of young offenders who have contributed to the delinquency of their child should be held responsible for the payment.

I hope that all members will take note of this serious problem and support this bill.

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

[Translation]

**PETITIONS**

## ABOLITION OF SENATE

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table today, on behalf of nearly 2,000 of my constituents, a petition asking for the abolition of the Senate. It is in addition to the 30,000 petitions already tabled. I hope the government will take abolition of the Senate under serious consideration for its next budget.

[English]

## IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting to the House petitions from concerned citizens of my riding.

The petitioners pray and request that the Parliament of Canada to introduce amendments to the Criminal Code to ensure that anyone convicted of impaired driving causing death receive a sentence from seven to a maximum of 14 years.

● (1210)

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am presenting today another 77 pages of petitions containing 1,700 names. The petitions are signed by people from all across Canada who are very concerned about the serious personal injury crimes and sexual offences involving children and in the way the criminals are treated by our justice system.

The petitioners request that changes be made to the Criminal Code. They want to be notified when a sex offender is released into the community. They want a central registry to be available for people who work with children so they will know who has committed these crimes. They want to prohibit pardons for those convicted of sex offences involving children.

I have now presented approximately 25,000 or 30,000 names on this subject.

[Translation]

## ABOLITION OF SENATE

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition signed by 720 people. Their names are to be added to the 30,000 signatures calling for the abolition of the Senate, that other Chamber which is still holding us, the elected members of the House, hostage.

## GASOLINE TAX

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, according to Standing Order 36, allow me to table a

*Routine Proceedings*

petition signed by 60 constituents from Carleton—Gloucester. The petitioners ask that Parliament not increase the federal taxes on gasoline.

[English]

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I also have seven petitions signed by 139 of my constituents. The petitioners ask that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and the charter of rights and freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 29 Calgary constituents who call on the government to support the immediate initiation of an international convention which will set out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons. They request that the initiative be concluded by the year 2000.

## PORNOGRAPHY

**Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present two petitions in the House today.

The first petition is signed by 75 Manitobans. The second is signed by 300 Manitobans, many of whom live in my riding of Dauphin—Swan River.

The petitioners draw the attention of the House to the negative impact pornography has on men, women and children. They urge Parliament to strictly uphold Canada's laws against obscenity.

[Translation]

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table a petition signed by 105 residents of Quebec, who are asking Parliament to intervene to ensure that immigration officials enforce the Immigration Act without discriminating against people connected with the Patriarche. Established in more than 15 countries including Canada, the Patriarche is a not for profit organization assisting addicts, including those from abroad.

Since 1992, immigration officials have denied entry to addicts who cannot prove they have been drug-free for at least two years. This is unjustified, as neither the legislation nor the regulations provide for the enforcement of this two-year criterion.

[English]

## EDUCATION

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present 11 petitions.

The first 35 petitioners request that Parliament not amend the Constitution as requested by the Government of Newfoundland and allow educational reform to take place within the context of the framework agreement in that province.

## TAXATION

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the next three petitions represent 245 citizens who urge the government to reduce spending instead of increasing taxes and to implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal spending.

## CITIZENS' RIGHTS

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have one petition containing 66 signatures. The petitioners call on Parliament to return the rights to the citizens of Canada from the criminals.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the remaining six petitions which I wish to present pertain to sexual orientation. More than 400 petitioners call on Parliament not to include sexual orientation in the Canada Human Rights Act, but to define this phrase and consult the Canadian people on this issue.

## LAP DANCING

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present an additional four petitions containing approximately 1,550 signatures.

The petitioners request that Parliament amend the Criminal Code to prohibit any type of lap dancing in any place to which the public has access. They do so because they believe obscenity distorts human sexuality and can be linked to violence.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, and on behalf of my colleague the hon. member for Don Valley West, I am pleased to present a petition which was received from the riding of Don Valley West.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament support the immediate initiation, with the conclusion by the year 2000, of an international convention which will set out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

• (1215)

[Translation]

## ABOLITION OF SENATE

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to table a petition signed by fewer people than the one tabled by my colleague for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup. Still, people are starting to talk about this. The 77 petitioners want the Senate

abolished, mainly because of its high cost, that is, \$43 million. They think we could do without this expenditure.

#### HIGHWAYS

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition with only 26 names but the petitioners want it to be tabled. They ask the government to get involved in funding the upgrading our national highway system.

[English]

#### DEATH PENALTY

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I pleased to present the following petitions from my constituents in Comox—Alberni.

The petition is signed by over 2,100 signatures, bringing the total number to 7,600. This represents 15 per cent of the voters in my riding.

The petitioners request that Parliament allow Canadian citizens to vote directly in a national binding referendum on the restoration of the death penalty for first degree murder convictions.

#### TAXATION

**Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table petitions submitted to me by 2,400 residents of Windsor and Essex County. The petitioners are objecting to the mandatory 25 per cent tax being withheld by the United States on their U.S. social security benefits.

These petitioners call on the Canadian government to renegotiate the Canada-U.S. tax treaty to stop this inequity. I know the government is working on a solution to this problem and I would urge the government to find it soon.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions I would like to present this morning.

In the first, the undersigned residents of Canada draw to the attention of the House that 38 per cent of the national highway system is substandard, that Mexico and the United States are upgrading their national systems and that the national highway policy study identified benefits of the proposed national highway program.

The petitioners urge Parliament to request that the federal government join with provincial governments to make the national highway system upgrading possible.

#### TAXATION

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the second petition, the undersigned believe that the application of the 7 per

#### Routine Proceedings

cent GST to reading material is unfair and wrong. The petitioners urge all levels of government to demonstrate their commitment to education and literacy by eliminating the sales tax on reading materials. They ask the Prime Minister to carry out his party's repeated and unequivocal promise to remove the federal sales tax from books, magazines and newspapers.

[Translation]

#### HIGHWAYS

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, the Automobile Association reminds us that 38 per cent of the highway system is substandard and that both the United States and Mexico are now upgrading their own systems.

Finally, the petitioners call on Parliament to press the federal government to work with the provinces toward upgrading our national highway system.

[English]

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by a number of my constituents who call on Parliament to urge the federal government to join with provincial governments to make the national highway system upgrading possible.

\* \* \*

#### QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 9 and 16 could be made Orders for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

It is certainly in accordance with what I said to my hon. colleague yesterday that he would have the answers before Christmas. Christmas greetings and some Christmas readings. Merry Christmas.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 9—**Mr. Hermanson:**

What is the total dollar amount spent on advertising by the government and its Crown Agencies in fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994 by province, in each of the following mediums: television, radio, daily newspapers, weekly newspapers, monthly newspapers, billboards and direct mail?

Return tabled.

Question No. 16—**Mr. Collins:**

Regarding the amount of Federal Government (including Crown Corporations) spending on advertising in all forms of media (radio, television, daily newspapers, weekly newspapers, magazines): please specify, by type of media, and by province, where Federal Government advertising funds were allocated for the years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995 and what amount was spent on each medium in each of those years, in

*Government Orders*

particular the amount spent on weekly newspapers, for all of Canada and broken down by province?

Return tabled.

\* \* \*

[English]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we currently have nine questions still sitting on the Order Paper with regard to the airbus fiasco. All of these are designated 2, meaning the response was requested within 45 days. Our Questions Nos. 62 to 70 were put forward by the member for Beaver River, the member for Lethbridge and me. Six were put forward on June 19 and my three questions are dated September 12.

We have not received responses to any of these and the government has missed the deadline. These questions are to be answered within 45 days and today is day 55.

• (1220)

Will the government tell us why it has missed the deadline and when it plans to respond?

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that we also have concern about the lack of response to our Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers, again related to the airbus fiasco, the role of former Prime Minister Mulroney and this Liberal government in those particular contracts. We currently have 17 such notices and have not received anything from the government on any of them. We gave notice for two of these on March 19 and for the other 15 on September 12.

Given that this is or at least is supposed to be the last day of sitting before Christmas, we would have appreciated a response from the government. So can the government tell us when we might get some action on these matters?

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague could tell by the 48 pounds worth of documents that his colleague from Kindersley—Lloydminster's order required, we have busy elves over here preparing the information for the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster.

I am happy that we were able to provide the important information that our colleague was looking for and I will look forward to perhaps getting the information that my hon. colleague is looking for next week.

We will look into the matter with due diligence and we will look forward to having that information some time before Christmas.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** If the Chair might be permitted a personal remark, it is to say how pleased the Chair is that the question of the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster has been answered. I know that my past involvement in securing the answer was one that interested the hon. member.

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY ACT**

Resuming consideration at report stage of Bill C-60, an act to establish the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and to repeal and amend other Acts as a consequence, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 7.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** The hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead has six minutes left to make his remarks.

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will ask for your indulgence in allowing me to raise all the points I consider necessary.

Before oral question period, when we resumed consideration of the motions in Group No. 7 amending Bill C-60, I said that the people were really concerned by this bill, as I tried to demonstrate.

I gave the example of my colleague, the member for Richelieu, as well as of my other Bloc colleagues who represent ridings where the people are different but share the same concern, that is the need to have credible institutions, institutions that they can trust. Unfortunately, as we said before and will keep repeating, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency that is proposed in Bill C-60 contravenes this objective.

I also said it was important to recall the guidelines underlying this bill. We have clearly shown that the president of this institution, who is appointed by the governor in council, will naturally have to show some gratitude to the government which appointed him. The appointee will undoubtedly also have to prove his political allegiance, and we hope that this person will still be required to have the skills needed to perform his functions.

That being said, if the bill is not amended, the advisory board will, in turn, be composed of members chosen by the cabinet-appointed president, who will use the same criteria to set up an advisory board that will be every bit as political.

*Government Orders*

● (1225)

As though that were not enough, there is even a clause which has very few equivalents, if any, at the federal level. It excludes the agency from the application of the Public Service of Canada Act.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Is it to save money? Is it to make things easier and the agency more efficient? No, Mr. Speaker. It is simply because they want to have total control over the hiring process, because they want to circumvent existing legislation and get rid of the unions. They want to hire whoever they want.

The very high risk of patronage was clearly established by my colleagues. And there is more. The list of arguments against this bill is endless. What do we find in clause 16, which is what amendments in Group No. 7 deal with?

Clause 16 will exempt the agency from section 9 of the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act when it hires experts from outside the public service. That section would have fouled up the government's patronage scheme, so out it goes.

Clause 16 circumvents section 9 of the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act by providing that the agency may, with the approval of the governor in council—that is cabinet—on the recommendation of the Treasury Board—that is a minister and one of the most partisan members of this government, namely the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer—“procure goods and services, including legal services, from outside the public service of Canada”.

When I read this clause, I can already see Liberal lawyers in the eastern townships opening their cheque books to make contributions to the Liberal Party since they will be the ones to get contracts from the Food Inspection Agency. That is a fact. We are about to give them a very nice Christmas gift.

Fortunately, our colleague, the agriculture critic and member for Frontenac, was vigilant and saw through it. He too has denounced this situation and proposed amendments which would create a framework for that process.

Mr. Speaker, in the minute I have left, I want to address the amendments put forward by my colleague from Frontenac.

What my colleague is proposing is that before procuring services from outside the government, namely consultant services, we make sure that we do not have the needed resources inside the federal public service. At a time when we are asking all public administrations to cut services and improve efficiency, it goes without saying that when the government needs consultant services it should look first among its own public servants. Many of them are very competent. We should use their services. That is what we are asking.

● (1230)

This is only common sense. It is terrible to have to raise the issue in this House at this time in our history. We understand that when the time comes to dispense patronage, and I will conclude on this, nothing can stop our Liberal friends. The economic context requires that everyone be cautious about the way they spend money, except if they contribute to the coffers of the Liberal Party.

[English]

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to keep my comments reasonably brief on Group No. 7 of the report stage of Bill C-60.

I do not believe I can support the two motions in this group because it looks like they will make it very difficult to contract out or privatize inspection services in the future. Although a provision in Motion No. 20 seems worthy of support. It calls for open bidding in the private sector for any goods and services procured by the new agency. We were recently reminded of how important that is when the auditor general uncovered another untendered contract to Bombardier.

Over the years we have noticed a very close affiliation between Bombardier and both the Conservative and Liberal governments. It is such a cosy relationship that it certainly makes one very uncomfortable. Any time there are untendered contracts without a proper bidding process, the taxpayer should be very nervous. Members of the Reform Party caucus are extremely nervous about the Liberal government's practice of offering untendered contracts to its friends in the corporate sector.

There is a broader question concerning the single food inspection agency: What kind of impact will these motions and the bill itself have on the effectiveness of the new agency? When we are trying to analyze the merits and problems of a new inspection agency it helps to make a comparison. We need something to illustrate our concerns.

An obvious comparison is the Pest Management Regulatory Agency which is currently under tremendous criticism by the industry. The PMRA is another institution that was amalgamated by Parliament. It has a fairly large staff. The amalgamation was supposed to save the taxpayers money and provide a valuable service to the industry. There was an outcry of protest from a diverse array of organizations such as the Crop Protection Institute of Canada, Prairie Pools Incorporated.

The CFA was very critical of the PMRA. The Canadian meat processors were extremely upset. The Canadian Cattlemen's Association has expressed its concern. The Ontario corn growers are very very upset at the costs the PMRA has forced them to incur.

*Government Orders*

That brings us to the issues of job security and job creation. The new food inspection agency will have the equivalent bureaucracy to the agencies and departments from which it will be birthed. Perhaps there will be jobs saved in the public sector but how many jobs will be lost in the private sector? How many jobs will be lost in the failure to see economic growth?

We know that products are not being registered effectively with the PMRA because of all the loops and hassles that the pesticide manufacturers have to go through to meet needless requirements of the PMRA. That is costing jobs. It is costing jobs in the agriculture sector. It is costing jobs in the manufacturing sector. It is slowing the growth of agriculture and affiliated industries that support agriculture. That is why these very astute agricultural organizations are so upset with the PMRA.

Imagine anything as diverse as the CFA, Prairie Pools, Crop Protection Institute, Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Ontario corn growers, meat processors. Even the horticulture people are very upset with the PMRA. It has been very difficult for their industry to grow and expand because of the bureaucracy and the clumsiness of that agency.

• (1235)

When the witnesses appeared before us in committee we challenged the government about whether or not this new single food inspection agency might be going the same route. In looking at some of the clauses we are debating today, it looks as though it may very well be doing that.

I do not believe that the Bloc's amendments will correct it, but certainly if there was a call for bids and an open tendering process, it would certainly help. If the focus on job creation was more on seeing the private sector expand and grow, industry grow and creating new, long term jobs, that would be far more beneficial than providing security for the approximately 4,500 employees of the new single food inspection agency.

I think I have made my point. I am not trying to delay the debate. I know we all want to get out and enjoy the Christmas season. As opportunity affords, I will speak to other groups and raise other issues later on.

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with Motions Nos. 19 and 20 which deal with a common service provider. It is important to make certain that we understand what the government's proposal is in this area. What we are trying to do is make certain that there are certain providers which can be put together in a cost effective, common way to make sure that the program delivery is efficient and effective and financially sound.

There is no question that before proceeding the agency must seek Treasury Board approval and governor in council approval to hire

outside people based on cost effectiveness and a sound business plan. Also, since there is a crossing of different ministries required in dealing with the agency, there is no question that the minister responsible has to confer with his colleagues in cabinet and make certain that everyone is aware of the crossings which may happen.

I would like to highlight as well that the proposed clause requires the agency to follow the normal contracting rules, including calling bids and tenders and respecting all current contract rules.

Many things that are being said are being said erroneously I believe because there is uncertainty about all of the details that are included in the bill. I do want to assure everyone that the contracting rules put in place by Treasury Board will be confirmed with the agency. I assure them that the rules with regard to contracts for employees are in place as well. I thought those areas should be clarified.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to discuss this series of amendments proposed by the hon. member for Frontenac, who is official opposition critic on agricultural issues.

The hon. member deserves to be congratulated for the quality of his work, and for his efficient and thorough review of this bill. The amendments that we are discussing today also seek to improve the proposed legislation, that is the Canadian Food Inspection Agency Act.

The federal government finally decided to clean up the food inspection sector, and it deserves to be congratulated for doing so. However, there is the issue of provincial jurisdiction regarding this activity, and we alluded to it when we discussed other amendments.

This group of amendments concerns a basic issue, even though it does not relate to the jurisdiction of the provinces. The same is true in the case of many other agencies and crown corporations: given the current wording of the bill tabled by the government, the minister responsible will be able to wash his hands of the actions that could be taken by the new agency.

• (1240)

There are examples of this at Canada Post. When it suits her, the minister praises Canada Post for its action, but when she is not pleased, she shirks the responsibility by saying that this is a crown corporation dealing at arms' length and that it can do as it pleases.

This issue is all the more important in the food inspection sector, since decisions made have an impact on people's health, and also on domestic and foreign trade for Quebec and Canada. We must make sure the minister is fully responsible and accountable to the House, and that he can make any changes that are required.

*Government Orders*

Our amendment to clause 16 proposes that the responsible minister for the agency's decisions in these matters have full responsibility, answer questions, take corrective action and ensure that everything is working properly.

Food inspection is an area that is very sensitive to public opinion. We do not have to imagine all kinds of scenarios. It is enough to remember what happened in Great Britain with mad cow disease. We need quick political reaction and politicians and responsible ministers who can act quickly.

If we do not ensure that the minister is truly responsible for his actions, we may create a vacuum that will harm the reputation of the agency and the quality of its food inspection services. That is why I think it the government should consider this amendment and make it part of the bill.

This amendment is in no way partisan. Its purpose is to recognize the role of elective representatives and the person who happens to be the minister responsible for this agency and to increase their effectiveness. There are many shortcomings and loopholes in the bill, in its present form, that would let the minister shirk his responsibilities, and this is not a good thing for food inspection.

The other aspect I wanted to raise is the agency's right to procure legal services from sources other than the Department of Justice. As in the previous groups of amendments, in the food inspection sector it is very important for lawyers to be able to speak out with full impunity and not be influenced by the situation.

I see a scenario where the agency could very well develop two kinds of legal contracts: there would be lawyers capable of being flexible in specific situations and there would be those the agency would use when it needs a very firm, very solid approach.

Who will decide how contracts are awarded? Is it not possible that awarding contracts for legal services from outside the government would open the door to patronage? Will the eligible lawyers on the list just happen to be Liberals? And when there is a change of government, will the list change so that we lose all the expertise that has been acquired in that sector?

As in the case of inspectors, the procedure for legal services must be watertight. The person who gives a legal opinion must not be subject to pressure in connection with his job or other situations. The best way to guarantee the independence of legal services is to ensure that those who give legal opinions are accountable only to the government and that they have job security. They must be able to give opinions that are impartial and devoid of any partisan considerations.

The government has its work cut out for it in this area. It has to work on making the agency independent. The agency must not be vulnerable to political interference. It must be independent at all

levels: inspectors, lawyers, board members and the appointment of the president.

• (1245)

That is the kind of guideline that is missing in this bill, a problem the Bloc's proposed amendments seek to address so as to maintain Canada's reputation for food inspection, which has served Quebec and Canada well in all our international initiatives. It must remain clearly and unequivocally 100 per cent unaltered. We must have an impeccable international reputation at all times and be able to show any consumer on the face of the earth that our products are quality products and that the services we provide are not marred by irregularities.

We have developed expertise in that area based on past experience. Consolidating the three government authorities into a single agency is a step in the right direction, but let us not throw the baby out with the bath water. We must not, on the one hand, make improvements and, on the other hand, end up creating a whole set of circumstances that could jeopardize the quality of the inspections performed.

These amendments are part of a series of amendments tabled by the hon. member for Frontenac and designed to retain the goods aspects of the bill. But in those cases where the Liberal majority indulged in making changes and decided changes were necessary, they figured they might as well go all out and make room for some of their friends. I urge the Liberal majority to reconsider that aspect of the bill. There is still time, as we consider the proposed amendments.

You do not have to pass them all as they stand, but I feel compelled to ask the Liberal majority to consider those that are on the table right now as part of this group. They should say: "All right, we agree that the minister should be really accountable and should have to account to this House for what this agency does".

We must have the clear assurance that the people concerned will act fairly and equitably with regard to procurement and contracts, particularly legal contracts, as well as in acquiring any other equipment required for this activity. Loads of new technologies and new tools that could be used are being developed all the time.

Before long, we will even be dealing with biotechnologies. Some moral issues will have to be considered in food inspection, and we will have to make sure we are not under the control of economic forces whose interests may differ from those of the general public.

Ultimately, the farmer, the processing industry and the consumer may have diverging interests. The government's responsibility is to make sure the chain of production does not have any weak link, because in food inspection, every detail counts and a rigorous follow-up is required.

*Government Orders*

In the past, I have seen reputations destroyed overnight, which is what happened in the case of the mad cow disease and also in the case of fish inspection. For all those reasons, I urge the House to approve the amendments moved by the hon. member for Frontenac, because they would improve this bill.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today we are debating an extremely important bill. In my beautiful riding of Rimouski—Témiscouata, and more specifically in Notre-Dame-du-Lac in Témiscouata, there is a big slaughterhouse for pigs.

Recently, the owners wanted to expand the facility to increase production. They wanted to increase the number of nurseries, and their plans sort of clashed with the Quebec legislation, which is very strict in this regard. Quebec cleaned up this sector a long time ago.

The important thing is to be able to guarantee to the public that food inspectors can do their work professionally, and with the proper safeguards to prevent any problem.

• (1250)

In Quebec, we had an inquiry on the tainted meat scandal. Incidentally, it was around that time that we got to know people who have since become great politicians in Quebec, including Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Chevrette. Following this episode, we decided that such an incident should never happen again. This is why we developed legislation which guarantees to the public that the work is done extremely well.

I think that the inspection of food should come under provincial jurisdiction. In February, the government pledged, in its speech from the throne, to do its utmost to eliminate overlap, duplication and useless spending. Since the federal government is getting involved in an area which, we feel, comes under provincial jurisdiction, it is headed in the wrong direction and should leave this responsibility to the provinces.

It is also very important to make sure the integrity and the competence of those hired to do this work can never be questioned. What is being proposed is an agency outside the government, but whose president would be appointed by the government. This president would select his own board members, hire his own staff and so on. The whole process would take place outside the scope of the Public Service Employment Act. If you establish an institution in this fashion, you are gambling as to who will be in control.

We can see it clearly in the case of certain other organizations. The government must keep its distance, remain at arm's length as they say in English. Unfortunately, I cannot think of the French word. There must be some distance between the government and the organizations in question. However, to move from that to

creating agencies and skirting the Public Service Employment Act is a bit disconcerting.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage did exactly the same thing. She created the ICO, the Information Canada Office. One of the deputy ministers at Heritage Canada became its director, and its employees do not come under the public service legislation. It makes you wonder where we are headed. The government says: "We have to cut costs, so, over a three year period, 45,000 public servants across Canada are going to be laid off". What is the government doing? It turns around and says: "We will need an office or a board here, an agency over there". And then, when new organizations are created, their staff is not subject to the Public Service Employment Act.

What raises concern is that new employees will be hired, but they will still be paid with taxpayers' money. Twenty million dollars were taken from the heritage budget to subsidize the ICO. But in that case, we no longer have any control. To a question I put to the minister, she answered: "Well, the hon. member opposite only has to check on the Internet and she will find everything she needs to know about the ICO". I have used the Internet several times and I am sorry to tell you that, if everyone surfing the Internet relies on the ICO for information on Canada, they will be sorry, because there are only about four pages on Canada, and most of it is propaganda and not information. Apart from the fact that the population of Canada hit the 30 million mark last summer, there is not much factual data to be found on the ICO site.

• (1255)

So we have an office that was set up. A director was appointed. He was given the authority to hire people and spend \$20 million, without being subject to any public service quality control measure. The exact same thing is being done here with this agency. What is likely to happen with a quasi-government agency? Unfortunately, we could see a lot of party politics, favouritism and patronage. We will go back to the old system: "If you vote for me, you will have a job, a position in the agency, in the office, in some other organization. Support my government and my party". This is the first risk.

We also risk having people who are almost in private sector, outside of government but not quite, but hired practically on the same basis as private businesses, people who, as we have seen in many sectors, inflate the bills and invent items that do not exist.

We hear these days of what is happening at the space agency. We would have a lot to say about that. The government says: "Come on, there is nothing to worry about", when in fact we are losing control of public funds. For the public, this is discouraging because it is like shifting money from one pocket to the other and saying that we saved something in the process. But if we really look at the figures, we realize that there are no savings because even if we have cut employees in the heritage department, we have created

the office and given it \$20 million. We may have cut positions in the agriculture department but at the same time we have created an agency that will control food quality, with all the very real risks involved.

And then, there will be court cases. Who will be hired as lawyers? Not federal employees. We will hire our friends. A Liberal government will hire Liberals. A Conservative government will hire Conservatives. And a Reform government will hire Reformers. Friends will be hired to go before the courts.

I think the public is not being fooled. They know what is going on. People understand that the government does not save much except at their expense, that it reduces its support to the less fortunate while it tries to set up official organizations that will allow it to continue to spend taxpayers' money.

Therefore, I urge the government to carefully review our amendments, which are very important in assuring Canadians that, in the future, there will be no more political patronage and wasting of money and that the new food inspection procedures will be in their best interest.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata was very eloquent in making the connection between culture and agriculture, as was the Quebec agriculture minister for whom I had the pleasure of working at one point. And she is right. She is right because the federal government's actions as regards culture and agriculture are similar in many respects in that it is trying to eliminate public service jobs for economic reasons to create an agency that will operate outside the public service and that will give more freedom to the governor in council, which, as you know, means cabinet.

● (1300)

The first amendment put forward by the member for Frontenac deals with the new agency, which groups together three agencies that used to belong to three different departments, namely the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, into one single agency falling under the jurisdiction of the agriculture department.

However, we can see that people would be appointed by cabinet. If the amendment is not adopted, the agriculture minister, when criticized, could defend himself by saying: "It is a cabinet decision. It is not my fault. I am not responsible. Yes, I am a cabinet minister, but because of ministerial solidarity—"

Finally, it makes the minister of agriculture look good, except that this is a rather special operation. I nearly said "spatial", because there has been so much talk of space today, but no, it is "special". We in Quebec are not all that familiar with this custom. These are measures taken in Quebec in very specific cases, in very

### *Government Orders*

specific areas not generally covered by specific departments or sectorial departments.

What is involved here is a food inspection agency, for which at least there is a precedent. At least three agencies have been doing the same thing. As I said yesterday, these various food inspection agencies have been consolidated since 1978 in Quebec. Eighteen years later, we see the federal government developing a desire to do the same thing, moreover in an area of shared jurisdiction, at least where agriculture is concerned. Where health is concerned, however, this would, in principle, be a provincial area of jurisdiction, except where foods from outside the country, or from other provinces, are concerned. But this is not always the case.

We do not, however, have any objection to the principle of consolidating three federal agencies. It is clearer, at least. People will have a clearer idea of whom they are dealing with. But, after grouping the agencies together, they take a diversionary tactic and create one agency which will be able to operate in a different way than the regular sectorial departments.

This leaves a great deal of scope for questions, not that we want to accuse anyone of bad faith, but still. Amendment No. 1 says: "Yes, but why go elsewhere looking for services, when there may be qualified people within the Public Service?" This would be logical, particularly since the fusion may result in early retirement offers or job cuts.

In this context, it seems to me that, before making such changes, thought ought to be given to using the services of people who are already working in the federal public service. That, I would think, would be self-evident. Yet, it seems to me that the government is resisting this amendment.

The other point concerns appointments as legal advisers. Obviously, in Quebec, and I imagine everywhere else as well, there have been appointments following the political trends of the time, and I am not addressing only this present government with this. It seems that the Conservatives also had a considerable appetite for the same thing, which they had had to stifle during the long lean years. It took them nine years to catch up, with a whole series of appointments of lawyers and other professionals, who had all been frustrated during the long Liberal years by not being appointed to legal services.

We in Quebec saw the same thing happen during the Trudeau Liberal years, if not before, and then Mr. Mulroney came along promising change. But the essential change he made was that he appointed different people. When you follow public affairs in Quebec, you see what is going on with federal appointments. With Christmas approaching, I think I could make an analogy with the party game of musical chairs, which it resembles greatly.

*Government Orders*

• (1305)

Kids like to play musical chairs, but when political appointments are involved, the game is less amusing. The Senate is, of course, the ultimate version of the musical chairs game. When people cannot run around the chairs fast enough, they send them on to the other place. One might call this a kind of compassionate treatment. I do not want to say that everybody in the other Chamber is no good, but this is a costly duplication of an institution.

What we have here is another example, in food inspection. The federal government obviously wants to keep its powers and responsibilities and not delegate to the provinces. It would, however, be much easier to say: "There is an area where duplication could be avoided, because food, fish, products, especially in the context of free trade today, move not only between provinces, but between countries as well". In this context, the government might well want to keep certain responsibilities. In an independent Quebec, in partnership with Canada, mechanisms could likely maintain this situation in cases where products moved between countries.

We have no objection to the mechanism. Our objection is to the way it is set up and to the excessive powers accorded the ministers and the cabinet, because, as we know, the minister can recommend appointments to cabinet. If criticized, however, he will say: "Yes, yes, but it is cabinet. You know, I am only a minister and I must not break ranks with the other ministers". Yes, we understand, but we do not know who is right and who is guilty in this game.

The people of Quebec and Canada want greater transparency and more public involvement in the management of public affairs and political life. It is in this spirit, that the choice of the new leader of the Bloc Québécois will be by universal suffrage. He will be elected by all members of the Bloc Québécois. Members of the Bloc wishing to take part will have to wait a few more weeks before the convention.

This is the sort of situation that shows how management of public affairs and political life could be improved.

Why do I say that? Because for a long time, at least in my first years here, I was youth training critic. I was often in contact with young people. What young people do not like about politics—and after being in politics for so long you are aware of this, Mr. Speaker, this will not faze you—is they would like to see some changes, they are tired of the same old ways, especially with regard to patronage appointments. Were the appointees selected because of their hard work for the party, or for their generous contributions to the party? We do not know how it works exactly and people think it is wrong. They would like to see a mechanism such as the one proposed by the member for Frontenac, namely an independent nominating committee.

Mr. Speaker, if I do not have the opportunity to talk to you again, I wish you a Merry Christmas and happy holidays.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** Pursuant to an order made earlier in this debate, all questions in group 8 are deemed to have been put and deferred. The House will now proceed to a debate on group 9, Motions Nos. 27, 28, 29 and 30.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing the amendments in Group No. 8—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** We are debating Group No. 8 which includes Motions nos. 24, 25 and 26. Please forgive me, but the information I gave to the House earlier was wrong.

• (1310)

**Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Therefore, Mr. Speaker, are you saying I am right? Are we debating Group No. 8?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** Yes.

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this debate the thrust of this bill has become increasingly clear. I think it is important that we keep it in mind. I will briefly review all the comments made by the opposition up until now.

This is what we have been trying to show all along, this bill, despite its main thrust, which is quite laudable, namely to streamline food inspection, bringing all responsibilities and prerogatives pertaining to food inspection under one single agency, the means used to reach this objective are totally unacceptable. They are unacceptable and will be counterproductive.

We have already shown, quite eloquently I believe, that the fact that the president is to be appointed by the governor in council is par for the course, but that chances are he will be chosen more for his political affiliation than for his ability to do the job.

Moreover, we have shown how extensive his powers will be, including selecting his own advisory board, in other words the power to be consulted on issues of his choice, to ask for advice of his own choosing that will go along with what he and the government, regardless of its political stripe, want.

Moreover, it was decided, under clause 10 or 12 of the bill, not only to exempt the hiring of employees and inspectors of the agency from the Public Service Staff Relations Act, but also to set the terms of employment the president would see fit to set. In other words, this amounts to eliminating the labour code and the long standing tradition we have in this country to entrust negotiating

labour agreements to a credible association controlled by its members.

We have seen, a little further on, under clause 24 I believe, that the agency will be able to hire whomever it pleases, including outside professionals. We know what the hiring criteria will be in such cases. Of course, this is going to be about consultants, whether legal or otherwise, who will have contacts, people who are on good terms with the agency and known as loyal servants, not of the government, but of the Liberal Party.

In the motions in Group No. 8 which we are discussing now, there is a reference to the report. There is an action plan the agency will have to submit and that will be subject to public scrutiny. How are they going to proceed? As I said earlier, it will be all behind closed doors, to speed up the process, so no one will realize what is going on and they can do things on the sly more often than not. The agency will have absolute control over the action plan it wants to develop. In other words, the agency will not seek the advice of the advisory board or the local people when preparing its action plan, but will seek the advice of outside consultants, which it is free to choose.

• (1315)

That is totally unacceptable and that is why the hon. member for Frontenac and agriculture critic has put forward amendments which hopefully will be considered on the basis of their merit and accepted. What do these amendments say?

First, when agency officials produce an action plan, we do not want this action plan to be put on the shelf and forgotten as soon as it is tabled in this House; it should be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture instead.

The members of this committee, government members and opposition members alike, take the future of the farming industry to heart, as, we assume, everyone else does. They want to ensure that the right decisions are made.

These members will scrutinize the action plan submitted by agency officials and will be in a position, at least we hope so, to make the necessary changes before the plan is tabled in the House, put on a shelf and forgotten by everyone. That is what our amendments are all about.

We want the agency's action plan to be referred to the agriculture committee for consideration and approval. This is not too much to ask. I cannot see how the Minister of Agriculture or the members of the government party could object to such a sensible motion.

### *Government Orders*

What else is suggested? That the agriculture committee, in considering the plan, listen to the groups concerned, those representing farmers from coast to coast. They could tell us whether this action plan is practicable and will achieve the stated goals at a reasonable cost.

We could also hear from the consumer associations' representatives to find out whether the inspection procedures meet the standards or whether the inspection should target another kind of industry or product.

We could also hear people from the industry. They could tell us whether the agency's action plan will allow them to operate normally, and whether it will give them credibility with the consumers and guarantee the good quality of food for consumers.

Before we develop an action plan or have it tabled in the House, only to meet the same fate as thousands of reports tabled here, that is being shelved for good, it would be worthwhile, if this process is to be of any significance, to have it referred to the agriculture committee. The committee could hear from all those interested and make sure, even if we have doubts concerning the agency and its executive, the action plan is at least credible and can be examined and judged on its merits.

I hope the government will consider these amendments and recognize the enormous amount of work the agriculture critic and his colleague have done.

Since this is my last speech before we adjourn, I would like to extend to you my best wishes for the season.

[*English*]

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe we have moved on to group No. 8. We support the amendments in group No. 8, Motions Nos. 24, 25, and 26.

Motion No. 24 suggests that a parliamentary review of the agency's business plan be undertaken before the bill is approved.

• (1320)

Motion No. 25 supports a parliamentary review of the agency's business plan before the bill is approved. It also supports the agency consulting with industry employees first. Accountability which is required by Parliament is essential.

I believe the committee did an excellent job of reviewing the bill. Excellent witnesses appeared before the committee. We were able to look at the strengths and weaknesses of the bill. However, when it came to implementing change, the powers of the committee were hampered because the government held the heavy hand on

*Government Orders*

the committee and insisted that its members not consider valid amendments and instead pressed ahead with the government's agenda, whether or not that was the best position to take.

To illustrate that point, I would like to mention the one amendment that was able to get through the clauses by clause session. It amended the preface of the bill. That amendment called for cost effectiveness. One would think that every member would think that is an essential measure for the bill. It would ensure that the new agency would be cost effective. The government said that was its intention. The witnesses said it was paramount. One of the key purposes of the agency is to make one food inspection agency more cost effective than having three separate agencies under three different ministers.

While this was a perfectly sensible and logical amendment, government members voted against it. Fortunately, two government members supported the amendment so there was a split. That was the only amendment which was put forward in committee on which government members were not unanimous. It struck me as being very odd that three government members on the committee would vote against cost effectiveness as a principle and guiding light for this new single food inspection agency. That tells me that government members are very hesitant for the agency to be accountable to Parliament. That is very sad indeed.

Another amendment we proposed at committee stage indicated that the fees set by the agency must be reasonable. The fees should not exceed a reasonable cost in providing the service or the use of that service.

Believe it or not, government members voted against that amendment. That shows us the wrong direction in which the government is going. A few months earlier when we debated the Administrative Monetary Penalties Act, which was studied in the agriculture committee, we were able to amend the act at report stage by inserting the word reasonable. It put guidelines on a government agency which said it could not be unreasonable.

Sometimes governments are unreasonable. We saw a lot of unreasonable things happen in the Mulroney government. Mr. Speaker, you were here then. You saw many of the unreasonable things that they did and you spoke about them.

Governments change from time to time. Mr. Speaker, you probably do not think this government is unreasonable, but governments from time to time are unreasonable.

The Liberal government says it is going to be reasonable. Of course we doubt that. It says that it will be reasonable, however, it will not implement a restraint or a constraint to ensure that these agencies deal with consumers and the industry in a reasonable way. The government says that it will ensure the agency will always be reasonable.

Sometimes governments are not reasonable. However, if the legislation says that the costs must be reasonable, they will have to be reasonable because it is the law of the land. If the bill is not followed, legal recourse should be available.

It was extremely disappointing that government members were opposed to amending the bill to ensure that the costs be reasonable for the services provided by the single food inspection agency. This is at a time when the government, under treasury board initiatives, is implementing cost recovery. The industry is saying that many times cost recovery is not reasonable. Strong statements were made by organizations such as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the prairie pools, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and food processors that said that cost recovery is not reasonable.

• (1325 )

The House has no powers to hold the government and these agencies accountable. It is not there. We wanted to put it in the legislation. The government said: "No. We want the minister to have all power and the committee can meet and discuss these agencies at length then".

We can talk until we are blue in the face, but unless we have the support in legislation we do not have the clout. If an unreasonable government is in place then our hands are tied behind our backs. That is not the way government should work. That is not what Canadians want. That is not what was in the red book.

The hon. member who left the Liberal ranks a few days ago because he could not be reconciled with his party over the budget and then tried to get back into the party was told: "No way, José". By the way his name is not José but I am not allowed to his name.

However, he got up in the House and said to the Prime Minister: "You promised that government would be more accountable. It is in the red book". When he quoted the page he was booed by his colleagues. They called him a traitor for quoting the red book. It was shocking. The government is moving away from being reasonable and accountable. It is disgusting. It is wrong.

The House is studying the single food inspection agency and amendments by my colleagues from the Bloc. We put forward similar amendments in committee. As I mentioned earlier, Reform put its amendments forward at committee stage because under the new process there is supposed to be a better chance of reasonable amendments being considered in committee if they are presented before the bill is approved in principle. No way. That is another broken promise.

Even a simple amendment that said the cost would have to be reasonable was defeated. At a time of user fees and cost recovery, at a time of friction between the government and the industry, the government said: "No. We don't want to be accountable. The committee can look into anything but it has no power. There is no sanction in the legislation. We want to keep the minister's hands entirely free. We want the agency to be able to do as it pleases,

*Private Members' Business*

charge what it pleases for the services it provides". That is unacceptable. That is unreasonable.

The auditor general should be able to hold this agency to full account as well. We are concerned that the auditor general will not have sufficient opportunity to hold the new single food inspection agency accountable.

The other day the auditor general in a report to committee that the whole system of guidelines for cost recovery are vague if they exist at all, that there are unquantifiable factors out there, that the department has not done its homework and does not know what it is talking about when it talks about what the cost recovery levels are for our competitors, what the expectations for cost recovery are, whether cost recoveries are considered to be in the public or the private good.

He said that guidelines have not been put in place by the department of agriculture or by Treasury Board and certainly will make it much more difficult to determine whether this agency is being accountable and reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this chance to speak to this grouping of motions. As I said, we support them.

Perhaps this is my last chance to address the House and the Chair prior to the Christmas break. We are not sure what is happening here. I certainly want to wish all members a very merry Christmas and, Mr. Speaker, may you enjoy the holiday season. May you all be safe and have precious time with your families. We will look forward to seeing each one of you in the new year.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** It being 1.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed in today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### PROGRAM COST DECLARATION ACT

The House resumed from November 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-214, an act to provide for improved information on the cost of proposed government programs, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to this bill presented by the Liberal member for Durham. I feel in this particular instance he is definitely on the right track. As this is a private member's bill I can personalize it

and strongly emphasize how much I support the general thrust and intent of the bill.

The bill will require that the estimated annual cost and the cost per capita of every new government program be published as soon as the bill that authorized it is introduced in Parliament or the regulation that implements it is issued. The auditor general's opinion on the estimate is also to be published.

When a bill would come to this House at second reading stage there would be a requirement for the government to present to us the costs and economic impact of the bill. The actual requirement is that the government would have to explain the economic impact so that all members of this House and all Canadians could understand the nature of the bill. This has to be a tremendous improvement over what we are doing now in this House of Commons. I will use two examples to illustrate areas that would be improved by this bill: the tobacco bill and the disability aspect of the Canada pension plan.

The tobacco bill is being hotly debated and hotly contested. It is a tough issue. There is a fine line between trying to impose regulations and steep taxes on this legal substance—it is legally allowed to be sold—and restricting the impact of this substance on the health and welfare of individual Canadians, especially the young people because of its highly addictive qualities.

We have debated this bill. The tobacco industry and related lobbyists have said that the advertising and sponsorship provisions in the bill and the restrictive nature of the sale of cigarettes will force them to reduce their funding.

The Minister of Health has not provided us with any numbers on the economic impact on advertising or sponsorship. He has raised the taxes by \$1.50 per carton. He said that he could not go any higher, that the committee had advised him a greater tax increase would encourage the smuggling trade. Some of these numbers should have been given to us, for example the extra revenue the tax increase will generate.

Why is it that cigarettes can be sold in B.C. for \$44 a carton with a high taxation level, which encourages east to west smuggling? When people are in Toronto they go to the huge warehouses and buy cartons of cigarettes for \$19 each whereas in B.C. they pay \$44. They will spend \$500 to save \$500. It pays for the air fare. If they bring \$1,000 they can really save money.

When bills are presented, these things are not being explained to us as members of Parliament. If this type of explanation were given, a bill like the tobacco bill would not be debated just on the basis of emotion, the emotion of addiction, the emotion of what it is doing to youth, the emotion of something that supposedly is bad but nevertheless is legal. The bill could be discussed with some balance; the emotional arguments would be balanced with the economic arguments.

*Private Members' Business*

The government has been trying to introduce the tobacco legislation for 14 months but has not been able to. People have been dying from smoking cigarettes. But when the health minister suddenly introduces the legislation, it has to be passed now, before Christmas. It has to be fast tracked because people are dying and that is all we are concentrating on.

If a bill were presented along with its economic impact it would have to have a more thorough review at the departmental and ministerial levels before it even got to cabinet. If cabinet were to approve the bill with its financial ramifications, it would then be presented to us on that basis. That would make a big difference for all parliamentarians. Then we could make a proper balanced decision on these bills.

I read the member for Durham's opening speech on this bill. He said that many members of Parliament end up voting just to go along with their party line, but they do not really understand what they are really voting for and why they are voting the way they are.

I am currently a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. We just finished reviewing chapter 17 on CPP disability. In his report the auditor general indicated that management is a problem in the civil service. I am not saying nor is he saying that it is mismanagement. The problem is undermanagement.

There is not enough leadership, not enough guidance. There are not enough rules for the people in management to carry out effective control of the programs they are in charge of. There are not enough effective controls to say yea or nay to certain people on disability. The rules are archaic. They have been added on since 1970. It is an abomination.

• (1335)

Some of these people in the bureaucracy need help. As legislators, we are the ones who are standing in the way. We have now given them the tools to work with so all they have to do is say no or yes to people and there are a lot of complaints. This type of bill would enable the presenter to make the proper changes and talk about the financial impact.

An overall review is necessary in our CPP, which we are doing, but it is also needed specifically in the disability area. Since 1993 the department has done 24,000 reassessments of long term disability claimants and found that 34 per cent of them no longer qualified but were still receiving benefits. Fortunately, over half of that money will be recoverable and the government will get some money back.

It is a serious matter. There has to be a mechanism in the rules which states that we must present a cost benefit analysis of a bill or changes to a bill so that everybody understands not just the kind of society we are trying to create or the caring we want to show the people in Canada but also the economic impact along with the emotional impact.

It is important for us as legislators to give those in the civil service the tools to work with so they can do a proper job in effectively controlling the public purse strings. It is becoming far too easy for politicians to stand up and say that they just blew it. If that is what we say, then we are not assuming our responsibilities to pass good and effective legislation that will make spending more visible, that will make the cost of government more apparent that will be in the best interests of every single political party in the House and all Canadians whose tax dollars we suck out of their pocketbooks. We must know who spends it, who is accountable for it and how wisely the money is being spent, which is what Bill C-214 does.

We could amend the bill a little by adding a sunset clause where it would be compulsory at the end of the fifth year to check out the viability of each of the programs to see if they are successful in achieving their desired ends.

On the auditor general's opinion on the estimates, which is also to be published, I disagree a little bit with my colleague from Durham in this area. The job of the auditor general is to audit after the fact and not predict before the fact.

The auditor general's job in auditing is to match the intent of government legislation and the intent of programs with the success or failure of achieving the objectives, which is what he is doing now. I believe that is something he can still do. He would be doing the value for money audits but for example, it would have been so much easier had the Minister of Health presented all the financial implications of the Tobacco Act.

There is also the Endangered Species Act. How much is that going to cost? What is the impact of that act? There is hardly a member of Parliament here who knows what the impact of that bill will be. Why has that not been presented to us by the minister?

We have a right to know how the money is going to be spent and who is going to have to pay for it. Things like that are very important, very critical and very crucial. I commend the member for Durham for bringing forward a private member's bill like this one.

This is what is going to happen with this. The President of the Treasury Board has said: "We must equip ourselves with better systems for evaluating the actions of government so that we can genuinely answer for actions first and foremost to our fellow citizens who are both clients and taxpayers". He is not showing his support for this bill. He is staying neutral because he says it is a private member's bill. He says it is the job of the standing committees to ask those questions about what a bill costs and what money is going to be spent.

My colleague from Lloydminster in a prior speech has pointed out how effective standing committees are in getting that kind of information. The minister says: "A cost analysis is given to cabinet confirming the financial impacts in a confidential memorandum". If it is already being done, then share it with the Canadian public

*Private Members' Business*

and the House of Commons. It should not be any big deal for the minister to support this.

I would just like to conclude with one comment by the member for Durham. I like this quote and will give him credit for it: "The forces that would turn government back on the road to fiscal irresponsibility are at work today", and they are still out there. "They ponder how to spend annualized surpluses, even though the debt stands at over \$600 billion. This legislation will serve as a check on these forces".

• (1340)

**Mr. George Proud (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to express my views to the House during the debate on Bill C-214.

The bill proposes that the government make a declaration to Parliament of the estimated annual cost of every new program which it intends to implement. I welcome the opportunity the member for Durham has given me to remind the House of the progress the government has made in recent years and is continuing to pursue in this very important area.

As an example, I would cite the improved reporting to Parliament project. This initiative responds to the need for better accountability. It entails working with Parliament to provide good, meaningful information not only on the costs of government programs but on the results we achieve in relation to the goals and objectives we set for ourselves.

We would all agree on the importance of the initiative, given that these programs and the results are funded by the dollars which the taxpayers have entrusted to us to manage well and to deliver the services they expect and need from federal departments and agencies.

In the improved reporting to Parliament project, the government is endeavouring to draw on the expertise of all stakeholders, parliamentarians, public servants, interested professionals and the clients and constituents whom we serve.

Improved information to Parliament is also a key component of two other recent government initiatives, program review and getting government right.

Program review is now in its second phase. We have been scrutinizing all federal activities to ask the questions that are important to us all, questions such as: What activity should the federal government continue to be engaged in? How should these activities be delivered? By what level of government? If federal, by

which department or agency and at what cost and for which level of service?

The results of the program review have been significant in a number of ways. We have clarified the roles, responsibilities and the priorities of federal departments and agencies. We have begun a thought process with respect to options for alternative organizational forums and mechanisms for program delivery.

The bottom line is that program review means that by 1998-99, annual spending on federal government programs are projected to fall by about \$9 billion and will be delivered by a smaller, more effective and less costly public service.

Getting government right is a complementary initiative which involves the modernization of federal programs and services to meet our obligations as a government and the expectations of our clients today and in the years to come.

I would encourage any member who has not already done so to read the progress report on getting government right which was tabled in this House on March 7, 1996. It describes what we have accomplished in clarifying federal roles and responsibilities in making the federal government work better and in rethinking program delivery so as to adjust to today's reality and the challenges ahead.

More specifically, getting government right means ensuring that resources are devoted to the highest priorities, responding to the public demand for better and more accessible government and achieving more affordable government.

In moving forward on this agenda, the government is mindful of the need to ensure that the role of the national government is preserved to meet core responsibilities. These include: strengthening our economy and economic union to ensure a prosperous country for ourselves and our children; enhancing social solidarity in Canada; pooling our national resources to achieve common goals efficiently and effectively; defending Canada's sovereignty; and speaking for Canadians collectively on the world stage.

While I support the objective of Bill C-214, its enactment would only add to the cost of government without making any substantive improvement in the quantity and quality of information which the government is providing and plans to provide to Parliament.

Consider the changes we have already benefited from in the 1996-97 estimates documentation. In addition to part I of the estimates which provides an overview of federal spending, part II, the traditional blue book which supports the Appropriation Act, and the individual part IIIs, two important innovations were introduced.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1345)

First, the government tabled a new document entitled "Program Expenditure Detail: A Profile of Departmental Spending". This document, while not formally constituting part of the estimates, represented an important step forward in that it combines federal program spending detail which was previously presented in both part I of the estimates and the budget. This provides a bridge between the budget document and other estimate documents.

"Program Expenditure Detail: A Profile of Departmental Spending" gives Parliament both an overview of program spending within the context of part I and program review and more detailed information on program spending by sector and by federal department. Program review's principal achievement will be structural changes in the business of government, many of which are already visible to all parliamentarians and the Canadian public.

For example, in the transportation sector shifting from owner, operator or subsidizer to regulator and policy maker; and in the agricultural sector, in partnership with the provinces, moving from commodity based agricultural subsidies to a whole farm safety net, focusing on income stabilization rather than income support.

Other important restructuring initiatives include withdrawing from programs which provide direct financial support to industry and addressing overlap and duplication to consolidate activities wherever possible, thereby making program delivery more efficient and more effective.

The second phase of the program review builds on the first. Specific measures resulting from program review II which affect primarily the 1998-99 fiscal year include the rationalization of subsidies, privatization and commercialization where feasible, and further reductions in spending.

While in some cases specific measures to implement program review II decisions will be developed over the next two years, it is clear to the government that innovation in service delivery is a key factor to our success.

We want to move away from traditional hierarchical delivery structures to forms which are more cost effective and more responsive to Canadians. The creation of the three agencies announced in the speech from the throne and the budget is well under way.

Another change which we saw in the 1996-97 main estimates in addition to the document profiling departmental spending was the tabling of six pilot part III of the estimates departmental expenditure plans. These documents are pilots or tests in the government's effort to address the concern of parliamentarians who have better information on the multi-year costs of government programs and

constitute a key initiative in the improved reporting to Parliament project.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out to my colleagues that the progress which we have seen today is only the beginning. The estimated costs of a program represent only one side of equation. The government is equally concerned with reporting to Parliament on the results.

The government is currently considering mechanisms for reporting to Parliament on the performance of government programs in a more timely and complete manner; for example, the introduction of performance reports which would be tabled in the fall of each year rather than as a component of the planned expenditure information which we currently receive as parts of the estimates documentation.

This government has made a concerted and ongoing effort to involve parliamentarians in shaping the form and content of the information which is presented to us not only on the cost of government programs but on their results. I believe our participation in this process is the key to improving the information for Parliament. The member for Durham shares our objective. However, I believe that the legislation being proposed presents potentially costly and ineffective alternatives to the initiatives I have just outlined.

I believe that more focused, streamlined information to Parliament will make it easier to assess government programs. Information which is better organized and more user friendly will strengthen the accountability of government to all Canadians.

I am grateful to have this opportunity to address the House on this proposal. I too wish you all a Merry Christmas and prosperous new year.

• (1350)

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. speaker, it is a pleasure today to debate Bill C-214, the program cost declaration act tabled by the hon. member for Durham.

Let me take a few minutes to outline the purpose of the act and what is behind it. The act, which is a votable item, would require departments of the government to provide a financial or cost analysis of each piece of legislation on its introduction to the House of Commons or at the time the minister or governor in council issues regulations or other instruments.

The auditor general would certify that the method used to arrive at this analysis was fair and reasonable under the circumstance. The cost would be disclosed in total as well as based on the per capita cost for each Canadian citizen.

*Private Members' Business*

This legislation would cause legislators and their departments to be more conscious of the financial impact their legislation would have. The PCDA, as it is called, would provide for a greater degree of disclosure and accountability for government programs and lead toward a more integrated expenditure system. It would give members of Parliament and the public more knowledge and to that extent more control and scrutiny over how government spends.

If this type of legislation had been in place years ago, I believe it is true that would not have so easily created the massive deficits and debt which the federal government is now forced to deal with.

That really is the purpose of the legislation, as stated by the member for Durham. I think it is transparent that the legislation is worthy of support. It has been supported in statements from the auditor general and the Canadian Taxpayers' Federation. The retiring president, Mr. Jason Kenney, has said that he supports the legislation. James Forrest, the executive director of the Alberta Taxpayers' Federation, has indicated that they support it. During the first hour of debate it received fairly favourable reviews from MPs representing all the recognized parties in the House.

I could also note that professional accounting organizations have also indicated their support. Marcel Latouche, president of the Chartered Association of Certified Accountants has indicated support; the Certified General Accountants Association of Ontario; the Society of Management Accountants of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. They endorse the principles behind the bill, and I could go on.

I guess the real question is why anybody would do it any other way. When we think about it, it is quite extraordinary that in this day and age governments would think of tabling and publicly adopting legislation without providing assessed cost information as part of the process.

I do not believe there is any chief executive officer in this country who would go to his board or his shareholders and not be prepared to give a definitive cost assessment on a project that the company had undertaken. Nor would any intelligent head of a household enter into a major purchase, any purchase other than out of pocket, without making an assessment of the real costs over time.

If anything, I think the bill probably does not go far enough. This is absolute bare bones, as some of my colleagues have pointed out. There are other things that could be done with the bill but which have not been done. There are no sunset clauses on any of these expenditures. There is actually no provision for making the targets that are assessed by the auditor general mandatory or for any amendment if the costs are out of range from the original estimate. There is no assessment required of benefits or of the present value of the cost stream. There is no requirement to indicate what the

source of the income would be to cover the cost or how precisely these sources are related to the benefits and the beneficiaries of any of the projects.

This is a very small step, one that is worth pursuing and I believe ultimately worth adopting. However, it is not putting any kind of undue restraint on government, nor is it even challenging some of the basic Liberal philosophy that I think is ultimately the problem here. I may get into this later if I have time.

● (1355)

This is what the member himself is ultimately up against because \$600 billion in debt was not run up in this country by accident. It may have been run up through incompetence but it really came down to the heart of the Liberal Party philosophy and the philosophy of modern liberalism which is that government exists to spend, to transfer money from some people to other people for the benefit of politicians and bureaucrats, and ultimately it is a political and not an economic question on how resources are allocated. That is the philosophy of modern liberalism, not just to serve a dependency but to create it, to nurture it and to build big government around it.

That is why we have the problems we do in this country. That is ultimately what the hon. member is up against in trying to move this bill forward not just with the philosophy of liberalism but, frankly, with a political party and a leadership that have to justify the last 30 years, justify the way things have been run. They surround themselves with the representatives of the old way of doing things. That is a problem when getting the House to look at this kind of measure.

I would point out in the few moments I have left that this is not by any means the only measure that parliamentarians of various parties have tabled in this Parliament to attempt to bring modern cost evaluation and cost control to the federal government.

I will mention a few of the private members' bills that are on the Order Paper right now, all of which relate to this kind of matter: Bill C-213 put forward by the hon. member for Capilano—Howe Sound to amend the Constitution Act to require balanced budgeting and spending limitations; Bill C-294 by the hon. member for St. Albert which would require the periodic evaluation of statutory programs, two-thirds of federal spending not subject to a regular review process; Bill C-342 by the hon. member for North Vancouver would require stated principles of fiscal management from the Minister of Finance consistent with generally accepted accounting principles and would require public periodic reports that deal with approaches to debt reduction, to balanced budgeting, contingency for risk and stable tax rules; Bill C-349 by the hon. member for Medicine Hat to require public disclosure and parliamentary scrutiny of federal user fees; Bill C-361 by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, the people's tax form act, which would give

*Private Members' Business*

voters and taxpayers a say on their tax forms in terms of what kind of federal government programs are supported and with what kind of tax dollars.

There are various other propositions. I think all the ones I mentioned are reform propositions but there are others from Liberal members which deal with not just reforming spending directly but making government more accountable, whether it is through giving people more say on their tax form or through referendums or through reforms of the House of Commons. There are endless numbers of propositions. None of these has been addressed so far in this Parliament or seriously entertained.

I would like to review some of the objections that have been raised to this type of legislation if I have time. Let me say before I get to that in summary that what all of these objections have in common, and I am sure we will hear this from the parliamentary secretary later, is somehow the theme that we are doing it right now. Everything is just fine the way it is. Cost control is really terrific. We now have only a \$30 billion deficit this year. Therefore what are we really worried about when it comes to taxpayer dollars? The other objection is how can we afford to spend this money to control federal spending and to control the federal budget.

These people never have any problem with spending money at the front end. They always find it very expensive to monitor. They can always afford to spend the money. They can never afford to have the accountant to keep the records. That is an amazing philosophy but it will come out in all the objections.

As I say, there is really no valid reason for opposing this type of bill. It is standard practice in every other institution. The auditor general knows this is consistent with modern accounting practices and would like to see his office handle this sort of role.

• (1400)

I commend this bill to the House. I know that many Liberal members support it. They reject the old philosophy. I ask them to vote in favour of this legislation.

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the bill of the hon. member for Durham. Essentially the bill calls for a full disclosure of costs for any legislation brought before the House, any regulations that are enacted or any other instruments that are implemented by the government.

This bill should be applauded. Canadians are demanding more accountability from their parliamentarians. I salute the hon. member for Durham for bringing this bill forward.

In the spirit of the bill, I am sure the member looked at the costs of implementing this particular bill. I would say that the costs of

implementing this bill would be very limited. I am sure the member will bring forward those costs at a later date.

Most departments and most ministers do some kind of accounting or cost estimating of what the implementation of proposed measures will cost. I am sure those numbers are reasonably available. What the member is saying in this bill is that those costs should be brought before the House.

Too often in the past legislation has come before the House and has been passed without members knowing fully what the costs and the impacts of the legislation will be. In my view, there are different kinds of legislation. Some legislation costs a lot of money to implement and some costs very little. However, if the costs are not known, it is very difficult to make any kind of judgment.

Another element can creep into legislation and that is the problem of incremental costs. A small piece of legislation on its own may not be that costly to implement, but given other legislation and other initiatives, the cumulative costs can be quite significant. The bill would provide a very transparent process. It would ensure that members of the House would know what the implementation costs of the legislation would be.

This bill calls for that information to be prospective, not retrospective. What good does it do if the auditor general comes along later and says that a program cost X dollars and the benefits were less than the cost? At that point it is too late. This bill demands accountability up front in terms of disclosure. It is a much more appropriate way to deal with the issue.

I echo what other members have said before me. The bill is a start. It is certainly not the full solution. It is a first step in a very important process.

Other questions need to be answered when legislation is introduced and when regulations are implemented. For example, what would be the impact of legislation on other stakeholders? Other stakeholders could include other orders of government. It could mean the business community. It could mean a whole host of things. While the bill deals with the cost of implementing legislation within the federal government, we also have an obligation to analyse what legislation will do to other orders of government and to the business community.

For example, a tool has been developed by treasury board and Industry Canada which is called the business impact test. It is used to assist legislators and departments to assess the impact of proposed legislation on business. The business impact test is affectionately referred to as the BIT. It is an important tool which parliamentarians should encourage. There is nothing to stop that information from being presented in the House when other legislation and costs are presented.

When we look at the impact of legislation we should also be looking at alternatives. What alternatives were looked at before the department brought in the legislation? Are there market instru-

ments that could be used as effectively? Are there voluntary means that could be implemented to achieve the same goals?

• (1405)

We have a habit of bringing in laws and legislation telling business how to run and operate its business instead of putting in legislation which sets certain standards and criteria that are required and allowing the business community to develop the processes by which it could meet those standards. When that is not done, it adds another cost to the burdens of government. It also makes business more inefficient.

The way that laws and regulations are brought forward, developed and implemented are very complex. A number of processes are in place. Sometimes legislation is driven by the bureaucracy. Sometimes legislation is driven at the political level. Sometimes it is driven by stakeholder groups that create a demand.

We need to be very cautious that we do not fall into the trap of building empires, whether it is building empires for bureaucrats, special interest groups or politicians. This legislation really provides a vehicle for a full debate, full disclosure and full accountability at the start of any proposed initiative.

Often we debate legislation and the issues of public policy and law in this House. That is very important but too often we do not debate the fiscal impact of some of the initiatives that are brought forward.

Perhaps if we had done more of this in the past, we would not be facing the fiscal challenges we face today. Now is the time to start on a new program, on a new footing. This bill allows us to do that.

The effect of this bill, in my view, is that it will have a large deterrent effect that would be positive. In other words, private members or the government of the day will be reluctant to bring forward bills that have a heavy cost associated with them, and where the benefits are not clearly defined.

Government is not like business. It cannot always put legislation in the context of cost and benefit in the same kind of quantifiable way that can be done in business. However, it does not preclude governments from adopting some of that rigour and applying it in any way it can.

I applaud the member for bringing this forward. Legislation and regulations have a huge impact on the competitiveness of our industries. The market does not solve everything. We know that, and governments have a role to play.

We need to really examine carefully the impact that regulations and legislation have on businesses because the capacity and the ability of businesses to develop jobs and economic activity will be partly a function of the regulatory environment and the legislative

### *Private Members' Business*

environment in which they work and how that compares with those environments in the countries where competitors are domiciled.

If we do not really look at those elements on an incremental basis or on another basis, we can put businesses on a footing where they are not competitive to deal internationally or even within our own domestic markets.

This bill is a giant step forward. I applaud the member again for bringing it forward. I certainly will support it. I hope other members will.

I too would like to take this opportunity to wish everybody a very happy and safe holiday and a prosperous new year.

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to speak in support of this bill, the Program Cost Declaration Act, Bill C-214.

It is said that the Canadian public is becoming cynical about the political process. I believe it was the American humorist Mark Twain who said that a cynic is a person who knows the price of everything but knows the value of nothing.

• (1410)

What the hon. member for Durham is trying to do with this bill is to put two concepts together. If we know the price of something and we know we are getting a good buy for the price then we are quite willing to pay for it. This bill is about how to determine the price and whether value for money is being given.

I will give an example. If one was to go down to one of the luxury car lots not far from Parliament Hill, no doubt a car could be found that was worth \$75,000. That is a lot of money. However, if I take the car out and test drive it, I may begin to feel that with all the bells and whistles and all the good things that are included, \$75,000 is not a lot of money to pay for the vehicle. In my opinion, \$75,000 is a lot of money for a car but if someone can afford it and it is good value, they will pay for it because it is not a problem.

As legislators, we often get into programs that cost money but, at the same time, are good value. I am not quite as cynical as some of the earlier speakers from the Reform who only talked about the price and did not want to talk about the value. They were only interested in the cost because it is a personal lifestyle issue to them as opposed to what it means to us as Canadians or to the country as a whole.

At the same time, as individuals, collectively we are entitled to know what the large picture cost is of this and what the individual or per capita cost is of the particular program.

As an example, a couple of years ago in the province of British Columbia, the then minister of the environment in that province wanted to introduce environmental legislation that sounded great. It was reformulated gasoline. It was a wonderful idea which would

*Private Members' Business*

have wonderful effects on the environment. People thought it was just what they needed and that the government should proceed with it.

However, when the people of British Columbia found out that it was going to cost them eight cents a litre more to buy reformulated gasoline, they had very severe reservations and told the minister of the environment to back off because they wanted to think about it. Once the price had been leaked to them, they started to realize that maybe under those circumstances they were not getting good value.

There is another side to this. As Canadians we know that health care costs a lot of money. Despite the fact that health care, no matter what country one lives in, has a large price tag attached to it, Canadians know that they are getting good value. If we compare ourselves to what I heard earlier from the Reform members, they are only interested in the price. They would prefer to adopt the American model which suggests that as an individual it does not matter what the price is as long as it is affordable. It does not matter if it is good value or not.

In the United States we know they are spending at least 2 per cent to 3 per cent more of GDP on a per capita basis for health care, whereas we know in Canada it is expensive but collectively we get a better deal and it is better value. That is where we differ from the Reform Party in the role of government.

However, that does not detract from what the hon. member for Durham is saying. I can recall in Ontario a number of years ago when government was growing that it was introducing all kinds of programs and would say: "This is a great program and it will only cost you 15 cents a week or 15 cents a month". That was one little department of the government keeping 15 cents here and 15 cents there. It all adds up at the end of the year when somebody has to pay for it. We know that the somebody at the end of the year is you, me and everyone else who was involved in the taxation system.

I want to point out one other thing. We have also heard from the Reform members. They know the price of everything but the value of nothing.

• (1415)

I would like to point out a strange twist in their philosophy. They stand in their places here and talk about getting tough with criminals: "Let us lock them up, do not give anyone the benefit of the doubt, do not consider the value of rehabilitation. Let us not say to a person: You have served your time, we will give you a second chance. I am a Reformer and I want to lock you up".

Maybe we should start costing what their criminal law amendments would add up to. Maybe we should sit down and ask: What

is the price that the Reform Party is putting on the criminal justice system? To you, Mr. Canadian Taxpayer, is it good value? Does it mean a whole lot to you that a person will be locked up forever? What does it mean to you as a taxpayer when we do the collective routine?

I am not a cynic in the sense of the Reform philosophy that there is a price. I am saying to tie the two of them together. Let us look at the price and let us look at the value we will get from it. What is the overall cost and is it good value? Is it something Canadians want? Canadians will have to know what they are paying for.

I realize a number of groups have endorsed this. The present auditor general has said that he shares the view that the cost of government programs and operations should be made more visible to Parliament and to taxpayers.

Today I heard the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour talk about program review and that programs are being made more cost efficient. That is the right thing to do and as a member of the government I applaud that. We must do that. We have no choice. And we are doing that.

But this is not a question of making programs more efficient. It is a question of telling people up front, right then when we introduce a law what it is going to cost the country and what it will mean to every man, woman and child in the country. Legislation has many yardsticks which can be applied to it. We put legislation to all kinds of tests, but this is the one test that has obviously been missing.

I realize that this may impose an onerous burden on certain departments. After having heard the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour speak, I think it is like a scene out of "My Fair Lady" where Eliza Doolittle was being taught English and she did not want to continue any more. She said that she was tired, fed up and could not carry on. In this case I would suggest that the department has no reason to be tired. It can carry on and it ought to carry on in the vein and with the intent, purpose and thrust of what the hon. member for Durham has proposed in the bill.

It is ironic that the Alberta Taxpayers' Association has said that the bill is a good first kick at the can and deserves the consideration of members of Parliament. This is what the member has succeeded in doing by getting this bill to the floor of this Chamber.

I know there are others who will speak to the bill today and in the future. At the same time I believe it is incumbent upon us to thoroughly examine the bill. In the end I believe we on this side of the House at least will conclude that we are not cynics but we do want to know the price and then we as legislators can determine whether this is good value for the people of Canada.

*Private Members' Business*

[Translation]

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would like to congratulate our colleague from Durham, for taking the initiative to introduce a bill to improve information on the cost of programs proposed by the government.

• (1420)

Our fellow countrymen, administrators, a list of accountants, which we have seen, and even the office of the auditor general have said that this initiative would be welcome. When we look at the enormous expenditures of the government, it is clear that we need mechanisms to ensure program costs are made public at least in general terms, given that it is impossible to have precise information and figures for a five-year period.

But the primary initiative of this bill will be to help bureaucrats realize that Parliament, which has the last word on programs, requires information that is as precise information as possible, because we are aware of the impact, the ramifications, of program expenditures and do not like to find out, a year or two down the road, that certain programs have ended up doubling or tripling the original estimates.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this. This is an initiative I like very much. There is no doubt that many mechanisms do exist, as our hon. colleague from Prince Edward Island has said. There are mechanisms in place to control, if you will, or to give some idea of the costs of programs.

However, I think that this proposal by the member for Durham would put our bureaucrats and, of course, ministers and deputy ministers, who are responsible for the various departments, on the alert, forcing them to make sure that the information provided is as accurate as possible, otherwise we are the ones who are going to incur the wrath of our fellow Canadians if they realize that expenditures were higher than anticipated.

In the short time I had, I just wanted to draw the attention of my colleagues to this aspect of the bill. Such legislation deserves a lot of attention and certainly deserves to be debated. I hope it will help those responsible for program analysis to realize that we have the last word and that we need information that is as accurate as possible.

[English]

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will start by wishing happy holidays to everybody, to all Canadians including my constituents, and of course a very Happy New Year.

[Translation]

I wish a Happy New Year and a good holiday to all Canadians and to my colleagues. I also say to all my Italian friends: Buon anno a tutti miei amici italiani.

I congratulate the hon. member for tabling a rather important bill. We need to have details when we vote as members of Parliament, and we also need to be convinced that the legislation is an important one for our communities.

My only concern relates to the auditor general's involvement, since it could delay the passage of an act that can be extremely important for the country.

[English]

Private members' bills are extremely important for the backbenchers who speak to their constituents and know what their problems are. There seem to be a lot of constraints on private members' bills. A private member's bill is the only tool a backbencher has. From my own experience I have introduced three private members' bills. They were intended to address injustices in the electoral act.

Some people may not know that a private member's bill first has to be introduced. Then the member's name has to be drawn and eventually the votability of the bill has to be established. I do not think that the votability should have to be established. We should be able to present and discuss the bill and then if the debate collapses, it collapses.

My first bill related to an injustice regarding political parties losing their party status. They had to decertify because they did not have 50 candidates. In British Columbia if we were to create a party, it would never become national because there are only 34 seats, whereas in Quebec for instance, a provincial party could be made national because there are 75 seats. That is something which should have been addressed but unfortunately the debate collapsed.

• (1425)

I would like to support this bill. It is important that there be more accountability in what is presented to the House and I am prepared to support that idea. It is a good idea that we all know what we are voting on and we know from the beginning what the costs are going to be.

Again, a very happy holiday to everybody and particularly to you, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I shall speak just a few minutes on the bill tabled by my colleague, the hon. member for Durham.

First of all, I will congratulate my colleague for having presented a truly worthwhile initiative, one worthy of the House of Commons' attention. I personally have had the opportunity to examine it and to ask a few questions, particularly of Treasury Board employees, in order to determine just what they do at the present time with regard to the information they provide about the House of Commons.

*Private Members' Business*

I am pleased to inform you that the main thrust of my colleague's proposal has already been implemented. The Department, and the President of Treasury Board, have undertaken to facilitate, and to provide far more information to members of Parliament than they did in the past. For example, in collaboration with the other political parties, they are starting to make it easier to obtain information and to provide far more reports, not only on the new government programs, but also on existing ones.

The government has also taken very aggressive initiatives to ensure that Canadians have access to affordable programs which are appropriate to the population's needs.

At the present time, the government is holding discussions with representatives of the provinces and territories with a view to saving money, while ensuring that the programs established to serve Canadians are appropriate and transparent.

My problem with this initiative is that it will be redundant. Each year the auditor general makes recommendations on the government's operations, and then makes his report public. Historically, more than 65 per cent of his recommendations have been implemented, whereas the government and the ministers take action every time the auditor general makes recommendations.

I think that it will bring in another type of bureaucracy one that will be more costly, especially when the government is already involved in implementing all manner of measures to ensure government transparency and the availability of information to the House and its members.

I just wish to say that the 1996-97 estimates have demonstrated the government's serious intent, since it has taken tangible steps. It has not only talked about taking steps, it has taken them. I therefore wish to congratulate the administrators and the ministers for their initiative.

Let me wish everyone a Merry Christmas, and as my colleague has said, *buon anno a tutti e grazie signor.*

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken):** Order. The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

Perhaps I might be permitted to say a few words.

[Translation]

On behalf of all of the occupants of the Chair, to my colleagues in the House and to everyone, I would like to wish a good holiday season.

[English]

I want to say how much the Chair and the other occupants of the chair—I say this on the part of all of us—appreciate the co-operation of all hon. members, of the clerks at the table, of our pages and of all those who make this Chamber work. Without the help of hundreds of people, we could not function here.

[Translation]

To everyone, I would like to express holiday greetings from all of the hon. members of this House.

[English]

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. We hope we will not be back next week.

It being 2.30 o'clock p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1997 at 11 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.30 p.m.)



## **APPENDIX**

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR  
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY  
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;  
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,  
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

**The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. BOB KILGER

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	Nunatsiaq	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélaïr, 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, Hon. Don, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.	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.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
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	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) .....	Cardigan .....	Prince Edward Island ..	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade .....	Dartmouth .....	Nova Scotia .....	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell .....	Cape Breton — The Sydneys .....	Nova Scotia .....	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh .....	Bramalea — Gore — Malton .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Maloney, John .....	Erie .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec .....	Ottawa South .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Manning, Preston .....	Calgary Southwest .....	Alberta .....	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul .....	Québec-Est .....	Quebec .....	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment .....	York West .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services .....	Sudbury .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Martin, Keith .....	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca ..	British Columbia .....	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance .....	LaSalle — Émard .....	Quebec .....	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure .....	Hull — Aylmer .....	Quebec .....	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip .....	Cariboo — Chilcotin .....	British Columbia .....	Ref.
McClelland, Ian .....	Edmonton Southwest .....	Alberta .....	Ref.
McCormick, Larry .....	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
McGuire, Joe .....	Egmont .....	Prince Edward Island ..	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen .....	Brandon — Souris .....	Manitoba .....	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey .....	Yukon .....	Yukon .....	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources .....	Edmonton Northwest .....	Alberta .....	Lib.
McTeague, Dan .....	Ontario .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans .....	Vancouver Quadra .....	British Columbia .....	Lib.
Ménard, Réal .....	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve ..	Quebec .....	BQ
Mercier, Paul .....	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes .....	Quebec .....	BQ
Meredith, Val .....	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley .....	British Columbia .....	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans .....	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception .....	Newfoundland .....	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole .....	Kingston and the Islands ..	Ontario .....	Lib.
Mills, Bob .....	Red Deer .....	Alberta .....	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J. .....	Broadview — Greenwood ..	Ontario .....	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .....	Beaches — Woodbine .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy .....	Parry Sound — Muskoka ..	Ontario .....	Lib.
Morrison, Lee .....	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia .....	Saskatchewan .....	Ref.
Murphy, John .....	Annapolis Valley — Hants ..	Nova Scotia .....	Lib.
Murray, Ian .....	Lanark — Carleton .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development .....	Kenora — Rainy River .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo .....	Bourassa .....	Quebec .....	BQ
Nunziata, John .....	York South — Weston .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D. ....	Labrador .....	Newfoundland .....	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat .....	London — Middlesex .....	Ontario .....	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	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.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	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
<b>ALBERTA (26)</b>		
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.
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)</b>		
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 National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	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
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND (7)</b>		
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.
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)</b>		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Lib.
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
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.
<b>ONTARIO (99)</b>		
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, Hon. Don, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	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.	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	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, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	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.
<b>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)</b>		
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.
<b>QUEBEC (75)</b>		
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
Dalphonf—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
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 of Human Resources Development	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
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
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
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of December 13th, 1996 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman:** Raymond Bonin

**Vice-Chairmen:** Claude Bachand  
John Finlay

Jack Iyerak Anawak Margaret Bridgman	Maurice Dumas John Duncan	Elijah Harper Charles Hubbard	John Murphy Bernard Patry	(11)
---	------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	------

#### Associate Members

Garry Breitkreuz John Bryden	Marlene Cowling Maurice Godin	Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin	Len Taylor
---------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------

### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Chairman:** Lyle Vanclief

**Vice-Chairmen:** Jean-Guy Chrétien  
Glen McKinnon

Cliff Breitkreuz Murray Calder Bernie Collins	Harold Culbert 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 John Cummins Allan Kerpan	Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis	John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor
---	---	--	--

### CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chairman:** Clifford Lincoln

**Vice-Chairs:** Gaston Leroux  
Beth Phinney

Jim Abbott Guy H. Arseneault	Mauril Bélanger Pierre de Savoye	Hugh Hanrahan Raymond Lavigne	Pat O'Brien Janko Perić	(11)
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

#### Associate Members

John Bryden Simon de Jong Stan Dromisky	Antoine Dubé John English	Christiane Gagnon Rey D. Pagtakhan	Louis Plamondon Monte Solberg
---	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:** Eleni Bakopanos

**Vice-Chairmen:** Stan Dromisky  
Osvaldo Nunez

Colleen Beaumier Judy Bethel	Maud Debien Hugh Hanrahan	Dan McTeague Val Meredith	Maria Minna Tom Wappel	(11)
---------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	------

#### Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger Jag Bhaduria Simon de Jong	Harbance Singh Dhaliwal Paul Forseth Beryl Gaffney	Christiane Gagnon Sharon Hayes Gar Knutson	John Loney Rey D. Pagtakhan Anna Terrana
--	--	--	--

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman:** Charles Caccia

**Vice-Chairs:**

Monique Guay  
Jean Payne

Peter Adams  
Jack Iyerak Anawak

Gérard Asselin  
Paul Forseth

Daphne Jennings  
Gar Knutson

Karen Kraft Sloan  
Paul Steckle

(11)

### Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman  
Rex Crawford  
John Cummins  
John Finlay

Maurice Godin  
Clifford Lincoln  
Bob Mills

Pat O'Brien  
John O'Reilly  
Julian Reed

Geoff Regan  
Darrel Stinson  
Len Taylor

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

**Chair:** Karen Kraft Sloan

John Finlay  
Paul Forseth

Monique Guay

Jean Payne

Len Taylor

(6)

## FINANCE

**Chairman:** Jim Peterson

**Vice-Chairs:**

Yvan Loubier  
Susan Whelan

Richard Bélisle  
Leon E. Benoit  
Dianne Brushett

Barry Campbell  
Brenda Chamberlain  
Ronald J. Duhamel

Ron Fewchuk  
Herb Grubel  
Gary Pillitteri

Yves Rocheleau  
Monte Solberg  
Brent St. Denis

(15)

### Associate Members

Reg Alcock  
Judy Bethel  
Jag Bhaduria  
Paul Crête  
Roy Cullen  
Nick Discepolo  
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk  
Bill Graham  
Stephen Harper  
Jake E. Hoepfner  
Dale Johnston  
Karen Kraft Sloan

René Laurin  
Peter Milliken  
Bob Mills  
Andy Mitchell  
Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Nelson Riis

Benoît Sauvageau  
Werner Schmidt  
Jim Silye  
John Solomon  
Paddy Torsney  
John Williams

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**Chairman:** Brent St. Denis

Richard Bélisle

Dianne Brushett

Herb Grubel

Paddy Torsney

(5)

## 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

René Canuel Harold Culbert	John Cummins Stan Dromisky	Ted McWhinney Lawrence D. O'Brien	Mike Scott Harry Verran	(11)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Vic Althouse	Ron Fewchuk Yves Rocheleau	Roger Simmons Paul Steckle	Elsie Wayne
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Chairman:** Bill Graham

**Vice-Chairmen:** Stéphane Bergeron  
John English

Sarkis Assadourian Michel Dupuy Jesse Flis	Beryl Gaffney Francis G. LeBlanc John Loney	Bob Mills Lee Morrison Philippe Paré	Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller	(15)
--	---	--	---	------

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Eleni Bakopanos Colleen Beaumier Réginald Bélair Leon E. Benoit Jag Bhaduria	Bill Blaikie Pierre Brien Maud Debien Jack Frazer Christiane Gagnon John Godfrey	Herb Grubel Jean H. Leroux Ron MacDonald Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin Ted McWhinney	Val Meredith Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić Svend J. Robinson Andrew Telegdi 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

Maud Debien	Beryl Gaffney	John Godfrey	Keith Martin	(5)
-------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	-----

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

**Chairman:** Michel Dupuy

Sarkis Assadourian	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
--------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

**Chairman:** Tony Valeri

**Vice-Chairmen:** Eugène Bellemare  
Gilbert Fillion

Colleen Beaumier John Bryden	Paul Crête Bill Gilmour	Stephen Harper John Harvard	Ovid L. Jackson Ian Murray	(11)
---------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	------

### Associate Members

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

## HEALTH

**Chairman:** Roger Simmons

**Vice-Chairs:** Harbance Singh Dhaliwal  
Pauline Picard

Antoine Dubé Bonnie Hickey	Grant Hill Keith Martin	John Murphy Andy Scott	Paul Szabo Joseph Volpe	(11)
-------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Colleen Beaumier Margaret Bridgman Jan Brown Pierre de Savoye	Maurice Dumas Réjean Lefebvre Audrey McLaughlin Réal Ménard	Pat O'Brien John O'Reilly Carolyn Parrish Bob Ringma	Svend J. Robinson Roseanne Skoke Rose-Marie Ur
--	--	---	--

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON BILL C-47, AN ACT RESPECTING HUMAN REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO HUMAN REPRODUCTION

**Chair:** Bonnie Hickey

Colleen Beaumier Grant Hill	Carolyn Parrish	Pauline Picard	Joseph Volpe	(6)
--------------------------------	-----------------	----------------	--------------	-----

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

**Chairman:** John O'Reilly

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

## HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua

**Vice-Chairs:** Jean Augustine  
Francine Lalonde

Gerry Byrne Christiane Gagnon Patrick Gagnon	Dale Johnston Gurbax Singh Malhi Ian McClelland	Larry McCormick Robert D. Nault George Proud	Jim Silye Anna Terrana Stéphan Tremblay	(15)
--	---	--	---	------

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Warren Allmand Chris Axworthy Leon E. Benoit	Jan Brown John Cannis Marlene Cowling Paul Crête	Paul DeVillers Antoine Dubé Jim Gouk Herb Grubel	Keith Martin Réal Ménard Svend J. Robinson Andy Scott
--	---	---	--



### SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

**Chairman: Derek Lee**

Nick Discepolo                      Art Hanger                      François Langlois                      George S. Rideout                      (6)  
Roger Gallaway

---

### SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFT REGULATIONS ON FIREARMS

**Chairman: Russell MacLellan**

Pierre de Savoye                      John Maloney                      Jack Ramsay                      Susan Whelan                      (6)  
Gordon Kirkby

---

### LIAISON

**Chairman: Bill Graham**

**Vice-Chair:**

**Mary Clancy**

Reg Alcock	Shaughnessy Cohen	Clifford Lincoln	Tony Valeri	(21)
Eleni Bakopanos	Sheila Finestone	Joe McGuire	Lyle Vanclief	
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Albina Guarnieri	Andy Mitchell	David Walker	
Raymond Bonin	Michel Guimond	Jim Peterson	Paul Zed	
Charles Caccia	Ghislain Lebel	Roger Simmons		

### Associate Member

Jack Frazer

---

### SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

**Chairman: Bill Graham**

**Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**

Jack Frazer                      Michel Guimond                      Andy Mitchell                      (5)

---

### NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Chair: Mary Clancy**

**Vice-Chairmen:**

**Robert Bertrand  
Pierre Brien**

John Cannis	Jack Frazer	Jean H. Leroux	John Richardson	(11)
Bernie Collins	Jim Hart	John O'Reilly	Bob Wood	

### Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron	Jesse Flis	Réal Ménard	Svend J. Robinson
Bill Blaikie	Gar Knutson	Val Meredith	Elsie Wayne
Pierre de Savoye	John Maloney	Bob Ringma	

---

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Chairman: Andy Mitchell**

**Vice-Chairmen:**

**René Canuel  
Peter Thalheimer**

Réginald Bélair	Bernard Deshaies	Julian Reed	Roseanne Skoke	(15)
David Chatters	Monique Guay	Bob Ringma	Darrel Stinson	
Marlene Cowling	David Iftody	Benoît Serré	Bob Wood	

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Leon E. Benoit	Roger Gallaway	Brent St. Denis
Gérard Asselin	John Finlay	John Solomon	Derek Wells

---

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Chairman:** Paul Zed

**Vice-Chairs:**

Marlene Catterall  
François Langlois

Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral  
Jack Frazer  
Mac Harb

Bonnie Hickey  
Bob Kilger  
René Laurin

John Loney  
Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Carolyn Parrish

Ray Speaker  
Chuck Strahl

(14)

### Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger  
Robert Bertrand  
Dianne Brushett  
John Cummins  
Ken Epp

Ron Fewchuk  
Deborah Grey  
Michel Guimond  
Hugh Hanrahan  
Stephen Harper

Dick Harris  
Jim Hart  
Jim Jordan  
John Solomon  
Darrel Stinson

Suzanne Tremblay  
Elsie Wayne  
Ted White  
John Williams

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

**Chair:** Marlene Catterall

René Laurin  
John Loney

Rey D. Pagtakhan

John Solomon

John Williams

(6)

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Chair:** Carolyn Parrish

Jack Frazer

François Langlois

John Loney

(4)

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Chairman:** Michel Guimond

**Vice-Chairmen:**

Leonard Hopkins  
Denis Paradis

Sue Barnes  
Rex Crawford  
Pierre de Savoye

Ivan Grose  
Charles Hubbard

Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye  
John Williams

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Jag Bhaduria  
John Bryden

Gilbert Fillion  
Mac Harb  
Ed Harper

René Laurin  
Ian McClelland  
Alex Shepherd

John Solomon  
Benoît Tremblay

## TRANSPORT

**Chairman:** Reg Alcock

**Vice-Chairmen:**

André Caron  
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne  
Roy Cullen

Joe Fontana  
Jim Gouk

Dick Harris  
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes  
Paul Mercier

(11)

### Associate Members

Vic Althouse  
Leon E. Benoit  
Paul Crête  
Antoine Dubé

Ivan Grose  
Jake E. Hoepfner  
Ovid L. Jackson  
John Maloney

Philippe Paré  
Bernard Patry  
Yves Rocheleau

Anna Terrana  
Stéphan Tremblay  
Elsie Wayne

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairman:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Roch Bolduc  
Philippe D. Gigantès  
Maurice Riel

**Vice-Chairman:**

Representing the House of Commons:

Peter Adams  
John Bryden  
Jim Karygiannis  
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier  
Pat O'Brien  
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

#### Associate Member

Ted White

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Joint Chairs:**

**Sen. Maurice Riel**  
**Albina Guarnieri**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Gerald A. Beaudoin  
Shirley Maheu

Jean-Claude Rivest  
Louis J. Robichaud

**Vice-Chairmen:**

**Jean-Paul Marchand**  
**Benoît Serré**

Representing the House of Commons

Warren Allmand  
Cliff Breitzkreuz

Michel Dupuy  
Georgette Sheridan

(12)

#### Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Jim Silye

### SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairmen:**

**Sen. P. Derek Lewis**  
**Ghislain Label**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

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

Shirley Maheu  
Pietro Rizzuto  
Nicholas W. Taylor

**Vice-Chairman:**

**Derek Lee**

Representing the House of Commons:

Gilbert Fillion  
Mac Harb  
Janko Perić

Geoff Regan  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(16)

## SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

### A CODE OF CONDUCT

**Joint Chairmen:**

**Sen. Donald H. Oliver**  
**Peter Milliken**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

W. David Angus  
Peter Bosa  
Consiglio Di Nino  
Mira Špivak  
Peter Stollery

**Vice-Chairs:**

**Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier**  
**Suzanne Tremblay**

Representing the House of Commons:

Mark Assad  
Ken Epp  
Bonnie Hickey  
François Langlois  
René Laurin  
John Loney

Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Bob Ringma  
Ray Speaker  
Harry Verran  
Derek Wells  
Paul Zed

(21)

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT**

**Joint Chairmen:**    **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**  
                              **Peter Milliken**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Consiglio Di Nino

Ken Epp  
Mac Harb

Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Suzanne Tremblay

(7)

---

**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. PETER MILLIKEN

**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 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 National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
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 of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	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

Friday, December 13, 1996

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Food Inspection Agency Act

Bill C-60. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	7503
Mr. de Savoye .....	7503
Mr. Hermanson .....	7504
Mr. Bachand .....	7505
Mrs. Lalonde .....	7506
Mr. Crête .....	7507
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	7508
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	7510

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Northern Lights Festival

Mr. Jackson .....	7510
-------------------	------

### Environmental Assessment

Mr. Forseth .....	7510
-------------------	------

### Appointment of Lise Thibault

Mrs. Debien .....	7511
-------------------	------

### Passenger Rail Service

Mr. Althouse .....	7511
--------------------	------

### The Environment

Mrs. Payne .....	7511
------------------	------

### COM DEV International

Mr. Perić .....	7511
-----------------	------

### Thistletown Community Breakfast Club

Mr. Cullen .....	7511
------------------	------

### Credit Cards

Mr. de Savoye .....	7512
---------------------	------

### Propane

Mr. Chatters .....	7512
--------------------	------

### Microcredit Summit

Mr. Harb .....	7512
----------------	------

### Postal Services

Mrs. Terrana .....	7513
--------------------	------

### Principal Pipe Organ Company

Mr. Finlay .....	7513
------------------	------

### Radio Canada International

Mr. Paré .....	7513
----------------	------

### Prime Minister

Mr. Strahl .....	7513
------------------	------

### Mothers Against Drunk Driving

Mr. Richardson .....	7514
----------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Duceppe .....	7514
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7514
Mr. Duceppe .....	7514
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7514
Mr. Duceppe .....	7514

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7515
Mr. Loubier .....	7515
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7515
Mr. Loubier .....	7515
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7515

### Taxation

Miss Grey .....	7515
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7515
Miss Grey .....	7516
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7516
Miss Grey .....	7516
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7516

### Canadian Space Agency

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7516
Mr. Manley .....	7516
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7517
Mr. Manley .....	7517

### Taxation

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	7517
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7517
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	7518
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	7518

### Employment Insurance

Mrs. Lalonde .....	7518
Mr. Nault .....	7518
Mrs. Lalonde .....	7518
Mr. Nault .....	7518

### Distinct Society

Mr. Strahl .....	7519
Ms. Copps .....	7519
Mr. Strahl .....	7519
Ms. Copps .....	7519

### Kenworth Corporation

Mr. Mercier .....	7519
Mr. Manley .....	7519
Mr. Mercier .....	7519
Mr. Nault .....	7519

### Fisheries

Mr. Culbert .....	7520
Mr. Mifflin .....	7520

### Customs

Mr. Hoepfner .....	7520
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	7520
Mr. Hoepfner .....	7520
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	7520

### Atlanta Olympic Games

Mr. Deshaies .....	7520
Ms. Copps .....	7520
Mr. Deshaies .....	7521
Ms. Copps .....	7521

### Canadian Wheat Board Act

Mr. Hermanson .....	7521
Mr. Goodale .....	7521
Mr. Hermanson .....	7521

Mr. Goodale .....	7521
<b>Canadian Fur Industry</b>	
Mr. Speller .....	7521
Mr. MacDonald .....	7521
<b>Indian Affairs</b>	
Mr. Bachand .....	7522
Mr. Irwin .....	7522
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Forseth .....	7522
Mr. Marchi .....	7522

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government response to petitions</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	7522
<b>Indian Claims Commission</b>	
Mr. Irwin .....	7522
<b>Holidays Act</b>	
Bill C-365. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	7523
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7523
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Bill C-366. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	7523
Mr. Strahl .....	7523
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Abolition of Senate</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7523
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Perić .....	7523
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	7523
<b>Abolition of Senate</b>	
Mr. Crête .....	7523
<b>Gasoline Tax</b>	
Mr. Bellemare .....	7523
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Bellemare .....	7524
<b>Nuclear Weapons</b>	
Mr. Silye .....	7524
<b>Pornography</b>	
Mrs. Cowling .....	7524
<b>Immigration</b>	
Mr. Nunez .....	7524
<b>Education</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	7524
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	7524
<b>Citizens' Rights</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	7524
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	7524

<b>Lap Dancing</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	7524
<b>Nuclear Weapons</b>	
Mr. DeVillers .....	7524
<b>Abolition of Senate</b>	
Mr. Dubé .....	7524
<b>Highways</b>	
Mr. Dubé .....	7525
<b>Death Penalty</b>	
Mr. Gilmour .....	7525
<b>Taxation</b>	
Ms. Whelan .....	7525
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Mr. Cummins .....	7525
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Cummins .....	7525
<b>Highways</b>	
Mr. Paré .....	7525
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Mr. Finlay .....	7525
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	7525
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7526

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canadian Food Inspection Agency Act</b>	
Bill C-60. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	7526
Mr. Milliken .....	7526
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	7526
Mr. Hermanson .....	7527
Mr. Pickard .....	7528
Mr. Crête .....	7528
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	7530
Mr. Dubé .....	7531
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	7532
Mr. Hermanson .....	7533

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Program Cost Declaration Act</b>	
Bill C-214. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	7535
Mr. Silye .....	7535
Mr. Proud .....	7537
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	7538
Mr. Cullen .....	7540
Mr. Gallaway .....	7541
Mr. Assad .....	7543
Mrs. Terrana .....	7543
Mr. Harb .....	7543
<b>Appendix</b>	

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**8801320  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

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

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

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

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