



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 140 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, March 7, 1997

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, March 7, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ) moved:

That this House condemn the federal government's lack of political will in refusing to take positive action in its areas of jurisdiction to promote economic equality between women and men and cutting transfer payments to the provinces by \$4.5 billion, including \$1.3 billion to Quebec between 1996 and 1998; and

That, moreover, this House remind the government of the formal commitment it made on March 8, 1994, to take specific measures to improve the socio-economic status of women.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Laval East, each of us using 10 minutes. It is indeed a great pleasure for me to speak today on this motion. I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about my vision of International Women's Day.

Many hold the—in my opinion unfounded—belief that celebrating March 8 is unnecessary. Why a special day for women? I must say right off that this day is intended as a day of reflection. It is an opportunity for women of all backgrounds, walks of life and faiths to take stock and see not only how far we have come, but also how long a way we still have to go. This is both a day of celebration and a day for taking charge aimed at examining and improving the social, economic and professional status of women worldwide.

Think that, not so long ago, women did not have the right to vote in Canada. But today, a number of us hold elected office at various levels of government. This is a step in the right direction, but there is still a long way to go.

International Women's Day has its origins in women's demands for decent working conditions. The new realities of the labour market, which are becoming the lot of a growing number of women, are best described by the words insecurity, instability, short term contracts and underpaid work.

The social safety net that had ensured, so far, that women in both Quebec and Canada could keep their heads above water is under direct attack by the federal government, which, under the guise of restructuring, is in fact using social program funding to reduce its deficit. Thus, the government is the primary cause of increased poverty among women and children in Canada because, instead of closing tax loopholes, as requested time and time again in this House by the Bloc Québécois over the past three years, the government chose to drastically reduce transfer payments to the provinces, restrict UI eligibility and cut benefits, not to mention downsizing, as it just did at Canada Post, by laying off an unprecedented number of employees, the majority of whom were women.

I would like to quote a few statistics on women, poverty and employment. It is very important to acknowledge these statistics today, as this may be an annual review we are doing here. In 1994, 70 per cent of all Canadians living in poverty were women or children; out of 4.8 million poor people, there were 2 million women and 1.3 million children. That is a lot of people. There are now 1.5 million children living in poverty, 200,000 more than when the Liberals took office. That is a clear setback.

• (1010)

Of all the industrialized countries, Canada is the one where the proportion of women in low paying jobs is the highest, at 34.3 per cent, with the exception of Japan, which has a rate of 37.2 per cent.

Let us look at more figures. Only 20 per cent of women have a full time job, throughout the year, for which they earn more than \$30,000 per year, compared to 40 per cent of men.

The vast majority of part time jobs are held by women. In 1994, 69 per cent of all part time workers in Canada were women, a figure that has not varied much over the last two decades.

Again in 1994, 1.6 million women, or 26 per cent of those who had a job, were part time workers, compared to only 9 per cent of

Supply

men holding a job. Moreover, an increasing number of women are working part time because they cannot find a full time job.

In 1994, over 500,000 women, that is 34 per cent of all women working part time, said they would like to have a full time job. The unemployment rate among certain groups of women is higher than the national average. For young women under 24 years of age, that rate stands at 15.6 per cent.

Here are more figures. The majority of working women hold jobs that have traditionally been women's occupations. In 1994, 60 per cent of all working women were teachers, nurses, or had a similar job in the health sector, were office workers, or were in sales and services. By comparison, 31 per cent of the working men had jobs in these areas.

Statistics show that 57.3 per cent of single mothers with children under 18 are poor. Regardless of women's level of education, their earnings are lower than those of men. Even female university graduates working full time throughout the year only earned 75 per cent of what their male counterparts made in 1993.

These statistics show that women are not moving forward, they are losing ground. Women are getting poorer year after year. Moreover, the number of jobs for women is decreasing. We also have to realize that, given the number of divorces and separations, there are more and more single mothers. These women find themselves in charge of a family, but without a job. Sure, they get support payments, but these are never enough to provide children with all they need for education, health, etc.

We are therefore in the process of taking a net step backwards. It is unacceptable when we realize that today in 1997 after all the progress women have made, all the work done by women's groups, all the work done by unions, by all the groups working to advance the cause of women and develop job markets for women that, today in 1997, we are losing ground.

At this point, I would like to remind you of the promises the Liberals made in the red book, and I will tell you what they were.

The Liberals gave us universal health care, unemployment insurance, old age benefits, the guaranteed income supplement, the Canada Pension Plan, the Canada Assistance Plan, the Canadian Human Rights Commission and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The failure of the economic and social policies of the Conservatives is obvious: there are 1.6 million unemployed; 4.2 million Canadians, including 1.2 million children, live in poverty; 62 per cent of single mothers live under the poverty line, and their incomes are slipping.

Since 1984, the Conservatives have systematically chipped away at the social safety net built up over the years.

• (1015)

They have cut health care, and assistance to children, seniors and the unemployed by billions of dollars. They have encouraged the development of a two tier society that separates the rich and the poor, those with education and those without, with middle classes gradually disappearing. Most Canadians do not want this kind of country.

It is well known that not nearly enough money is being spent on research into breast cancer, which affects one woman out of nine. Many single mothers would like to find work but, for lack of quality day care, must settle for welfare. They must rely on meagre welfare payments, food banks and inadequate housing. They cannot receive training or find jobs that would make them financially independent. If we look at the cuts made by the federal government in social housing alone, it is truly shocking.

In conclusion, for I see I have used up all my time, I would like to mark this day. I would like to pay tribute to all the parliamentary women who are working today and who, I hope, will see, today, tomorrow and Sunday, in their various regions and fields of activity what remains to be done to advance the cause of women.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for kicking off debate on this issue. I think it is a very important issue and there are some dimensions that I hope the member and other colleagues will raise in the debate because it is not just men and women and how they live in our country separately. The issue for me is how the family survives, men and women together raising children. Society as we know it would cease to exist without the family and without those children.

A report from the Vanier Institute on the Family stated that there is one divorce for every two marriages in Canada, according to the latest statistics; a 50 per cent divorce rate in Canada.

In addition, the member would know that 23 per cent of all families in Canada are lone parent families. I want to make sure the member hears this; lone parent families, not single mother families. That 23 per cent of lone parent families account for 46 per cent to 53 per cent, depending on the research, of children living in poverty.

In my view, a significant portion of the member's argument has ignored the fact that the crisis of the family in Canada, particularly the breakdown of the traditional nuclear family, has been a major contributor to the poverty of women in Canada. Half the marriages break down and the vast majority of arrangements give custody of children to the women and in any family breakdown if both

Supply

parents' income stays the same that is going to result in poverty for no other reason other than there is a second residence and second living costs.

Does the member not believe that the crisis of the family in Canada, the breakdown of the family, is a major consideration in terms of dealing with the issue of economic independence of women?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Guay: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the Liberal member properly, he was telling me that women are to blame for divorce. Divorce is very common these days, and women and children are the ones who pay the price when there is a divorce.

Who looks after the children? The women who become single parents. They often do not even have any support payments because the husbands disappear into the woodwork and they cannot manage to get any help from them in raising their children. I am not saying that everyone is in the same boat here, but there are many women who are forced to clothe and feed their children, finance their educations, help them get as far ahead in the world as possible. We see this every day in our ridings. And if there are divorces, this is a choice. A divorce is a choice made by a couple to live apart. People cannot be forced to live together.

• (1020)

I have already spoken to my hon. colleague on this, because I was so angry at this idea of wanting to force people to stay together for the sake of the children. Children would not be any happier living with parents who detest each other, who would happily tear each other's eyes out, than living in a divorced family. It is far healthier for them to grow up with parents who, although divorced, are rebuilding their lives and see eye to eye about their education, their diet, their health and so on. Women's situation is, therefore, precarious. We need to open our eyes.

I referred to social housing. The federal government has completely cut funding to social housing. Today, social housing is being cut back more and more, and the problem is being dumped onto the provinces. Today, we find women living in run-down and poorly heated housing. Is this any good for their health and the health of their children? Really, Mr. Speaker.

Something has to be done somewhere, then. This government is responsible for some of the actions that have been taken in the past three and a half years, and today is the ideal time, perhaps, to wake up to reality and to make the necessary changes.

Mrs. Maud Debieu (Laval East, BQ): Madam Speaker, International Women's Day is celebrated annually in many ways. For women, it is a time to consider what they have achieved, which has been significant over the years, especially thanks to the battles they have fought.

It is also a time to consider what remains to be done, and in this respect, the figures show that although women in our country now have equal rights, they still have a long way to go in terms of equal opportunities.

Earlier, the hon. member for Laurentides mentioned a few statistics that were self-explanatory, and I think they bear repeating again and again. I am referring to the fact the battle is not won, that women are still poorer than men and more vulnerable when the economy falters, and that governments are letting this situation continue.

These issues were again in the news this week when the Canada Labour Congress released a study that concluded that women's equality is a myth. According to the study released on Wednesday, only 20 per cent of Canadian and Quebec women have a full-time, steady job which pays about \$30,000 annually, compared with 40 per cent of the men. Of all industrialized countries in the OECD, Canada, after Japan, has the highest percentage of women in low paying jobs. Women have less than 20 per cent of the highest paying jobs and more than 70 per cent of the lowest paying jobs.

The unemployment rate is incredibly high among many groups of women. Among young women under 24, it is 15.6 per cent. Among women who are members of a visible minority, 13.4 per cent. Among native women, 17.7 per cent. And among women with a disability, 16.6 per cent.

In less than 20 years, the number of part-time female workers has increased 200 per cent. During this period, women represented 70 per cent of the part-time labour force. More than one third of the women employed in part-time jobs would prefer to work full-time but can only find part-time employment. That is one of the reasons why they are severely penalized by employment insurance reform. So, one job out of ten is now temporary.

The myth of women's equality is everywhere. Although women's demands for wage equity have a long history, there is still more talk than action in this respect. There is still a 26 per cent gap between the wages of a man and those of a woman, both working full-time.

• (1025)

On her latest income tax return, Mrs. X will report an average income of \$29,700 and Mr. X a salary of \$40,600. Even with a college or university degree, women earning a good salary are on average paid 10 per cent less than their male counterparts.

Women make up half the population, have the same democratic rights as men, and their contribution to political, social and economic life in Canada and Quebec is a recognized fact. However, although many women are actively involved in our society and are highly qualified, they are still under-represented in executive positions. This low representation of women in positions of authority may not only prevent a real understanding of the

Supply

problems that specifically affect women in Quebec and Canada but it also deprives the institutions that wield this authority of a range of views and experience that would be a real asset to the way they conduct their business.

Women may have succeeded in opening the doors to the corridors of power, but to achieve any kind of recognition, they must struggle to adjust to a political and organizational culture that evolved at a time when women were excluded. Furthermore, they must often be far more resourceful than their male colleagues to reconcile the various aspects of their lives.

Economic equity is the key, in a society that calls itself egalitarian. Today's employment market for women is characterized by insecurity, instability, short term contracts and underpaid jobs.

The social safety net that in the past helped Canadian and Quebec women manage, as my colleague for Laurentides mentioned, is now being sabotaged by the federal government on the excuse of eliminating the deficit. And the effect is greater poverty among women and children. We must not forget that one child in five in Canada lives in poverty.

By choosing to reduce transfer payments to the provinces, by limiting access to unemployment insurance and lowering its benefits, the federal government is the one responsible for the unraveling of the social safety net.

It was, however, the Liberal government that established the Canada assistance plan and made the commitment with the provinces at the time to cover the costs of health care, social assistance and higher education. It was the same Liberal government that broke all its election promises to not touch social programs—and this is verbatim from the red book—and decided to use the money set aside for social programs to reduce the deficit.

Thus, between 1996 and 1998, the federal government will take \$4.5 billion away from the provinces, including \$1.3 billion from Quebec. During this time, the insecurity of the job market and the cuts to unemployment insurance will increase the welfare load of the provinces. In 1995, Quebec had a record number of households on the welfare rolls.

When now, more than ever, women need income assistance between two jobs, the federal government is tightening its unemployment insurance eligibility criteria, thus making it less accessible to part time women workers.

In the past, 300 hours worked entitled an individual to benefits. Now the figure is 910. The Council on the Status of Women pointed out that it is reasonable to assume that the first hour worked will not, in many cases, improve access to the plan.

• (1030)

Women will be paying into a plan they may never benefit from. Moreover, while the government is tightening criteria and shortening the benefit period, it is building up surpluses in the unemployment insurance fund that might reach a record \$12 billion by 1998. We are told that these surpluses will be used to artificially lower the deficit instead of creating jobs.

I would also like to say a couple of words about the Employment Equity Act passed in 1977 by this Parliament. The Liberal and Conservative governments in power since it was enacted have done everything in their power to stall its implementation. Despite the fact that the Employment Equity Act has been in force since 1977, some 80,000 civil servants, mostly women, have been waiting for Treasury Board to act on this problem.

We could also mention the broken promise to create 150,000 day care places, the dismantling of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the cuts to funding for women's groups. Instead of helping the women and children in this country, the heritage minister is trying to make us believe that the Canadian flag can turn into pizzas in Canadian elementary schools. Whether we are Canadians or Quebecers, I do not believe that a flag is a good substitute for milk, fruit and vegetables.

To conclude, I would like to salute all the women in the riding of Laval East and the women's groups who are striving, with what little resources they have, to improve living conditions for women in Laval.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend the member for Laval East for her speech which was, as always, well documented, clear and soberly delivered.

Even if tomorrow is International Women's Day, it is appropriate for some men to rise in this House to voice their support for the women's movement, for improved living conditions for women and for some aspects of this movement, this progression toward greater economic autonomy, equality and equity.

For two years now, the efforts made in Quebec, under the stewardship of the Fédération des femmes du Québec, which coordinated the two Bread and Roses marches, have increased Quebecers' awareness of the plight of many women among them.

Unfortunately, the tight economic situation and, as the member for Laval East reminded us, the non-application of legislation on employment equity in the public service, added to all the cuts that were made, created a situation where some women will have to wait longer than they normally should before they can enjoy equity.

Among the measures which could improve the status of women, one is a greater presence in politics. I do not want to annoy my colleague from Laval East, but I would like her to tell us if she

agrees that more women in politics would be a solution, if stressing the importance of women's involvement in politics would improve things.

Mrs. Debien: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question. Would it make a difference if there were more women in politics, in power and in decision making circles? I think it would. As I said earlier, women make up 50 per cent of the population. Men and women complement each other. There is what is often called in Latin the *animus* and the *anima*. This is an old theory which, I think, was developed by Teilhard de Chardin during the course of his work.

• (1035)

So the *animus* and the *anima* complement each other. I do not want to turn this issue into a battle of the sexes, but I do think that the presence of women in politics must be considered from that perspective. Women bring with them 50 per cent of mankind's knowledge and experience. Their contribution is different from men's contribution, and this is why their presence in power and decision making circles is so important.

I would like to come back to an something my colleague from Mississauga-South talked about a while ago because I feel compelled to respond to his comments. He talked about family policy and he talked about the fight against poverty. That is the problem with this government as it was with its predecessor: they confuse a comprehensive and consistent family policy with a policy to fight poverty. These are two completely different things. I will use the child tax benefit proposed by the government as an example.

We know that the child tax benefit is part of a family policy. Right? Well, that is one thing. The government is using poverty as an excuse—

Must I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker? It is very unfortunate. I would have liked to talk at length about the distinction that must be made between family policy, which should be under provincial jurisdiction—and Quebec has already developed such a policy—and a policy to fight poverty.

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the motion on women's economic autonomy that is currently before the House. I am pleased that my hon. colleague attaches such a high importance to the enhancement of women's economic autonomy, because there is still a great deal that we still must do. She is extremely right.

Let us remember where women have come from. Women only got the vote federally in 1918. In Quebec, women only got the vote in 1940. Aboriginal women have had the vote only since 1969.

Supply

Women were only considered persons in 1929. We have a long way to go.

Some of the things that need to be done to ensure women taking their full place in society, economically, socially, politically and culturally are going to mean embarking on some very long term measures that will take time. Women have only just, in the later and middle part of this century, actually come into their own.

Women's economic security and independence affect every single aspect of women's lives. Why? Because women are made up of all the things that contribute to their lives. If we talk about women's economic autonomy, we have to talk about the impact that women's poverty and women's dependence have on violence against women.

We have to talk about the fact that 80 per cent of single parent families are headed by women. We need to talk about the diversity of women. We need to talk about the fact that many women face triple barriers, not just the barrier of their gender. Therefore, we cannot present a simplistic solution to women's economic autonomy. They must, necessarily, be comprehensive as they must cross every single segment of women's lives.

[Translation]

As Secretary of State for the Status of Women, I am very proud of what our government has done to promote women's economic independence and equality between the sexes in general in Canada. Although there is still a lot to do, we are determined to advance the cause of the equality of women.

[English]

Therefore, the government has taken an approach to women's equality that is multi-faceted and comprehensive. Its accomplishments are many and varied. In a little over three years it has moved forward on a wide range of issues of importance to women.

• (1040)

While the federal government moves to strengthen employment equity, certain provinces are moving to cancel employment equity measures. It has moved to deficit reduction because a stable Canadian economy gives the ability to assist and to move forward with good social strategies to assist women.

Firearms control, child support reform, Canada child tax benefit and job creation and growth are all things that must and will impact on women's economic autonomy. The government has moved on education and training, prenatal nutrition and women's health issues, because health is an economic resource. It has moved on youth employment because the young girl child will become the woman of tomorrow. Reproductive technologies, outlawing female genital mutilation, action on child poverty and more are all measures which the government has moved on.

Supply

All of these may seem unrelated but they have an impact on women's economic autonomy. The foundation of women's equality must be built on a composite of positive actions which touch on all aspects of their lives. One issue interacts with another. The actions of one government department impacts on another. Policies must be shaped, which is what the government is doing with a careful eye to their full implications for all Canadians, no matter whether they are women or men, young or old, rich or poor, recent immigrants or long time Canadians.

As Secretary of State for the Status of Women, I have focused my work therefore on three key priority areas: economic independence and autonomy for women, eliminating violence against women, and women's rights as human rights, with particular emphasis on the role of the disadvantaged.

We have moved first and foremost to secure the future of Canada's social programs, many of which are vital to the economic well-being of women. We know that women's incomes do not only depend on paid work, they depend on transfers from governments and transfers from individuals such as alimony and child support. They depend on the amount of unpaid work that women do. And they also depend on whether women have children or not.

There are fewer and fewer jobs for women which speaks to a discrimination that is rampant against women. That is why we have moved forward to deal with these issues with a short term and a very long term holistic strategy. The 73 cents that many women in full time jobs earn to the \$1 that every man earns has to do with the fact that many women have children and that impacts on their ability to secure full time work.

What has the government done? In this budget it has strengthened literacy programs because women need to be assisted to become literate. In this budget access to training and work has been improved. Slowly an infrastructure has been built over the past three years.

Look at the EI system. Everyone has heard talk about the EI system. What has not been said is that over 270,000 women will have work insured for the very first time in their lives. The reinvestment of \$800 million in employment benefits will help women to find jobs. Sixty-seven per cent of the people who receive family income are women. The average benefit for the single parent, given that 80 per cent of them are women, will be increased by 13 per cent.

Seven hundred thousand women, including 495,000 who pay premiums today are going to have their premiums refunded under the EI benefit. We do not hear about these things. We also do not hear about the fact that under the new EI benefit women will now have choices, especially when we consider that women with children have problems in the workforce. With the new EI benefit, women will be allowed to make a choice to stay at home and look after their children for up to five years and still have access under the employment insurance to go back to training.

Labour market support. Look at the Employment Equity Act which has targeted women as a very high group in terms of looking at employment equity for women.

The Canada student loans program, which gives grants to part time students, such as single women, will fund increased day care and tax credits to women in high school now. These things are all new. They may seem to be small things but when they are stacked one on top of the other, they become a holistic, long term, bit by bit infrastructure which can be built on to help women achieve economic autonomy.

• (1045)

[*Translation*]

Among our accomplishments, we might mention consolidation of the Employment Equity Act and a series of measures aimed at improving access to post-secondary education.

[*English*]

We have now improved the ability of women to go into post graduate programs, specifically in science and mathematics, because these are where the new sustainable long term jobs will come from in the next century.

These are some of the things we talk about. They are not grandiose gestures because centuries upon centuries of women's inequality cannot be fixed with one single move. It must be built with a strong, solid infrastructure.

This is why we have looked at the issue of unpaid work. For the first time in the history of the country there have been questions about unpaid work in the census forms. They will define exactly how much unpaid work women do in terms of nurturing and care giving. They will look at how that is factored into national accounts so we can realize that unpaid work supports the economic structures of the country.

We need to look at the child support programs. Many women who head single parent families do not have the ability to support their children properly. These children live in poverty. That is why scheduled to come into effect on May 1, 1997 will be the new child support payments act to ensure that women do not have to fight tooth and nail for every penny they receive to support their children. These children will finally get the support they need to help them get an education and to have the quality of life they need to become strong and secure adults.

There is practically no dispute that the federal government has put its fiscal house in order. That meant spending restraints. We could not exempt transfers from the spending restraints because transfers make up 20 per cent of all federal funding.

Supply

We have been a lot tougher on ourselves than we have been on the provinces. Between 1993-94 and 1998-99 Quebec's transfer entitlements will decrease by 10.9 per cent. During that same period the federal government transfers will be reduced by 15 per cent. The government of Quebec knows very well that the reduction of budgetary deficits imposes difficult choices. The Quebec government also knows it must bear its share of the effort.

Premier Bouchard made very clear that restraints involve tough choices when he said in the National Assembly on March 25, 1996: "To those who say not in my backyard I reply that there must be something in everyone's backyard".

Then there was Bernard Landry who told the National Assembly on December 9, 1996 that it must nevertheless be admitted there is a sense of responsibility that binds us to do our share to help get Canada out of a debt we helped create.

In the current fiscal year federal transfers to provinces for health, post secondary education and other social programs will be \$26.9 billion. In addition, provinces like Quebec receive well over \$8.5 billion in equalization payments. Quebec is getting federal transfers of approximately \$11 billion a year or 31 per cent of all transfers. Where that province chooses to spend its money will depend on the goodwill of the province and its commitment to women. If it chooses to spend the money on women then it will. It is the provinces' choice as to what they cut and not ours.

For the provinces to be able to build some long term goals into their programs for the future of women and children, we have stabilized the transfers to a five-year program that in the last two years will see an increase. There will also be an \$11 billion cash flow so the federal government can continue to keep a set of national standards to ensure that women have the social programs and the health care they need.

We talk about women's economic well-being and the health of women. We have set up five centres of excellence for women's health across the country to deal specifically with helping to form good policies to assist women to be healthy so they can contribute to the economic growth of the country.

This is what we mean when we talk about economic autonomy. We do not limit it to whether or not a woman has a dollar in her pocket. Some of the things we have done in the last budget will assist about 1.4 million families to get more money in their pockets, and 2.5 million of them have children.

• (1050)

Women are the heads of households, the majority of whose children live in poverty. When we attach money to children who

live in poverty we assist the well-being of women and their families. They are interdependent.

It is important when we talk about women's equality, Women's International Day and Women's International Week, to remember those who say we do not need to have programs, that we do not need to look at women as disadvantaged group, or that many women like aboriginal women, lesbians, disabled women and women of colour continue to be triply and doubly disadvantaged. If we do not understand that then there are those of us in the House who are out of touch with the real lives of women, who do not understand that women are the poor, that women are among the most illiterate and that women are the ones who need access to good training programs.

As a Liberal government we realize it. We have specifically targeted women so that they have access to training and that because they have children they are able to find work within their homes, to be able to set up their own businesses. Since we have come into power women's enterprise centres have been targeting women, assisting them to get money to start their own businesses and assisting with work plans so their businesses can be successful. Over 46 per cent of new businesses are headed by women and they are the most successful businesses that have given women the choice to have economic independence.

When we speak about women's economic independence and about violence against women, we speak to women and their human rights. One of my colleague's across the way talked about women in politics. Women make up over 50 per cent of the population. If we do not understand that getting women into political structures where they can play a part in decision making is simple democracy then we do not understand democracy. If we do not have appropriate representation from over 50 per cent of our population in decision making we do not factor in the reality of how the country is structured or the reality of the gender differences that make up the country.

The Minister of Finance said that helping women to achieve their full potential was simply a matter of good common sense. If women make up over 50 per cent of the population they must have a key role to play in forming the important human resource development that is necessary. The Minister of Finance also said resources for the country in the 21st century would not lie in the ground on which we walk but would lie in the people who walk on it. Those people make up 50 per cent of our population. They are women. They are still disadvantaged. They are still not equal.

The government has dedicated itself to ensuring that a strong infrastructure for the long term development and enhancement of women's economic equality is starting. We started it. We will continue to build it. It will be strong. In the 21st century we can be assured that, with many of the initiatives we have taken, women will be well on their way to fulfilling their place in Canada.

*S. O. 31**[Translation]*

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the minister realizes that much remains to be done for women, politically, socially and economically.

But I would like to see, first of all, how much influence the minister has in cabinet. Her speech was very eloquent, very passionate, but is such a strong stand taken on the status of women, the issue of women and children, in cabinet meetings? What I would give to be a fly on the wall and see how much importance is given to these issues.

I have a question for the minister. She mentioned a number of initiatives she feels the federal government has taken to improve the economic situation of women and, therefore, of children.

• (1055)

Does she realize that, by totally eliminating transfer payments for social housing, making billions of dollars in cuts and cutting 10,000 jobs at Canada Post, the government is affecting a growing number of women, who end up on UI or welfare? Does she realize also that, by abolishing the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the government has impeded the advancement of women?

I would like her to elaborate a bit on this, because what we on this side of the House are noticing is that this government is tearing the social safety net to shreds. Promises are made that are not kept, except for cuts, cuts, and more cuts. They keep cutting transfer payments.

She mentioned earlier that it was up to the provinces to decide where the money went, but let me tell you that, with no money coming in, it is almost impossible to make up for the shortfalls created by the federal government.

I would like her comments on this.

[English]

Ms. Fry: Mr. Speaker, I will address the first question about my influence as Secretary of State for the Status of Women in cabinet.

The issue of women's equality is too important to be left to personal influence. That is why the government has embarked on gender based analysis, a clear government tool to ensure that every policy, initiative and piece of legislation being considered by every federal department, institution, agency and crown corporation is looked at through the eyes of how it affects men and women.

That is how much importance the government has placed on women's equality. It is too important to be left up to the influence of one person. We have written it into a tool kit so that gender analysis is being done by every department on everything they do.

The second question concerned transfer payments. It is a bit ironic that the Bloc Quebecois should be raising this issue and opposing measures to bring Canada's fiscal stability into order as the government has done.

[Translation]

I would like to remind the members of the Bloc Quebecois of what the PQ government did in Quebec. The PQ has reduced financial assistance to the poor while at the same time cutting the social programs intended for these people. They have also cut transfer payments to the municipalities.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): There will be questions and comments to the minister when we resume orders of the day later this day.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

QUEBEC GAMES

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the first time since the creation of the Quebec Games, in 1971, the provincial finals were organized by a RCM, that of the Chutes de la Chaudière, located in my riding.

Thanks to the joint efforts of eight municipalities, the 32nd Quebec Games are being held in the riding of Lévis this year. I take this opportunity to congratulate the 3,000 volunteers who made a success of these games, as well as the athletes from all over the province who are taking part in the competitions that will conclude this weekend.

However, I must also deplore the attempt made by the federal government to make political gains out of this event. Indeed, the government made its financial contribution conditional to the flooding of federal material promoting Canadian unity.

Again, congratulations to the organizers and athletes of the Quebec Games, but shame on the federal Liberals for associating the performances of young Quebec athletes with the promotion of the Canadian identity.

* * *

[English]

KAP'YONG HILL

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister was on his last trade mission to Asia he took the liberty of renaming a local landmark in my riding. Our local landmark was known as Radar Hill. It has now been arbitrarily renamed to Kap'Yong Hill and my constituents are furious.

The Prime Minister did not even have the courtesy to review the issue with the local residents in Tofino and Ucluelet before he went ahead with his announcement.

• (1100)

Radar Hill was named for its prominence during World War II and has significant historical meaning to British Columbians. The national park staff along with many other organizations has recommended to the Prime Minister that he allow Radar Hill to keep its name and instead establish a memorial site on Radar Hill dedicated to Kap'Yong. This is a fair compromise arrived at and supported by local communities.

On behalf of my constituents in Comox—Alberni, I ask that the Prime Minister agree to this compromise, reinstate the name of our historical landmark and establish a memorial site on the hill instead.

* * *

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are over 30,000 nuclear weapons on earth posing a threat to the health and survival of humans and the global environment. It is for this reason that our government strategy has been a progressive effort to establish international norms and to lay the foundation for peace and nuclear disarmament.

Canada co-sponsored the resolution to reaffirm the UN Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and we were among the first to ratify and implement the chemical weapons convention.

A peace organization in my riding, Ploughshares Ottawa, has recognized the importance of working with the international community for nuclear disarmament, and its members would like to see the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

I commend groups like Ploughshares Ottawa and the Peace and Environment Resource Centre for their work in this area. I know that our government will continue to work to make the world a safe place to live in.

* * *

KOREA

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today millions of people across Canada and around the world are celebrating the World Day of Prayer. This year the women of South Korea have prepared the service which is being observed in over 170 countries around the world.

I am particularly honoured to share this information because I feel a personal bond with the people of Korea. Since coming to this House I have participated in the Canada-Korea Interparliamentary Friendship Group and was elected president.

S. O. 31

I believe our links with Korea are very important. The hands of friendship that are extended across the ocean are peaceful. Peace has brought friendship, trust and respect. In this context trade is occurring, providing jobs and growth for both our countries.

Today Korean voices and the voices of people around the world are joining with my constituents and other Canadians in more than 3,500 communities from Newfoundland to Yukon. Prayers on the theme "like a seed which grows into a tree" will be offered.

Let us add our prayers with theirs. May crime and starvation be eradicated.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is International Women's Day, an occasion for the Liberal government to take note on the report on women's work released this week by the Canadian Labour Congress. It revealed the sobering statistic that Canada has the second worst record among industrialized countries for the percentage of women in low wage employment.

In exactly the same way we have seen with Canada's shameful record on child poverty, Canadians now have before them the evidence of the terrible social damage being inflicted on Canadian families by this Liberal government's economic policies.

The Liberal cuts have made the situation worse for women, as some 64 per cent of the public sector jobs lost have been women's jobs. Think of the thousands of well paid jobs lost by nurses and other health professionals in the latest round of health care cuts in Ontario, cuts jointly sponsored by Mike Harris and the Prime Minister.

The Liberals are fond of saying how they got the economic fundamentals rights. They dare not say this on International Women's Day.

* * *

YORK NORTH TOWN HALL

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night I hosted my 34th town hall meeting. The people of York North dealt with the politics of surplus, life after a balanced budget. They were happy to note that for the first time in a long time Canadians were in a position to debate priorities for the future.

They were pleased that we had regained our economic sovereignty that clearly outlined a vision for the future. They want a nation with a highly skilled, highly paid and highly trained workforce that produces value added products. They want accessible, affordable medicare. They want to be the lowest taxed jurisdiction of all the industrialized countries, reduce child poverty and build an efficient government. That means a clarification of

S. O. 31

federal and provincial responsibility and lowered trade barriers between the provinces.

They view the sectors of education, science, technology and the environment as engines of growth and they want a government that invests in these areas to generate economic growth and expansion.

Town hall meetings have been a tradition in our riding since 1988 and on behalf of the Government of Canada I would like to thank all the contributors.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STATUS OF WOMEN IN RWANDA

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have often mentioned in this House the terrible genocide that took place in Rwanda. Over half a million people, mostly men, have been killed, and over 250,000 women were not only raped, but often mutilated and tortured.

• (1105)

It is important to condemn this situation, because women currently account for 70 per cent of the Rwandan population. Even more tragic is the fact that 60 per cent of these women are widows, because of the genocide, and cannot inherit their dead husbands' assets.

Even though the international assistance to Rwanda in the last two years has totalled \$2.5 billion, of which \$75 million is from Canada, these women only received a meagre part of that amount.

In addition to condemning this terrible and unacceptable situation, I wonder how we could possibly ignore such a large group of the population, and I also wonder if the Canadian government intends to finally take action to help these forgotten women.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, among the many myths that the Reform Party has continued to rant and rave about is the supposed 73 per cent increase in the Canada pension plan.

I have been asked by constituents what the actual increase in CPP premiums is to the average taxpayer.

The truth is that the increase in CPP premiums, together with the reduction in EI premiums, will by the year 2006 result in an additional cost of little more than \$125 annually, or 35 cents per day.

Everyone wonders why Reform is making such a fuss over nothing if this is all it will cost to solve the problems with the CPP and put it back on strong financial footing.

All I can say is Reform members are not interested in the facts. All they are interested in is the politics of opportunism, the politics of envy and greed.

The Liberal government is committed to saving the CPP for future generations.

* * *

TOBACCO

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard a Liberal \$10 billion tax hike as being nothing.

At the launch of the tobacco bill, the Minister of Health made a mistake. Twice the minister spoke ill about the effects of a particular type of tobacco. Twice he got his facts wrong.

When the minister was threatened with a libel suit because of his comments, he took the quick and easy way out. Instead of the minister apologizing himself, he passed the buck and forced his deputy minister to issue an unqualified written apology.

The minister did not have the courage, the integrity or the parliamentary morality to stand up and take the responsibility for his own words.

The minister alone is accountable for his actions and the actions of his department. When staff members are right, he is happy to take the credit. When they are wrong, he hangs them out to dry—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): Order. I know the hon. member knows it is improper to use Standing Order 31 for an attack on another member. He is getting very close to the line. I urge him to be more temperate in his remarks. He has 10 seconds left.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the convention of ministerial responsibility says that the minister is accountable for what happens in his department and for what he says.

* * *

DISABLED PERSONS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been very fortunate to work closely with several Nepean residents who, as disabled persons, face real barriers in their everyday lives.

I have always been especially concerned with the challenges faced by people with disabilities and I had the privilege to work on their behalf when I chaired the Standing Committee on Human Rights and Persons with Disabilities.

I am very pleased to see that the budget has allocated \$230 million for Canadians with disabilities, including more eligible expenses for medical expense tax credits, duty free entry into Canada for goods designated for persons with disabilities, the elimination of a limit on attending care expenses for disabled workers and the opportunities fund which provides \$30 million a

year in partnership with service organizations to help disabled workers.

The two key thrusts of the task force on disabilities are increasing tax recognition on the cost of disability and reducing barriers to employment. I am pleased to see these as well in the budget.

Through these initiatives persons with disabilities who want to work can do so and, as such, can become financially—

* * *

[*Translation*]

MONTREAL ECONOMY

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while separatists continue to scare away investors and to weaken Montreal by fuelling divisions among Quebecers, our government is taking concrete measures to help Montreal.

This morning, the federal Minister of Industry and his colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, announced a \$32 million investment by the Canadian government.

This repayable contribution will help CAE Electronics Ltd, a world leader in flight simulators, develop its VISTEC project, a name that stands for visual technologies. The VISTEC project should lead to the manufacturing of ultramodern image generation and display devices.

● (1110)

This commercial investment by the Canadian government in the development of a promising technology will result in the creation of 200 jobs over five years at the Montreal plant. This is another concrete example of federal development assistance for Montreal.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day is an important occasion, and the Canadian government has made concrete, albeit modest, efforts with regard to women.

Since 1993, the Liberal government has appointed 18 senators, 10 of whom were women. Of the 173 judicial appointments made, 59 went to women, which means that 34 per cent of all appointed judges were women. It is a respectable start.

The Prime Minister of Canada did not hesitate, in the last election campaign, to support women by nominating eight women as official candidates for our party. Four of these women were eventually elected and are now serving their constituents in this House.

S. O. 31

These are all concrete and positive measures that really help—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): Order, please. The member for Argenteuil—Papineau has the floor.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 8, is International Women's Day. I would like to say a few words about this event.

Women make up more than half the population, but they do not hold half the power, particularly not half the political power. Some countries do not even allow women to vote. In Canada, the proportion of women in the various legislatures varies between 15 and 20 per cent.

The percentage of members of Parliament who are women comes as a surprise. It is 11 per cent in the United States, 10 per cent in the United Kingdom, and only 6 per cent in France. Although there has been some improvement, a new electoral dynamic must be found that is more favourable to women.

Progress is certainly under way towards the equal access of men and women to political office, but it must continue if there is to be real democracy throughout the world. Scandinavian countries have almost achieved this representation and I express my hope this March 8 to all women that this objective will be attained as quickly as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day is an important opportunity to speak out for all women and all concerns.

Government policy and priority focus solely on equal workforce participation and economic autonomy for women. I speak today for many women caught in the time crunch of competing demands. I speak for the ultimate concern of many women, their communities, their homes and their children. I speak for their right to make choices and be free from economic and social penalty in raising their own children. I speak for the many men and women who recognize that some of the greatest architects, engineers and scientists are those who build and work not in the marketplace but in the shaping of our future generations.

Today I salute their right to be heard by a government that has been deaf to their concerns. Today I am proud to stand with the Reform Party whose fresh start policies include their voice.

*Oral Questions***THE LATE DR. CHEDDI JAGAN**

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to express sadness at the passing of His Excellency Dr. Cheddi Jagan, President of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, who passed away yesterday at age 78.

Dr. Jagan was a political leader in his native Guyana for a period that spanned 50 years. His prominence and experience gave him a presence far beyond his homeland, particularly in the western hemisphere.

In addition to his lifelong contributions to the citizens of Guyana, a country of several cultures, he was a leader in the evolution of democratic left of centre politics, in the evolution of Guyana's economy and social state and in the transition from colony to independent state.

In a meeting in Ottawa last fall Dr. Jagan made it clear how Guyanese and Central American and Caribbean politics has affected us all in North America. With the more than 100,000 Guyanese Canadians and all the people of Guyana, we mourn the passing and the loss of Dr. Cheddi Jagan.

* * *

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in the House today in recognition of the achievement of McMaster University in my riding of Hamilton West.

McMaster consistently ranks in the top five medical doctoral universities in *Maclean's* magazine's annual university rankings. In the fall of last year the UN flag was raised on campus, instituting McMaster as North America's first campus of the United Nations University Network on Water, health and the Environment.

• (1115)

Now McMaster has been honoured in *Newsweek* magazine's annual guide to graduate schools as one of six innovative medical schools in North America. McMaster is credited with being the birth place of problem based learning where medical students worked on real or simulated patient cases in a clinical setting.

McMaster president, Dr. Peter George, says that the *Newsweek* honour is a fitting tribute to the leadership of then university president Dr. Harry Thode and the founding dean of the new medical school, Dr. Jean Evans.

Since its inception in 1965, the McMaster approach to teaching and learning medicine has attracted worldwide attention.

On behalf of my constituents of Hamilton West, I applaud McMaster for its leadership in this field and congratulate the president, Dr. Peter George.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec organizations working for the status of women called on women to unite and keep up their efforts on the occasion of International Women's Day.

From all corners of Quebec, women have worked together to create a cloth chain of messages, with each of the links symbolizing the solidarity that unites them. In addition, a human chain will surround the Montreal stock exchange, the hub of economic and government decisions, next March 12.

Women hope to show, by means of this demonstration, that economic equity and the fight against poverty are the cornerstones of an egalitarian and fraternal society.

I would like to pay tribute to all the women from Laval who are here today to weave this great chain of solidarity.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Labour Congress has just released a study on women's work.

The study shows, using OECD statistics—as you know, the OECD represents major industrialized countries throughout the world—that Canada is the industrialized country with the highest percentage of women in low-paying jobs, after Japan. The report tells us that only 20 per cent of women have full-time jobs paying more than \$30,000 annually. In other words, poverty has a gender. Poverty is female.

My question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Does this government, which promised not to touch social programs, realize today that the consequences of its decisions are that millions of women are doomed to even greater poverty?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that question is exactly why this government has embarked on certain initiatives to deal with economic autonomy of women. It is precisely why we have started to build a strong infrastructure that will assist women to get sustainable jobs in today's economy and also in the information, technology and science economy of the 21st century.

It is the beginning of every federal department's ensuring and looking at the sustainability of women's equality and economic

equality with gender based analysis as one of the key and most important levers to help women in Canada to become economically autonomous.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the answer is somewhat surprising, because as far as the infrastructure program is concerned, the main criticism from women's groups was that the program did not give any jobs to women. It had practically no impact on women because it was not even intended for women.

So the answer was very surprising, but surprises seem to be the order of the day.

The labour market situation is deteriorating. Today in particular, we see that the number of jobs is decreasing: 14,000 jobs were lost last month, while existing jobs are less dependable, do not last as long, and pay less, and women, who have 70 per cent of part-time jobs and 70 per cent of the lowest paying jobs, are bearing the brunt of this situation.

Does the government agree that the term highway robbery applies to the way women have been affected by employment insurance reform which, in their case, has meant reduced access to unemployment insurance, reduced benefits and reduced benefit periods, at a time when the unemployment insurance fund has a record surplus of more than \$5 billion a year?

• (1120)

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the hon. member to some of the very important initiatives that the government has taken since it came into power.

In its strengthening of employment equity it has targeted women as a key group for employment equity strategy.

Second, when we talk about the infrastructure program, I think the hon. member should know that some of our youth strategies are aimed at helping young women into non-traditional jobs like construction work, which will be part of the infrastructure program.

Finally, the employment insurance bill changes ensure that women can now make choices. Women can get back into the workforce under EI five years after maternity leave and well over 300,000 women will be able to get benefits for the first time in their lives.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that the government has

Oral Questions

targeted women, but the trouble is, it regularly misses the target, and when it scores a hit, it is for the wrong reason.

I may remind you that Canada Labour Congress vice-president Nancy Rich said this week that, since the Minister of Canadian Heritage had resigned when the Liberals reneged on their promise to abolish the GST, today the whole cabinet should resign for reneging on the promises made in the red book and by the Prime Minister regarding social programs.

Again, I want to ask the Acting Prime Minister how she thinks Canadian and Quebec women judge their government which, in spite of its promises, has savagely torn the social safety net they so badly need, since women and children represent more than 70 per cent of the poor in Canada, according to Statistics Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate.

In the new employment insurance bill over 700,000 women, including 495,000 women who pay EI premiums today, will not have to pay EI premiums. That is a major breakthrough for women.

Second, when we talk about cuts not benefiting women, the child benefit that has been put in place by the government will make a difference to women. Eighty per cent of single parents are women. Sixty-five per cent live in poverty. By targeting women with small children a lot of women are being helped.

Child support benefits assist women to improve incomes to help them look after their children. Dealing with women's economic autonomy is not only dealing with the issue of employment because women depend on many other things to assist them in getting economic autonomy. We are addressing this in a comprehensive holistic way, not simply in a one shot linear unilateral way.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to listen to these words without anger, knowing that women were the hardest hit by the cuts to employment insurance and to social transfers.

My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. The government has gazed into its crystal ball and predicted more than 300,000 jobs in 1997, but this morning's figures hardly support its enthusiasm. Instead of creating new jobs, Canada has lost 14,000 jobs since the beginning of the year. As we approach March 8, women have still less to celebrate, for 44,000 full time jobs have been lost since last month.

How can the Acting Prime Minister explain that her government is still predicting such a rosy future, when the employment situation of women continues to deteriorate?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the issue that my hon. colleague is talking about has to do with transfer payment cuts.

I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to some comments made by Lucien Bouchard when he made it clear that he knows that restraints involve tough choices. He said in the National Assembly on March 25, 1996: "For those who say not in my back yard I reply that there would be something in everyone's back yard".

• (1125)

In the current fiscal year, federal transfers to provinces for health and other social programs will still be \$26.9 billion. In addition, equalization payments will top that up. Quebec is getting federal transfers of approximately \$11 billion.

How Quebec determines to place its emphasis and its priorities on what it does with its money is Quebec's business, and it should consider whether women are a priority.

[Translation]

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that it is mostly women who pay the price.

Since the end of 1994, or since the Liberal Government's reforms have come into full effect, the number of full time jobs for women has increased by only 10,000, whereas the number of part time jobs has risen by 140,000.

How can the Acting Prime Minister deny such a deterioration in the employment situation, particularly for women?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member does not understand the full and holistic component of what is done for women's jobs.

Many women cannot have sustainable full time jobs because they have children, a fact which statistics support. We are looking at how to assist women with children. One of the most important things to help women to get training for long term sustainable jobs is the new EI benefit where women can take five years off for maternity leave. Five years is a massive increase which will allow women to still go back and get training.

We have talked about leveraging money into literacy programs so women can get into the job market. We have talked about leveraging money so women can have post-graduate training in sciences and math. Those are the things that create an infrastructure for women to build their economic autonomy.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal-Tory years have been hard years for the one and a half million unemployed in Canada. StatsCan announced today that the unemployment rate for February was 9.7 per cent. That is the 77th straight month, or six and half years, that unemployment has been over 9 per cent. It is the worst string of job numbers since the Great Depression.

I ask the Minister of Finance, where are the jobs, jobs, jobs that the Liberals promised Canadians in the last election?

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr Speaker, we are concerned about the February figures which the hon. member mentioned.

I point out to him that the unemployment rate has not risen but has stayed the same. The trend over the the last four months has been strong job growth. If he had read this morning's papers he would have seen articles by a number of analysts who clearly stated that while this is disappointing, all the prospects for continued job growth are there.

This morning's papers were full of indications of increased house starts, increased house resales, increased purchases, increases confidence. As private sector forecasters assert, those indicators will lead to 300,000 to 350,000 new jobs in the coming year when Canada will lead the industrialized countries in growth.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, great words, but no jobs. I cannot believe the government is actually trying to justify an unemployment rate of 9.7 per cent.

Let us look at the numbers: 38,000 full time jobs disappeared last month; 44,000 more women are out work; the lowest number of young people working in 20 years. What is more, CIBC Wood Gundy and Canadians who had given up looking for work say that the unemployment rate is up to 13.9 per cent.

Why has the government broken its red book promise? Why have the Liberals failed completely and miserably to create growth and opportunity?

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is simply untrue to leave the impression that the government does not care about employment. We care very deeply about it. Our strategies which are reflected in our budgets support that.

• (1130)

First and foremost we have, as the hon. member and his colleagues have insisted we do, maintained the course on deficit reduction. That has kept interest rates low, leading to investment.

Oral Questions

That is going to translate into greater job growth this year. We are not stopping there and not sitting back.

The hon. member represents a party whose approach to all these questions is simply cut taxes for their friends, sit back and wait for everything else to happen. Canadians want a government that takes action so not only is it acting on deficit reduction but it is investing in short term growth and providing immediate impetus for jobs through infrastructure, foreign trade, youth employment measures, unemployment insurance reforms, reform of the CPP. It is also investing in long term growth in jobs through the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, through higher education support for that and investing in a stronger society, something we care very much about.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is another story of more talk and more taxes and fewer jobs. In Canada 1.5 million people are unemployed, two million to three million underemployed, 800,000 moonlighting to make ends meet, the lowest number of young people working in 20 years, and one in four who are worried about losing their jobs. That is the Liberal job record.

What is the Liberal answer to this crisis? A 73 per cent hike in payroll taxes that its own department is saying is going to kill even more jobs.

With an unemployment rate of 9.7 per cent, with 1.5 million Canadians unemployed, why is the government introducing a 73 per cent payroll tax hike that is going to kill more jobs?

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people know which side of the House is talking and which side of the House is acting.

On the question of the CPP contribution increase, it is somewhat irresponsible of the hon. member opposite to talk about something as a job killer when it is an investment in the public pension plan shared risk that all of us share to ensure a decent retirement, a foundation for retirement. It is contributions toward a fund that is invested for the benefit of the workers, the present retirees, the future retirees. It is something that we will continue to support and make sure is viable and sustainable.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

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

On October 4, 1995, the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General gave Judge Lynn Ratushny the task of examining the files of the various women who were sentenced for killing their abusive partner. The judge has just released her findings and concludes that

four women should be freed, one should be given a lighter sentence and another should be given a new hearing before the court of appeal.

When does the minister intend to implement the judge's recommendations?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have received Judge Ratushny's preliminary report. It is being studied by a working group of officials in the Department of Justice and the Department of the Solicitor General. They are also consulting with the provincial attorneys general.

Because this matter raises some rather novel juridical concepts we have to proceed with all due deliberate speed. I look forward to having a response from the Minister of Justice and myself before too long.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps important for the Solicitor General to take his time. This is a report he himself requested with his colleague in Justice.

I would like to know at what point the women prisoners are likely to get out of prison, because you are going to act on the recommendations. How long will it take to examine the files? How long should these women expect to wait: a week, two weeks, six months? What hope are you giving them?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Judge Ratushny's work. I think she would be the last person to say that her report should be simply treated as something with a rubber stamp.

• (1135)

Instead, what is involved in her report is something quite novel and that is applying a ruling of a court to a trial in a decision of another court that took place quite a while before the judgment that has led to the study by Judge Ratushny.

Under the circumstances, when we are talking about either asking for a new trial under section 690 of the code or using the royal prerogative of mercy, certainly we have to think carefully about the implications for the justice system. We also, in that connection, have to take into account the views of our provincial counterparts.

We want to proceed with all due deliberate speed but we want to do it in the right way.

*Oral Questions***HOSPITAL CLOSURES**

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this week I had occasion to visit two of the Ottawa hospitals that are slated to close, the Montfort and the Riverside.

In the case of the Riverside, it is closing because the Liberal government chose to give its entire budget, \$97 million, to a corporate buddy, Bombardier. How can the government possibly justify its choice of corporation subsidies over Canadian hospitals?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite continues to make reference to the situation in the province of Ontario with regard to the decisions that the Ontario government and Premier Harris have made.

I wish to quote for the hon. member a statement by the Minister of Finance on March 6, 1997:

In other words, he should understand that if hospitals are being closed in Ontario it is as a result of a political choice. Tax cuts are being made. I will not dispute them, but they are not the result of a reduction in transfers from the government.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, maybe the health minister could then explain how Harris has cut the hospital beds in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

These cuts are the direct responsibility of the Liberal government. Maybe the health minister should listen to what Dr. Tony Wade, president of the New Brunswick Medical Society, thinks about the Liberal's attack on health care. He stated: "I don't need a dictionary to know that they spell abandonment".

Can the health minister tell Dr. Wade of New Brunswick why the Prison Art Foundation gets \$100,000 that should go to the hospitals in New Brunswick? Explain that.

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again I thank the hon. member for the lob ball question.

The hon. member should be aware of the situation in the great province of Alberta. I wish to quote again the federal Minister of Finance who said on March 6:

At the same time the province of Alberta is declaring surpluses and cutting taxes. He cannot say that it is reductions in federal transfers when Alberta is cutting taxes and declaring surpluses.

And at the same time it is closing down hospitals.

* * *

[Translation]

BREAST CANCER

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): My question is for the Minister of Health.

The red book states on page 81, and I quote: "It is well known, for example, that research into breast cancer, which afflicts one woman in nine, has been seriously underfunded." As a result of the parliamentary report on breast cancer, the Conservative government had committed significant investments for research on this issue, but the program is coming to an end in 1998.

On the eve of International Women's Day, is the Liberal government able to tell us that it intends to renew for another five years its commitment to research on breast cancer in Canada, as did the Canadian Cancer Institute and the Canadian Cancer Society?

[English]

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question because it is substantive and important to women all across the country.

Earlier this week I met with a number of representatives from the Canadian foundation, the breast network association across the country, as well as other representatives to discuss with them their proposals and ways in which to work together in order to continue financing this initiative.

We have also contributed \$2.7 million over five years to the breast cancer information exchange pilot projects. The hon. member is aware that Canada and the United States had the first ever women's health forum whereby one of the clear priorities of Canada and the United States is to focus research on breast cancer.

• (1140)

I assure the hon. member that this is a serious issue and that we are taking it very seriously.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this evaluation report states that research is often disconnected from reality and recommends that women who have survived breast cancer play a more active role in research.

Does the Minister of Health intend to follow through with this recommendation by modifying the research funding criteria?

[English]

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that point is very substantive and has been made to me. It deserves very serious consideration.

I have asked my officials as well as the various funding bodies to examine that to accommodate what I believe is a very legitimate request made by the hon. member and by other members as well.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is committed to publicly funded health care in Canada.

I will speak very slowly so that the Minister of Health and members on the other side will understand real life examples of my experience in the emergency department.

A young woman came in needing urgent dialysis. She could not get it because the hospital has had its funds cut. She went into cardiac arrest after three days and almost died. On an average night 8 out of 13 hospital bays are filled with patients. There is no room in the hospital and the hospital does not have any money.

Is the minister's version of better health care management to give \$97 million to Bombardier or to give money to health care so that Canadians can get urgent treatment when they medically need it?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not think any member on this side of the House would want to debate or argue the sincerity of the hon. member opposite, particularly in relation to his preamble.

In *Hansard* in 1995 he said the following:

Let us allow the provinces to experiment with alternative funding models such as private clinics, private insurance and the like.

I know the hon. member is doing flip flops, huffing and puffing, but I suggest that he, his friend from Macleod and the leader of the Reform Party get their acts together and come to the floor of the House of Commons with a reasoned, well thought out health policy.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yes, let the provinces deal with health care but do not cut the legs out from under them.

Why has the government chosen handouts over health care? Why has it chosen to give \$97 million to Bombardier when patients are absorbing the \$4 billion in health care cuts with their own flesh and blood and sometimes by their own lives?

Will the minister tell patients and the hospitals how the government will provide urgent health care to Canadians when they medically need it?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member underlines the significance in every substantive provincial and federal report by royal commissions and by quasi-royal commissions. The issues affecting health care are primarily under the jurisdiction of provincial governments as they relate to hospitals. It is not an issue of funding; it is an issue of management.

Oral Questions

What is the hon. member talking about? He is talking about management issues which are the sole responsibility of the different provinces.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PAY EQUITY

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Under the Liberal and Tory governments, the Treasury Board did all it could not to give women employees their due as far as pay equity was concerned. Showing an evident lack of good faith, the Treasury Board used all the stalling tactics it could find to postpone the day when it would have to meet its obligations and comply with the Human Rights Act on the issue of pay equity.

• (1145)

Why did the President of the Treasury Board insist on delaying equity, why did he spend millions of dollars on legal quibbling, refusing to give female government workers the money they were owed and perpetuating pay inequity within the federal public service?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, my colleague echoes some of the myths that are being spread, especially by her colleagues, and that are diametrically opposed to reality.

Not only did the federal government pass a law, in 1978, well before most of the provinces, stating—

Mrs. Tremblay: It was in 1977.

Mr. Massé: Check your dates. Not only did that legislation establish the principle of pay equity, but since then, we have spent more than \$1 billion to implement that principle, to turn it into reality, and we have succeeded.

We have even negotiated with some of the unions, with the professional employees, an agreement granting pay equity. Let me add that we are willing to implement pay equity. We have already indicated that we are ready to negotiate the pay equity issues.

The unions chose to go before the courts. We are awaiting a court ruling. There is no doubt that we have established the principle, that we have put it in place and that we will continue to adhere to it, as we must.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board spoke about myths.

I could remind him of all the stalling tactics used by Treasury Board from 1990 to this day, simply to avoid implementing the legislation on pay equity. I have a list here and I could table that document. The President of the Treasury Board talked about hearings before the Canadian Human Rights Commission, which should render its decision shortly.

Oral Questions

Will the President of the Treasury Board commit himself to abiding by the decision of the commission and, this time, really implement the legislation as quickly as possible?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the truth is that in this field the federal government provided leadership to the private sector and the provinces.

I repeat, we have paid over a billion dollars since the legislation came into force to implement pay equity. Not only do we believe in pay equity, but we have negotiated agreements with a number of unions. Therefore, in those cases, the unions were in agreement with us. We negotiated agreements to implement pay equity.

However, when demands reach \$2 or \$2.5 billion, you would expect any good government, especially if the process is flawed, to say the equity principle requires that we serve all taxpayers, not just the ones in the public service, and that is what we have done.

I repeat, we are willing to negotiate with the unions and settle the issue, even before the court makes a decision.

* * *

[English]

TRANSPORT

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport or his parliamentary secretary.

According to the Transportation Safety Board rail tanker cars presently used to haul dangerous chemicals are vulnerable to breaking apart in accidents, putting people, communities and the environment at risk.

Would the Minister of Transport proceed with the safety board's recommendations and ensure that tanker car standards are strengthened for the protection of the public?

Mr. Stan Keyes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Davenport asks an important question. I want him to take comfort in the fact that safety is and will always be Transport Canada's number one priority.

• (1150)

Even before the recommendations by the Transportation Safety Board, Transport Canada limited the carriage of 80 dangerous goods in the tanker cars the member is concerned about.

With respect to the recommendation made by the TSB, Transport Canada has already eliminated two of sixteen dangerous goods and

is doing a thorough examination of the remainder. Work is already in progress to upgrade the strength of the tanker cars.

* * *

SENATORIAL SELECTION

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, British Columbia has a law in place called the senatorial selection act which allows British Columbians to elect their own senators.

B.C. Senator Len Marchand was to retire March 1. However now the Prime Minister has coaxed the senator to stay on until after the next federal election. Despite Marchand's postponed retirement, we can be sure that B.C. will have a vacancy in the Senate very shortly.

Will the Prime Minister allow British Columbians the opportunity to elect their next senator?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the tribute paid to Senator Len Marchand. I for one would like to see him serve the people of British Columbia and Canada in the Senate for a very long time.

However, if he chooses to step down, I am sure the Prime Minister will be very careful about following his constitutional responsibilities to the utmost.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Glen Clark, the premier of British Columbia, indicated that he will back an elected senator. Where do we stand?

The people of B.C. want to elect their next senator. The premier of B.C. says he will back electing the next senator. The B.C. senatorial selection act allows that to happen in law. The only person preventing British Columbians from electing their next senator is the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister recommend to the Governor General the individual chosen by the people of British Columbia to fill the next Senate vacancy?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is one problem among others in the hon. member's suggestion. Once the senator is elected how does one bring the senator's term to an end? What if the people of British Columbia decide that the person they elect no longer has their confidence? The Reform scheme does not deal with that point at all.

Furthermore Reform Party members, if I am not mistaken, rejected a package of constitutional reforms that called for an elected Senate. It is rather strange that today they are doing something exactly the opposite to what they followed when they had a chance to speak for constitutional reform. Who can take them seriously on this important subject?

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA**

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

Spokepeople from the correctional service of Canada have announced the transfer of 47 women prisoners to men's penitentiaries. Yet, the Arbour commission concluded last year, with regard to similar events, that there was at least an appearance of oppression in incarcerating women in an institution that inevitably houses many sexual offenders.

Since the correctional service just finished building five new penitentiaries for women, including one in Joliette, and in light of the conclusions of the Arbour report, how does the minister explain this service's decision?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it turns out that there is a small number of disruptive, high security women prisoners for whom the new regional women's prisons do not offer adequate facilities. Until a permanent solution to the issue is worked out the correctional service has decided to set up a limited number of special units for these women.

They are in facilities originally intended for male prisoners, but it is my understanding these special units will be quite apart from male prisoners and will offer special services and programs for women of a high security nature, pending the working out of a more permanent solution.

• (1155)

[Translation]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what guarantee can the minister give that correctional services will take all the necessary steps to remedy the situation and to provide women prisoners with detention conditions that respect the spirit and intent of the Arbour commission's recommendations?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a small number of women prisoners who are of a high security nature and have potentially disruptive tendencies. We are not talking about all women prisoners. We are talking about having them in special units where they receive the programming necessary to help them get back into normal society.

In any event, as I have said, this is an interim step. It is not a permanent step. It is being supervised by the new deputy commissioner for women's corrections.

* * *

FINANCE

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have a conundrum in the finance department. Over and over and over officials in that department have said the Canada pension plan is a payroll tax. Yet yesterday the Minister of Finance said he received advice from that department to act quickly with the provinces so it would not appear to be a tax.

Furthermore the department has stated on a number of occasions that payroll taxes kill jobs. Yet now we are being asked to believe the 70 per cent increase in CPP will create jobs. How does the Minister of Finance reconcile these 180 degree out of phase points of view?

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly the member opposite continues to confuse a number of different things.

Under the government payroll taxes have been reduced. UI premiums have been reduced significantly putting \$1.7 billion back into the economy.

When he tries to roll in the CPP package it is really quite incredible. Canadians will not be fooled. What is going on with the CPP is a serious attempt, in conjunction with the provincial governments, to make that program sustainable so that it will be there for those who are retired and for those who will be retiring in the future. It is not killing jobs. It is saving for people's retirement.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the conundrum continues. Over the last 30 years the Liberals and the Conservatives trusted members of the Department of Finance, or they deliberately distorted or whatever what members of the department were saying by saying the CPP plan as proposed was sustainable.

Now suddenly it is not sustainable. How can that be reconciled? How can we reconcile that it is sustainable on one hand and Canadians were to believe? Now it is not and they are to pay 70 per cent more.

Mr. Barry Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, now I have a conundrum. If I can read between the lines the hon. member is saying that we should never look at a program over time and decide whether or not it should be changed.

We have done that with the provinces. It is the responsible thing to do. Canadians told us to make sure the Canada pension plan was

Routine Proceedings

there for them when they retired and that if it required adjustment we should have the courage and the fortitude to provide the leadership to do it. We have done it.

* * *

PAY EQUITY

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. On the eve of International Women's Day around the globe economic equality for women still remains an elusive goal.

In Canada it has been over a decade that federal employees in female dominated groups have been seeking equal pay for work of equal value. Unfortunately many of them now believe the human rights tribunal has ruled and our government is refusing to implement the ruling.

Would the President of the Treasury Board clarify the situation with the tribunal to make clear what our government is prepared to do to end pay discrimination and to give women the pay they deserve for the work they do?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question. She is well known for having defended the questions of pay equity and rights of women in the community and in Parliament, and she continues to do so.

She should be proud of being in a party, in a government, that has done so much for pay equity and the full rights of women.

• (1200)

Not only have we been among the first to accept the principle but we have been the first to have paid over \$1 billion in order to implement it. At present there is a case in front of the tribunal and in that case the pleading has stopped a few months ago. We expect the judgment to be as soon as possible in the next few months.

We have already solved the question with some unions and I am prepared to offer to the unions involved, if they want to get a settlement quickly rather than having to wait for the judgment in court, to tell them let us sit down at a table and negotiate the issues so we can have a quick judgment.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the acting Prime Minister.

According to labour force statistics released today, 44,000 full time jobs for women disappeared in January. Medical technicians, educators, clericals and other women's jobs in the public sector

have led the cuts. This Liberal government cut 45,000 jobs and thousands more were lost as a result of a \$7 billion cut to health transfers to the provinces.

Will the acting Prime Minister acknowledge that women's jobs have never been a priority for this government, or have the Liberals entirely written off women as productive workers in the economy?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that hon. members across only seem to ask questions about women's equality and women's economic autonomy on International Women's Day. What happens to the rest of the year?

We spent a whole year as a government dealing with issues of women's economic autonomy in terms of training, literacy and looking at women's transfer payments from their custodial parents for their children, sustainable training for women, bringing women into the real world where construction jobs are open to them. We spent every single day analysing in every single department through gender based analysis the issues of the reality of women's rights and how our government impacts on it.

It is very strange that the members of the opposition only seem to think about this on International Women's Day.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(6), I have the pleasure to table, in both official languages, the 1995 report on Canada's participation in regional development banks.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

EMERGENCY PERSONNEL

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions today. The first comes from St. Catharines, Ontario.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that our police and firefighters place their lives at risk on a daily basis as they serve the emergency needs of all Canadians. They also state that in many cases the families of officers killed in the line of duty are often left without sufficient financial means to meet their obligations.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to establish a public safety officers compensation fund to receive gifts and bequests for the benefit of families of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes from Welland, Ontario. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

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

AGE OF CONSENT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today.

The first calls on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code of Canada to raise the age of consent for sexual activity between a young person and an adult from 14 years to 16 years.

• (1205)

I support this petition and call on the government to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): The hon. member will know it is out of order for her to indicate either opposition to or support for a petition. In the presentation of petitions, the practices of the House require that a member state a summary of the petition and may indicate where the petitioners are from but it is not normal to indicate support for or opposition to a petition. I invite her to comply with that portion of the rules.

TAXATION

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I present is from my riding and contains 76 signatures. The petitioners call on Parliament to not increase the federal excise tax on gasoline.

The third petition, containing 260 signatures, is again from my riding and other lower mainland constituencies. The petitioners urge all levels of government to demonstrate their support of education and literacy by eliminating the sales tax on reading materials.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition sponsored by the Canadian Automobile Association. The petitioners call on Parliament to urge the federal government to join with the provincial government to make the national highway system upgrading possible beginning in 1997.

Supply

THE SENATE

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present the following petition which comes from my riding of Comox—Alberni and contains 274 signatures. The undersigned bring attention to the fact that British Columbia has a senatorial selection act which allows the election of B.C. senators. They also draw attention to the fact that British Columbia Senator Len Marchand will resign his seat in the Senate shortly.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to urge the governor general to appoint a duly elected person according to the forthcoming vacant British Columbia seat in the Senate of Canada.

I fully concur with the petitioners and endorse this petition—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): I hoped the hon. member had heard me indicate to one of the other members earlier that it is out of order for the member to indicate his opposition to or support for a petition. I invite him to comply with the rules in his use of the time during presentation of petitions.

TAXATION

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 45 individuals in the greater Toronto area. While recognizing the change in government policy to fully rebate goods and services tax on books purchased by educational institutions and libraries, they call on the government to pursue the policy further and remove the tax from books, magazines and newspapers.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. George Proud (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF WOMEN

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to rise today to speak to this motion put forward by the Bloc which condemns the federal government's lack of political will in refusing to take positive action in its areas

Supply

of jurisdiction to promote economic equality between men and women, and so on.

Today, as I speak to this motion, I would particularly like to dwell on the elements of the motion that deal with economic equality between men and women and the government's place in that.

It certainly is a discussion that is appropriate for this, the day before International Women's Day, and in the period of International Women's Week.

As I speak to this idea of economic equality between men and women, it is an issue that affects those in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada. As I go forward, I want to address two issues. First, what has the government done on each of these parts of the question, and what has the government done specifically on the economics of this country? Second, what has the government done in terms of equality issues in this country?

• (1210)

Lately the government came forward with its budget. This is a government that has been in power for the last three and a half years. I would like to put to this House that the Liberals are hiding the facts of their record within that time period.

We now have in Canada record consumer debts. We have in Canada record personal bankruptcies. Today there are 1.5 million Canadians unemployed and 76 months straight of unemployment at over 9 per cent. This is the worst record since the depression.

Today two to three million Canadians are underemployed. Today one in four Canadians is worried about losing their job. We have to show for the last three years over \$100 billion more in debt and now we have a record \$600 billion debt to pass on to our children as they come into the workforce. In this time, average family incomes have been cut by \$3,000.

Earlier today I heard Liberal MPs saying that it is up to Canadians who have had to make tough choices. There have been cutbacks. I want to talk about those in a minute.

I hear Liberal MPs talking about tough choices to other Canadians while increasing payroll taxes by approximately 73 per cent and making the tough choice to maintain their own pensions. It is five times greater than what other Canadians can have. Is that making tough choices on that side of the House?

Most of the deficit fighting this government has done has been on the backs of taxpayers with 36 tax increases since 1993. Most of the rest has been on the backs of the provinces with \$7.5 billion reduction in transfer payments.

About 92 per cent of the reduction in the deficit to this date has been a direct result in tax revenue increase. As I have mentioned, they are ready to kill more jobs with the CPP tax increase of 73 per cent.

While with the transfer cuts they have cut funding to health and post-secondary education funding, the government will spend \$4.2 billion to subsidize its crown corporations like the CBC and Canada Post.

This government's vision, the Liberal vision, is a country where average taxpayers send \$10,200 to the federal government each year, and \$3,400 of that every year from every taxpayer is to service the debt alone.

The Liberal vision is a country where 7.3 million Canadians earning less than \$30,000 pay 17 per cent of their incomes to the federal government.

What has this government done in terms of economics? It has slashed transfer payments. It has made choices that have not been the priority of Canadians, like health care. It has increased our debt. It has made no commitment to deficit elimination and it has done poor service to Canadians.

What has this government done on equality issues? I would like to spend most of my time, as other speakers have, on this area. Canada has taken a leadership role. I saw that firsthand at the UN Beijing conference. It has taken up the standard of gender equality along with other nations. With this gender equality stance, it has promoted the theme of equal outcome for men and women.

The Reform Party looks at this theme and says equal outcome is not the issue. Individuals, regardless of who they are, should have equal opportunity in the job opportunities.

Success in terms of gender thinking is measured by full workforce participation and economic independence and autonomy, as we have already heard from the secretary of state many times today.

• (1215)

I ask, is this true equality? I say to the House that a person, whether male or female, who has equal protection under the law of the land and the equality of choice and opportunity in society: that is equality.

If we look at the history of the women's movement there have been equality seekers, first in the fight for the right to vote, the opportunity to put their name on a ballot. There has been equality of entry into occupations. There have been pioneers throughout the years who have put forward arguments to put women in certain occupations. There has been equality for entry into positions of leadership. Women have been elected to the House who are helping to lead the country politically; there are women business leaders, in teaching and in the sciences.

Supply

The history of the women's movement is the fight for equal opportunity, for their place in society and they have done well. The history of the women's movement is the freedom to make economic and political choices according to their own desires and dreams. Women want freedom to make those choices. True feminism is a belief in women and in the choices and in the wisdom of the choices they will make. As I have travelled through Canada and through my own riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam my belief in that kind of feminism is strengthened by what I see. The majority of students graduating from university are women. They are taking positions of leadership with great success.

More women than men are starting up their own businesses. Statistics show that the likelihood of their success is greater than that of their male counterparts. They have shown excellence in non-traditional roles. Yesterday I learned of an insurance company that in four of its six regions the top sales persons were women. There is also excellence in the traditional roles.

The Liberals are out of touch with the real women, with their potential. In their very policies they deny women the respect for the abilities they possess.

The greatest concern I see in gender analysis and equality philosophies is the rejection of diverse opinion. In gender analysis there is a blindness to constructive alternatives to ways of doing things in society. The main theme of gender analysis and policy making, as I saw in Beijing and I see in government policies, is that it drives always and ever to economic independence and autonomy for women. It drives to equal outcome and equal participation in the workforce. It would demand a social revolution, a remaking of society, and a mandate for people to follow in its dictated choices in order to do so.

In the last 20 years we have been witness to the progress of this agenda. In the last 20 years the movement has been toward two working parents. Presently it is seven out of ten households, up from three out of ten. However, within that time the total household income is virtually the same.

Seventy per cent of women are now in the workforce. In the last 30 years divorce has increased 800 per cent. In fact, Canada has one of the highest divorce rates in developed countries. As we have heard, the tragedy of that is the poverty rate. It is greatest among the single mothers who are very often the product of those family break-ups. It is shown that the economic impact of divorce is the greatest on women.

• (1220)

Federal taxes of the average family, according to the *Globe and Mail*, November 1992, was \$1,894 more in 1990 than in 1984. Recent statistics have told us that the after tax earnings of an average household have actually fallen by \$3,000 since the government came to power. As I have mentioned, 36 tax increases have

been implemented by the federal government alone to help make that happen.

These kinds of things happening in society have very real results. They are not just numbers. According to government statistics child poverty has increased by 40 per cent since 1989. Youth violent crime has doubled in the last nine years. Canada is among the highest in the world in youth suicides. Today we have less money because of cutbacks to direct toward needed programs for those who actually need government help because of debt servicing charges and wasteful government spending.

In the last couple of days we have heard about government spending going toward a prison art foundation in New Brunswick of \$100,000; \$87 million to Bombardier; \$300,000 to friends at the Shawinigan Industrial Centre. Are these the choices of the men and women in Canada? Is this compassion? Do these programs reflect the priorities of most women?

Who sets the goal? Who defines the standard of success for women? Do most women define success as equal workforce participation? Or do most women define success for themselves, that of their friends and of their communities as safety in their streets, an opportunity to achieve for all Canadians, a government that can provide help for those who cannot achieve hope for their youth and for their children and strength in their homes. This is what most women and men define as success, not equal workforce participation.

The government, as I mentioned, rejects diversity in its definition of gender equality. The government has chosen to follow a gender feminist philosophy. Quoting from the government's material: "Status of Women works to ensure women's equality is integrated into all federal government legislation, policies, programs and initiatives". Women's equality is defined as autonomy and equal workforce participation. What is the price of that? The simple dollar price for the status of women in the main estimates is \$17 million of tax funds every year plus \$8 million more in grants both in 1996 and 1997, and that was tripled from the previous year, 1995-96.

The price of the status of women policies goes far beyond the dollars that go into that program. I will quickly give three examples. First, the government's commitment is to women working. The finance minister in a letter refused to even consider tax change proposals that might be a disincentive for a spouse to work.

I have with me today a letter from a constituent who supports the fresh start platform of our party which increases the spousal exemption from \$5,380 to \$7,900, thereby levelling the field for parents who choose to stay home to care for their children and extending the child care deduction of \$5,000 to every preschool child, including children whose parents stay at home to care for them.

Supply

My constituent states: "Before my child was born in 1994 I was employed as a social worker for the B.C. government. I saw the effect of parental absence from the home in young and teenage children and decided that to raise a child properly I needed to be in the home caring for my child. My husband and I have faced extreme financial hardship as a result of this decision but still feel that children and family are the most important factor in our lives".

• (1225)

She goes on to say: "I hope that all women and men merely have a choice to be parents first, and to find this role to be of equal importance to a career".

The Liberal Party rejects Reform's proposal of a child care tax credit to all parents, and instead chooses to reward only those who put their children in reputable day care.

The government shows zero tolerance feminist style. It seems appropriate that I mention a Vancouver planning meeting at the Vancouver status of women location which was held last November. I have the notice for that. It says: "Come help organize for the 1997 International Women's Day event". This meeting was held on November 19 at 7.30 p.m., at the Vancouver Status of Women, Grant Street, "all women welcome".

Two women were refused entry at that meeting. They were identified by the people there as pro-lifers. Not only were they refused entry but there was attempt made to forcibly remove them. Police were called. By the time the altercation was finished, medical attention was required. Cameras were broken and bruises were received.

The Vancouver police have recommended to the crown prosecutor that charges be laid because of this event at the Vancouver status of women location. The Vancouver status of women has received federal grants which total \$917,000 since 1984. When the Secretary of State for the Status of Women heard of this, she gave her apologies but replied in a statement that this was not in her backyard. This mind-set is in her backyard.

Last year she made this statement: "This government believes each and every individual, group and community in Canada must be treated equally and with respect". Yet what has she done to address this very real event that occurred at the Vancouver status of women location which is connected with her department?

Status of women and the gender equality thing is no equality of choice and no recognition of various sentiments or ideas of many women. It does not recognize the importance of parenting. It does not recognize the importance of other opinions.

Another example of rejection of other opinions is what we saw lately in Bill C-41, a bill that spoke to child support and access.

Like so much of what the Liberal government does, it referred to one side of the argument and forgot that there are two players. In fact in Bill C-41, which dealt with divorce and child support, there are more players. There are the custodial and non-custodial parents and the children.

This bill gave rights to the custodial parent, responsibilities to the non-custodial parent and basically left the ball there. Who will pay for unequal treatment? Who will pay for a bill that does not address the real needs of those who are involved in child support and access issues? Who will pay for the unequal treatment of Canadians in Bill C-41? Not only the non-custodial parent but the children involved in the process of a divorce procedure which will not serve their purposes.

I will reiterate. We have a society that would like to recognize the uniqueness and the freedom to make choices for all Canadians. It is not equal workforce participation but things like safety on the streets, incentives to achieve, help for those who cannot, hope for our youth and strength in our homes which is where most Canadians feel the priorities of government should be.

• (1230)

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised by the comments of my colleague, the fact that she skipped away from the main subject matter, which is to recognize that there is a lot more work that still needs to be done in order to ensure there is equity in our society.

Simply put, all she had to do is look at the latest Statistics Canada report which shows that women still earn less than their male counterparts. They earn only 73 per cent of what males earn.

As well, there is a lot more work that needs to be done in particular for women with disabilities, women from visible minorities and aboriginal women. Opportunities for those women are still not there.

I want to also indicate that my colleague did not take into account what this government did in terms of action taken, particularly in the area of the Employment Equity Act which recently was introduced by this government. How handy that Employment Equity Act is. It is incredible.

On the occasion of International Women's Day, this new legislation would extend coverage to include federal public servants, agencies and commissions in ensuring that employment equities are a must. It would increase the legislative authority of the Canadian Human Rights Commission to initiate investigations of employment equity issues and subject federal contractors to mandatory compliance with the principles of the act.

As well, I would like to inform my colleague in case she is not aware that a total of 350 large private sector employers, crown

corporations and industries such as banking, communications and transportation are covered by the legislation.

Under the act, these organizations have to satisfy their obligations in terms of employment equity. For example, they have to conduct a workforce analysis to determine the degree of under representation of the designated groups, as I mentioned earlier.

They have to review employment systems, policies and practices to define employment barriers to members of these groups. They have to prepare a short term plan, one to three years, with measures to remove any barriers, make reasonable accommodation and institute positive policies and practices by setting goals and timetables for hiring and promotion.

Finally, they have to set longer term objectives and strategies to increase the overall representation of designated groups in their workplace.

These are examples of what this government has done over the past three years in order to address employment inequities that exist in our society. These are some of the measures that this government has taken in order to ensure that women receive the treatment and equality they deserve and which they have earned and which is their right in our society.

To that extent, my colleague made reference to the government initiatives on attacking child poverty. The government should be very proud of what it has done on the whole notion of child poverty and trying to deal with the question of child poverty.

We will not cease to continue our work to ensure that children who need assistance and support will receive the support and assistance they need.

Members opposite, particularly in the third party, were up on their feet opposing the vast majority of initiatives taken by this government in trying to address issues of equity, equality, fairness, support for people who need support and assistance.

Now we stand up and talk about initiatives that the third party has proposed. Let us put them on the record. Let us examine some of those initiatives. In fact, none of those initiatives will seriously and effectively deal with the issue of poverty, particularly child poverty.

• (1235)

I would like my colleague to tell me what her difficulties are with the latest federal government initiative dealing with child poverty, and specifically what part of the federal government's proposed legislation in dealing with child poverty does she disapprove of. How would she replace it and with what?

Mrs. Hayes: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where to start with what I have just heard. From employment equity to child poverty, this government's policies are abysmal. It has caused the very child poverty it is talking about. It used to take 40 hours a week to

Supply

maintain a household on an average wage. Now it takes over 70 hours a week to maintain a household in this economy.

How in the world can a single parent on an average salary not be in poverty with what this government has done to our Canadian families? Is it any surprise that single parents are in the highest percentage of poor people in this country? It is simply because they cannot survive on what this government has done in the marketplace.

We have a policy that we brought forward that is very different in concept and philosophy to what the Liberal government has done. In our fresh start program we state that we must first reduce the size of government. We must go through government programs that have duplication and are wasteful. Let us take \$87 million to Bombardier, for instance. That may be a good start. We have programs that give money to crown corporations which waste Canadian tax dollars. It is taken from programs that it wants to have and it is taken from the pockets of taxpayers.

We must first reduce the size of government and then give tax relief to families. Our tax relief proposals will take 1.2 million Canadians off the tax rolls altogether. Right now, why should someone earning \$30,000 a year pay any tax at all? We would take the vast majority of those same Canadians off the tax rolls altogether. That is how you help the poor. Do not tax their families and say we are helping the children. That is Liberal logic and makes no sense at all.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam for her comments and for what she has contributed to the debate. I would like her to comment on some observations I have made during this whole debate.

I would like to quickly touch on three or four gifts that the Liberals have given to women in this country and their children. The first gift is that 50 cents of every \$1 a working woman and man makes in this country goes to taxes in one form or another because of this Liberal government's contribution to that high rate of taxation. How can we expect families not to live in poverty if 50 cents of every \$1 that they earn is taken away in taxes in one form or another?

This government's policies have created the very child poverty and family poverty it is now recognizing and pretending has suddenly appeared. It has appeared because of the misguided, reprehensible policy directed at reducing the economic power and stability of families.

We look at the double digit unemployment that has hovered in that area for the last three years which includes women. We look at the \$100 billion addition to our federal debt and the enormous amount of interest we have to pay in addition to the tax revenue we have just to pay the interest on that debt.

Supply

We also, of course, look at the latest statistics, another gift from this Liberal government, 44,000 women unemployed this month alone. That is the gift from this Liberal government to working women and their children. I wonder if my colleague would care to comment on some of those points.

• (1240)

Mrs. Hayes: Mr. Speaker, simply put, I think my colleague has addressed some of my concerns very well.

The government that thinks it has the solutions to all Canadians rather than leaving those solutions and those choices in their hands is a government that is headed for disaster and is heading our country and our children into disaster.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): The hon. member for Mount Royal informed me in writing that she would be unable to present her motion during private members' business, on Monday, March 10, 1997.

[*English*]

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence. Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop that item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, private members' business will be suspended and government orders will begin at 11 a.m.

* * *

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF WOMEN

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the eve of International Women's Day, it is appropriate to take a look at the current situation. I would love to be able to tell you that I am pleased that progress has been made. Unfortunately, I cannot do so in reference to women, and the children for whom they are responsible, in Quebec and in Canada.

In fact, the new unemployment figures released this morning reflect a situation that women have been experiencing for the last three years. Indeed, this morning we learned from Statistics Canada that 44,000 full time jobs were lost last month, while—and this is no compensation, far from it—14,000 part time jobs are said to have been created. The net loss for women is 30,000 jobs.

It would be one thing if this was just a blip, just a bad month in a period during which the situation was improving for women, but it is not the case. Since this government came to office, in fact since one year after the beginning of its mandate, only 10,000 full time jobs have been created for women, compared to 140,000 part time jobs. The reality for women is that a large number of them are part time workers because they have no other option.

In Quebec and in Canada, the majority of part time jobs are held by women. Also, the unemployment rate for certain groups of women is higher than the national average. We know that women are in jobs that have traditionally been reserved for them, and for which they are often paid less than the average salary for men.

In 1993, women's earnings represented 75 per cent of the average salary for men, a proportion which remains basically the same year after year. Given these conditions, and knowing how hard it is to find full time jobs—with these being usually low paying occupations that pay less than men's occupations—one realizes the importance of social programs for women.

• (1245)

But what have we seen since this government came to power? Not just an erosion, because "erosion" is a word suggesting slow breakdown; and "illusion" does not really describe the situation either. What we have seen is a radical decrease in the coverage provided by social programs to women and women with children.

Whether it is employment insurance, the successor to unemployment insurance, slashed deeply by this government, or the equally radical decrease in social transfers that forced the Government of Quebec to cut social services, education and welfare, social programs have been very hard hit.

I was struck by a passage in the finance minister's budget speech, enthusing how proud he was that Canada had gone from the bottom spot among the seven richest countries, the G-7, to the top. Why was he proud? Because of the fight to bring down the deficit. So Canada is congratulating itself because it is the most successful in bringing down the deficit.

But I asked him the other day why he was content to be near the bottom, not this time of the richest countries, but of the 28 developed countries in the OECD. Canada is bringing up the rear, with New Zealand and the United States. And this is on the basis of the 1990 figures, which do not take into account the radical cuts we have seen over the last three years.

There is a widespread myth in this country that Canada's social programs are extremely generous. This is not the case. Compared to other developed countries, our social programs are anaemic. So when we see the Minister of Finance crowing because Canada now tops the list of countries that are making cuts in order to lower their deficit, with no concern for the effects on women and children in particular, on families, on the most disadvantaged in society, when

Canada was already lagging behind in this social protection, there is cause not just for concern but for real distress.

There is also the fact that many women are poor, not only women who are heads of single parent households, but also women who are in a relationship and who are obliged, because of the many cuts to the social programs, to invest more of their time in addition to the effort they put into looking for a job, even a part time one.

What they find is that unemployment insurance is less accessible than it used to be, that the tax benefits for children the government promised will in fact increase by only \$33 per child in poverty this year and that, as far as the rest is concerned, this election promise is just as empty as the promise of a national daycare service, for which not one single cent has been forthcoming.

When we see the effect of the measures on the poor and the reduction in welfare because of cuts, the life of women who are heads of households and those who live with a partner, who may be just as poor or who is a part of the middle class, and they want to have children or are having a difficult time giving the child a reasonable education, we realize that the situation for women has deteriorated. It is distressing. It is worrisome. I have a hard time swallowing the government opposite's smugness in the face of the void that women are having to face.

• (1250)

Employment is hard to come by and it is poorly paid. Employment insurance is hard to get and available for a shorter time. Maternity leave is not so readily available, and welfare has been cut and is hard to obtain. I hope next year's status report is different.

Count on us to be a vigilant and effective opposition. We will not let you out of our sight. The women we represent today have enormous needs.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think all members would agree the economic autonomy of women is an important issue, not only to talk about but also to act on.

I raise for the member's consideration another aspect of the consequences to women and to children. We talk in this place about child poverty. The member will know according to the Vanier Institute that 50 per cent of marriages break down in divorce. When we consider the breakdown of common law relationships which are not reported in those figures we could conclude the Canadian family is in crisis. We need to address family issues as part of a strategy to address the economic issues related to women.

Supply

The reason for this is that children are involved in 60 per cent of divorces. The custody arrangements by the courts are basically automatic. Women are awarded the custody of the children. The courts and society as a whole have decided that women are in the best position to care for children.

We know that 23 per cent of all families in Canada represent lone parent families. What is worse is that those 23 per cent of families account for 53 per cent of all children living in poverty.

Would the member care to comment on whether she feels the Canadian family is in crisis and the role or the economic condition of women might be helped if we were to help find ways to make the Canadian family stronger?

[Translation]

Mrs. Lalonde: Madam Speaker, I must say I am somewhat surprised by what the member opposite has just said. Tomorrow is International Women's Day and I would have liked him to address this issue for once. What concerns him is that so many marriages end up in divorce and that there are so many common law relationships.

A caring society provides families, single families and couples alike, not only with emergency help but also with the means to meet their needs. Down through the centuries, the family has evolved, and if it is evolving now it is largely due to the fact that the industrial society has become post industrial and disruptive.

It is not up to society or to the government to decide what constitutes a family, and to spare no effort to make sure it remains that way. In any event, even if it tried, the government would not succeed. What we have to expect is that society will evolve to adjust to changes, and that the elements therein will follow suit.

• (1255)

I agree with those who say we must help couples, but we cannot prevent society from evolving. We could mention education too; and I agree. Obviously, since relationships are not forever, we should teach men and women to put the well being of children first. I did say men and women. But this will never be an excuse for not providing a minimum of help to find employment, get an education, and support women and children. This will never release society from providing the bare minimum.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on the hon. member's motion, which deals with the government's lack of action to improve women's living conditions.

I want to put this issue in a global context and go back to the federal cuts and their harmful effects on health, social assistance, employment insurance, old age pensions—not to mention the forgotten promises made regarding employment and health—be-

Supply

fore finally discussing the federal government's inaction regarding the problems women are facing, particularly violence, poverty and children.

The federal government cannot merely appoint a Secretary of State for the Status of Women and think that women's problems are automatically going to be solved. In spite of the valiant efforts of the secretary of state, any government action to help women must get the support of all the ministers, particularly the Minister of Finance, otherwise it is doomed.

Recently, we noticed problems in several departments, including national defence, where a woman, who might have become Canada's first woman to reach the rank of general, was forced to leave the military because her colleagues were giving her a hard time. Women know how hard it is to be a woman in a woman's world, and even more so in a man's world. When it comes to work, we all know that women must do more to find their place in the sun.

I feel strongly that concerted action by the government is necessary to further the cause of women. What we see is that the government has unfortunately failed to deliver. It has not really undertaken any concerted action and has considerably reduced funding for various social programs that might have helped improve the cause of women in this country.

Some cuts and their effects: there are still, theoretically and legally, one and a half years left in the Liberal government's mandate, and we are hearing a lot more about the likelihood of a spring election than about new programs to try to keep a few promises.

Has the government kept its promises to protect and to promote the rights and the cause of women? Unfortunately not. Women were the first to be hit by the Liberal government's never-ending cuts in funding for health, social assistance, unemployment insurance and education, as well as by the announced reform of the pension plan.

In the area of health, in 1995 the federal government announced a revolutionary new program: the Canada Social Transfer. What this program really boiled down to was \$7 billion in cuts in transfers to the provinces for health, social welfare and education.

These federal health cuts are coming at a time when the aging of the population requires an increase in resources aimed at seniors, such as home care. Older women will pay the cost of lowering the government's deficit.

As for social assistance, tighter eligibility criteria for employment insurance and continued high unemployment have forced many women to go on welfare. In 1995, Quebec held the dubious record of 485,000 households receiving income security benefits.

• (1300)

As for employment insurance reform, which bases eligibility on the number of hours, not weeks, worked, this penalizes part time workers, and we must keep in mind that 70 per cent of these are women. These workers will now contribute to the system from the first hour worked, but will have little chance of accumulating sufficient hours to qualify for benefits if they lose their job.

By depriving numerous women of a replacement income between jobs, while the unemployment insurance fund surplus will total \$12 billion in 1988, the federal government is choosing to make women who are working, and women who are unemployed, foot the bill for part of its deficit reduction.

As for seniors' pensions, the federal government plans to bring in a system for calculating pensions according to family income in the year 2001. The calculation of how much pension a woman will receive will, therefore, depend on her husband's income.

This measure will mean less money for couples, but also less independence for women. After all the years of struggle to obtain the recognition of women as persons in their own right, seniors will be treated differently depending on how much their husband's income is.

Yet, 44 per cent of women over the age of 65 are living below the poverty line, compared to 25 per cent of men. Why, then, reduce women's pensions?

A few promises have been forgotten. On March 4, 1994, the government voted in favour of the Bloc Quebecois motion urging the government to recognize the principle of economic equality between women and men and to implement measures to guarantee equity in employment, wages and living conditions for women. But the federal government has never put its money where its mouth is, despite its great eloquence on the matter at the time.

A federal pay equity bill was passed, in 1977 according to our sources, but in 1978 according to the minister's, and the government is dragging its feet unduly on its implementation. The Public Service Alliance estimates that women may be owed in excess of \$2 billion.

The federal government's inaction in the area of job creation affects women in particular for they are, more often than not, the ones in precarious, underpaid, temporary or part time jobs. Women hold 69 per cent of part time jobs, but not by choice, for 500,000 of them would like to have full time work. Only 20 per cent of women have a full time job which pays more than \$30,000, compared to 40 per cent of men. Women, whatever their level of education, earn less than men. Even female university graduates make only 75 per cent of the salary paid to their male colleagues.

In the health and employment sector, the Liberal government also failed to keep its promises. It considerably reduced transfers for health care and did nothing to create jobs, although in its red book, it said on page 81, and I quote: "The social and economic experiences of women provide the context within which their health needs must be reviewed. Canadian women are poorer than Canadian men, and there is a clear link between poverty and poor health".

The government's inertia continues. The government has done nothing about certain major problems that affect women, including violence. Community agencies that provide support and counselling for women who are victims of domestic violence, as well as the shelters for women and children have been severely affected by federal cuts in community assistance. The very fact that this sector was not spared by the government proves that violence against women is not a priority concern for the Liberals.

In 1994, 70 per cent of poor people in Canada were women or their children, which adds up to 2 million women and 1.3 million children, and under the Liberals, the situation continues to deteriorate. We now have 1,600,000 poor children, and the average family income dropped by about \$1,000 between 1994 and 1995. The government, instead of taking vigorous steps to deal with this problem, has reduced transfers to the provinces for social assistance, plans to provide minimal amounts that would be barely enough to survive and suggested that disadvantaged citizens go begging in the streets.

When the latest budget was brought down, the Minister of Finance realized all of sudden that child poverty was a problem. I would like to point out that to fight child poverty, we must first help families with employment policies, social security and community support.

• (1305)

The Canadian Institute of Child Health calculated that the best way to improve the standard of living of our children would be to develop a national job creation strategy for adults who have to support a family. That is pretty obvious. To improve the circumstances of women and their children, the government should listen to the suggestions coming from the official opposition and many women's groups, and act on those suggestions, and act positively by creating jobs for women and stopping cuts in social programs. Although theoretically and legally women have equal rights, only economic equality will make them truly equal. Then maybe we will no longer need March 8.

[English]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Bloc for her comments and concerns in this

Supply

area. We all have a vested interest in the whole question of the equitable standards that women live and work in.

There are three women in my family whom I love very much. Two of them are working. They would like to see from government a greater reduction in the taxes they have to pay. They look at their paycheques and they would like to see more expendable income left for them to support their children and buy the goods and services they need. I believe every working woman in the country would like to see that. That is how to strengthen the economic stability of working women.

What has happened? The government participated in taking 50 cents in taxes in one form or another from every dollar a working woman earns. I think this is wrong.

In addition, in the next six years or so working women will have to pay another 9 or 10 per cent on their Canada pension contributions. This is what is weakening the economic stability of working women. Over the last month these policies have resulted in 44,000 women becoming unemployed and their children living in poverty.

When I hear the minister across the way speak as she did this morning about all the wonderful things the government is doing for women, I cannot help but fight the feeling and thoughts of hypocrisy that well up in my mind. It was reprehensible, pathetic rhetoric.

The best way to help working women and the children living poverty is by examining the policies that led to the situation. What policies over the last two and a half decades led to child poverty and were recognized by the government?

One child in five is supposedly living in poverty. If the child is living in poverty the family is living in poverty. How could we expect anything but that when the three levels of government are taking 50 cents from every dollar they earn? How can we expect anything but poverty for these women and their children?

I listened very carefully to my colleague's comments. I would like her to address the policies of the government that have led to family and child poverty which the government recently recognized exists directly as a result of the policies of the government.

[Translation]

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, it is all too clear that the government opposite is arrogant and has a certain disdain for the people of Canada because of its absolute majority in the House. It may continue to think it has no opposition across from it. The papers continue to say that the opposition is not playing its role and that the government continues to do what it likes.

Supply

• (1310)

There will be a Grand Prix Sunday, because negotiations went on all night and all morning to reach an agreement with the government, which did not want to lose face and change things.

It is always the same with this government. It makes the policies it likes. It rises in this House to defend the health of children. We are not allowed to use the word that comes to mind. I have little time left and I do not want it taken away from me. To be able to claim to be protecting children's health, the government should have made fewer cuts. When it decided to cut transfer payments to the provinces, it decided to increase poverty. It would bust its britches with its own self importance and continue to make everyone poorer.

[English]

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in my place today to speak to the motion by the hon. member for Laurentides concerning the socioeconomic condition of women.

In the course of the debate I hope the House will not lose sight of the government's role to help women support their families. The issue of how Canadians care for their families should not be separated from a discussion about the socioeconomic condition of women.

I will outline how the government is moving on three fronts to improve the well-being of women who care for families. Maybe this will respond to the previous questioner's concerns. They are assessing the value of unpaid work, reforming the national child benefit system and ensuring that child support payments are made when a family breaks up.

The first issue is the unpaid work many women perform. It includes housework, care of children and care of other dependants such as the elderly. Most of this work is done by women, two-thirds according to Statistics Canada. This unpaid work provides the foundation of society. It keeps our families strong. It serves as the bedrock of the social order upon which our paid economy can be built. This unpaid work is extremely valuable to society.

In 1994 Statistics Canada placed a monetary value on it of \$285 billion. Even while it contributes so much to society and the economy, unpaid work often has a detrimental impact on the socioeconomic well-being of women. For many it means they do not have the choice of entering the workforce. For others it means their chances of advancing in their careers is limited. For some it means a double shift that can wear them out.

We need a better understanding of the role unpaid work plays in helping us promote the equality of men and women. It would help Canadians rebalance the sharing of family responsibilities.

The government has established an overriding, long term initiative to measure and value unpaid work. In 1996 we counted unpaid household work, child care and elder care for the first time in the census. We expect to see the results in 1998 and will add the information to the time use surveys and evaluation methods that have already been conducted.

Our efforts are now being directed toward a framework for evaluating the policy implications of unpaid work. Part of this is being developed through joint research with other OECD countries. In the years ahead we will use the information to improve our initiatives and to promote the socioeconomic equality of women.

While the government takes long term steps to promote better policy it has also taken immediate action to improve the socioeconomic impact of how women care for their families. Nowhere is that more important than in the case of child poverty, the second broad issue I will outline before the House.

Children's poverty is intricately linked with women's poverty. Many children live in poverty because they are under the care of a lone parent. That parent is usually a woman and that woman usually has to make ends meet for herself and her children with a low paying job or with the support of the social safety net.

The government has moved on all these fronts. In the last budget the Minister of Finance introduced an historic initiative, the national child benefit, which will provide more money to families where lone parent mothers must care for children. It builds on the child support reform introduced last year.

• (1315)

Under the benefit system, a Canada child tax benefit worth \$6 billion will be in place by July 1998. That is one step in a two step process to create the new system.

Every step involved in the working income supplement, which will increase in July 1997 from \$500 per family to \$605 for one child, \$1,010 for two children and \$330 for each additional child, is good news for low income families with children who want to get into the workforce.

In July 1998, one year after we increased the working income supplement, we will combine it with a child tax benefit. Benefits will increase to all low income families in which the parents have paid work as well as those who receive social assistance.

As a result of these measures, more than 1.4 million Canadian families will see an increase in federal child benefit payments by July 1998. That represents 2.5 million children. Many women will see their socio-economic condition improve and find themselves able to take better care of their families.

The third broad area where the government has moved to improve the socio-economic condition of women through family initiatives involves the support payments for children should a family break up.

Recently this House passed child support legislation based on the premise that when parents separate or divorce, a child's standard of living should reflect the means of both parents. Children are a shared responsibility. Both parents have an obligation to support their children.

The legislation changed the way that child support payments are taxed. Child support paid under a written agreement or court order made on or after May 1, 1997 will not be deductible to the payer or included in the income of the recipient for tax purposes. Therefore the new tax rules will apply to all new orders or agreements made on or after May 1, 1997.

The legislation also introduced measures to complement provincial and territorial efforts to enforce court orders. As a result, in a province's effort to enforce a court order, federal licences can be suspended and federal pensions can be diverted.

Federal data bases, including Revenue Canada's, can be used to track defaulters. Passports can be suspended if a debtor is in persistent arrears.

We also introduced child support guidelines to make the system more predictable and offer a simpler means to update awards. They have three main elements: child support payment schedules, rules to adjust the award to reflect four types of special child related expenses, and rules to adjust the award in cases of undue hardship.

Part of the reason for introducing these guidelines was to cut down on the legal costs of determining child support. Money that is spent on lawyers would be better spent to support these children.

These changes in child support legislation were long overdue. Soon lone parents will begin to benefit from them. In many cases these parents will be women, many of whom must struggle to keep their children fed and clothed.

The burden of caring for a family under these hardships adds an enormous strain to the health and well-being of these women. It is a burden that contributes greatly to the socio-economic inequalities that women face.

This is International Women's Week. It is a time to rededicate ourselves to the challenge of creating socio-economic equality of women. We acknowledge that much remains to be done to advance women's equality.

The advances must be an inclusive process that engages all sectors and individuals to make changes happen. Governments cannot do it alone, but this government under the Prime Minister has taken some very important steps to help ensure that we will all get there together.

Supply

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech by my hon. colleague, for whom I have great respect and who has given considerable thought to social concerns in general.

I would like her comments on the fact that, in Canada, one in five children still lives under the poverty line and the number keeps growing. I would like her comments on the 10,000 jobs cut at Canada Post, the majority of which were held by women.

• (1320)

I would also like to know what she thinks of the cuts in social housing made since this government took office, the fact that housing used to be subsidized but now government no longer spends a red cent on developing social housing. It has passed the buck to the provinces. Add to that cuts in transfer payments, which interfere with the provinces' capacity to maintain their own social safety net.

As she pointed out earlier, initiatives like the child tax benefit were indeed put forward. But, for a single mother raising two or three children, an extra \$800 per year is not enough, when the time comes to pay rent at the end of the month, pay telephone bills or the groceries, if she wants her children to be well fed. Without adequate housing, when cuts are made, there is less for health, food, and so on; that is where the money has to come from. I would like to know what the hon. member thinks about this.

I sincerely believe that all the policies that have been put in place will never compensate for the lack of focus on the needs of women, and therefore children, because they are the ones looking after the children. I sincerely think that the provinces should get more, they should get their fair share. The provinces are not asking for handouts. They want what is supposed to be theirs, the transfer payments they are entitled to, and to be able to meet the needs of women and children, within their jurisdictions.

[English]

Mrs. Gaffney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member from the Bloc Quebecois for her kind comments.

I do not think any government in history has been as concerned about the lives of women as this government in trying to improve the lives of women and to decrease the amount of poverty among women and children.

When the finance minister was preparing his budget every government department was asked to look at every issue where there was a proposed cutback or whatever it was with regard to gender equality and gender issues. It was one of the most important things a government could be concerned about. It is too important to leave to one person, as the minister responsible for women's

Supply

issues said this morning. We have to draw in all government departments.

Maybe the member from the Bloc Quebecois was not listening too carefully to me. I outlined many areas where this government is concerned with women's and children's issues and the poverty in this country.

I have time to expand on a couple of them. When one in five lives under the poverty line that is not acceptable, I agree, but if she had listened to what I said there are many measures that we are putting in place to try to decrease that amount.

With regard to transfers to the provinces I can only speak for the province of Ontario, the area I am most familiar with. In terms of transfers to the province of Ontario, and I assume it is the same with the province of Quebec, the federal government has decreased the transfers since 1993 to today by as little as \$1.5 billion. That is less than what our government departments were asked to cut back. I think it is around 11 per cent. Each government department has been cut back by 15 per cent.

Why would a premier of a province then initiate a tax benefit to the people of Ontario? Who does this tax benefit or tax cut go to? It goes to the wealthy in the province of Ontario. They are the ones who are benefiting. Who are the ones who are being hurt in the province of Ontario? It is the poor people who are not benefiting. In addition, why has the premier cut back in education and hospitals? He must come up with \$4.5 billion to cover his tax cut in the province of Ontario.

Let us not blame this on the federal government. It is not our fault. That is four times the amount of money that the federal government has cut in transfers to the provinces. It is about time to put the onus where the onus should be, back on the premier of the province of Ontario.

With regard to the 10,000 jobs lost at Canada Post, I have to assume the member is referring to junk mail.

• (1325)

It is my understanding that those 10,000 jobs will be picked up in another area with regard to the private sector which will then be providing the same quality of service. I hope that will be the case.

With regard to the cutbacks in social housing, it is not my understanding that there are cuts in social housing. We are working with the provinces to increase social housing in this province. In fact, we are very concerned about some of the aspects of what different provinces are doing. Again I cannot quote on Quebec, but I know that in Ontario there is talk about privatizing and we are very concerned about any effort to privatize social housing in Ontario.

I hope I have responded to her concerns.

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask my hon. colleague a couple of questions specifically about gender analysis.

I am aware that because of the fourth UN conference on women, to which Canada was a signatory, it was recommended that there be a review in every federal department. It was interesting to note that the hon. member suggested that it was going forward and was in place at the present time.

We should review all legislation as to how it affects women in particular, which is called gender analysis, although I think the secretary of state would say it is men and women, but it specifically goes to issues dealing with women.

I know my hon. colleague is very concerned with families in Canada and certainly realizes their importance. I would ask if she feels that a similar kind of review should take place as to how government policies affect families in Canada. Are they not as important an institution as any other in this country? Should there not be a similar kind of government activity addressing how government policy affects family units in Canada?

Mrs. Gaffney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

I addressed in my speech how the child tax benefit helps families. I outlined the different amounts of moneys. Maybe the member was not in her seat at the time but I would be delighted to repeat what I said.

Through the working income supplement and the enriched Canada child tax benefit program, the 1997 budget will help to improve the assistance available to children in low income families who are the ones who most need help. This will be increased by \$195 million in June 1997. This will provide a maximum supplement of \$605 for the first child, \$405 for the second and \$330 for each additional child.

If this is not a major benefit and a major expense that this government is putting forward to help children, families and moms and dads, then I cannot understand her question. This is a major effort on behalf of this government.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just for the record, this has been a great day where we all had a chance to make some brief and some lengthy comments concerning International Women's Day. However, we certainly all recognize the fact that notwithstanding what every government has done over the years, a lot of work still needs to be done.

As my colleague from the official opposition very eloquently put it, in Canada, the richest country on earth, where we still have over one in every five children living below the poverty line, it is clear that our work is not done.

However, one could say that at least we know the task has not been completed.

Over the past three years the government—it has only been in power for about three and a half years—has done a tremendous amount of things in order to address many of the concerns that were raised by my colleagues. It has taken a number of initiatives to restore confidence which was one of the most important elements and concerns that faced Canadians over the past nine years. That was done.

The second initiative undertaken by the government was to put its house in order. I would suggest, and my colleagues would agree, that our house is in order. The deficit is controllable. It is below \$19 billion. The economy has grown at an incredible rate, higher than any other country in the western hemisphere. Interest rates are low and inflation is low.

The next move is to invest. I would suggest with the budget discussion that was initiated by the Minister of Finance the government is now moving toward investments. Before I sit down, I would suggest that with another mandate I am sure many of the concerns raised by my colleagues will be addressed.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): Since debate has now ended, the proceedings concerning the motion before the House are completed.

[English]

It being 1.30 o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

UNIFIED FAMILY COURT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider, in conjunction with the provinces, the active promotion and implementation of the Unified Family Court in order to emphasize mediation in family law issues, and to improve the administration of the interjurisdictional aspects of family law.

She said: Mr. Speaker, for the record to be complete, I am pleased to speak to this motion and I will repeat the motion now:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider, in conjunction with the provinces, the active promotion and implementation of the

Private Members' Business

Unified Family Court in order to emphasize mediation in family law issues, and to improve the administration of the interjurisdictional aspects of family law.

I brought this motion forward because the landscape of family life in Canada is changing dramatically and radically. Many factors are involved in this change.

Those factors range from changes in technology to the mobility of persons, changing expectations even within society. But I would put to this House that perhaps the most notable change of all has been the change in marital breakdown within society.

Divorce in Canada is too important to be ignored. It is too important for government to step aside and let what is happening happen. The patchwork legislation such as Bill C-41 is simply not enough, so I am pleased again to bring forward some suggestions that are in the process and relate to this very important item of divorce.

Divorce is under federal jurisdiction and was made so in the British North America Act in 1867. At that time divorce was granted only if it could be proven that one spouse committed adultery. The jurisdiction was shared between the federal Parliament that enacted the law and provincial legislatures that gave courts the authority to grant divorce.

In 1968 the grounds for divorce were expanded to include marital breakdown and marital offences where breakdown was defined as such things as desertion, imprisonment and separation for at least three years. Marital offence was defined as physical or mental cruelty. It was quite a span of time from 1867 to 1968 before any changes were made at all to the law.

In 1985 the Divorce Act was opened again. It was amended so that marital breakdown was deemed the only ground for divorce. That was defined as separation of at least one year, adultery and/or physical or mental cruelty.

It is interesting to note that the no fault provision, that is separation for at least one year, was used in 91 per cent of the divorces in the first year after the passage of that bill in 1985.

• (1335)

Between 1965 and 1988, before the first change to the bill and after the second, Canada has the record of going from one of the lowest rates of divorce to one of the highest in the industrial countries. The latest statistics state that approximately one in every two marriages today ends in divorce, showing another increase.

This eight fold increase in divorce since the changes in 1968 underlines a fundamental shift in our understanding of the basic concepts of marriage, children, relationships and others. They reflect a change in things like social mobility, lower birth rates, equality rights and entry of women into the labour force.

Private Members' Business

Even though divorce is rampant, it is true that seven out of ten Canadians remarry. Marriage is not forgotten. However, the process of divorce takes its toll.

As a society our concern is the major effect of this process on children and, therefore, the social and economic effects that result from that.

Children are our country's most valuable resource. Scientists have said that there are certain developmental and cognitive predictors we can look at to see how successful they will be and how they will contribute to society.

Scientists have noted life changes that affect children and have listed and quantified them. Some of the life changes that have dramatic effects on children are negative economic circumstances, particularly of women after divorce; erratic or no contact with the non-custodial parent; ongoing parental conflict or less availability of the residential parent because that parent may have to work.

In contrast, the top factors that work toward positive consequences in the event of divorce would be the extent to which parents resolve the conflict surrounding the divorce, the quality of the custodial relationship and the extent of not feeling rejected by the non-custodial parent. These all have positive effects on children.

As the government looks at legislation relating to divorce it has a responsibility in these areas, not in just one or two of them because they all affect children, the products of the marriage, and all too often the victims of the divorce.

The signs of stress from this epidemic are everywhere. Youth suicides are escalating, teen pregnancies are escalating, youth violent crimes doubled in the last few years. Even such things as academic achievement, which has been shown to relate specifically to the security of the child and the feeling of belonging, in recent days has shown to be lacking in Canadian standards.

When I think back to what the government did in Bill C-41, I see it as a dismal failure. Bill C-41 will create renewed legal wrangling between custodial and non-custodial parents and that will work directly against the best interests of children.

The Liberal government is out of touch with the realities faced by Canadian families in their homes and in the process of divorce. Bill C-41 essentially relegates the non-custodial parent to the role of a money machine. The guidelines lack any recognition or encouragement of special circumstances or commitments of time or resources unless it is above a 40 per cent access threshold. It encourages an all or nothing mindset as to whether someone is a custodial or non-custodial parent. The justice minister has claimed that this legislation is designed to reduce conflict. Because of this legislation, the battle lines will be drawn earlier and the battle will go on longer.

• (1340)

Other factors are that access to the non-custodial parent are ignored and the non-adversarial atmosphere that is recommended is ignored. The government is blind to the real needs of Canadians and has refused to consider support and access together, despite the testimony of many Canadians and experts.

One thing the government can do is move in the direction of a valuable change to promote more aggressively something that came through in 1974 from the Law Reform Commission of Canada. This was a suggestion to establish a unified family court system across the country.

Federal officials say that the government has supported the idea of a unified family court ever since the law commission issued this report. Yet 27 years later we have very little to show for it. In 1974, the Law Reform Commission said: "In some provinces, as many as five different courts may handle family problems. Overlapping and fragmentation occurs in the areas of custody, wardship, adoption, maintenance and divorce. This not only leads to multiplication of effort, but can produce irreconcilable decisions". Twenty-seven years later, this is still the case.

The commission also said: "The most distressing effect of the present state of affairs is the despair, confusion and frustration it causes to the participants". I would add, to the children of the participants. Divorce and separation are traumatic enough without being made more difficult by the court system. Yet little has been done to remedy the situation.

Shortly after the commission report in 1977, Ontario implemented a unified family court pilot project in Hamilton. In 1978, Saskatchewan set up a unified family court. Today, Saskatchewan has a family court in three urban centres and Ontario has it in five. Also, Manitoba and Newfoundland provide province wide access to a unified family court. Previous debate in B.C. and Alberta about the implementation of a unified family court has collapsed.

Twenty-three years after a commission report, we have a convoluted variety of family court systems with no visible national commitment to establish a nation wide family court. Meanwhile, those who are suffering from the lack of action are families, especially the children.

Stronger leadership is needed from the federal government to encourage all the provinces to establish unified family courts for the sake of children.

A unified family court, according to the Law Reform Commission, should have the authority over most family matters, including the formation of marriage, divorce, judicial separation and separation orders, alimony and maintenance, custody, access, adoption and child neglect. The commission recognized differences of opinion over such matters as interspousal or interfamilial torts and contracts, guardianship of the property of minors in interspousal or

interfamilial offences of a criminal nature including, of course, family violence.

A unified family court offers several clear advantages for litigants over the present system. First, it will eliminate the problem of overlapping and fragmentation in many present rulings along with the confusion and frustration litigants face with this state of affairs. It can also save time and money.

As the Law Reform Commission said: "Present systems cause duplication of effort by judges, lawyers, witnesses, court administrators and the parties themselves". This naturally leads to increased costs.

Consolidation of family law jurisdiction in a single court would reduce the cost of legal services to the litigants. Not only are initial costs lowered but future costs can be as well.

• (1345)

A spokesman for the Hamilton unified family court said:

If you come back to the court, say, five years later to seek a variance on a ruling, you can apply for it in the unified family court through a motion, which is simpler and less costly than the usual application that is required in other courts.

The Hamilton unified family court has also implemented case management, a more efficient way of processing court cases. A case is assigned to one judge who is responsible for seeing it through to completion. He can deal with the various aspects of the case and while doing so develop a familiarity with the litigants and their problems which will help him to guide them through the process as quickly as is helpful to them.

Further to these benefits is the commitment in unified family courts to consider the dynamics of family conflicts. Judges in a unified family court specialize in family disputes and therefore can more effectively work with them on a personal and individual basis. A judge having developed a familiarity with a case can often offer advice. Also the litigants are saved the confusion of having various judges involved in different aspects of their situation offering contradictory advice.

Family court judges also look differently at situations than criminal court judges. For example, they are responsible to take into consideration the best interests of the child. In the case of a wayward child, if the judge knows the child is involved with social workers from within the same court he may well treat the case differently from one in which the provision of help for the child is less clearly defined.

Unified family court can also facilitate more effectively the use of mediation, an alternative to the adversarial and more destructive litigation process. Mediation is becoming increasingly popular as

people experience the benefits of this approach to conflict resolution.

I will speak specifically to mediation. Last year the civil justice task force report by the Canadian Bar Association made strong recommendations for increased use of alternative dispute resolution instead of litigation to resolve civil cases. Noting the increased use of dispute resolution methods such as mediation in place of litigation that is already taking place, the Canadian Bar Association urged even more dedicated commitment to pursue that such methods be made.

It recommended that every jurisdiction make available as part of the civil justice system opportunities for litigants to use non-binding dispute resolution processes. While it did not advocate mandatory mediation it did suggest the use of incentives to encourage litigants to use dispute resolution methods and to do so as early in the process as possible.

The Ontario government has recently launched a pilot project that imposes mandatory mediation as the first stage in all civil disputes. Interestingly enough it has accepted family conflicts.

Why do we want to stop and look at mediation in family disputes? The Canadian Bar Association did not go specifically to matters of family law, but the principles and recommendations made by the bar have also been used effectively to resolve family disputes and are being used to one degree or another in different jurisdictions in Canada.

The main concern about family conflicts that led to their exemption from the mandatory mediation pilot project was that in some cases it could involve domestic violence and other power imbalances in family relationships that some say would disadvantage women in the mediation process. However all provinces have had quite a bit of experience with mediation already and screening systems can be implemented to filter domestic abuse cases out of the mediation channel.

The Divorce Act already requires lawyers to make their clients aware they can pursue mediation in place of litigation and to different degrees provincial governments encourage the use of mediation.

Let us consider mandatory mediation. The commitment to mediation in family disputes must be stronger than simply a suggestion. Extensive documentation already exists about the negative effects of divorce on children. The adversarial nature of litigation and common battles over child custody leave even more scars on these innocent victims.

As the Canadian Bar Association stated, court trials should be seen as "an option of the last resort". Rather than mediation being an option within the hands of lawyers I suggest that lawyers become an option only if mediation becomes unworkable.

Private Members' Business

• (1350)

Is mediation the entire answer? Should consideration be made for counselling as well? The idea of courses before divorce, premarital courses, marriage and parenting courses has some real validity. The government minimizes by neglect the implications in societal contribution of strong marriages and so ignores such suggestions. The government minimizes by neglect the devastating effect of marital breakdown on children.

As usual government policy is working against families without these recognitions being in place. Financial incentives for counselling such as tax credits or at the very least a GST exemption for counselling services would be a step in the right direction.

Whether we make mediation mandatory or simply offer strong incentives which make it or counselling a more appealing alternative in most cases, the federal government needs to urge each Canadian jurisdiction to take seriously the importance of providing Canadian families with a practical alternative to litigation.

The Law Reform Commission of Canada report calls for reform in our court systems to aid families. The recent Canadian Bar Association task force suggests dispute resolution approaches that are already proving effective in resolving family disputes in some jurisdictions. The benefits of unified family court and mediation process offer families something that is not now there in the process.

Due to the growing concern over family conflict with today's level of divorce, due to the non-partisan nature of concern for Canada's children and due to the recognition there is much that can be done to prove their lot in society the motion deserves more than just one hour of debate. I therefore ask for unanimous consent to make the motion votable.

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

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): There is not unanimous consent.

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the issue of a unified family court although it took a long time to get around to that in the hon. member's address. It occurred to me that perhaps she was trying to use Motion No. 147 as a way to go back over Bill C-41. It is interesting that would be the case.

It is also interesting since we are so close to International Women's Day that the member would again promote an anti-feminist agenda which promotes the interest of the boys and not of women as the Reform Party usually does.

She suggests the federal government has somehow failed in the area of unified family courts when these courts virtually exist all

over the country. We are talking about a court system that requires a lot of provincial co-operation. She should return to her own province and speak to them about the importance of unified family courts and of co-operating with us on that process.

It is unfair to suggest the federal government has failed here. A simple reading of the Constitution by a child would indicate that the court system is the responsibility of the provincial government.

Unified family courts as they exist now have provided a model of co-operation in the administration of justice. Governments, providers of professional and community services, the judiciary and the bar have all co-operated to establish these in some provinces. Unified family courts send a strong message of what can be accomplished through the development of partnerships and the sharing of ideas. The federal government is ready, willing and able to be at the table but not all provinces co-operate. The federal government has supported the establishment of unified family courts for over 20 years.

It is interesting the hon. member would cite the 1974 Law Reform Commission of Canada report. When we recently reinstated the commission the Reform Party voted against it. In any event she is relying on their old work and I suppose we should be thankful for that.

• (1355)

Discussions followed shortly after that report with all governments. What we found out at that time is that all governments were concerned over the division of jurisdiction of family law matters between two and sometimes more levels of court.

In some provinces as many as five different courts were handling family problems. There was overlapping, fragmentation and different judges for custody, wardship, adoption, child maintenance and divorce. This led to a multiplication of efforts but also sometimes to irreconcilable decisions. This complexity also had an effect on the ability of families to resolve their disputes quickly and at reasonable cost.

An additional concern for governments was the provision of adequate support services for family litigants. It was agreed that intake services, including referral to community based professional services, was essential for the effective operation of a unified court. Family counselling and family life education programs were recommended by the Canadian Law Reform Commission and enforcement services were also recommended that could take on the responsibility for ensuring that court orders were respected.

In Ontario those enforcement provisions have fallen apart because Ontario wants to put in a multi-billion dollar tax cut which results in their not having enough money for their enforcement proceedings. My office and the office of other Ontario MPs are receiving requests for assistance every day to enforce their orders.

Private Members' Business

The hon. member might want to keep that in mind when she is talking about tax cuts.

There was wide agreement in 1974 that these kinds of services were important in ensuring that those who sought help could get it in the form most appropriate to their needs. In July 1975 Prince Edward Island became the first province to create a unified family court. Then, in May 1976 a funding program administered by the Department of Justice, under which the federal government agreed to cost share the operation of unified family court initially for three years, was instituted. Four other provinces then participated, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and New Brunswick.

The first unified family court was in Hamilton—Wentworth, established in July 1977, 20 years ago. In August 1995 the family court became a separate branch of the Ontario Court general division and expanded to London, Barrie, Kingston and Napanee.

Saskatchewan established a unified family court in December 1978. In December 1994 those services which started in Saskatoon were expanded to Regina and Prince Albert.

A unified family court in St. John's, Newfoundland was established in June 1979, providing services to St. John's and the surrounding area.

New Brunswick established a unified family court in 1979. In September of that year a court was created to provide family services at Fredericton. In 1983 a family division of the Court of Queen's Bench in New Brunswick was established to provide those services province wide.

Manitoba did not participate in the pilot projects but in 1983 it established a family division of its Court of Queen's Bench to serve greater Winnipeg.

All these courts, including one in Nova Scotia which is now being established, have been set up with the co-operation and financial support of the federal government. A unified family court will be one of the options considered in discussions on court structure for the new territory of Nunavut.

Progress on the creation of a nationwide system of family courts has proceeded at a steady pace. It has been aided since 1981 by the maintenance of a pool of judicial salaries, pre-authorized by Parliament, that can be used as the need arises to fill positions created by provinces and territories.

With respect to the unified family courts and the structure and the need they fill, I would like to talk a bit about the philosophy behind the unified family court as it exists. It is to able families to resolve their differences to the greatest possible extent in a single forum. This can only be done if the courts are given both federal and provincial powers to deal with all aspects of family law. This is something the Reform Party seems to forget.

Since a large part of family law, including divorce and custody, falls within federal jurisdiction, unified family courts have to be established at that level. This ensures that the single court concept, one stop shopping, is maintained. Unified courts de-emphasizes the adversarial approach normally associated with courts of law in favour of a more informal dispute resolution approach.

Alternatives to legal resolutions are sought where practicable. A wide variety of professional and community services are made available to court users.

• (1400)

This model is seen as a way of making the court system more accessible, less threatening and more responsive to the needs of family members. It has wide acceptance among the public, family support professionals and organizations as well as the legal profession.

There has been high degree of co-operation between provincial and federal governments in the process of identifying women and men who are best suited to exercise the role of judge in these courts. There has been co-operation on funding. For example, when Ontario expanded its court in 1995 the federal government required that the salary savings realized from the federal government paying judges' salaries instead of the province be funnelled back into support services for the court.

Nova Scotia is willing to accept or has at least suggested a similar arrangement to assist in the funding of its courts. The obvious benefits for both governments are that we take over the payment of judges' salaries and the province uses that money that it has saved and it does not have to find new money to pay for important services.

All the things that my hon. friend is suggesting are going on, while the federal government then has the assurance that it requires that adequate funding will be made available to support the court once it is established.

All governments are wrestling with the problem of maintaining court services in attempting to reduce overall costs. To suggest, though, that the federal government is not doing its share is quite unfair. The hon. member talks about case load management like it is something new.

Case load management in Hamilton—Wentworth grew out of a system in Windsor, Ontario in the federally appointed court which was applied to family matters and other matters. All courts are working with this.

Mandatory mediations, all the things that the hon. member is suggesting, exist. They may not be mandatory but they do exist. After all, I would suggest to the hon. member that it is up to the litigants, the people who are involved, to decide whether they want to slug it out in court or whether they want to go to mediation. It is not up to the hon. member who, I would suggest, is following an

Private Members' Business

agenda which is more suitable to the support of men's rights than to the support of the rights of families.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member's motion on the creation of a unified family court. After reading her motion and listening to her speech, I am convinced the hon. member's intentions are good.

The Reform member surely has valid amendments to propose in order to deal with family breakups, the increasing number of divorces, and the problems experienced by children following their parents' divorce. However, creating a unified family court would not solve these problems.

In fact, it would create another problem. Whenever a change is made to a system, particularly the judicial system, the objective must be to improve that system. I do not believe that creating a court which would overlap existing tribunals would improve the system.

It must be understood that, in the current system, as the Liberal member pointed out, the majority of provinces already have their own family court. In Quebec, the Superior Court's family division deals with all family related issues.

So, establishing a unified court over the structure already in place in some provinces would be interfering in areas over which the federal has no jurisdiction. My main objection to the motion is that, once again, it ignores the respective jurisdictions in this country called Canada. The government is deliberately imposing national standards, or a very federal view, on anything that moves in this country.

I am sure the member means well, but I think she should have examined this issue more closely. There is no reason at this time to create such a court, which would merely duplicate what already exists.

• (1405)

I will give you an example to show how it would create more problems than it would solve. I am thinking of the famous trial and appeal divisions of the federal court. This is a court specifically for cases involving the federal government, when each of the provinces is equipped to settle these differences.

But no, the federal government felt the need to have a court with trial and appeal divisions in order to complicate Canada's judicial system. It would be exactly the same thing if it were to institute a federal unified family court.

I think that if we look at what is being done in the provinces, and I will refer to Quebec because I practised there for at least eight years, I know that in the case of family law, which is handled by the

Superior Court, there are weaknesses, but there are also some things that work very well.

I think that, if we want to help soften the blow of a separation or a divorce on families, we should perhaps try to find a way of actually helping affected family members. In Quebec, one of the methods we have adopted is compulsory mediation.

The hon. member says that the unified court would be able to do mediation, but here again, this is already being done in a number of provinces, including Quebec, which has compulsory mediation services. This means that individuals involved in a divorce or separation are invited to meet with professionals in this field to try and reach an amicable arrangement. We do not need the unified court to do this. I think we should let the provincial legislatures try to find the right way to deal with the problem of divorce.

At the present time, there is no evidence that the system is not effective, so I suggest we let the system be and try and find ways to improve it. Let me give you another example to show why Quebec cannot consider having a unified family court, and I am referring to Bill C-41, a bill that was discussed by the two members who spoke earlier.

According to this bill, and I may remind you that the Bloc Québécois was against this kind of legislation since in Quebec we already had a support payment tax rate structure that could be either federal or provincial. The criteria were not the same, the amount was not the same, and some aspects were perhaps important to people in English Canada, while others were more important to Quebec, so that the party making the payments could negotiate on which basis support payments would be paid. He would opt for the tax rate that suited his particular case, and it could be either federal or provincial.

Still on the same subject, if a unified family court is established in Canada, this will open the door to various interpretations, to decisions that might be at odds with a family policy developed in Quebec, for instance, by the National Assembly.

Clearly such a motion exposes the real cost of centralizing federalism. Everything possible is to be directed toward Ottawa. The aim is to take over provincial jurisdictions as much as possible in order to reduce the power of provincial legislatures as much as possible.

In Quebec City, they want as much of that as they can get. As regards the family, if Quebec wants a structured view of the 2000s, it will first have to recover all its powers in family matters, including divorce. The Quebec Civil Code contains a part that provides for recovering all facets of divorce proceedings, and we are waiting for the federal government to decide to withdraw from this area.

• (1410)

You will understand that, with Quebec claiming more and more powers in this area, we cannot support the motion by the Reform member.

I repeat, I am sure her intentions were good in moving this motion, but they will not take her to the objective she set with such a motion. The result would be duplication, overlap and higher administrative costs in an area of jurisdiction that is exclusively provincial.

[*English*]

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, despite a severe cold it is a pleasure for me to rise today to speak to Motion No. 147 brought forward by my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam.

This motion calls on the government to work together with the provinces to actively promote and implement unified family courts and to emphasize mediation of family law matters.

It is a sad reality that in 1990 about 30 per cent of all marriages in Canada ended in divorce. In 1990 the average length of marriage was shorter than ever before.

Out of all divorced and separated Canadians, 350,000 are parents. We know about the emotional toll that divorce and separation takes on adults, but the impact of family law battles on children is even more traumatic. It should be of great concern to everyone in this House.

The system, as it stands now, does little to alleviate children's pain. The administration of family law is a mess. This country seems to have forgotten the value of parenting and the importance of preserving the child-parent relationship in the context of family break-up. Instead, we have an adversarial system that creates winners and losers. Inevitably those who have the most to lose are the children.

The administration of family law in Canada as it exists today can be summed up in three words, inconvenience, confusion and frustration. We know that family conflicts are seldom cut and dry. They involve many different issues. The break-up of a marriage that involves children can lead to issues of child support, spousal support, custody and property division.

In most provinces, people who are separating are forced to go to different courts for different issues that come up. Divorce, custody, access and support issues cross over federal and provincial jurisdictions and create a tangled web of red tape that inconveniences, confuses and frustrates.

For example, in most provinces if a couple decides to split up but not divorce and they want to deal with custody, access or support issues, they must go to one court. Then, if they later decide to divorce, they must go to another court. Then there is enforcement, which is generally a provincial matter. The list goes on and on.

Private Members' Business

When will the confusion end? Is the whole process not stressful enough without aggravating matters by this sort of nonsense? What kind of impact is this having on our children?

I can say what kind of impact it is having. There are studies out there telling us that the emotional toll that long, protracted family law litigation has on our children is simply devastating.

This psychological damage is the root of many of the social problems we are seeing today, youth crime, suicide and poverty. This raises serious concerns about the future social health of our country.

Anyone who has ever been involved in any kind of lawsuit will say that litigation should be the last resort. It is not as though this is news to anyone either.

In 1974 the Law Reform Commission of Canada reported that the main goals of government should be to encourage resolution of family matters without resorting to litigation and to lessen the confusion by vesting jurisdiction over all family law matters in single, unified family courts.

Here we are 23 years later. The Liberal government has spent a good part of its mandate reviewing family law issues. Yet it still does not have it right. This government has done nothing to address this sad state of affairs.

We are still left with an adversarial system that destroys any chance of ongoing healthy relationships after the smoke clears in the courtroom.

• (1415)

While there are presently unified family courts in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Newfoundland, not all are province-wide and the matters they deal with vary from one province to another. Some provinces do not even have unified family courts. We heard earlier from the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair as she took us through the history of the present unified family court system, that it is working in some provinces and that we have made substantive progress.

However, the question that must be asked and which has failed to be answered is why is it so slow to get this process in place across the country. Why is it taking so long? It is because it is a very low priority for this government.

Equally troubling is the fact that nowhere in Canada is mediation mandated as the preferred method for resolving family law conflicts. When relationships end it is only natural for people to blame each other and feel a sense of hostility. But if these people can be assisted and encouraged to respect each other as loving caring parents, this can only be good for the children involved. This government owes the children at least that much.

The advantages of mediation are undeniable. The financial cost is much less than litigation. Most family law conflicts can be resolved in five to ten one-hour mediation sessions. Mediation costs an average of \$100 to \$150 per hour. Compare this with the

Private Members' Business

millions of dollars pumped out to family lawyers each year to battle it out in court.

Mediation can allow parents to work out amiable solutions to parenting and support issues without being forced to use their children as pawns. This is better for everyone involved. It has been shown that compromises that tie access and support issues together will not only be emotionally better for children but also financially better.

Several studies have linked non-payment of support with the non-custodial parents' frustration at being deprived of participation in their children's lives. For example, a study in 1995 showed that 79 per cent of non-custodial parents with access paid their support, while only 59 per cent of those without access paid.

It makes good sense that people are more willing to go along with decisions they have made themselves than with decisions that have been imposed on them. But the Divorce Act takes a weak approach to this issue. All it does is require lawyers to inform their clients that mediation is available, hardly an encouragement. The Bill C-41 disaster does nothing to address these procedural failures or to help families on an emotional level either. It is just a piecemeal approach which does more for lawyers and judges than it does for average Canadians.

The list of problems with Bill C-41 is endless but what concerns me most as a parent is the fact that this government has not even dealt with the suffering of children, children who are denied the right to enjoy relationships with both parents, not just the custodial parent. Divorce is meant to end the marriage bond, not the child-parent bond. It is disturbing to realize that in 1992 Canadian courts awarded sole custody to mothers approximately 72 per cent of the time, and yet joint custody was only awarded 16 per cent of the time.

I do not know if the government understands the impact of this, but in the words of the Canadian Council for Co-parenting, there's no hurt like it. Kids need both parents and both parents need their kids.

I offered a solution to this problem. In March 1996, I tabled Bill C-242 which would make joint custody automatic unless not in the child's best interests, as in cases of abuse. Psychologists have also offered a solution called joint custody mediation which has been used with success in some American states. I call on this government to look closely at these options because so far this government has missed the boat on this issue.

Bill C-41 misses the boat by only dealing with outcomes, not with actual process, a process that is leaving deep emotional scars on anyone who has the misfortune of being involved in it. If this government were more concerned with the process and especially with what it is doing to this country's children, the social cost of divorce would not be what it is today.

Canadians are looking for some real procedural reform here, reform that addresses the current jumble in the administration of family, reform that lets Canadians actively participate in the resolution of problems in a way that is best for all involved. That is why I urge all members to support this motion. It is time the House demanded some action from this government. It is time we called on this government to work together with the provinces to encourage and implement reforms to the administration of family law in Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): There being no further members rising for debate and the motion not being designated as a votable item, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2.20 p.m., this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.19 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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 7th, 1997 — 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 | Marlene Cowling 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

Chairman: **Stan Dromisky**

Vice-Chairs: **Judy Bethel
Osvaldo Nunez**

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------|
| Colleen Beaumier Mauril Bélanger | Maud Debien Hugh Hanrahan | Dan McTeague Val Meredith | Maria Minna Tom Wappel | (11) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------|

Associate Members

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

G rard 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 B lisle
Leon E. Benoit
Dianne Brushett

Barry Campbell
Brenda Chamberlain
Ronald J. Duhamel

Ron Fewchuk
Herb Grubel
Gary Pillitteri

Roger Pomerleau
Monte Solberg
Brent St. Denis

(15)

Associate Members

Reg Alcock
Judy Bethel
Jag Bhaduria
Paul Cr te
Roy Cullen
Nick Discepola
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk
Bill Graham
Stephen Harper
Dick Harris
Jay Hill
Jake E. Hoeppepner
Dale Johnston

Karen Kraft Sloan
Ren  Laurin
Peter Milliken
Bob Mills
Andy Mitchell
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Nelson Riis

Yves Rocheleau
Ben t Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Jim Silye
John Solomon
Paddy Torsney
John Williams

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Richard B lisle

Dianne Brushett

Herb Grubel

Paddy Torsney

(5)

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen:

Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells

Ren  Canuel
Harold Culbert

John Cummins
Ted McWhinney

Lawrence D. O'Brien
Mike Scott

Paul Steckle
Harry Verran

(11)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Vic Althouse

Ron Fewchuk
Yves Rocheleau

Roger Simmons

Elsie Wayne

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English

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

Associate Members

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Diane Ablonczy 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 George Proud 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 PicardAntoine Dubé
Bonnie HickeyGrant Hill
Keith MartinJohn Murphy
Andy ScottPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersColleen Beaumier
Margaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Pierre de SavoyeMaurice Dumas
Réjean Lefebvre
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Carolyn Parrish
Bob RingmaSvend 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 HickeyColleen Beaumier
Grant Hill

Carolyn Parrish

Pauline Picard

Joseph Volpe

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS**Chairman:** John O'ReillyGrant Hill
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur

Joseph Volpe

(7)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua**Vice-Chairs:**Jean Augustine
Francine LalondeGerry Byrne
Christiane Gagnon
Patrick GagnonDale Johnston
Gurbax Singh Malhi
Ian McClellandLarry McCormick
Robert D. Nault
George ProudJim Silye
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Warren Allmand
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. BenoitJan Brown
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling
Paul CrêtePaul DeVillers
Antoine Dubé
Jim Gouk
Herb GrubelKeith Martin
Réal Ménard
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Sheila Finestone**Vice-Chairmen:**Maurice Bernier
Andy ScottSarkis Assadourian
Jean AugustineJohn Godfrey
Deborah GreySharon Hayes
Russell MacLellanRéal Ménard
Georgette Sheridan

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Mauril Bélanger
Robert BertrandMaud Debien
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY**Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Walt Lastewka
Nic Leblanc**Morris Bodnar
Pierre Brien
Bonnie BrownNick Discepola
Jay Hill
Ron MacDonaldPhilip Mayfield
Réal Ménard
Ian MurrayBernard Patry
Werner Schmidt
Joseph Volpe

(15)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Leon E. Benoit
Pierre de Savoye
Bernard DeshaiesJoe Fontana
Maurice Godin
Karen Kraft Sloan
Ghislain LebelAndy Mitchell
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Yves Rocheleau
Roseanne SkokeJohn Solomon
Darrel Stinson
Paul Szabo
Len Taylor**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CONVERSION OF MILITARY
INDUSTRIES TO CIVILIAN PURPOSES****Chairman: Walt Lastewka**

Bonnie Brown

Réal Ménard

Ian Murray

Chuck Strahl

(5)

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS**Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Michel Bellehumeur
Paddy Torsney**Pierre de Savoye
Paul DeVillers
Nick DiscepolaArt Hanger
Gordon Kirkby
François LangloisJohn Maloney
Jack Ramsay
Geoff ReganGeorge S. Rideout
Andrew Telegdi
Randy White

(15)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Jag Bhaduria
Garry Breitkreuz
Jan Brown
John Finlay
Paul Forseth
Jack FrazerChristiane Gagnon
Patrick Gagnon
Roger Gallaway
Jim Gouk
Stephen Harper
Jay HillGhislain Lebel
Derek Lee
John Loney
Russell MacLellan
Val Meredith
Bob MillsSvend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Bernard St-Laurent
Myron Thompson
Susan Whelan
Ted White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee**Nick Discepola
Roger Gallaway

Art Hanger

François Langlois

George S. Rideout

(6)

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

Chairman: Russell MacLellan

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

LIAISON

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chair:

Mary Clancy

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

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairman:

Paul Zed

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----|
| Reg Alcock Jack Frazer | Michel Guimond | Andy Mitchell | Lyle Vanclief | (7) |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----|

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair: Mary Clancy

Vice-Chairmen:

**Robert Bertrand
Pierre Brien**

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

Associate Members

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

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chairman: Andy Mitchell

Vice-Chairmen:

**René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer**

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

Associate Members

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jim Abbott Gérard Asselin | Leon E. Benoit John Finlay | Roger Gallaway John Solomon | Brent St. Denis 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:

**Ivan Grose
Denis Paradis**

Sue Barnes
Pierre de Savoye
Roger Gallaway

Charles Hubbard
Rey D. Pagtakhan

Yves Rocheleau
Alex Shepherd

Jim Silye
John Williams

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Jag Bhaduria
John Bryden

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Ed Harper

René Laurin
Ian McClelland

John Solomon
Benoît Tremblay

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairmen:

**Joe Comuzzi
Paul Crête**

Gerry Byrne
Roy Cullen

Joe Fontana
Jim Gouk

Dick Harris
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
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

 Mark Assad
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:

 Mark Assad
Gilbert Fillion
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:

 Murray Calder
Ken Epp
Mac Harb
Bob Kilger
Gar Knutson
François Langlois

 René Laurin
John Loney
Gurbax Singh Malhi
Preston Manning
Bob Ringma
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)

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. |
| 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 — Whitechurch — Stouffville | | Lib. Dem. |
| 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Breitkreuz, Garry | Yorkton — Melville | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Bridgman, Margaret | Surrey North | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Brien, Pierre | Témiscamingue | Quebec | BQ |
| Brown, Bonnie | Oakville — Milton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Brown, Jan | Calgary Southeast | Alberta | Ind. |
| Brushett, Dianne | Cumberland — Colchester | Nova Scotia | Lib. |
| Bryden, John | Hamilton — Wentworth | Ontario | Lib. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Caccia, Hon. Charles | Davenport | Ontario | Lib. |
| Calder, Murray | Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe | Ontario | Lib. |
| Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance | St. Paul's | Ontario | Lib. |
| Cannis, John | Scarborough Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Canuel, René | Matapédia — Matane | Quebec | BQ |
| 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Dromisky, Stan | Thunder Bay — Atikokan | Ontario | Lib. |
| Dubé, Antoine | Lévis | Quebec | BQ |
| Duceppe, Gilles | Laurier — Sainte-Marie | Quebec | BQ |
| Duhamel, Ronald J. | St. Boniface | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Dumas, Maurice | Argenteuil — Papineau | Quebec | BQ |
| Duncan, John | North Island — Powell River | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Dupuy, Hon. Michel | Laval West | Quebec | Lib. |
| Easter, Wayne | Malpeque | Prince Edward Island | Lib. |
| Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade | York Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| English, John | Kitchener | Ontario | Lib. |
| Epp, Ken | Elk Island | Alberta | Ref. |
| Fewchuk, Ron | Selkirk — Red River | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Fillion, Gilbert | Chicoutimi | Quebec | BQ |
| Finestone, Hon. Sheila | Mount Royal | Quebec | Lib. |
| Finlay, John | Oxford | Ontario | Lib. |
| Flis, Jesse | Parkdale — High Park | Ontario | Lib. |
| Fontana, Joe | London East | Ontario | Lib. |
| Forseth, Paul | New Westminster — Burnaby | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Frazer, Jack | Saanich — Gulf Islands | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) | Vancouver Centre | British Columbia | Lib. |
| Gaffney, Beryl | Nepean | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons | Saint-Léonard | Quebec | Lib. |
| Gagnon, Christiane | Québec | Quebec | BQ |
| Gagnon, Patrick | Bonaventure — Îles-de-la- Madeleine | Quebec | Lib. |
| Galloway, Roger | Sarnia — Lambton | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition | Roberval | Quebec | BQ |
| Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification) | Portage — Interlake | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Gilmour, Bill | Comox — Alberni | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation | Don Valley West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Godin, Maurice | Châteauguay | Quebec | BQ |
| Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Regina — Wascana | Saskatchewan | Lib. |
| Gouk, Jim | Kootenay West — Revelstoke | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Graham, Bill | Rosedale | Ontario | Lib. |
| Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada | Windsor West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Grey, Deborah | Beaver River | Alberta | Ref. |
| Grose, Ivan | Oshawa | Ontario | Lib. |
| Grubel, Herb | Capilano — Howe Sound | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Guarnieri, Albina | Mississauga East | Ontario | Lib. |
| Guay, Monique | Laurentides | Quebec | BQ |
| Guimond, Michel | Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans | Quebec | BQ |
| Hanger, Art | Calgary Northeast | Alberta | Ref. |
| Hanrahan, Hugh | Edmonton — Strathcona | Alberta | Ref. |
| Harb, Mac | Ottawa Centre | Ontario | Lib. |
| Harper, Ed | Simcoe Centre | Ontario | Ref. |
| Harper, Elijah | Churchill | Manitoba | Lib. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Province of Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Harris, Dick | Prince George — Bulkley Valley | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Hart, Jim | Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Winnipeg St. James | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Hayes, Sharon | Port Moody — Coquitlam | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Hermanson, Elwin | Kindersley — Lloydminster | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Hickey, Bonnie | St. John's East | Newfoundland | Lib. |
| Hill, Grant | Macleod | Alberta | Ref. |
| Hill, Jay | Prince George — Peace River | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Hoeppner, Jake E. | Lisgar — Marquette | Manitoba | Ref. |
| Hopkins, Leonard | Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke | Ontario | Lib. |
| Hubbard, Charles | Miramichi | New Brunswick | Lib. |
| Ianno, Tony | Trinity — Spadina | Ontario | Lib. |
| Iftody, David | Provencher | Manitoba | Lib. |
| Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Sault Ste. Marie | Ontario | Lib. |
| Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board | Bruce — Grey | Ontario | Lib. |
| Jacob, Jean-Marc | Charlesbourg | Quebec | BQ |
| Jennings, Daphne | Mission — Coquitlam | British Columbia | Ref. |
| Johnston, Dale | Wetaskiwin | Alberta | Ref. |
| Jordan, Jim | Leeds — Grenville | Ontario | Lib. |
| Karygiannis, Jim | Scarborough — Agincourt | Ontario | Lib. |
| Kerpan, Allan | Moose Jaw — Lake Centre | Saskatchewan | Ref. |
| Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport | Hamilton West | Ontario | Lib. |
| Kilger, Bob | 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. |
| VACANCY | Calgary West | Alberta | |
| VACANCY | Jonquière | Quebec | |
| VACANCY | Notre-Dame-de-Grâce | Quebec | |

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; BQ—Bloc Québécois; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| ALBERTA (26) | | |
| Ablonczy, Diane | Calgary North | Ref. |
| Benoit, Leon E. | Vegreville | Ref. |
| Bethel, Judy | Edmonton East | Lib. |
| Breitkreuz, Cliff | Yellowhead | Ref. |
| Brown, Jan | Calgary Southeast | 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. |
| 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. |
| VACANCY | Calgary West | |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA (32) | | |
| Abbott, Jim | Kootenay East | Ref. |
| Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport | Victoria | Lib. |
| Bridgman, Margaret | Surrey North | Ref. |
| Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific) | Richmond | Lib. |
| Cummins, John | Delta | Ref. |
| Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh | Vancouver South | Lib. |
| Duncan, John | North Island — Powell River | Ref. |
| Forseth, Paul | New Westminster — Burnaby | Ref. |
| Frazer, Jack | Saanich — Gulf Islands | Ref. |
| Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women) | Vancouver Centre | Lib. |
| Gilmour, Bill | Comox — Alberni | Ref. |
| Gouk, Jim | Kootenay West — Revelstoke | Ref. |
| Grubel, Herb | Capilano — Howe Sound | Ref. |
| Harris, Dick | Prince George — Bulkley Valley | Ref. |
| Hart, Jim | Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt | Ref. |
| Hayes, Sharon | Port Moody — Coquitlam | Ref. |
| Hill, Jay | Prince George — Peace River | Ref. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jennings, Daphne | Mission — Coquitlam | Ref. |
| Martin, Keith | Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca | Ref. |
| Mayfield, Philip | Cariboo — Chilcotin | Ref. |
| McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Vancouver Quadra | Lib. |
| Meredith, Val | Surrey — White Rock — South Langley | Ref. |
| Riis, Nelson | Kamloops | NDP |
| Ringma, Bob | Nanaimo — Cowichan | Ref. |
| Robinson, Svend J. | Burnaby — Kingsway | NDP |
| Schmidt, Werner | Okanagan Centre | Ref. |
| Scott, Mike | Skeena | Ref. |
| Stinson, Darrel | Okanagan — Shuswap | Ref. |
| Strahl, Chuck | Fraser Valley East | Ref. |
| Terrana, Anna | Vancouver East | Lib. |
| White, Randy | Fraser Valley West | Ref. |
| White, Ted | North Vancouver | Ref. |

MANITOBA (14)

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|------|
| Alcock, Reg | Winnipeg South | Lib. |
| Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs | Winnipeg South Centre | Lib. |
| Blaikie, Bill | Winnipeg Transcona | NDP |
| Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources | Dauphin — Swan River | Lib. |
| Duhamel, Ronald J. | St. Boniface | Lib. |
| Fewchuk, Ron | Selkirk — Red River | Lib. |
| Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification) | Portage — Interlake | Lib. |
| Harper, Elijah | Churchill | Lib. |
| Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services | Winnipeg St. James | Lib. |
| Hoepfner, Jake E. | Lisgar — Marquette | Ref. |
| Iftody, David | Provencher | Lib. |
| McKinnon, Glen | Brandon — Souris | Lib. |
| Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister | Winnipeg North | Lib. |
| Walker, David | Winnipeg North Centre | Lib. |

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|------|
| Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage | Restigouche — Chaleur | Lib. |
| Culbert, Harold | Carleton — Charlotte | Lib. |
| Hubbard, Charles | Miramichi | Lib. |
| Rideout, George S. | Moncton | Lib. |
| Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole | Madawaska — Victoria | Lib. |
| Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans) | Beauséjour | Lib. |
| Scott, Andy | Fredericton — York-Sunbury | Lib. |
| Wayne, Elsie | Saint John | PC |
| Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of 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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| NEWFOUNDLAND (7) | | |
| Baker, George S. | Gander — Grand Falls | Lib. |
| Byrne, Gerry | Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte | Lib. |
| Hickey, Bonnie | St. John's East | Lib. |
| Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans | Bonavista — Trinity — Conception | Lib. |
| O'Brien, Lawrence D. | Labrador | Lib. |
| Payne, Jean | St. John's West | Lib. |
| Simmons, Hon. Roger | Burin — St. George's | Lib. |
| NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2) | | |
| Anawak, Jack Iyerak | Nunatsiq | Lib. |
| Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth) | Western Arctic | Lib. |
| NOVA SCOTIA (11) | | |
| Brushett, Dianne | Cumberland — Colchester | Lib. |
| Clancy, Mary | Halifax | Lib. |
| Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health | Cape Breton — East Richmond | Lib. |
| LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs | Cape Breton Highlands — Canso | Lib. |
| MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade | Dartmouth | Lib. |
| MacLellan, Russell | Cape Breton — The Sydneys | Lib. |
| Murphy, John | Annapolis Valley — Hants | Lib. |
| Regan, Geoff | Halifax West | Lib. |
| Skoke, Roseanne | Central Nova | Lib. |
| Verran, Harry | South West Nova | Lib. |
| Wells, Derek | South Shore | Lib. |
| ONTARIO (99) | | |
| Adams, Peter | Peterborough | Lib. |
| Assadourian, Sarkis | Don Valley North | Lib. |
| Augustine, Jean | Etobicoke — Lakeshore | Lib. |
| Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue | London West | Lib. |
| Beaumier, Colleen | Brampton | Lib. |
| Bélaïr, Réginald | Cochrane — Superior | Lib. |
| Bélangier, Mauril | Ottawa — Vanier | Lib. |
| Bellemare, Eugène | Carleton — Gloucester | Lib. |
| Bevilacqua, Maurizio | York North | Lib. |
| Bhaduria, Jag | Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville | Dem. |
| 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Cohen, Shaughnessy | Windsor — St. Clair | Lib. |
| Collenette, Hon. David M. | Don Valley East | Lib. |
| Comuzzi, Joe | Thunder Bay — Nipigon | Lib. |
| Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage | Hamilton East | Lib. |
| Crawford, Rex | Kent | Lib. |
| 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. |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Nunziata, John | York South — Weston | Lib. |
| O'Brien, Pat | London — Middlesex | Lib. |
| O'Reilly, John | Victoria — Haliburton | Lib. |
| Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker | Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold | Lib. |
| Parrish, Carolyn | Mississauga West | Lib. |
| Perić, Janko | Cambridge | Lib. |
| Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions) | Scarborough East | Lib. |
| Peterson, Jim | Willowdale | Lib. |
| Phinney, Beth | Hamilton Mountain | Lib. |
| Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Essex — Kent | Lib. |
| Pillitteri, Gary | Niagara Falls | Lib. |
| Reed, Julian | Halton — Peel | Lib. |
| Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs | Perth — Wellington — Waterloo | Lib. |
| Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Etobicoke Centre | Lib. |
| St. Denis, Brent | Algoma | Lib. |
| Serré, Benoît | Timiskaming — French River | Lib. |
| Shepherd, Alex | Durham | Lib. |
| Speller, Bob | Haldimand — Norfolk | Lib. |
| Steckle, Paul | Huron — Bruce | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa) | Northumberland | Lib. |
| Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue | Brant | Lib. |
| Szabo, Paul | Mississauga South | Lib. |
| Telegdi, Andrew | Waterloo | Lib. |
| Thalheimer, Peter | Timmins — Chapleau | Lib. |
| Torsney, Paddy | Burlington | Lib. |
| Ur, Rose-Marie | Lambton — Middlesex | Lib. |
| Valeri, Tony | Lincoln | Lib. |
| Vanclief, Lyle | Prince Edward — Hastings | Lib. |
| Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health | Eglinton — Lawrence | Lib. |
| Wappel, Tom | Scarborough West | Lib. |
| Whelan, Susan | Essex — Windsor | Lib. |
| Wood, Bob | Nipissing | Lib. |

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

| | | |
|--|--------------|------|
| Easter, Wayne | Malpeque | Lib. |
| MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency) | Cardigan | Lib. |
| McGuire, Joe | Egmont | Lib. |
| Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour | Hillsborough | Lib. |

QUEBEC (75)

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

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bernier, Yvan | Gaspé | BQ |
| Bertrand, Robert | Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle | Lib. |
| Brien, Pierre | Témiscamingue | BQ |
| Canuel, René | Matapédia — Matane | 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 |
| Dalphonde-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 — Maisonneuve | BQ |
| Mercier, Paul | Blainville — Deux-Montagnes | BQ |
| Nunez, Osvaldo | Bourassa | BQ |

| Name of Member | Constituency | Political Affiliation |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Paradis, Denis | Brome — Missisquoi | Lib. |
| Paré, Philippe | Louis-Hébert | BQ |
| Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Pierrefonds — Dollard | Lib. |
| 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 |
| VACANCY | Jonquière | |
| VACANCY | Notre-Dame-de-Grâce | |

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

| | | |
|---|--|------|
| Althouse, Vic | Mackenzie | NDP |
| Axworthy, Chris | Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing | NDP |
| Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification | Saskatoon — Dundurn | Lib. |
| Breitkreuz, Garry | Yorkton — Melville | Ref. |
| Collins, Bernie | Souris — Moose Mountain | Lib. |
| de Jong, Simon | Regina — Qu'Appelle | NDP |
| Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food | Regina — Wascana | Lib. |
| Hermanson, Elwin | Kindersley — Lloydminster | Ref. |
| Kerpan, Allan | Moose Jaw — Lake Centre | Ref. |
| Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada | Prince Albert — Churchill River | Lib. |
| Morrison, Lee | Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia | Ref. |
| Sheridan, Georgette | Saskatoon — Humboldt | Lib. |
| Solomon, John | Regina — Lumsden | NDP |
| Taylor, Len | The Battlefords — Meadow Lake | NDP |

YUKON (1)

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-----|
| McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey | Yukon | NDP |
|-------------------------|-------|-----|

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 Inter-governmental Affairs |
| John Godfrey | to Minister for International Cooperation |

CONTENTS

Friday, March 7, 1997

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Socio-Economic Status of Women

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Motion | 8765 |
| Mrs. Guay | 8765 |
| Mr. Szabo | 8766 |
| Mrs. Debien | 8767 |
| Mr. Dubé | 8768 |
| Ms. Fry | 8769 |
| Mrs. Guay | 8772 |

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Quebec Games

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Mr. Dubé | 8772 |
|----------------|------|

Kap'Yong Hill

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Gilmour | 8772 |
|-------------------|------|

Nuclear Weapons

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Mr. Harb | 8773 |
|----------------|------|

Korea

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. McCormick | 8773 |
|---------------------|------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Blaikie | 8773 |
|-------------------|------|

York North Town Hall

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| Mr. Bevilacqua | 8773 |
|----------------------|------|

Status of Women in Rwanda

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Bergeron | 8774 |
|--------------------|------|

Canada Pension Plan

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Calder | 8774 |
|------------------|------|

Tobacco

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Williams | 8774 |
|--------------------|------|

Disabled Persons

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mrs. Gaffney | 8774 |
|--------------------|------|

Montreal Economy

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Bertrand | 8775 |
|--------------------|------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Assad | 8775 |
|-----------------|------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Dumas | 8775 |
|-----------------|------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mrs. Hayes | 8775 |
|------------------|------|

The Late Dr. Cheddi Jagan

| | |
|---------------|------|
| Mr. Lee | 8776 |
|---------------|------|

McMaster University

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Keyes | 8776 |
|-----------------|------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mrs. Debien | 8776 |
|-------------------|------|

ORAL QUESTIONS

Status of Women

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Duceppe | 8776 |
| Ms. Fry | 8776 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 8777 |
| Ms. Fry | 8777 |
| Mr. Duceppe | 8777 |
| Ms. Fry | 8777 |
| Mrs. Lalonde | 8777 |
| Ms. Fry | 8778 |
| Mrs. Lalonde | 8778 |
| Ms. Fry | 8778 |

Employment

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Williams | 8778 |
| Mr. Campbell | 8778 |
| Mr. Williams | 8778 |
| Mr. Campbell | 8778 |
| Mr. Williams | 8779 |
| Mr. Campbell | 8779 |

Justice

| | |
|--|------|
| Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) | 8779 |
| Mr. Gray | 8779 |
| Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) | 8779 |
| Mr. Gray | 8779 |

Hospital Closures

| | |
|--------------------------|------|
| Mr. Hill (Macleod) | 8780 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8780 |
| Mr. Hill (Macleod) | 8780 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8780 |

Breast Cancer

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Mrs. Guay | 8780 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8780 |
| Mrs. Guay | 8780 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8780 |

Health Care

| | |
|---|------|
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) | 8781 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8781 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) | 8781 |
| Mr. Dingwall | 8781 |

Pay Equity

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mrs. Debien | 8781 |
| Mr. Massé | 8781 |
| Mrs. Debien | 8781 |
| Mr. Massé | 8782 |

Transport

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Caccia | 8782 |
| Mr. Keyes | 8782 |

Senatorial Selection

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Gilmour | 8782 |
| Mr. Gray | 8782 |
| Mr. Gilmour | 8782 |
| Mr. Gray | 8782 |

Correctional Service of Canada

| | |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Laurin | 8783 |
|------------------|------|

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. Gray | 8783 |
| Mr. Laurin | 8783 |
| Mr. Gray | 8783 |
| Finance | |
| Mr. Epp | 8783 |
| Mr. Campbell | 8783 |
| Mr. Epp | 8783 |
| Mr. Campbell | 8783 |
| Pay Equity | |
| Ms. Catterall | 8784 |
| Mr. Massé | 8784 |
| Employment | |
| Mr. Solomon | 8784 |
| Ms. Fry | 8784 |

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Regional Development Banks | |
| Mr. Boudria | 8784 |
| Petitions | |
| Emergency Personnel | |
| Mr. Szabo | 8784 |
| Taxation | |
| Mr. Szabo | 8785 |
| Age of Consent | |
| Mrs. Hayes | 8785 |
| Taxation | |
| Mrs. Hayes | 8785 |
| National Highway System | |
| Mr. Harb | 8785 |
| The Senate | |
| Mr. Gilmour | 8785 |
| Taxation | |
| Mr. Lee | 8785 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Questions on the Order Paper | |
| Mr. Proud | 8785 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

| | |
|--|------|
| Supply | |
| Allotted Day—Socio-economic Status of Women | |
| Consideration of motion resumed | 8785 |
| Mrs. Hayes | 8785 |
| Mr. Harb | 8788 |
| Mr. Ramsay | 8789 |

| | |
|------------------------------|------|
| Business of the House | |
| The Acting Speaker | 8790 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Supply | |
| Allotted Day—Socio-Economic Status of Women | |
| Consideration resumed of motion | 8790 |
| Mrs. Lalonde | 8790 |
| Mr. Szabo | 8791 |
| Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) | 8791 |
| Mr. Ramsay | 8793 |
| Mrs. Gaffney | 8794 |
| Mrs. Guay | 8795 |
| Mrs. Hayes | 8796 |
| Mr. Harb | 8796 |

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

| | |
|--|------|
| Unified Family Court | |
| Mrs. Hayes | 8797 |
| Ms. Cohen | 8800 |
| Mr. Bellehumeur | 8802 |
| Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) | 8803 |
| Appendix | |

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Public Works and Government Services Canada — Publishing
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux 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 Public Works and Government Services Canada — Publishing,
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 à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada — Édition,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**