



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 037 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, November 25, 1997**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 25, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1000)

[*English*]

## POINTS OF ORDER

### MAIN ESTIMATES

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to provide additional information to that provided by the government House leader as to why the point of order raised by the member for St. Albert is not a valid one. In no way do the estimates which are before the House derogate from or usurp the authority of this House to adopt legislation, nor do they presuppose the will of this House in any way.

• (1005)

To begin with, I would like to commend the hon. member for St. Albert on his continuing interest in the supply process and for the diligence of his research. He will recall, through his active participation in the improved reporting to Parliament project, the initiatives that the government has taken in improving the information provided to parliamentarians over the last 12 months, initiatives in which the hon. member has been an active participant and which he has supported on two occasions in this House.

As part of the 1997-98 estimates process, the government introduced modifications to part III of the estimates on a pilot basis for 16 departments. These changes were intended to improve the quality of the information provided to Parliament and to provide better information on strategic and future plans, as well as to lay the basis for providing performance information on a more timely basis.

It is in fact from the part IIIs for these pilot departments that the hon. member has drawn most of the information he uses to support his point of order.

The point of order is based broadly on the precept that the estimates should neither anticipate enabling legislation, nor should

appropriation bills be used to legislate. This is a fundamental principle and one which the government wholeheartedly supports. I am not going to question that principle at all. I would just indicate that the point of order which the hon. member has made in fact does not apply in this case.

The hon. member identifies five votes in which he claims that the government is seeking parliamentary approval of funds for purposes for which Parliament has not yet given legislative authority. I will argue that this is simply not the case in any of the five votes which have been mentioned.

I can understand why the hon. member may have come to his conclusion. The part IIIs explain the government's plans for the next three years, not just the first year, 1997-98, which is the only subject of the appropriation bill.

In each of the five cases cited, the government has signalled its intention to modify the way it does business. It has done this through tabling draft legislation for consideration by Parliament and, as it undertook to do as part of the improved reporting to Parliament project, it has done this by spelling out its plans in the part IIIs of the department concerned, not just for the main estimates here but for two additional years.

In being asked to approve supply legislation, Parliament is requested to approve a series of specific votes. It is the wording of these votes that provides the legislative basis for the expenditures of government.

The previous Speakers' rulings which the hon. member cited dealt with specific instances where this wording was considered inappropriate. That is not the case with the appropriation bill at issue here. In no case is the vote wording providing or seeking additional authority that has not already been granted by Parliament.

In each of the five cases identified the funds sought through the estimates process are needed for continuing operations of the programs concerned. If the legislation authorizing the operational changes is approved by Parliament, and only if, in each case, then the funds will be spent in accordance with the new legislation. If the enabling legislation is not adopted, then these same funds will be spent in accordance with existing parliamentary authorities.

The part IIIs from which the hon. member draws his information are all quite clear that they are dealing with future plans and in depicting any legislation at issue as proposed.

*Points of Order*

• (1010)

[Translation]

For example, part III states clearly, under Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and I quote:

Priorities over the next three years include continuing reform of safety nets and grain policy.

Part III under the heading Environment Canada is equally clear:

The proposed new CEPA, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, will result in a more efficient process for categorizing toxic substances.

[English]

For the hon. member to argue that these votes be struck down on the basis that the government has provided specific details on its future strategies is to argue that the government should retreat under a veil of secrecy. That is precisely what we are trying to avoid as part of the improved reporting to Parliament project, a project that, I underline again, has received the hon. member's support, for which I both commend and thank him.

What a wonderful opportunity these documents provide. Parliament now has a three year planning horizon to help them understand the context within which new legislative proposals will operate. I would go so far as to suggest that this level of future planning information and disclosure is probably unique among our fellow OECD countries.

The situation is similar for the three items where the hon. member claims that we are legislating through supply legislation. Again, this is simply not the case.

Vote 35 for the Canadian International Trade Tribunal is simply for program expenditures. That is the wording of the vote. There is nothing in these words that could possibly be construed as extending its mandate as the hon. member suggests. The vote is neither providing nor is it seeking new or additional authority. It is merely seeking supply.

As the hon. member notes, the Canada Communications Group item is statutory. By definition, the amount shown is authorized by legislation previously approved by Parliament and by that same definition it is shown in the estimates or information as it does not form part of the appropriation bill that Parliament will be asked to approve. It is statutory.

The final item with which the hon. member takes issue is the Canada Information Office. The fact of the matter is that the order in council in question is presumed valid until repealed or set aside by a court. Given this fact, the "program expenditures" referred to in the vote can be nothing but entirely consistent with that order.

The hon. member's arguments simply challenge the basis for the order in council and have nothing to do with either the supply process or any impropriety in the estimates themselves. The order in council can be challenged, but once again it is valid as long as it

has not been set aside, repealed or declared invalid by the government or by the court.

Part II of the estimates that I tabled earlier this year contained two assurances. I will repeat both here again.

Individual expenditure proposals included in votes seek authority during the 1997-98 fiscal year to make expenditures necessary to deliver various mandates which are under the administration of a Minister and are contained in legislation approved by Parliament.

In light of the House of Commons Speaker's ruling in 1981, the government has made a commitment that the only legislation that will be amended through the estimates process, other than cases specifically authorized by statute, will be previous appropriation acts.

• (1015)

I think that in the estimates what we have done is have submitted for the vote of the House expenditures which correspond exactly to the wording of each vote.

The explanations given in part III, which once again are for three future years, explained the plans of the government in case new legislation or new policies are adopted. In every one of the cases mentioned by the hon. member for St. Albert, the expenditures that are sought in supply are expenditures under the authority expressed properly by the wording of the votes.

**The Speaker:** Yesterday when the point of order was brought up I permitted what was like a mini debate. This is new information which I have decided to hear. If there is anything else to be added, if you are going to make an interjection you will get one shot at it. We are not going to go back and forth. Whatever you have to say on this point of order I will listen to. I will then take all the information, retreat and make my own decision.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the President of the Treasury Board with interest and I appreciated the compliments regarding the work we have done on the improved performance and reporting to Parliament.

The point we want to make is that by the very definition of improved reporting to Parliament we are in command of better information in order for us to make appropriate decisions and vote according to the information laid before us.

I think the government and the estimates, especially the part IIIs, have not provided that information to us or the minister is alleging that we are unable to discern from these part IIIs what monies are to be expended including the part IIs and what are for future years.

I have already written to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans regarding one item in this improved reporting to Parliament regarding TAGS. TAGS is a very important program for Atlantic Canada because of the situation there. The new improved reporting to Parliament contains three lines regarding TAGS. The auditor general had to write three chapters on the issue. The fisheries committee has been consumed with the issue since then. However, this improved reporting has given us three lines to tell us the

*Points of Order*

government's initiatives, its plans, its hopes and aspiration for this program.

Therefore, what I am trying to tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that this improved reporting to Parliament has a long way to go. Perhaps this debate we are having today would indicate that the government has an obligation to clearly set out in the part IIIs, which is an amplification of the information in the part IIs, the Appropriation Act, so that we can understand what is in the part IIs and also provide their direction as to where they are going down the road in the future.

I draw your attention to the points I raised yesterday regarding the Ports Canada Corporation. In the part IIIs and in the part IIs the budget has been reduced to zero for this fiscal year. The corporation is still ongoing because the legislation has not been passed in this House. Obviously the work the corporation was doing is still ongoing. Obviously the money it is spending is coming from somewhere because the proposal by the minister is that budget be zero. We are being asked to vote on that budget to say the budget is zero.

We know, the minister knows, the Minister of Transport knows that the work is ongoing and the methodology and the focus of the government will change once the legislation is passed. Here we are in this particular instance, and no doubt it applies to the others too, where by our vote this evening, if we are to vote, we will endorse something the government intends to implement rather than voting for what has taken place so far.

• (1020)

The minister talked about legislation, using the part IIIs, improved reporting to Parliament and how they outline initiatives that the government may wish to take. Hence he used that to justify his argument about legislation to be introduced.

As I said, the government has an obligation to tell us what we are voting on. We do not want to debate the issues of the estimates in a vacuum. This was the whole debate regarding the improved reporting to Parliament as far as the estimates, the performance documents and so on, and the whole debate circled around that. But we do not want to try to determine the \$50 billion odd that we are voting on without having it in context.

So we ask the government to lay out its plans for the future. The performance documents will give us some historical documentation in the same format so we can assess the issues. But we specifically ask that the estimates be laid out clearly as this year's appropriations within the context of a wider vision, forward and historical.

Again I tell the minister, and I use the TAGS example of three lines for a very major and important program that affects very seriously a major part of this country, that if the government feels that improved reporting to cover what it is doing this year, next year and how it is going to resolve the issue down the road can be covered off in three lines, that beats me. I think that speaks for itself.

The minister talked about the proposed environmental protection act. Part IIIs talk about the proposed environmental protection act. It was introduced in the last Parliament. I said yesterday that the part IIIs were introduced last February 20 and the identical documents were introduced on October 1, even though it now appears that with the intervening election the government's initiatives, agenda and list of priorities have changed.

We are being asked to vote an appropriation act based on the government's agenda as it was before the election, not as it is today. We know, because the government did not table all the legislation that died on the order paper, that the government's agenda has changed.

Surely if the government had respect for this House it would have redrafted the estimates to reflect the new initiatives and it sought not to do so.

The mandate for the International Trade Tribunal appears, again according to the part IIIs, to have been expanded and extended and legislation is required for that. There is nothing in the part IIIs to suggest that the government intends to introduce legislation.

On CCG, the Canada Communications Group, the minister talks about it being a statutory program. I outlined in my argument yesterday why even though it is a statutory program we as parliamentarians are being asked to vote on it. It is because it has a revolving fund and we vote on revolving funds. Take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, when you are doing your deliberations please.

Finally, when the minister talked about how they are valid until challenged and struck down here or in court, this is the highest court of the land. I am asking you, and I asked you yesterday, not to defer this decision to a court, but this court; this court that defends the rights of the people and the rights of the Commons, that has the sole right to grant supply to the crown. No one else has it. No one else has ever had it.

We know that by our parliamentary democratic procedure that nobody else should have it. If we are to believe in the theory of taxation and representation this House and this House alone retains for itself the right to pass these things.

Therefore I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to set aside the minister's arguments that this is a valid procedure until struck down by a court of law.

*Routine Proceedings*

• (1025)

We are asking you, Mr. Speaker, to stand up for this court and rule accordingly.

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, you heard from the official opposition yesterday what our concerns were. We indicated to you that there was a considerable amount of expert study into this matter. This is not something that just a couple of researchers had looked at. It had been done for some time.

The President of the Treasury Board has had an overnight look at this and has come back with some argument on it, and that is good. Mr. Speaker, you have now heard from both sides.

I could go through some of the comments the President of the Treasury Board made but I do not think I want to duplicate anything and I believe my colleague from St. Albert has done a very good job on that. However, I want to make two observations on the differences in the argument.

For instance, the minister said he was not seeking new authority, he was seeking supply. We maintain that there is no legislated authority to seek supply for, and that is the big substantive difference in this argument.

Mr. Speaker, I think all the way through the argument that was put to you by the government side, notwithstanding what the minister said, he needs to get the Canadian information office, for instance, established before seeking supply. Therein lies the problem with the vote tonight. We are being asked to supply before we legislate. It cannot be. This party cannot vote for such an approach.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that when you deliberate and look at this today and decide prior to the votes tonight you remove those items that are in fact illegal. Give us an opportunity to approve or at least vote for the items that we feel perhaps could pass that test. There is a very important test today that you are being asked by the official opposition to apply and look at.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members in the opposition had, to use a colloquialism, two kicks at the can. I am going to have one last crack at it here. The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

**Hon. Marcel Massé:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with care and attention to the arguments being given. I would submit to you that the first one by the hon. member for St. Albert that the part IIIs should be improved is certainly one with which I could agree. Part IIIs should be improved. In the course of the years to come we plan to give more information and more specific results. However, I would also indicate that this fact does not affect the controversy on whether the five votes are properly submitted to the House.

On the second comment that we should have redrafted the estimates because the government after an election has new priorities, I suggest that if we did that we would be committing the sins that the opposition is reproaching us for which is that before having legislative approval in the House we would be redrafting the estimates to show what our new priorities are before they have been implemented through legislation approved by the House. Therefore, although I agree that the estimates should be drafted in the most appropriate manner possible, I submit they are at present drafted in the right way until new legislation has been approved by the House.

On the point that this House is the highest court of the land, I would not oppose the argument. I would merely submit that when we have an order in council that gives the authority for a program to be implemented, that order in council remains as the legal authority until it is repealed or set aside and until Parliament perhaps, if it is the highest court in the land, declares that it is illegal. Until that point, that order in council is a valid basis for a vote to include supply.

• (1030)

My last point about the information office is exactly that. The information office must be established first before seeking supply. I submit that the information office has been established. It was established by order in council. We and our lawyers believe that the order in council is valid. Once again it is held to be valid as the authority for establishing a program until it is repealed or set aside, which it has not been. Therefore the vote that deals with the information office is also under the authority of an order in council that is still valid and therefore means the creation of a proper information office for which we can seek supply because the information office has a legislative basis.

**The Speaker:** I do think all the members who took part in this point of order are trying to clarify both sides. As I said yesterday, I have been gathering information. I will take into consideration the material and opinions that have been put forward this morning.

It is my intention to rule on this. If it is at all possible, I will rule on this before the votes take place this afternoon. That is my intention right now.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### ENVIRONMENT

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as part of my ongoing commitment to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental assessment, I am

tabling today as the ministerial guideline to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act procedures for an assessment by a review panel. I present it in both official languages.

\* \* \*

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table in both official languages the government's responses to five petitions.

\* \* \*

### PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION REVIEW ACT

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-287, an act to provide for the study of proportional representation in federal elections and a national referendum on the recommendations that result from the study.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill would simply establish an all party committee that would have the power to travel to all provinces and territories of this country to consult the Canadian people on various forms of proportional representation that could be mixed into our current system and to study the various forms of proportional representation.

The committee would report back to the House and with the concurrence of the House cause a national referendum to be held where the people themselves could choose between the current single member constituency electoral system that we have and the method of proportional representation to be mixed into that system as recommended by the House of Commons through that committee.

I believe this would allow the people's votes to be reflected accurately in the House of Commons which is not the case today. It is really a new democracy for a new millennium.

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

\* \* \*

• (1035)

### BROADCASTING ACT

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-288, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce this bill which will amend the Broadcasting Act, specifically the broadcasting policy section.

### Routine Proceedings

The bill as presented today is the same bill that was introduced in the 35th Parliament and as subsequently amended by the Senate. It has received the support of the Minister for Canadian Heritage as stated in the House last spring. The bill will simply give consumers the right to say no to cable company services, something that consumers have wanted as evidenced most recently by the unfair practices of Videotron in the Montreal marketplace.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### BANK ACT

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-289, an act to amend the Bank Act and the Statistics Act (equity in community reinvestment).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by indicating that this bill is inspired by an act that has been in existence in the United States since 1977, called the community reinvestment act. The purpose of this bill is to require banks to reach, to all intents and purposes, a better balance between the deposits they receive and the loans they make, particularly where disadvantaged communities are concerned.

I hope this bill will receive unanimous consent in this House.

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### PETITIONS

#### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of a number of constituents from the Trochu area of Alberta. Their petition states the following.

That section 43 of the Criminal Code states that every school teacher, parent or person standing in the place of a parent is justified in using force by way of correction toward a pupil or a child who is under his care if the force does not exceed what is reasonable under the circumstances.

That section 43 recognizes the primary role of parents in raising and disciplining their children.

That the federal government is under pressure from various sources, including the United Nations to remove section 43 because we ratified the UN convention on the rights of the child.

That the removal of section 43 would strengthen the role of bureaucrats while weakening the role of parents in determining

*Supply*

what is in the best interests of children and therefore would be a major and unjustified intrusion by the state into the realm of parental rights and responsibilities.

That despite its stated intent to preserve section 43 at this time, the government continues to fund research by people who advocate for its removal and will be facing Senate Bill S-14 which calls for the repeal.

Your petitioners request Parliament to affirm the duty of parents to responsibly raise their children according to their own conscience and to retain section 43.

## HIGHWAYS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition in which the petitioners call upon Parliament to urge the federal government to join with the provincial governments to make the national highway system upgrading possible beginning in 1997.

\* \* \*

• (1040)

[Translation]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## SUPPLY

## ALLOTTED DAY—CALGARY DECLARATION

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.)** moved:

That this House recognize that strengthening the unity of Canada is its highest priority and given that nine provincial premiers and two territorial leaders have begun a process of consultation on national unity built on the Calgary declaration, this House:

1. endorses the efforts of the premiers, the territorial leaders and grassroots Canadians to foster national unity;
2. declares its support for the consultation process begun by the premiers and territorial leaders;

3. urges Canadians to become involved in the consultation process and in particular to express their approval of, disapproval of, or suggested improvements to such principles as the equality of citizens and provinces, respect for diversity including the unique character of Quebec society, and the need for rebalancing the powers of the provincial and federal governments;

4. urges the Government of Canada and members of this House to communicate with Quebecers regarding the Calgary declaration, and to consult the people of Quebec on its contents; and

5. regrets that the separatist government of Quebec has chosen not to participate in the discussion of national unity, and has refused to include Quebecers in the consultation on the Calgary declaration.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 1997, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer:** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River. I will repeat the motion so it is clear for all members of the House:

That this House recognize that strengthening the unity of Canada is its highest priority and given that nine provincial premiers and two territorial leaders have begun a process of consultation on national unity built on the Calgary declaration, this House:

1. endorses the efforts of the premiers, the territorial leaders and grassroots Canadians to foster national unity;

2. declares its support for the consultation process begun by the premiers and territorial leaders;

3. urges Canadians to become involved in the consultation process and in particular to express their approval of, disapproval of, or suggested improvements to such principles as the equality of citizens and provinces, respect for diversity including the unique character of Quebec society, and the need for rebalancing the powers of the provincial and federal governments;

4. urges the Government of Canada and members of this House to communicate with Quebecers regarding the Calgary declaration, and to consult the people of Quebec on its contents; and

5. regrets that the separatist government of Quebec has chosen not to participate in the discussion of national unity, and has refused to include Quebecers in the consultation on the Calgary declaration.

[Translation]

In the first Oral Question Period, I asked the Prime Minister if he would be putting the Calgary Declaration to the people of Quebec. He said he might, and, quite honestly, I was satisfied with his response.

• (1045)

I understand it is not easy for the Prime Minister to stand up to Mr. Bouchard and his separatist acolytes. As the Prime Minister has spent his political career humouring and appeasing the separatists, he was displaying his exceptional leadership skills when he said he might put the Calgary Declaration to Quebecers.

Two months have passed since the Prime Minister said in the early days of this Parliament that he would perhaps put the Calgary Declaration to the people of Quebec. I have remained patient only because I thought perhaps the Prime Minister needed time to discuss the idea with his advisors. I thought maybe he needed time to formulate a plan.

Did he put the time to good use? No. Instead of formulating a plan for submitting the Calgary Declaration to Quebecers, he simply pretended it was not necessary to consult them. Why bother consulting the people of Quebec on the Calgary Declaration, when they already know what it is about and already support the constitutional proposal?

Why waste all that money holding public consultations in Quebec and risk displeasing the separatists, when you know already what Quebecers think about the issue? That is the message the Prime Minister was sending to Canadians.

Finally, on October 3, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said in this House that the Calgary Declaration had support from British Columbia to Newfoundland. I found it strange when the *Globe and Mail* reported on September 29 that a public poll showed that Quebecers did not even understand the Calgary declaration.

Quebeckers do not know whether or not the expression “unique character” means the same thing as “distinct society”. They are not sure whether the Calgary declaration would give them the same powers, fewer powers or more powers. Yet, according to the Hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Quebecers strongly support the declaration.

I think it would be better to consult with the people of Quebec on this before stating that they support it. And the Quebecers I spoke to agree with me.

On October 31, nearly a month after questioning the Prime Minister about public consultations, I asked him if he had any concrete plans for consultations in Quebec. The reply I got was that the government still had no plans in that respect. One month later, the government did not even have a plan.

At that time, all the provinces and territories, except Quebec, were conducting public consultations or in the process of planning and preparing for consultations. Only Quebec was not in on this, and the government was still dragging its feet.

I looked at the public consultation plans of the provinces and territories. In fact, members of the Reform Party actively encourage their constituents to participate in these consultations. We want Canadians to take charge of their country's future. I had hoped that the Prime Minister would want Quebecers to do the same, but this seems to be the least of his worries.

### *Supply*

Since I am a particularly persistent man, on November 19, I asked the Prime Minister again—for the third time—whether he would be putting the Calgary declaration to the people of Quebec and respecting their democratic right to participate in constitutional consultations which are likely to change the face of this country.

Here is what the Prime Minister replied: “We are not saying that we will not hold consultations in Quebec but at the same time we are not saying that we will”.

• (1050)

After nearly two months, the Prime Minister has nothing to say and Canadians are losing patience.

We must not let the Calgary declaration fail through negligence. If it does not capture the interest of Canadians, if it is incapable of defining and embodying the future values and visions of Canadians, it will have failed for good reason. But if it fails because the people of Quebec do not view it as a constitutional proposal that they have helped to forge and that reflects their desire for greater autonomy, then it will have failed because of the negligence of this government.

The people of Quebec deserve to be heard. I therefore urge the Prime Minister to set aside petty political considerations and to consult the people of Quebec without delay. I urge the Prime Minister and the Liberal caucus to support this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. As part of the hon. member's policy and platforms it is the position of Reformers that they consult with their constituents. If the constituents do not agree with the motions or the suggestions put on the table, those members vote with the constituents.

Has the member consulted with his constituents of Edmonton—Strathcona? In the last election campaign that position was not put forward by the Reform or the people who supported his party.

Has he consulted with his constituents? If he has, what is their answer? If the answer is not in support of the motion, is it a fact that he would then vote against it?

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify. I hope the member understands what I have addressed in the motion.

To address his question, I had a town hall meeting. I consulted a number of people in my riding on the issue. There are different feelings about the Calgary declaration. That is fine.

My colleagues in caucus and I have encouraged various people with different opinions on the Calgary declaration to actually communicate them to their provincial governments through this public consultation process. Once the public consultation process

*Supply*

is over we will know exactly how the people of Canada feel about it. Then we as a political party can act on their feelings.

As the motion stands, we are only clarifying and encouraging Canadians to take part in what we feel is a very important part of the future of the country.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I begin by congratulating the member for Edmonton—Strathcona for having the initiative to table in parliament such an important issue.

As I read the member's motion I felt a couple of things were missing but one in particular. Toward the end of the last parliament one of our members, Len Hopkins from Renfrew, the dean of the last parliament, sponsored a private member's bill, Bill C-441, an act respecting the territorial integrity of Canada.

I will read one sentence on the principles:

This Act reaffirms that the Government of Canada has a moral and a legal responsibility to maintain and protect the territorial integrity of the Federation as it presently exists, or as its territory may be increased in future by constitutional amendment or otherwise, and that this responsibility is based on the following principles:

He goes on and on to indicate that Canada is a sovereign state, one and indivisible.

In the spirit of open debate, would the member consider including an amendment in his motion that would take in that member's private member's bill?

• (1055)

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer:** Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the comments and the question of my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood.

I would like to clarify that I am in favour of what he just mentioned and the fact that Canada is indivisible. I agree wholeheartedly with that private member's bill in the last parliament.

In this motion I tried to emphasize the importance of the Calgary declaration that is being considered right now as we speak. It is important for Canadians to take the time to participate in the process. It is a short process. Most provinces are winding up the process by mid-February.

Although I am in favour of what the member just put forward it is important, instead of clouding it up with other issues, to stick to the content of the Calgary declaration.

I encourage my constituents who may have the same concern to include it in their comments as they submit them to the provincial government. I thank the hon. member for his question.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as a member of the unity team representing the municipalities, I am pleased to speak to the very important topic of unity. We all know

that this discussion is necessary and is on the minds of most Canadians.

I begin by telling the House what the Official Opposition has done so far to promote public awareness and discussion of the Calgary declaration.

We have circulated two letters to more than 4,400 municipal councils in Canada encouraging them to get involved in the process. That is the first order of government, the level of government closest to the people.

We have circulated copies of the Calgary declaration to municipal leaders on demand. We have circulated letters to all the premiers encouraging them to get involved with the municipal leaders in discussions. We have asked the prime minister to make a copy of the Calgary declaration available to every household in Quebec. We have posted a copy of the Calgary declaration on the website of the Reform Party of Canada, [www.Reform.ca](http://www.Reform.ca), including an analysis and survey.

Some questions need to be raised about what the government is doing at this point in time. What leadership has the prime minister taken to involve Quebeckers in awareness and discussion of the Calgary declaration?

Another question needs to be raised. What has the prime minister done to involve municipal leaders in the unity discussion coming out of the Calgary declaration?

I would like to elaborate on some of these points. I will begin by addressing the issue of municipalities, governments that are part of the main stakeholders in the Canadian unity debate.

Canadians are looking for leaders who will work in positive ways to strengthen and to unify the Canadian federation. There is no doubt that many of my former municipal colleagues in the House, and there are at least 60 of them, believe that the municipalities should be heard and taken into account.

Municipal governments provide direct service to citizens. No one understands the real issues related to serving the public at that level as they do. It is long overdue that the federal government recognize municipal governments as legitimate entities in their own right.

I reiterate that in 1996 the current prime minister in Calgary, at a meeting of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, acknowledged the importance of municipalities. He indicated that he would do something more than just acknowledge them as an entity and their own rights. We are still waiting for that to occur.

As a newly elected member of Parliament and as Official Opposition deputy critic on national unity for municipalities, I want to make sure that municipalities are involved in building a better and more united Canada.

During the last federal election national unity emerged as a key issue, certainly in my riding. Federalists across Canada, regardless of political affiliation, were disturbed by the near failure of the federalist side during the last Quebec referendum campaign. There is a deepening conviction among more and more Canadians that a positive resolution to the unity issue requires a two pronged approach.

• (1100)

One is a vigorous, inspiring and far-sighted vision for making federalism work better, a vision of a 21st century Canada which appeals deeply to all Canadians, including Quebecers. This vision must reconcile and integrate the values and aspirations of importance to Canadians in every part of our country and at every level of government.

Second, a well defined, federal contingency plan for dealing with another referendum on sovereignty and/or a declaration of independence by Quebec. This plan must be made clear in advance of any decision on such matters and what the consequences would be for Quebec and Canada as a whole.

The Reform Party of Canada, which now forms the official opposition in this House, is committed 100% to the task of building a better and more united Canada, a Canada that includes Quebec as a full, essential partner.

Specifically, we have committed to co-operating not only with federal and provincial governments but also with Canadian municipal governments to help develop a vision for a better Canada and to propose alternatives where these are needed, including in Quebec.

Over the last six years as a municipal official, it was my privilege to visit and speak to many municipalities across this country. It is my conviction that public support is growing for a new non-constitutional effort designed to strengthen the unity of this country and that such an effort should focus on defining a vision of a better Canada which includes the following five elements.

First, a stronger commitment from the federal government to the equality of citizens and provinces in law.

Second, a rebalancing of the federal and provincial powers to meet the demands of the 21st century that take into account the responsibilities of municipalities as the governments closest to the people.

Third, ensuring this rebalancing equips each province with the tools required to protect and develop the unique features of their economies and societies.

Fourth, reform the institutions of Parliament and the federal system to make them more effective and accountable to the representation of local, regional and public interests.

### *Supply*

Fifth, ensure genuine consultations with the public involving them in any major changes to the federation.

Municipalities are putting forth resolutions that will reconcile and integrate the principles and values of equality, uniqueness, balance of powers, effective representation and public involvement which go a long way toward defining the vision that Canadians are looking for to strengthen and unite the country.

I do not have time to read the many letters that I have received from municipalities across Canada, but I will at this time indicate the meat of the letter that I sent to the premiers on September 18 which reads "Municipal leaders across Canada are already making clear that they have a stake in the future of our country. Municipal governments frequently refer to themselves as the first order of government, the government closest to the people. Could we encourage municipal leaders to participate and hold town hall style meetings in each community open to residents of the communities with the assistance of facilitators. The information will be provided by the provincial governments with input from experts, including the participation of local MLAs, MPPs and MNAs. The key advantage of such a process and mechanism is the opportunity to transcend political partisan loyalties over commitments. This is the kind of leadership I believe Canadians are looking for."

I would like to close by saying that Canada is a federal union of provinces and territories and Canada desires a balanced federation where provinces and citizens enjoy equal status before the constitution and the law of Canada. Canadians nationally and in each province and territory desire a country with better jobs, with brighter prospects for their children, with better health care, with more responsible and efficient government services, lower taxes, greater individual freedoms and more open and accountable government institutions.

Therefore, the Government of Canada and the provinces should pursue only policies and legislation which express the aspirations of Canadians to build a better Canada, more equal and united from sea to sea.

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC):** Mr. Speaker, having myself been a mayor for 10 years, I have much in common with the hon. member, who spoke about the importance of municipalities. However, he mentioned in his speech that municipalities were the first order of government. I would remind him that, in the Constitution, the federal government, and not the municipalities, is the first order of government. However, I agree with him that it is the order of government closest to the people.

I would like to ask the hon. member if, in his opinion, constitutional changes indicating whether municipalities should come under provincial or federal jurisdiction are required. Does the hon. member think changes are required?

*Supply**[English]*

**Mr. Inky Mark:** Mr. Speaker, I think this is an opportune time for this country to re-evaluate the relationship between the three levels of government. The hon. member may know or may not know that there are other countries in the world which only have two levels of government and do not have three levels such as this country.

The reality of history is that municipal governments existed long before the federal system came into being, way before confederation came about. Even though the provinces always elaborate and keep saying the municipal governments are the creatures of the provinces, they have taken a very paternalistic approach to the relationship between provinces and municipalities, it is high time we have a little more equality among all three levels.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the speech by the Reform member on today's opposition motion.

I find it somewhat disconcerting that he seems to claim that, since municipalities are the level of government closest to the public, they should be the ones doing the consultations. They should be the ones reviewing the agreement—the term “agreement” is used, but it is saying a lot about a piece of paper signed in Calgary, since there is absolutely no agreement in it, only proposals made with everybody's input. Is the hon. member really saying that municipalities should be the ones consulting people on this meaningless piece of paper?

What I find even more disconcerting is the question from the Quebec MP who asked the member whether he thinks municipalities should come under federal jurisdiction. The Reform member says that everything is on the table and that this may be an opportune time to consider such an option.

I should remind the hon. member that municipalities are created by legislative assemblies—the National Assembly in Quebec's case. According to the Canadian Constitution, not our constitution, not the constitution we never accepted, but the Constitution of 1867, they come under provincial jurisdiction. It is not up to the municipalities to examine or decide whether an agreement or a piece of paper such as the Calgary declaration is good or not.

I find it strange that the Reform member, and the member who tabled the motion, are concerned about Quebec and the consultation process, given that, according to the media, the consultation in their own part of the country, in their own province, is a phoney consultation in which practically no one is interested or involved.

I would appreciate it if the hon. member could comment on my remarks.

*[English]*

**Mr. Inky Mark:** Mr. Speaker, I respect the hon. member's comments and I respect his position. I do know that municipal governments are under the responsibility of all provincial governments, including the province of Quebec.

I think the object here is to encourage provincial governments to seek the assistance of municipalities to get into the milieu of discussion. The downfall of the last attempts with Canadian unity was the lack of grassroots involvement. If the hon. member believes in accountability to the people who elected and sent him to Ottawa, then I believe that the municipal governments and the citizens who live there and pay taxes are equally as important as the people who sit in the legislature at the provincial level.

● (1110)

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to thank the member for Edmonton—Strathcona and also the member for Dauphin—Swan River for their initiative today and to explain why the Government of Canada will support this motion from the opposition.

Canadian unity is not a partisan issue. We have our disagreements on how this country should be governed, and it is normal in a democracy that there be a liberal approach, a social-democratic approach, a conservative approach and a reform approach, or whatever we choose to call it. What is important, however, is that we all work together for the unity of Canada.

The premiers have proposed principles that can gain the support of all Canadians, and as such can strengthen our unity. The Calgary declaration is not the only part to Canadian unity, but it is an important one to show that Quebeckers, just like Albertans, just like all Canadians, share values and can look forward to the next century with a shared purpose rather than in a spirit of division. That is the objective of this declaration.

It is a wonderful declaration because it shows that in Canada, perhaps more than in any other country, we know that equality is not the same thing as uniformity. Equality is an important value that is being pursued further in Canada than anywhere else, along with diversity, which is also an important value, and this country finds its strength in diversity. Diversity is not at all at issue; it is a strength, and these two values go together.

That diversity covers various features. There is of course the bilingual character of the country; there is the multicultural character of the country, there is the contribution made by

aboriginal peoples, and there is the Quebec society, which is in a unique situation in North America, for reasons on which everyone can agree.

What is also new in the Calgary declaration is the fact that it is clearly stated that no special status is being created for anyone. All provinces have equal status. Either they are provinces or they are not. If they are provinces, equality of status always applies, but recognition of the equal status of the provinces should not prevent, in fact it should promote, taking into consideration the particular circumstances of each province, because we have a very diverse country, and circumstances in Alberta are not in many respects the same as those in Nova Scotia.

One province is totally unique by virtue of its majority language, its culture, its civil code, its own institutions, and that province is Quebec. There can be recognition of this province's unique situation without creating a situation of inequality compared to the others, merely by stating that everything to be given to one province, in light of its particular situation, must also be available to the others if they should require it.

Quebeckers are not jealous people. They do not want anything for themselves that others would not be able to have. They simply want assurance that, in this decentralized federation, their identity and their way of being Canadians "à la Québécoise" can be reinforced in the coming century with the assistance of other Canadians.

[English]

Other Canadians, Albertans and citizens from other provinces, are not jealous people either. They are not saying that since they do not need it, they do not want Quebeckers to have it. They just said that anything that is available for a province must be available for the provinces because this is equality.

It is in this way that we have reconciled the values of diversity and equality. We must commend all the premiers for having done that and we must support them.

I am very pleased to see how in this House the parties that believe in Canada speak with one voice. We support those principles.

I want to quote a great Canadian, a key Canadian for this very moment in our history coming from the province of the hon. member. "I believe in a Canada where all provinces have equal status, but a Canada that allows Quebec to protect those things that make it such a unique part of our national character. do not think those two principles cancel each other out. The Canada I am describing might be familiar to many because most of us grew up here in the tolerant and diverse nation where we are equal as Canadians no matter where we live, but where the word equality is not used as a blanket to smother diversity."

### Supply

• (1115)

I agree with that fully. That is exactly the spirit of the Calgary declaration which was stated last spring, well before the Calgary declaration, by Premier Ralph Klein. So it is not a partisan matter.

[Translation]

We are with premier Klein and with all the premiers, in this initiative which is aimed at enhancing our key values.

[English]

As the Leader of the Opposition said recently, Alberta political leaders have chosen to act as big westerners, not little westerners on this issue.

I am very proud to share this country with the hon. member from Alberta. We will fight together to make sure that we will stay fellow citizens. Whatever arguments we may have about social, economic and criminal policies, we will have the pleasure of fighting together in the same country.

We are having a disagreement right now which is not a fundamental one. It is a disagreement about how to speak to Quebeckers at this very moment. It is not fundamental but it is something we have to discuss. I am happy that this discussion will occur today.

The point of view of the government today is that it is too soon for that. As the member from the Bloc said, it is not so easy to consult with people even in a province where a premier like Premier Klein is strongly supporting the resolution of the Calgary declaration. It is not easy because when people get up in the morning it is not their first preoccupation to listen to a debate about this declaration.

It does not mean that people do not support it. In fact, if they were strongly against it the likelihood that they would rush to these kinds of consultations would be greater. However, I think they support the principles.

I know that polls are polls, but what is interesting are the polls that are compared with the ones we had in Charlottetown or Meech. When we go into the details of the declaration, the support is even greater for the declaration in Quebec.

[Translation]

When Quebeckers are asked "Do you support the Calgary declaration?", the support is there, but not strong support. When they are asked "Do you support citizen equality?", there is very strong support. When they are asked "Do you support the equality of status of the provinces?", there is strong support. And when they are asked "Do you support the recognition of Quebec's unique character?", there is very strong support.

In other words, the more detail there is given on the declaration, the more people support it, and this is grounds for considerable optimism, even if the process of consultation in those provinces whose premiers support the process is not as easy as some would

*Supply*

believe. People are not rushing to share their points of view, but there are still grounds for considerable optimism.

Where are we headed with all this? It is desirable for the premiers of the nine provinces and the territorial leaders who believe in a powerful united Canada, coming out of these consultations, to be able to find sufficient public support to enable them to submit to their respective parliaments a statement of principle, which will no doubt be fairly close to the Calgary declaration and will show the extent to which Canadians do, in fact, share the same values. This will lead to declarations by the legislatures.

[*English*]

It will not be a constitutional act. We are not speaking about the Constitution now. It is a declaration of principles that shows that yes, we share values. If one day we are ready, especially if there is a premier in Quebec who believes in Canada, we will see if there is still support among the people for something that would be a more legal document that we may consider putting in the Constitution.

The approach that we have with the support of the Leader of the Opposition and all the leaders in the House who believe in Canada and who support the step by step approach is something great and I am very proud to do it with all my colleagues in the House who believe in Canada.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. minister for his very constructive remarks and his leadership on this issue.

• (1120)

The minister will know that many people, particularly in western Canada, continue to be concerned about the singling out of the unique character of Quebec society in the fifth clause of the Calgary declaration. The concern is that this will be the seed of a new distinct society interpretive justiciable clause which could create two categories of provinces in Canada.

I wonder if the hon. minister could address that concern. Is it a legitimate concern? How would he respond to the view that recognizing the unique character of Quebec society in some way derogates from the equality of all provinces?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It is a legitimate question, but I do not think the concern is well advised.

It has been very clear since the beginning that with an interpretive clause, first, you cannot override what is clear in the Constitution. It is something which helps to interpret the Constitution when the Constitution is not clear.

Second, it cannot give to one province more powers or privileges than it gives to other provinces.

In order to be sure that it is very clear that this is not special status, what the Calgary declaration added is the principle stating that if any future constitutional amendment confers powers on one province, those powers must be available to all provinces.

That is already what we are doing. We could take the example of the manpower training agreements which we are negotiating with the provinces. Alberta and Quebec have decided to use all the powers which the agreements give them, but Newfoundland did not feel that it needed them, so there will be co-management with Newfoundland. Newfoundland will not have full autonomy in this field.

What is important is that everything is available for everyone. This is equality and we are committed to ensure that this will always be the case.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the government is supporting the Reform Party's motion faulting the Quebec government, which will not be consulting Quebecers on the Calgary declaration or at least has yet to decide to do so.

I would like to hear what the minister has to say in response to three questions I have. First, what does he think of the statement by Mike Harris, who trivialized the concept of unique character to the point of describing it in terms of Pacific salmon?

Second, what does he think of the report in this morning's papers that only 4% of Albertans know about the Calgary declaration, that a televised report revealed last week that some people thought it concerned a labour dispute and that others did not know there was such a declaration? How can he preach ethics to us, when the people of Alberta, the people voting for the Reform Party, are not aware of the Calgary declaration?

How can he say that they are not speaking up probably because they support it? I would like him to explain his remarks. If people are unaware of something and they do not talk about it, it is probably because they agree with it. That is what he said.

On the subject of the powers to be given to everyone, not just Quebec, I would ask him to list the powers that will be given to Quebec and the other provinces in Canada as the result of the Calgary declaration.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** Mr. Speaker, I will start by answering the last comment. Should it become a legal text enshrined in the Constitution, in itself it would not confer any powers on anyone.

However, it would reflect the values on which this country must build. One of these values is certainly ensuring that each constitu-

ent part of this country can develop on the basis of its own identity and particular values. We know how important this is to Quebec. I gave the example of occupational training, which is but one example.

Here is another example. Bilingualism is an asset to Canada. It is a great advantage to have two legal systems in Canada, and so is having two official languages. But this bilingualism needs to be strengthened, especially now that we are expanding our relations with countries whose legal culture is different from ours, and this ability to understand two different legal cultures, based on the fact that we have two in our country, gives us an advantage on countries where there is only one legal tradition.

We have decided, and I will close with this, to better harmonize federal legislation with the Quebec civil code. This will be very good for Quebecers and for all Canadians.

• (1125)

[English]

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe we should have more time for questions. I assume the minister would have a half hour spot here in this debate which would include his speech and questions. We have only had about 20 minutes.

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I was not looking for unanimous consent to extend debate, although I would certainly be happy to get that. Under the rules of this debate I believe each speaker is given a half hour to make comments and then to answer questions unless they specifically state that they will share their time. Did the minister do that or will we have the half hour?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Hon. members would know that in this debate the member moving the motion has a half hour. After that it is 15 minute interventions comprised of 10 minutes and 5 minutes for questions and comments. In the second round it goes to the method by which you are assuming it is all going. After the first intervention we are at 10 minutes and 5 minutes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words on the Calgary declaration. In my statement, I will elaborate on some of the points that have just been mentioned.

First of all, we are discussing this issue today following an initiative by the Reform Party, which wants Parliament to endorse the Calgary declaration. It also wants to blame the Government of

### Supply

Quebec for not holding consultations on the Calgary declaration. Behind all of this, we can also see that the Reform Party is starting to look for a way out, on this issue.

There are four aspects I would like to deal with quickly: Why the Calgary declaration, the consultation process, the absence of consultations in Quebec, and, finally, the reasons behind the Reform Party's initiative.

Why the Calgary declaration? I have to go quickly and I will not have enough time in ten minutes to cover all the history behind this, but I will point out some main events. It should be remembered that following patriation in 1982 of the Constitution, which was not signed by Quebec and where Quebec was isolated, attempts were made to remedy this extraordinary error by the Liberal Party of Canada, but also with several premiers, some of whom are still around today.

Later, Brian Mulroney, the Prime Minister of Canada, and Robert Bourassa, the Premier of Quebec, tried in their own way to resolve this issue. Their argument was "Quebec has to be brought back in with honour and dignity". As we all know, this led to the Meech Lake accord, which failed, and then there was the Charlottetown accord, which was rejected by the population. I do not want to spend too much time on these events that have been dealt with at length by others. This led to the arrival in the federal Parliament of regional parties, a trend that was maintained following the last federal election.

But above all, this led to the 1995 referendum. Very often, federalists forget to mention that there were two referendums in Quebec, even three. In 1992, Quebecers refused to endorse the Charlottetown accord, by which Quebec would have signed the patriation of the Constitution under the Charlottetown conditions. We must always remember that Quebecers said that no, under those conditions, they would not sign. This is an important issue in this debate. It seems that federalists have a selective memory and that they forget that episode.

In 1995, with a participation rate of over 93%, 49.5% of the population voted yes on the proposal for the sovereignty of Quebec accompanied by an offer to form a partnership with the rest of Canada.

In a panic, faced with this result, Ottawa did not know exactly how to react and took a hard line, with everything that implied under plan B, to attack Quebec, to make people think that the question was not understood, nor the issues, and everything else, and to come up with the greatest scare tactics that were ever used, on territory, etc.

• (1130)

In fact, we know that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is now the leader of the partitionist movement in Quebec. He is spreading the idea everywhere, not just in Quebec, but outside the province too. All this led provincial premiers to say "We must do

*Supply*

something". But how can they do something when they have hardly any room to manoeuvre, when just about everything has been tried in the negotiations that led to Meech and Charlottetown? Still, they feel they must do something symbolic because there will be an election in Quebec and, should the Parti Québécois win, another referendum will be held.

Under the circumstances, the premiers decided to find a way to send a message to Quebec to the effect that they may be prepared to do something to please Quebecers, because they do not want—and the Calgary exercise is primarily the result of this concern—the federalist party in Quebec, that is the Quebec Liberal Party, going into an election campaign with nothing but a promise to renew federalism and no concrete measures to support it.

So, the idea is to create the illusion that there will be a follow-up to this promise. That is why the premiers took a piece of paper on which they wrote great principles. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs himself said earlier, among other things, that should the agreement become part of the Constitution, these values would guide us in an eventual decentralization of power and so on. At the rate things are going, we better not hold our breath, because it could take a long time before anything comes out of this. The minister also talked about manpower training, which is a prime example of federalism at work, given that it took over 30 years to come up with a solution. This administrative agreement may be short-lived, because we never know what the federal government may decide.

Furthermore, we, as members of Parliament working in their ridings, know that the federal government is launching all kinds of youth training initiatives, but that it does not even respect the spirit or the lofty values by which it says it is guided. It obviously has no interest in them whatsoever, nor in that agreement. This is not a lofty principle, but a small administrative agreement to fool people into thinking that this system can evolve, can change.

But I do not want to look like the only one criticizing the Calgary declaration, so I am going to quote from a number of newspaper articles I have come across recently. I will start with Lise Bissonnette of *Le Devoir*, who gives a bit of the context in which the Calgary declaration was arrived at, and I quote "It confirms, nonetheless, that the stumbling blocks of the past are still with us and are crystallizing into three points that have always been viewed as essential in Quebec circles that believe in the renewal of federalism". And these three points are: the concept of political pact between two peoples, constitutional recognition of the distinct character of Quebec and its real significance, and the division of power between the two levels of government.

She goes on to explain that there has been failure on all three counts. But I know that members opposite will say that Ms.

Bissonnette is a nasty separatist, a sovereignist and whatnot. I will therefore continue.

According to an article in *Le Soleil*, after a tour by the then premier of New Brunswick, Frank McKenna, the specific nature of Quebec was too much for the West to swallow. The article refers to the non-inclusion of Quebec institutions as part of its unique character. They did not want to use the word "institution". Frank McKenna said "I tried, but there was too much resistance in the West".

One of the best articles, headlined "A path filled with pitfalls", is by Alain Dubuc—whom one cannot classify as a sovereignist unless he has undergone a recent conversion, and if so someone should let us know. Allow me to quote from this article:

It is normal, however, for Quebecers to welcome this initiative with as much circumspection as the premiers put into formulating it. Quebecers, leery after the failures of recent years, are sceptical and want to know where all this is headed before they voice an opinion.

Alain Dubuc himself says that we need to watch what happens elsewhere before we voice an opinion ourselves.

He continues:

The way the premiers started off this new round, there was nothing to stir up any enthusiasm. In their palpable discomfort, their careful language, their way of paying lip service to their love, the nine premiers bore less resemblance to politicians beginning to rebuild their country and more to nine men in a waiting room waiting to be called in for vasectomies.

The author of this article is Alain Dubuc, senior editorial writer at *La Presse*. He goes on to list a series of traps, concluding with this:

The fourth trap is love. Some premiers have expressed their love for Quebec. But since it was obvious how terrified some of them were of public opinion, this message did not ring true, just as it did not ring true on the eve of the referendum. Recognition and respect would be more credible and more than sufficient.

Alain Dubuc wrote that.

• (1135)

The text probably never made it to the Power Corporation office.

I have here another article headlined "Bones without flesh: Jonathan Sauvé urges his party to be wary of the Calgary declaration". Who is Jonathan Sauvé? He is the president of the Quebec Liberal Party youth commission, who made this statement a few days after the Calgary declaration was issued. I hope he will stand by this statement during the provincial election.

"Bones without flesh". "The Calgary declaration: opening or setback?". This is followed by a quote from Claude Ryan, saying that the declaration reflects mistrust of Quebec. This is Claude

Ryan, the former Quebec Liberal Party leader, who is not known to be a staunch sovereigntist either.

There is also this document in which the Government of Newfoundland clarifies what is at stake, and the minister was quite clear on this, but I would like him to repeat this everywhere he goes.

Why use the term "unique" instead of "distinct" to describe Quebec's character?

The answer is found in this guide being distributed to the public.

The word "distinct" is reminiscent of earlier discussions. In many parts of Canada, it has taken a negative meaning. In addition, "distinct" conveys the idea of "separate", which goes against unity.

On the other hand, the expression "unique character" suggests something that is special but does not adversely affect unity. Accordingly, the expression "unique character" more accurately conveys what we mean.

These people want to play on words. If they want to recognize Quebec for what it is, why do they feel the need to get into a semantics debate to decide what word to use, if not because there is a degree of distrust, fear, apprehension and hesitation in many places?

Mr. Speaker, I know you are about to interrupt me, so I will conclude this part of my speech and then I will answer questions.

Let me briefly touch on the motivation of the Reform Party, which calls on their constituents to make sure this never happens by way of a constitutional amendment recognizing Quebec's distinctiveness. They are telling their supporters to express their views on this.

Now their leader is saying that Senate reform should be included in there somewhere. Preston Manning is looking for a way out and trying to put the blame on Quebecers because they are not holding consultations. That is what we are witnessing today and we will be discussing what their real intentions are throughout the day.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is hard to come up with a speech more deplorable than the one we have just heard on this subject.

Choosing passages that suit the member from documents supporting the Calgary declaration in general terms—

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur:** Talk about the 4 per cent in Alberta.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion:** He made no mention of scholarly papers like the one prepared by professor Benoît Pelletier explaining why the declaration is good for Quebecers. No, it is too long. I have little to say.

### *Supply*

I would like to point out some fairly elementary mistakes. Earlier, the hon. member said that only 4 per cent of Albertans were aware of the Calgary declaration. In fact, 4 per cent responded to the questionnaire.

**Mr. Pierre Brien:** Mr. Speaker, the minister says that I chose passages from people who support the Calgary declaration. As far as I know, Alain Dubuc's editorial—I will send him a copy—contained little support for the Calgary declaration.

Ms. Bissonnette did not appear to be giving much support to the Calgary declaration. Jonathan Sauvé of the Liberal Party did not give it much support either. I will send him a copy because I imagine he has some free time and that he will take the time to read it in between two speeches on separation.

As regards what is happening in Alberta and the fact that a number of people responded, I remember a report we heard on a CBC radio station. They were doing man-in-the-street interviews in Alberta. Of ten or twelve people, two or three thought it involved a labour dispute, the others had no idea what they were talking about and knew nothing about the Calgary declaration.

That said, before we go calling that support, let us wait and see. I suggest he be prudent, because he knows very well that, before it gets support in Alberta and B.C., the Calgary declaration would have to be put to a referendum if it were to become a constitutional amendment. Then there would be a real debate, and I am sure that the minister and many members of his government would find the results most surprising.

● (1140)

[*English*]

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member began and ended his remarks by saying that people in Quebec and the rest of Canada do not know what is in the Calgary declaration. If that is the case, that is why we are recommending in point four of our motion that the government and members communicate with Quebecers regarding the Calgary declaration and consult the people of Quebec on its contents.

We all know very well the hon. member's secessionist views. Notwithstanding, does he think it is within the interest of well informed public debate in Quebec on this matter to take steps to inform Quebecers about the content of the Calgary declaration, or does he want to leave them in the dark? What is he trying to hide from Quebecers with respect to the content of the declaration?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Brien:** Mr. Speaker, in 1995, barely two years ago—and these people do not know, because they are told all sorts of things by the federal government—a consultation process was

*Supply*

held through the commissions on the future of Quebec. The process was criticized by this government, which claimed that it was a phoney consultation from which nothing would come out. Yet, during these consultations in Quebec, more testimonies were heard than in the best consultation process under way on the Calgary declaration. So, I hope they will reconsider, apologize and recognize that the process was in fact a great democratic exercise in Canada.

This being said, the ball is clearly in the federalist camp. In the last referendum, 49.5% of Quebecers voted in favour of sovereignty, along with a partnership offer. It is not true that Quebec will now support meaningless proposals that have no constitutional value and that are simply meant to gain support for Daniel Johnson in the next election. Federalists want the Quebec government to go along with this so they can ultimately put the blame on Quebec by saying "in any case, Quebecers do not want it. Therefore, we will not support it because they do not want it".

Federalists from all parties and from the other Canadian provinces should start by agreeing among themselves. They should act while Quebec is still a province, because the countdown has begun. Let them agree on a substantial offer to Quebec and then we may have a debate. Otherwise, in the next referendum, people will have to choose between the insignificant Calgary declaration and its principles—some people even trivialized Quebecers' unique character by comparing it to Pacific salmon—and sovereignty with a partnership offer. I am pretty sure which one of these two options will prevail.

[English]

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the member from the Bloc. It reinforces why it is important for all of us who believe in Canada and want to see Canada remain united in the future to get our act together and to be able to say something to Quebec that will be acceptable, if not to the hon. member who just spoke, which is unlikely, then to a great majority of Quebecers who may wish to stay in Canada if they feel the rest of Canada is in a position to offer them the possibility of a relationship that satisfies both their own self-understanding and a vision of Canada that is acceptable inside Quebec and outside Quebec.

I welcome the motion by the Reform Party. I welcome the news that the government intends to support it. Certainly the New Democratic Party also intends to support the motion.

One of the reasons for doing that is the need to show that in spite of differences which may exist from time to time on other issues, and indeed from time to time on the constitution, on the unity file, there is the possibility of coming together on this day in support of this resolution.

I hoped this would be a foreshadowing of future events in which we could come together around something more substantial, either the Calgary declaration as it stands or the Calgary declaration as amended or as followed up on in respect of other concerns that have been raised and will be raised in the course of the consultation.

The very nature of consultation, it seems to me, is that one is open, and I presume the premiers are open, to suggestions on how to approve the declaration or how to move beyond the declaration in ways that address very legitimate concerns that have been raised.

• (1145)

The first one that comes to my mind is the concern raised by the aboriginal leadership in this country, that there is wording in the Calgary declaration which, in their judgment, does not reflect properly their status within Canada, their self-understanding within Canada.

I and my party share their concerns. They are not concerns that would lead us to vote against this motion because this motion is about the consultation process. I note that even the Reform Party, whose members drafted this motion, are very careful not to indicate support for the Calgary declaration. Support for the premiers in their efforts, support for the consultation process, yes, but if one reads the motion very carefully, as I did, nowhere does it express support for the Calgary declaration. I do not know whether that is intentional. It could be intentional with good intentions. On the other hand, it could be intentional with not so good intentions.

Perhaps future speakers from the Reform Party could indicate the reason why. It does not necessarily vitiate one's commitments to consultation to take a stand for oneself as to the worthiness or unworthiness of a particular resolution.

One can then go out, consult and find that there are legitimate criticisms, legitimate suggestions as to how it can be improved and how those suggestions can be acted upon.

I would be interested in knowing from future Reform Party speakers just where they stand on the Calgary declaration as opposed to all the language of support for the process.

It seems to me, again with respect to what has been said so far by the Reform Party in support of its motion, that much of what the first speaker said had to do with his insistence that the Government of Canada consult with the people of Quebec now, immediately, yesterday, on the Calgary declaration.

I listened to the minister say that he felt that the time was not right for that kind of consultation. I tend to agree with the minister. I say to the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona that I think it would be a serious mistake to go into Quebec either through the instrument of the federal government or in some other way to create another round of expectations if we are not sure in the rest of

Canada that we can actually say with a certain amount of unity and a certain amount of certainty that this is what we agreed upon.

We want to know what the people of Quebec think about this and we want to know their opinion on this.

At some point that has to happen, obviously. If it were not to happen, then that would be a serious mistake. When we reach that point, I do not think we should be fearful of the provincial government in this regard.

I think we have a right as Canadians and the federal government has a right as the federal government to consult Quebecers on this issue. I do not say this out of caution or out of fear of what the view of the Quebec government is on this.

I just offer it as a tactical reflection, if you like, that the worst thing that could happen is one more round in which expectations are created in Quebec and then Quebec finds one more time that the rest of Canada really does not have its act together and cannot agree among itself, therefore whatever expectations would be created by going through a process in Quebec now would be disappointed.

It seems to me that that is the point of the Calgary declaration and the consultation process that it creates, to see if there is enough unity in the rest of the country—outside Quebec, that is—so that we can actually say to Quebec with some certainty that this is how we propose to redescribe and reconfigure our relationship with Quebec and, for that matter, reconfigure Confederation; what do you think? Some people may reject it, some people may accept it, but until we are in a position to do that, I think it might be a serious mistake to do what the hon. member has suggested.

• (1150)

I do not quarrel with the principle. I suppose I am asking him to reflect on the timing. Maybe it is just because I have seen this happen before and I am worried that we may repeat the scenario of creating expectations which cannot be met.

Having stated my reservations about what seems to be at the top of the Reform Party agenda, which is an immediate consultation with Quebec, I want to repeat that I doubt the wisdom of it at this time.

I also want to say to the government that it should find a way to meet the concerns of the aboriginal leadership in the country which they expressed not so long ago and which I know have been expressed personally to the minister by Grand Chief Phil Fontaine and to the premiers as recently as last week.

Let us not get into the bind we were in before where because we have agreed on something that we cannot agree to change it. We need to be able to agree to change things or to follow up so that we do not get into the corner we have been in so many times before,

### *Supply*

unfortunately, where we have not been able to respond appropriately to concerns that have arisen.

Finally, from a social democratic or NDP point of view, we also say to the government though we do not offer a simplistic or economic reductionistic view of unity in this regard, we do however believe that part of building a strong country means addressing the growing social and economic inequalities that exist in this country and which are more pronounced now than they were 20 years ago.

We cannot encourage people to think as citizens, as a community or to think that they are all in the same boat if on the other hand we are pursuing policies which increasingly divide and separate people into winners and losers and people who regard themselves as part of a society that no longer cares for them. They cannot bring themselves to care for a society that does not care for them.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the last speaker. This is a man who is asking himself some hard questions.

Will the Calgary declaration, which I have only examined briefly, but which talks about the unique character of Quebec society, be accompanied by new inputs or amendments to the existing Constitution? If this notion of unique society were adopted in Quebec or elsewhere in Canada, has it been proposed to Quebecers that this notion of Quebec's unique character be enshrined in legislation, which would be our new Constitution, and which would be accompanied by a change in the Senate, by a change in the division of legislative responsibilities, or whatever? I have heard nothing.

There is no doubt that Quebec is unique. It is unique in speaking French. It is unique in having its own poetry. It is unique in many of its structures.

But I would like the hon. member to tell me whether, in Calgary or in the consultations now under way, proposals to Quebecers were formulated.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I thought the minister had addressed this in his remarks, but it seems to me at this time that what we are talking about is language. My experience of this constitutional dilemma is that it is often not the technical legalities and not even the distribution of power that is at the root of the problem. It is people's level of comfort or discomfort with certain ways of describing the country and describing Quebec's place within the country or describing the place of the aboriginal people in Canada and so on. We are trying to find a way of talking to each other about ourselves that does not cause us to divide, that does not cause us to be in conflict with each other.

*Supply*

• (1155)

I see the Calgary declaration as one more attempt, because there have been so many unsuccessful ones, to find a way of talking about Canada in a way that meets the need in Quebec for both a symbolic and practical recognition of their distinctiveness but to do that in a way that does not offend against other images of the country and understandings of the country with respect to equality of the provinces and so on—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Colleagues, with permission, when there is obviously a good deal of interest in joining the debate, if we could keep our comments and questions to about one minute and responses to a minute we would be able to get a lot more in. Let us give that a shot.

Questions and comments, the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. member that I share most of his point of view.

I will ask him if he is in agreement with the following statement. I want to say that it is normal that there is a lot of suspicion throughout the country. Our country has been in this debate for 30 years now. Though some people have some concerns it does not mean that they do not agree with the goal, with the objective which is to say which values we all share. I want to quote, and it will not be long.

[Translation]

“This gradual approach, which is based on consultation and which includes the opposition parties, this desire not to set overly ambitious goals, shows that Canada has learned from its mistakes and wishes to put all the chances on its side so as to avoid another failure. This is wise. The Quebec minister responsible for Canadian intergovernmental affairs, Jacques Brassard, simply laughed off the suggestions of other provinces, showing clearly that his government is cutting itself off from the people of Quebec”.

I quoted Alain Dubuc, whose remarks the member distorted earlier.

[English]

**Mr. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, what happened here to me points out what I have seen so many times and what I think is wrong. I do not know whether the member was asking me a question or was debating with the Bloc Québécois. Sometimes it is hard to tell. One becomes the presumption or the platform for another family fight between Quebecers. They are all in the same family whether they like it or not. These family fights are sometimes more vicious than the debate which goes on between the rest of Canada and Quebec.

I would simply ask Quebec members of Parliament, and Quebecers whoever they might be, on whatever side they might be, to try to rise above this tendency to always be at each other's throats and try to take the rest of us into the debate because this is our country too.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, before beginning and with your leave, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to share my time with the hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC):** Mr. Speaker, what is surprising today, is that we have a motion from the Reform Party, at a time when there is a process under way that seems to be going well, but it is not making headlines, and Reform is once again stirring up trouble on this issue.

• (1200)

When a process starts to work well, the Reform Party has to stir up trouble. Now, we have learned that the government side will join them, and also the New Democrats.

We of the Conservative Party will be voting against this motion for several reasons. It harbours negative sentiments. It comes from the Reform Party, and in the House they make themselves look good, and so on, but when we discuss with them outside the House, we realize that they want nothing to do with Quebec and francophones. My colleague from Brandon—Souris will be speaking shortly on the real stance of the Reform Party on constitutional matters. They are skillful in political and parliamentary manoeuvring in the House, but outside of the House, over a coffee or other refreshments, we get to see the other side of the Reform Party, and now people will know what the Reform really stands for.

We cannot agree with this. The leader of a party cannot take on a new image within six months. During the election campaign, we saw what the Reform Party stood for. That same outlook is still here today, and the party structure is the same.

We are against this motion. It is not the time for such a motion. The process got under way in Calgary. For us, in any case, there are other ways to make this country work rather than with constitutional changes, with plans B, C, D, E or F. We proposed something different in our platform, a Canadian pact. In fact, the government will most likely borrow from this position during coming meetings.

We do not agree with this either and we are very surprised that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the minister who creates

havoc each time the Constitution is mentioned, supports this proposal. He and his counterpart in Quebec are firing off letters to each other. They are writing an essay on federal-provincial non-relations, on how to ensure that these relations will not work. Now we are getting ready to go to the supreme court for a real bout of legal and constitutional squabbling.

Could we not come back to the basic principle of dialogue and action? We want a federalism that is efficient and sensitive. Other solutions can be found. We are ready to share these and to discuss them. Let us not attempt however to go to Quebec to talk about the Calgary process. Quebecers are capable of reading and understanding what it is about.

I would like the Bloc Québécois member who spoke earlier about the national commissions on Quebec's future to know that I was a commissioner. On constitutional matters, such as the Calgary declaration or the Meech Lake accord, ask Quebecers to name the five conditions of the Meech Lake accord and few could do so. What they understand is that an attempt was made to keep the country together. So, we can let the Calgary process take its course.

In the meantime, let us try to give this country some real solutions. We are prepared to share our ideas, as I said earlier, including the Canadian pact. What is it? It involves—and the people in the Bloc Québécois will be happy and we agree with them—respect for individual jurisdictions and an end to overlap and duplication. Our government is a centralizing government forever shoving its nose in others' business. The Reform Party now wants municipalities to come under the federal government. This is a real mess.

What we are saying is that, without a constitutional amendment—as our leader often points out—we can talk, meet others' standards and respect their jurisdictions, come to mutual agreements and, under the British parliamentary system, establish traditions that go on to become law. So let us try to get back to the real priorities.

The Reform Party tabled a motion this morning because they want to screw the whole thing up. They want to stop it from working. That is where the problem lies. Talk to Reformers, talk to certain MPs and their staff outside the House, and they will tell you that, for them, Canada means no Quebec, no francophones, no multiculturalism, no official languages. That is what the Reform Party is all about. Just look at their web site. The Reform web site is not even bilingual. Close to 50% of them are bilingual, and they want to be a national party. Forget it, it just will not work.

What we are proposing is to sit down together, respect jurisdictions, and make the country work on an administrative basis. Let us get back to bread and butter issues. People will not be able to explain what the Calgary declaration is, or what Meech Lake is, if they have no bread on the table.

Now I will give the floor over to my colleague from Brandon—Souris.

### *Supply*

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to remind my Conservative Party colleague that the Meech Lake accord is not something I was promoting. That was an agreement between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party of Quebec. If people did not learn about the conditions of that agreement, it is more or less their fault, not mine.

• (1205)

When people voted in the 1995 referendum, they knew what they were deciding on. He himself says that he was a member of the commission on the future, which discussed the matter thoroughly.

I would like to ask him a question concerning a letter written by his leader on the eve of the Calgary meeting. The letter states “As I have pointed out, a successful meeting would include—and here he names things—a draft definition of an action plan for Canada. The statement could set out the following points: the need to rebalance the roles and responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments”.

He also speaks of spending power. He says “The measures limiting this power should focus on the long term common good”. He speaks of a reform of institutions that ought to include an indispensable reform of the Senate.

I repeat the first phrase: “A successful meeting would include the following”. Is the hon. member in agreement with his leader, then, and can he conclude, as he must, that the Calgary meeting was a failure?

**Mr. André Bachand:** Mr. Speaker, yes, I am in agreement with my leader. I campaigned with my leader because that is what I believed in. This letter basically repeats what was in our election platform.

The Calgary process is one that will hopefully evolve. As for the statements the Bloc Québécois member attributed to my leader, yes, I am in agreement. If we could implement the points the member has quoted from the letter by the member for Sherbrooke, I think the country would perhaps be in better shape. The Bloc member knows very well that the position of my leader, the position of the Conservative Party in Quebec, is one of the most popular positions and one which has the potential to rally all Quebecers. This is something the Bloc member knows, and that is why they do not want us to gain too much power in Quebec because they know that the next time they will be out the door.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Quebec for sharing his speaking time for a member and a colleague from western Canada to speak to an issue I consider to be of utmost national significance.

*Supply*

I am pleased to be in this House to see the transformation from a cocoon to a butterfly of the Reform Party. It is now putting forward its position on national unity. A short six months ago the positions taken with respect to national unity by hon. colleagues from the Reform Party were not quite as positive as the position now being put forward in this House.

It is no secret that the Progressive Conservative Party believes very strongly in the federation of Canada. It believes very strongly in ten provinces and two territories. It believes this country has everywhere to go in the future to ensure we embrace the national unity of the federation and to make sure we have ten solid provinces and two solid territories.

I can speak to the experience and the confidence of the leader of our party. It was the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party who brought this country back from the abyss. In the last referendum he was called upon because there was no leadership from the Liberal government. He was called upon to make sure this country did stay together. There is a majority in Quebec that wants to remain Canadian and it will do so.

The policy of the Progressive Conservative Party has always been one of consultation, conciliation and understanding unlike the policies of the Reform Party.

The Calgary declaration is embraced and accepted by the Progressive Conservative Party. It is nice to see there is leadership in this country beyond that of the federal Liberal government which has not given any indication of leadership. The premiers of the provinces had to sit down to put forward a plan, the Calgary declaration. They had to come forward to say that this question is of such importance we have to deal with it ourselves without the leadership of the federal Liberal government. I am thankful for the Calgary declaration which we embrace and I thank the premiers.

I will discuss the Jekyll and Hyde transformation of the Reform Party. A short six months ago during the election campaign the Reformers stated quite emphatically that Quebecers do not know how to solve the unity crisis. The motion which is before us specifies that the Reform Party wants to consult with the people of Quebec. There is the Jekyll and Hyde. I would like to know the motivation behind this particular motion.

• (1210)

I would also like to discuss distinct society and unique society. All of a sudden it seems that Reform members have this wonderful transformation and unique society is something they can accept. I fought in the trenches during the last election campaign and I can say that distinct society was a major issue. It was an issue which the Reformers used as a cheap political trick to push hot buttons in western Canada.

I would like to remind the House of the motives—

**An hon. member:** Did you support it?

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Yes, I supported distinct society and I do now. In fact, Quebec is distinct. It is very distinct and unique, as are all provinces of this country very distinct and unique. There are no special powers but they are distinctive nonetheless. We accept bilingualism. We accept the fact that they speak a different language. We accept the fact that there is distinctiveness in Quebec.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House an ad campaign during the last election. The ad campaign said quite emphatically, "Do you want any more leaders from Quebec? We do not want any more leaders from Quebec". This is the same party which now wants to consult with Quebecers about the types of leadership we should have in this country? I think not.

I do not believe the motives of the Reform Party. I have some serious concerns about them. As a matter of fact, a high level staffer in the Reform Party issued in the Calgary *Sun* of October 30 ten different resolutions, one which suggested "Eliminate bilingualism and multiculturalism. With Quebec gone the rationale for bilingualism and multiculturalism would go too". To me this does not speak of a resolution put forward for consultation—

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has cited an article dated October 30. I wonder if he could cite the year and table the document.

**The Deputy Speaker:** If the hon. member is going to table the document, it will require unanimous consent but he is free to answer the question, which is not a point of order.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to have this document passed on to the hon. member. It is an article from the Calgary *Sun* dated October 30, 1995.

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Oh, all right.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** I see. Things have changed quite dramatically since 1995.

The motives I am afraid are not acceptable to the Progressive Conservative Party and our members will not be supporting the resolution put forward by the Reform Party.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate that the Tory caucus will not be co-operating with this kind of initiative, as will the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party. It seems that once again the Tories are joining their old separatist allies, the people who kept them in power for nine years, people like Lucien Bouchard.

If that party is so strongly in favour of national unity, then why did it have card carrying members of the Parti Québécois running for it in the last federal election? Is that its degree of commitment? If the leader of the Tory party is the great hero of the last

referendum, why did he lose his own riding to the oui side in the last referendum?

What is it that the hon. member objects to? The advertisement to which he referred said that it is time for all Canadians to have a voice in the national unity debate. That is exactly what we are calling for today. By opposing this motion are they opposed to giving all Canadians a voice on that debate? Are they satisfied with the failure of the former Tory, Premier Bouchard's government's failure to let Quebecers have a say on this issue? Why not let Quebecers speak to the Calgary declaration?

Does the member not understand that the unique characteristics clause in the Calgary declaration is a non-justiciable, non-interpretive clause which is qualified by the equality provisions riddled throughout that declaration which were entirely absent from the failed Charlottetown and Meech accords imposed by the top down Mulroney government?

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Mr. Speaker, once again the rhetoric coming from the hon. member for Calgary Southeast is rather enjoyable. I am sure the hon. member realizes that from a unity perspective the Progressive Conservative government had a much better understanding of the Quebec issues than does the Reform Party.

As for consultation, we have always said that the consultative process is a keystone of bringing Quebecers into the federation of Canada.

• (1215)

Make no mistake. Federation in Canada is 10 provinces. No one province is more equal than another province. We recognize in our own policy that all provinces have to work together to make the federation stronger.

That is what we wish to do with the province of Quebec. That is what we wish to do with the consultative process in Quebec. We believe very strongly in that. We do not believe in divisiveness. We do not believe in intimidation. We do not believe in the 20 point plan put forward in the last election which said that it was their way or the highway.

**Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time today with my colleague for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

I am pleased to stand in support of the Calgary declaration which frameworks a national dialogue on Canadian unity. We have come a long way in the two years since the referendum. Two years ago in the referendum we were told not to talk, not to discuss, and to stay out of the situation.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favour of this important motion for two reasons. First, I indicate my support and

### *Supply*

that of my constituents for a strong and united Canada that is a welcoming home for the people of Quebec as well as all Canadians.

Second, I hope to teach the government a bit of humility. Why humility? It is for one simple reason. If our country is to be saved it will not be by the government. It will not be by the plans of the Prime Minister or the letters of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or the strategies of public servants who only a few short years ago were the architects of the Charlottetown accord. The sooner the government accepts a bit of humility, the sooner the real work can begin.

The people of Canada will save Canada, the men and women who love the country and make it work every day through their work and their faith; the 150,000 people who flooded into Montreal during the referendum campaign to demonstrate their love of country; and the many millions at home who held their breath during the voting. Canadian unity hit absolute bottom that day.

As I have said in the past, if Canadians have the will and determination we can resolve federal and provincial concerns. We can resolve aboriginal concerns. We can resolve language concerns. It will be an expression of popular will and not a master plan of political manipulation that will make the difference. The grassroots will prevail.

This is a lesson that the nine premiers and two territorial leaders took to heart three months ago when they framed the Calgary declaration. To their credit they realized that making a grand statement was not the object of the exercise. Rather it was setting up the process for consultation that was so important.

Every province and territory, with the exception of Quebec, has put in place a consultative mechanism so its citizens can have their say on the principles of the Calgary declaration and the future of their country.

This is a very important step. Through the motion we can urge the House to endorse efforts to encourage consultation. As parliamentarians we must use our good offices to encourage our constituents to participate in the provincial consultation processes. As Canadians we must make sure that all Canadians, especially those living in Quebec, receive the very important messages contained in the Calgary declaration. Canadians wish to have dialogue to encourage unity discussions with all.

The Calgary declaration has some advantages over previous efforts to renew the federation. We should be working to ensure its success. It has the advantage of having come from the premiers and not from Ottawa, which will give it some added credibility in the eyes of many Canadians who remember the top down executive federalism that produced the Meech and Charlottetown accords. Discussions involve the people of Canada and will have their direct input.

*Supply*

It has the advantage of not being a fait accompli. Instead it signals the flexibility of the federal system in which provinces have the freedom to exercise their powers in the way it best suits their traditions and character.

• (1220)

I had the pleasure to appear at a town hall discussion hosted jointly by my provincial elected colleagues. Our open forum discussions touched on many topics but encouraged all to send their ideas and concepts to the Alberta legislature.

The declaration is suggesting for consideration a way of breaking the deadlock that the phrase distinct society has created, rightly or wrongly, by polarizing opinion on whether Quebec should have a special status in Confederation. Distinct society was undefined. Unique has equality qualifications.

The Calgary declaration recognizes the unique character of Quebec's society, including its French speaking majority, its culture and tradition, the civil law and the role that the Quebec government and legislature have in protecting and developing this unique character within Canada. It also recognizes the legitimate aspirations of all provinces, the equality of their status in Confederation and the fairness of ensuring that any powers offered in a future constitutional amendment to one province be available to all.

I believe Canada is blessed by the uniqueness of many areas. In short, the Calgary declaration recognizes reality. That is what makes it so regrettable that the Bloc Québécois and provincial government have not consulted Quebeckers on this important dialogue.

The Calgary declaration emphasizes equality of people, equality of provinces and equality of powers. If one province is conferred powers, they ought to be available to all.

It is important we take the steps necessary to extend the dialogue to include the people of Quebec. We call on the government to do so in a formal manner. We ask all hon. members to recognize their responsibilities as parliamentarians and to speak out in favour of a strong and united Canada.

In closing, let me reiterate my support for the motion as a member of Parliament, as an Albertan and as a Canadian. It is my sincere hope that members of the government party will see the wisdom of putting their energy and enthusiasm behind the success of a Calgary initiative that does so much to encourage dialogue with all and of voting for the motion.

It is my hope members of the Bloc Québécois will act in the best interest of all Quebeckers and will urge their masters in Quebec City to let their constituents have their say. All Canadians must have the opportunity to speak out on the unity of our great country.

I move:

That the motion be amended by inserting immediately after the words "equality of citizens and provinces" the following:

"and special status for none".

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will take the amendment under advisement for the moment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC):** Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign, Reformers said that Quebeckers were not worthy to run the country. When I hear that and read motions such as this one saying that the Reform Party has made a 180 degree turn, I cannot accept this, or the fact that they are undermining national unity. They seem to come up with arguments valid only for the day they are used. They are not speaking for the good of Canada as a whole. I find this frustrating, and it worries me to see what is developing within the Reform Party. It is something I cannot accept.

• (1225)

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Goldring:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to what the hon. member was alluding. I can only speak most assuredly for myself. I am standing in the Chamber as a result of the last referendum. I was in Quebec City visiting and I saw the voting going on. It was on a plane coming back to Edmonton that I resolved to seek out political parties on the work they were doing for national unity.

I had discussions with several parties and the one plan I wholeheartedly agreed with that supported national unity was that of the Reform Party. That is when I first started working for the Reform. I am standing here today because of the convictions of the Reform Party and its definite interest in national unity.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to step into this disagreement between Conservative and Reform Party colleagues.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur:** It's all one family.

**Mr. Pierre Brien:** So it is. We were criticized for the same thing earlier, but we can see that there is a family quarrel of much greater magnitude in that corner of the House.

Before putting a question to the Reform Party member, I would first like to explain to him that, when Quebeckers see his leader, whose campaign advertising blamed Quebec's leaders, with everything we know about his leader, when we see him, Jean Chrétien, and Stéphane Dion hand in hand, this creates a lot of mistrust in Quebec. Furthermore, I can understand why Quebeckers feel this way.

I would like him to explain to me how they can teach us anything about democratic spirit, when we know that there have been three referendums in Quebec in 15 years, that various forms of consultation were held on the constitutional issue, that we engaged in the highly democratic exercise of referendums.

Why does he not share the view of his NDP colleague that the ball is clearly in the federalists' court and that they should first of all agree among themselves on what they can offer Quebeckers? The first step before any consultation of Quebeckers is to agree among themselves on what they can offer. Why does he not share the opinion of his NDP colleague on this issue?

[English]

**Mr. Peter Goldring:** Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Reform Party position on consultation. It is a grassroots position. There is more truth and intelligence coming through from the people of Canada than we have seen. I also stand to repeat that the referendum of two years ago was the result of 35 years of mismanagement by a revolving door of political parties in Ottawa which brought us to that abyss, which brought us and national unity to rock bottom. That was management by federal parties.

I totally believe in the Reform Party's support for the process which involves consultation with the people of Canada across this great land. That is where we will have real initiative and real movement on Canadian unity.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the debate on the resolution. We in the Chamber are talking about something that is a priority or should be a priority to the House of Commons, the unity of our country.

I listened to members of the Bloc, the separatists. I have listened to Liberal members. I have listened to members of the Tory party. One thing became very clear to me. There is a tremendous difference in the approach and the definition the Reform Party gives to the word unity and the approach and the definition the Tories, the Liberals and the separatists give to the word unity. For the three parties, the Tories, the Liberals and the separatists, the word unity is all about politics and political power.

• (1230)

The difference between them and us is that the word unity means bringing our country together, a united Canada, where the people of Canada have a say in the future of this country. It is not about politics. It is not about the Tory politics where under the regime of Brian Mulroney he brought separatists into his party simply for political power. It is not about the politics of the Bloc members who have, through their snake oil salesmen, convinced so many people in Quebec that there is some sort of a nirvana out there if they can form their own nation. It is not about the politics of the

### Supply

Liberal Party seeking to re-establish its political roots it lost in Quebec.

To us it is about unity and uniting this country, uniting the grassroots of this country into a belief that this country can be better strengthened by the unity of all peoples under one flag, one nation, one people. That is the difference.

I laugh at the suggestions of the Tory party. I laugh at the suggestions of the Bloc and the Liberal Party. Their arguments are just beyond belief because we know the agenda behind their arguments.

Unity should be the number one priority of this Parliament. We in the Reform Party do endorse the initiatives that have come out of the Calgary declaration. In particular, we endorse the philosophy and belief in that Calgary declaration process that the most important people and the most important factor in this whole unity debate is the input that comes from the ordinary Canadian citizens who love this country. That is one of the things that has been left out of this discussion for over 30 years. The Liberals have left it out and the Tories have left it out. They prefer to make their master plan for this country in the backrooms with their political strategists. That is what is wrong and why the Meech Lake accord failed and the Charlottetown accord failed. They never went to the people and consulted them.

That is the difference between what the Calgary declaration is attempting to do and the failed attempts of the Mulroney Tories and the failed attempts of the Liberals who joined together under the Charlottetown accord saying this was a great plan for our country. That is why it has failed. The NDP also supported that. It failed because they did not go to the people first and find out what the people thought.

There is an idea that this idea by the Reform Party of bringing the people of Canada into this debate is nonsense, this idea from the Tories, the Liberals and the Bloc. I shudder to think that if we left it up to the old line parties to come up with a master plan the people once more would not be invited to participate.

We are seeking to develop a plan that has some credibility and that can only be accomplished when we go to the people. The political parties that sat in this House in the past have no credibility when it comes to designing a unity plan. We have seen this over the last 30 years. They have failed. They prefer to carry on the family fight between Quebec Liberals and separatists and the Tories and the separatists for political power within the province of Quebec, seeing who can outdo each other, not caring one whit for the unity of this country but more for the political power they could get out of the appeasement policies.

The important thing about the Calgary declaration that we want to establish in this debate is that it was initiated outside of Ottawa. It was initiated by the premiers and the territorial leaders. It was a plan that would involve the people of Canada and bring them into

*Supply*

this consensus gathering as to how we are going to get this country together. It is time for Canadians to show the politicians how Canada should work, not the politicians to tell the Canadian people how this unity thing should work.

I call on all Canadians in this debate, as we will today, to make their opinions known, to attend the unity meetings across the country. This is something the Tories did not allow under Brian Mulroney, something they did not allow under the Charlottetown accord and something the separatists would never even consider.

• (1235)

They would prefer to have their slick talking leaders carry on this dream of a wonderful nation that can survive and exist without the rest of Canada, which they know is a lie.

The Calgary declaration is not a done deal. It is merely a start of a process that can possibly lead to a solution to our unity crisis. Therefore there are important interests that we want to consider.

First of all, we want to consider the fundamental policy, the fundamental belief that all Canadians are equal. No one should have special status in this country. Why? This just creates problems. It has created problems for 30 years and we see it in the House today, as the Quebec Liberals and the separatists banter back and forth.

We see it as the Tories join in the conversation. They do not recognize equality in this country. While all province may be diverse in their characteristics, they should have equal status in this country.

We cannot have one province holding a position that is higher than the other provinces. I do not care which province they are talking about, whether it is my home province of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan or Quebec. No status that is not equal, it cannot happen.

Equality is the cornerstone of getting to this position of unity in this country. No one wants to live in a second class province. No Canadian should have rights that are not enjoyed by other Canadians and no equality simply increases regional resentment and national division.

Without equality we cannot have a collective, united feeling about our country. While the Tories, the Liberals and the separatists would prefer to talk about what is best on a regional type basis, the Reform Party wants to talk about equality where all regions in the country, all provinces and all people live together on an equal basis under that wonderful Canadian flag that adorns this House.

Equality also means an end to domineering federalism. We in the Reform Party have talked about devolution of powers, getting rid

of this big central government which dictates to the provinces in areas where it should not even be involved.

Yes, we talk about passing powers down to the province of Quebec that it should handle itself. At the same time, we talk about passing those same powers down to the other provinces.

I cannot believe that the separatists here, when we are talking about the transfer of powers into areas the federal government should not be in, on to their province, would not be in favour of that. Yet they are not because it does not fit with the big lie that they have been telling the people of Quebec.

I would ask that all parliamentarians in this House forget about the politics they have been playing for the last 30 years. Forget about that and start thinking about what is best for this country.

The Liberal members opposite laugh when we talk about unity. It does not fit into their philosophy. They are more interested in politics, as I stated earlier. I ask the members to support this resolution and let us begin another step toward the unity of this country.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think it was really ironic to hear the member talk about unity so many times and yet the Conservatives are not to be trusted, the Bloc Quebecois is not to be trusted, the NDP is not to be trusted, the Liberals are back peddling. No one is to be trusted except the Reform Party which, by some sort of magic, has the perfect formula for unity.

He accuses us, in his own words, of not caring one whit about Canadian unity. I find this very offensive.

• (1240)

I find it extremely offensive that we get told by the Reform Party that all of us here do not care one whit for Canadian unity, as if they have the golden message, the true faith, they are the people who have the answers for everything else and everybody else is wrong. The hon. member accuses the Liberal Party of not having carried out consultations during Charlottetown. I do not think he knows his dossier very well. We were not the government party so we could not have carried out consultations. He had better check his files.

I really think the Reform Party in trying to push its motion, which has a lot of good in it, should really try to involve all of us if it really cares for unity, rather than just saying "we have the perfect message and all of you, a curse on your houses". I think that is a very sad message coming from the Reform Party.

**Mr. Dick Harris:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been listening I pointed out that given the dismal failure of the Liberals

and the Tories and the NDP who joined with them over the last 30 years in trying to bring this country together, and they have failed, they have lost the trust of Canadians and they have to start to earn that again.

That first step starts with involving the people of Canada in this process which they have never done in the past.

I would point out that during the failed Charlottetown accord the Liberal joined with the Tories and the NDP to try to sell that Charlottetown accord to the Canadian people, a process getting to that accord that did not involve the Canadian people. Sure, there was a dog and pony show going across the country with hand selected witnesses to give their input, but the average Canadian was left out and that is why they voted against the Charlottetown accord.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I find that the debate between the Reform member for Surrey, if I am not mistaken, and the member from the La Salle Blues Band across the way exemplifies the kind of situation we are facing in Canada because we have two opposite views. On the one hand, the hon. member from the Reform Party, who does not speak French and may not even have bothered to come to Quebec to enquire about the real demands Quebec has been making for 30 years, but is nevertheless trying to preach the virtues of unity based on some kind of Anglo-Canadian supremacy that would basically drown out Quebec's demands.

On the other hand, there is the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis, who is presenting the other side of the national unity issue, one that seems to reflect a clear understanding of Quebec's demands, because we are well aware that he once was a minister in the Quebec National Assembly. Yet, the end result is exactly the same. In fact, it would not make any difference if they were members of the Conservative Party or the NDP; the bottom line is that they argue, but they all agree on one thing: to put forward proposal like the Calgary declaration, in which there is nothing but empty words, that has no political weight whatsoever and ignores the legitimate and justifiable demands Quebec has been making for 30 years.

[English]

**Mr. Dick Harris:** Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies to stand in this House and say that I am unable to speak French. I make no apology for that. I am a Canadian and I love this country. If anyone should apologize it should be this separatist member who sits there and refuses to acknowledge that Canadian flag, refuses to sing the national anthem of this country in this House and day after day preaches the breaking up of this country. If anyone should apologize it should be that separatist member there.

*Supply*

[Translation]

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate today, but before I begin, I wish to inform you of something.

[English]

I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Waterloo—Wellington.

It is really quite tempting to raise a number of the issues that were addressed by the last speaker from the Reform Party.

• (1245)

I am extremely surprised and disappointed at the comments that were made. There was a comment that Quebec could not make it alone. What a wonderful way to start a dialogue. There were comments such as “a dog and pony show” that ridiculed the efforts of Canadians and their elected representatives to try to understand and to find solutions. There were other comments too numerous to mention.

I am tempted to talk about issues such as what was mentioned in the last campaign, that no Quebecker should ever again be prime minister. I am tempted—I am looking for some divine help—to talk about double talk, the comment about Stornoway and what happened, but I shall resist temptation.

[Translation]

I want to address the Reform member's proposal, which I find pretty reasonable, perfectly reasonable in fact. Perhaps this is due to the fact that he is new and others around him have not had the chance to socialize with him so far. He came up with a perfectly reasonable proposal, as far as I am concerned, and he wants to promote consultation with Canadians across the country. I applaud this approach. He wants to get Canadians involved. He seems to want to go beyond partisanship and I support that.

But I think he should speak to his colleagues. One of them has just stated that there was nothing accomplished over the last 30 years. Another claims that his party is the only one that can make a contribution. Still another has made comments that are unworthy of this House.

Nevertheless, the proposal we are discussing today should be supported. It should be supported because it refers to consultations with Canadians across the country. What I would like very much to know is the position of this political party and also of each political party on the Calgary declaration. Is it too early to decide on this issue? It is not too early however to tell others what they should be doing. I would like to say a few words on this today.

*Supply*

So obviously, our political parties differ, even if we agree more or less on the proposal that we are discussing today. There are a great number of differences on immigration, the role of aboriginal peoples in Canada, bilingualism and many other things. I could talk a lot longer on this, but the point to remember is that there are great differences, in all areas, and these will never disappear.

The meeting of Canada's premiers called for public consultations. This declaration is a good starting point for creating understanding about our country, about the needs of each region, and, of course, about the needs of Quebeckers. The Calgary declaration has the support of a great number of people throughout the country. It is true that there are people who are completely against it, and that is understandable. But many responsible people endorse this declaration.

It is important that the public discuss this proposal and talk about Canada, and that people gain a greater understanding of each province and territory, and, of course, of Quebec, which is often not well understood. Consultations are necessary because they might go beyond that in terms of creating a greater understanding of who we are as a community. I am speaking about all the communities within the country. I believe they can promote pride.

• (1250)

We may come to realize that we must work more closely together to be stronger and more receptive to our various needs as citizens of a specific province, or as members of a specific linguistic, religious or cultural group.

I will now talk about certain principles. I will begin with equality. Let me share with you what a Canadian citizen told me. He said "This is a principle with which we cannot disagree, a principle recognized in section 15 of the 1982 Constitution Act. It is clearly stated that all Canadians are equal, regardless of sex, race, religion, social status or wealth. To state such a principle is in itself sufficient to demonstrate its validity".

Some political parties—and, as I said earlier, I will try to restrain myself—will use something like the principle of equality to make other claims. The fact is that it has been in Canadian law for a very long time. The question is whether the principle is always applied fairly. We could probably find examples where it was not the case, but let us look at the big picture.

[*English*]

Let us look at the equality of provinces. There is but one legal status for the provinces. There are not six. A province is a province. None can pull rank on the others. We know that. Though equal they are nonetheless different, with their own economic, social, cultural and historical characteristics. Though equal the provinces are nevertheless differentiated from one another.

That is what some people misunderstand. They misunderstand it profoundly and they exploit it. They exploit it to their political advantage. As they do so they tear up the country. They are guilty of tearing up this country.

This country, which has supposedly done nothing for the last 30, 40, 50 years, is the envy of the world. It is number one on virtually everyone's list. Millions of people have come to it as quickly as they could.

[*Translation*]

Let us talk about other principles. Let us talk about diversity, tolerance, compassion and equal opportunities. Let us talk about how we could meet the needs of Aboriginal people, about how we could get them more involved. Let us not forget multiculturalism, which is an undeniable reality.

As stated in the declaration, respect for diversity and equality underlies unity. However, equality does not mean uniformity.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** This is what is not understood by a number of political parties, including the members who are yelling.

Again, the declaration states that respect for diversity and equality underlies unity, but equality does not mean uniformity. To reconcile the principle of equality with the great value of diversity, Canada can count on a political system which, thanks to its flexibility, promotes the enrichment of our collective heritage. No other example better illustrates this reality than the recognition of Quebec's unique character.

But what is this unique character?

**An hon. member:** These are just words.

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** I heard someone say that these are just words. It is unfortunate that the member cannot read and understand the declaration. This is the problem. He did not take time to read the declaration or to understand it.

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand:** Explain that.

**An hon. member:** Mike Harris?

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** Yes, one person only. Let us take one person in one province only and let us pretend he knows the truth.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur:** The Premier of Ontario.

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** Oh, what an effort you are making to understand.

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau:** Give us details.

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** What an effort you are making to show how openminded you are, dear colleague.

*Supply*

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur:** The premier in Toronto understood.

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** But allow me to continue. “In Canada’s federal system”—and I will end on that point—“where respect for diversity and equality underlies unity, the unique character of Quebec society, including its French-speaking majority, its culture and its tradition of civil law, is fundamental to the well-being of Canada”.

I could go on, but unfortunately I am being interrupted. How undemocratic, don’t you think?

• (1255)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Before going to questions and comments, I wish to inform the House that I have considered the amendment moved by the hon. member for Edmonton East, and I declare that it is in order.

Debate is on the amendment, therefore. The hon. member for Chicoutimi, for a comment or a question.

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I think this debate clearly shows that as politicians we all have a professional interest in constitutional matters. We have not always made a very positive contribution. On the contrary, past failures can rarely be blamed on the citizens we represent, while, in many instances, politicians displayed a lack of responsibility for which we are still paying.

I am very surprised. I hope that the Liberal Party of Canada is in caucus, because its position is rather hard to understand: to accept and support a motion moved by a party with a not so glorious past, asking that we communicate with Quebecers and consult them on something that is really incomplete. That is perfectly normal. We are in a phase where a process was put in motion and it is perfectly normal to take some precautions before getting everyone involved, before consulting a people, namely the people of Quebec, who were sorely disappointed in the Canadian federal system in the past.

While realizing that it is not good to dwell on the past, opportunities must always be sought to give people a chance to change their minds. But when we read what Preston Manning has written—the man who once said in passing, at the time of the Meech Lake failure: “I wish one of the western premiers would deliver the deathblow to the accord”—it is hard to conceive that he could change his position so quickly.

Given all the recent negative publicity about politicians in Quebec, it is asking a lot to support today’s motion, which urges the government to consult Quebecers.

The Liberal Party endorses a motion which is pure provocation for all our fellow citizens in Quebec and for all French-Canadians.

I wonder if my hon. colleague from the Liberal Party would support the withdrawal of the Reform Party motion out of respect for all Quebecers and all French-Canadians, until such time as, hopefully, a proposal can be put forward that is substantial, takes into account Quebec’s historical demands and stands a chance of gaining wide support.

If my hon. colleague could kindly tell us what he thinks of this idea, because the course we are on today is a collision course, which, far from helping the debate, is making it worse. Once again, it would be irresponsible for us as politicians to fast track something without being properly informed.

**Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel:** Mr. Speaker, I think everyone, including my colleagues from Quebec, know that I have enormous respect for Quebec. I always have. I speak French. I wear my culture with pride. I always have. I did not convert after I entered political life. It is not a matter of respect. Both I and my colleagues have respect.

What is happening today? It is true that the party that moved this motion does not have a glorious past on this issue. But there are members of this party who are trying. Trying to do what? To consult. To have Canadians understand what this is about. So, obviously I will support such a process. Why not? Why not give a chance to this new member, who could perhaps enlighten some of his colleagues who are not so enlightened, if we are to judge by the speeches today. We are talking about consultations.

• (1300)

I also asked this party about its position on the Calgary declaration. Ours is very clear. We support the consultation and we support Quebec’s unique character. This is the party that introduced the motion we voted on in support of Quebec’s distinct nature. Have people forgotten that? This is the party that did so.

[English]

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today before this House to give my views on this very important motion introduced by my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona.

There is no more important issue than the unity of Canada. We on this side of the House confirmed this view in the Speech from the Throne earlier this fall by identifying national unity as our highest priority.

As we all know, the premiers of nine provinces as well as two territorial leaders met on September 14 to discuss a framework for consulting the population about strengthening the Canadian federation. What resulted was the Calgary declaration.

The Calgary principles and consultations are a gesture of goodwill toward all Canadians including Quebecers, aboriginal peoples and our linguistic minorities. While the declaration is not a legal draft nor a proposal for a constitutional amendment, we believe it is an important step in the right direction. It is an

*Supply*

invitation extended by 11 provincial and territorial governments to all Canadians and all regions to reflect on and engage in a new discussion about the values we share as Canadians.

We also hope that the Calgary principles will lead us to a consensus on the core values of our country including respect for the unique character of Quebec.

We on the government side endorse the principles of the premiers, the territorial leaders and all Canadians to foster national unity. Further we fully support the consultation process begun by those premiers and territorial leaders.

The Calgary principles are the work of the premiers and the territorial leaders. The federal government was not a participant at the Calgary meeting and is not a major participant in the current provincial and territorial consultation procedures. That being said however, I do intend to do what I can to promote positive public debate on this very important issue, the Calgary principles, both in my own province and across the country.

We recognize the Calgary initiative was undertaken in part because of the interest of the nine premiers and the territorial leaders in consulting their own populations to create a better working environment. While they are at various stages, consultations on the Calgary principles are well under way in those nine provinces and the territories. This demonstrates a commitment of those premiers and leaders to the Calgary principles and by all accounts to date support for these principles has been widespread.

We on this side of the House urge Canadians to become involved in this very important consultation process. We urge them to express their opinion or to suggest possible improvements to the principles as outlined.

Why is it that the separatist government in Quebec will not consult Quebecers on these principles? Is it because the principles make sense and define Canadian values and ideals? Is it because it knows that the majority of Quebecers in fact support these principles?

Let me be specific on each of the seven principles as outlined by the premiers and the territorial leaders in the Calgary declaration.

First, the equality of citizens. All Canadians are equal and have rights protected by law. This principle is entrenched in section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This means that all Canadians irrespective of sex, race, religion, social or economic status are equal before the law. But equality is not the same as uniformity.

In a democracy like ours, equality and freedom go hand in hand. Nothing forces us to have the same beliefs or preferences as

anybody else. We all have the right to be different. In other words all the children in the family are equal but that does not mean we are all the same. That is why the Constitution itself in section 36 of the Constitution Act, 1982 commits all governments in Canada to the promotion of equal opportunities for the well-being of all Canadians. It is why various sections of the Constitution recognize aboriginal and treaty rights of our aboriginal peoples as well as the rights enjoyed by our linguistic minorities.

Second, the equality of the provinces. We believe that the principle of equality that applies to individuals also applies to the provinces. It is our view that all provinces have equality of status. None is set above the others and all have the same fundamental legal relationship with the people who live there. Having said that, their equality of status does not mean that they cannot be different one from the other.

• (1305)

As is the case for all individual Canadians, provincial equality does not mean provincial uniformity. Each and every province deserves equal consideration but each province has its own needs which vary depending on circumstances. This is how our federal system makes room for differences and avoids locking the provinces into a rigid structure that would make it impossible for them to respond to their own special needs.

Third, diversity, tolerance, compassion and equality of opportunity. The history of Canada has been marked by genuine openness to differences and by a generous spirit of tolerance. While every country has its weaknesses, circumstances have led us in Canada to develop greater respect for the diverse backgrounds of all our citizens. Our spirit of partnership and compassion has inspired our federal and provincial governments to create social programs that are the envy of the world and which attest to our desire to work in partnership to give equal chances to everyone and our compassion for the neediest among us. That is very important.

Fourth, our national identity is enriched by the contributions of our aboriginal peoples, the vitality of the English and French languages and the multicultural character of Canada. Like the Calgary declaration and the more recent statements released by the premiers and leaders, the Speech from the Throne recognizes the invaluable contribution of the aboriginal peoples to the building of Canada and the richness of our identity. We and the aboriginal peoples must work together to respond to the challenges they face.

Canada's two official languages are another of our country's riches. Linguistic duality and the viability of both official language communities in all parts of the country are part and parcel of our great identity. One of the strengths of Canada, our official languages are two of the languages in greatest use worldwide. They

contribute substantially to Canada's success economically, socially, culturally and internationally.

The multicultural character of Canada is a source of national pride and enrichment as well as being a universal ideal.

Fifth, the unique character of Quebec society. Our recognition of the linguistic and cultural differences of Quebec addresses its unique needs and circumstances and is in keeping with the equality of the provinces and of individual Canadians. That is why Parliament has adopted a resolution recognizing these differences.

This recognition of Quebec is a positive message to Quebecers who want to be part of the great Canadian family. It demonstrates to Quebecers that the rest of Canada does accept them and respects their right to be different. It is also linked with the core Canadian values which Calgary underscored, that Canadians share with their fellow citizens in Quebec: the values of respect, partnership, fairness, justice and openness.

Sixth, if any future constitutional amendment confers powers on one province, these powers must be available to all provinces. While the Calgary declaration does not call for any amendments in or additions to the division of powers among the governments, in the event that such an amendment were contemplated, then the equality of provinces would apply.

We believe that all provinces must have the same tools available to them to promote their own development. Any tool available to one province must meet its specific needs and must be available to all others.

Seventh, greater partnership among the two levels of government while respecting each other's jurisdiction. This is what the seventh principle states. We can all agree that the vast majority of Canadians want their provincial and federal governments to act in the common interest of all and build a true Canadian partnership based on solidarity and respect for our diversity and for areas of federal and provincial jurisdiction.

The federal government has been working very hard to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the federation by emphasizing consultation and collaboration. The list of all the areas on which the federal and provincial governments are collaborating is long. To name a couple, they include labour market training and federal-provincial talks.

[Translation]

To conclude, I would like to say that the federal government recognizes that our country is constantly changing. This is the reality of the Canadian community. It is also a fact that we must change if we are going to survive as a society.

*Supply*

[English]

As members can see, the consultative process and the seven principles set out in Calgary are critically important to the unity of Canada.

• (1310)

I hope that all members on both sides of the House will get the message out to all Canadians. I would personally like to thank the official opposition for requesting a debate on the unity of Canada. There is nothing more important than keeping Canada together and the motion put before the House today is useful in achieving this objective.

[Translation]

Canada's past was remarkable, its future will be even more so.

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciated my colleague's speech. It was polite and eloquent but it meant nothing.

I would suggest, if he has the time, that he read a book by a journalist at *The Globe and Mail*, Ray Conlogue, entitled *The Impossible Nation*. He would learn a lot from that book on the reality of Canada, a reality symbolized by the Calgary declaration.

In 1980, there was a referendum, the first referendum ever held in Quebec, and on that occasion, Quebec told Canada how much its situation in Canada was frustrating. That referendum led to the Meech Lake agreement, the Meech Lake formula proposed by a federalist Quebec government, Robert Bourassa's government. That agreement represented the minimum Quebec could ask from Canada at the time. Naturally, Canada refused that minimum and there was a second referendum in which Quebec voted even more strongly to express its discomfort at being part of Canada. That process led to the Calgary declaration.

But there is absolutely nothing in this declaration. It is a formula offering even less than the Meech Lake formula, where the uniqueness of Quebec within Canada is mixed in with so many other elements that we no longer recognize Quebec.

I wonder if the member could tell me how the Calgary declaration can solve the problem of unity and equality in Canada.

[English]

**Mr. Lynn Myers:** Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the Calgary declaration and what it stands for and especially by the consultation process that is part and parcel of that very important statement not only by the premiers but also by the territorial leaders.

It is important that we know that Canada is now able to proceed along these lines and take a look, and a hard look, by all Canadians in a consultation process to ensure that all Canadians are heard and that we try to unify the country in a manner consistent with our

*Supply*

history and consistent with our aims and objectives as we move into the 21st century.

The Calgary declaration is a very important first step. I am heartened by the leadership role that has been taken not only here today but also by the premiers especially and the territorial leaders in this very important area of nationhood.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Hon. members, as we stated earlier, in questions and comments if there is more than one person wanting to respond, if I see some activity on the benches, please keep your questions and comments down to about a minute.

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our colleague from the Liberal Party for his very non-partisan speech. It was very welcome.

I would however like to ask him a question. We have seen over the last 15 years successive provincial separatist governments in the province of Quebec wanting to carve the province out of Canada. Given what he has seen over the last 10 to 15 years in this country, does he himself believe that the current Bloc Quebecois, Mr. Bouchard and the Parti Quebecois have any interest whatsoever in keeping Quebec within Canada?

**Mr. Lynn Myers:** Mr. Speaker, I would never presume to speak for the Parti Quebecois or the Bloc Quebecois but I would say on my own behalf that I would hope Canadians, men and women of goodwill across this great nation, would work very hard to ensure the viability and the unity of this great country of ours. I would expect that would be the position taken by people who genuinely want to unify Canada and maintain the strength of this great nation.

I would hope as we move into the 21st century that is the position taken by Canadians. I see that being the case. I am heartened more and more by the fact that we are moving in this direction and I am confident that that is the direction that precisely we will take.

• (1315)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my speech in French in order to send a clear message to the people of Quebec. Unfortunately, my fluency in French is limited. Therefore, I will speak in English.

[*English*]

I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona for bringing this motion to the House today at this very important time.

We are, in effect, as part of the Reform Party trying to articulate, trying to break the glass ceiling on the national unity issue. This issue has been with us for over 200 years but in particular over the

last 15 years we have seen our nation fractured into two solitudes or into a number of solitudes.

The ties that should bind us as the greatest nation of the earth are not being encouraged. In fact, because of repeated inaction by federal governments and a lack of courage and a will to really deal with this issue in a substantive way through consulting and dealing with the people, we have seen our nation be but a shadow of what it could be and the ties that should bind us as people break apart.

We have seen a separatist movement in British Columbia. We have a separatist movement in Quebec. We have seen rumblings in the maritimes. What a shame for a nation, for all the wealth that we have as a country, to have this happen.

If we are to continue on this course, we will indeed fracture. Would it not be a profound tragedy for that to happen? Would it not be a profound tragedy for us to fracture into little solitudes in our own little worlds when indeed we could be far greater as a group than what we could be as individuals?

At no point in time was this more evident than in 1995 during the referendum. This did not merely appear on our television sets overnight or in a few months. Rather, it was the culmination of at least 15 years of profound dissatisfaction from the people of Quebec and people across this country.

The dissatisfaction of the people in Quebec is expressed perhaps in different ways but equally passionately by Canadians across this country. We do not feel that the current constitutional envelope in which our country currently exists is working. Indeed, the proof is in the pudding.

The people of Quebec, people in British Columbia, people across our nation have been clamouring for a new vision for Canada, a new Canada where the provinces can have the powers to do what they do best and the feds have the powers to do what they do best, where Canadians have a direct input into the policy making that happens in this House.

What happens in this House is not a democracy, as we all know. The people out there are disarticulated from the policy that is made in the House of Commons. In part that explains the dissatisfaction from the people of Quebec. That has to be dealt with and it has not.

If, for argument's sake, we continue going the way we are going and separation starts to fall by the wayside as it has been, if in the next referendum the people vote 60% no against separation, would that be success?

I would argue that it is not success. I would argue that the way we are going, the people who would vote 60% no would merely be voting for the bastard that they dislike the least, not voting for a vision of Canada for the simple reason that no one, except I would argue the Reform Party over the last few years, has been trying to

articulate a new message, a new vision, a new division of powers for the country.

We have seen the failures of Liberal and Conservative governments before. I am not going to dwell on this but merely state a historical fact. We need to look at a new way and we want to work with all members in this House, all parties in this House to do that.

In fact my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona in his motion has said very clearly that we want, we demand and we encourage the government and particularly all Canadians, to be involved in this important process. We want the people of Quebec to be involved in this process. For too long the people of Quebec and indeed the people of Canada have been left out of this debate. This debate has taken place in the rarefied atmosphere among political elites and intellectual elites. While our country hangs in the balance this debate has gone on in quarters that are less important by far than the public. The public must be involved.

• (1320)

This process is only valuable if the government is going to listen to what the people are saying. It is not going to be useful if their wishes and their desires are going to be ignored again. Merely going through the motions is not going to do justice to articulating that vision that holds our nation together.

I asked the member before a very important question. I asked him whether or not he felt that the Parti Québécois, the Bloc Québécois, Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Parizeau and their ilk are interested in keeping our country together. If we ask the Bloc Québécois members here today, they are not interested in keeping Quebec in Canada. We asked them that in the last Parliament and they said “Vrai”. It is true that they do not want to keep Quebec in Canada.

Why are we negotiating with people who have no interest in keeping Quebec in Canada? We have repeatedly gone around in a circle because we repeatedly try to debate and discuss and put forth solutions to people who have no interest whatsoever in keeping Quebec in Canada. Therefore, we cannot win. It is impossible to win in this debate.

Therefore, we have to negotiate with the people of Quebec. We have to get in the trenches. We have to parler français avec la francophonie, parler anglais with the English speaking people, work with the allophones, work with the anglophones, work with the francophones, get our message across directly to the people of Quebec.

We will fail miserably if we continue to negotiate with separatist politicians who are only interested in keeping Quebec out of Canada. It is a loser's game.

### *Supply*

I cannot implore more strongly, I beg as a Canadian, not as a member of Parliament, for this House to bring the message repeatedly and consistently to the people of Quebec. It is exceedingly important, essential in fact in keeping our country together.

It is also extremely important that in the process of doing this we dispel the myths that have occurred. In the last referendum the people of Quebec thought they could send members of Parliament to this House if they separated. The people of Quebec felt they could use the Canadian dollar, which they might do. They felt also that they would have more power over their economy. They used the European Union as an example.

If Quebec was to engage in a relationship as an independent country along the lines of the Maastricht treaty, along the lines of the European Union, their control over monetary and fiscal policy would be less than what they have today.

The people of Quebec did not understand that. There were many myths flying around and no one was doing anything about them because the government said “Don't worry, be happy, everything is going to be fine”. We came within a razor's edge of fracturing Canada. That will never happen again as long as the Reform Party is here to defend Canada.

The message that we send across goes directly through a separatist leaning francophone media in Quebec, not all but the vast majority of them. That is part of the reason why the majority of Quebecers are more familiar with plan B than plan A. They can be manipulated in that way to think that the rest of Canada does not want them in Canada.

As the member for Quebec East said in the last Parliament, the problem is that English Canadians hate French Canadians, en français. That message gets across to the people of Quebec and we do nothing to dispel those horrendous and poisonous myths. What about the francophone population in the rest of Canada? What about the Acadian population in New Brunswick? No one speaks about that, least of all the separatist members in this House.

• (1325)

The member for Quebec East was on a television program with me. I asked him the following question: If you separate what will happen to the French-speaking people in New Brunswick, the Acadians in New Brunswick, and the French-speaking people in northern Ontario? He answered “Who cares?” Who cares? We care.

The French-speaking population, the French culture and the French language are integral and essential to Canada. We are proud of that fact, we love it and we want francophones to be a part of

*Supply*

Canada forever as equals. The people of Quebec also want to be equals.

What do the people of Quebec want? It is understandable that they do not want their language and culture diluted in a sea of anglophones. That is why the Reform Party said we should give the powers over culture and language directly to the provinces to manage. Then the province of Quebec, as every province, would be the master of its own cultural and linguistic destiny.

The people of Quebec want better jobs and a better future for their children. They want strong social programs. That is what the Reform Party stands for and I am sure that members across this House stand for the same thing. We have effective solutions. We have put those solutions forward repeatedly. Before the last referendum we gave the government a plan on how to give the provinces power over what they do best and how to give the feds power over what they do best. That is essential to keeping our country together.

It is important to heal the wounds and to articulate this vision of a stronger future for all Canadians. It is important to note what the people of Quebec actually receive from the federal government. It is amazing to listen to the myths believed by many in Quebec, that Quebec gives money to the federal government and gets nothing in return. Twenty-seven per cent of Quebec's provincial budget comes from the federal government. When I say that, an extraordinary number of people in Quebec feel they have just dropped off the edge of the planet. That kind of thing must occur.

A division of power is important. The Reform Party also put forward the notion of the triple E senate. During the Charlottetown agreement discussions there was an agreement on a 2.5 E senate with regional rather than provincial representation. At least this way the senate would balance out the population powers in this House by regional interests and regional power. That way all people in our country could be more empowered, including the people of Quebec.

I cannot argue strongly enough that today more than ever we need to have a vision for our nation. We are not a country without an identity. We are a country with a very strong identity which we get from our international experiences, through peacekeeping and the agreements and work in the House of Commons yesterday in the pursuit of a ban on land mines which will save thousands of people's lives.

Canadians are respected throughout the world as peacemakers, as organizers, as individuals and as a nation of people that can be respected abroad. Canadians are respected because we show respect abroad. We can lead the world as a nation that has managed to bring in people from all over the world from disparate religions and languages into an environment that is relatively safe. No other country in the world has been able to do that.

We need to deal with the national unity issue now. That is why my colleague from Edmonton—Strathcona and the other members of the Reform Party are trying to push this issue. We no longer want to go to the edge of the precipice as we did in 1995 to find our country almost lost. We must articulate a message that involves the devolution of sensible powers to the provinces under the umbrella of equality. We must enable the feds to do what the feds do best and the provinces to do what the provinces do best.

• (1330)

We must articulate that message directly to the people of Quebec and not through separatist politicians who have one interest and one interest only, the separation of the province of Quebec.

We must send our message not through the separatist media in Quebec but directly to the people, eyeball to eyeball, heart to heart, soul to soul. We must dispel these myths. We must reach out our hands in an environment of equality. We must build bridges of tolerance and understanding so that we together can be brothers and sisters in this great nation of Canada.

We must respect our differences. Indeed we must use our differences to build a stronger nation.

For decades we have used our differences to pull ourselves apart. We have isolated ourselves. We have developed as a nation of solitudes. These differences are not chasms which keep us apart; they are ties which bind us together.

If we could look at ourselves in the same way foreigners look at us, we would be proud. Perhaps we would have a new insight on what it means to be Canadian.

I hope that all members of the House and, more important, Canadians will understand this motion, work on its principles and reach out to all Canadians to build a stronger and united Canada.

**Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of wonderful words from the member opposite about brothers and sisters and working together.

Normally I would congratulate the Reform Party for this motion, except that I smell a hidden agenda. I wonder about the suggestion of going to the people of Quebec. If Reform members are going to communicate with the people of Quebec, I would like the member to tell me if they intend to use the same advertising agency they used during the federal election campaign, which sent a very poisonous message that was not helpful to Canadian unity.

I would agree with the member that the separatists have no interest whatsoever in keeping this country unified. However, we must develop a reasonable option where if we are saying that the separatists do not want to keep Canada together, we are prepared to talk to Quebec.

*Supply*

I would ask if the member could tell us exactly how Reform members would calmly talk to Quebecers to ensure them that they are indeed a unique people.

**Mr. Keith Martin:** Mr. Speaker, we would speak to the people of Quebec as we have spoken to the people of Quebec in the House today. The message that we have given today will go to people all across the country, including the people of Quebec.

The Reform Party's agenda is not hidden. The Reform Party's agenda is very transparent: keep our country together, build a stronger country, work together toward unity. We would do it by the division of powers. Let the provinces do what the provinces do best, and let the feds do what the feds do best. We would ensure that the people of Quebec would have the power to control their culture and language, as would all the provinces. We would do it under the umbrella of equality for all.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca that as a whole, I appreciate what he had to say. I want to come back to his suggestion. He seems to have something to say to the people of Quebec; I would suggest, if he is really interested in solving the problem, that he listen to Quebecers.

The problem in Canada is that people do not listen to Quebec. To begin with, he should wonder why is Canada falling apart. It is not Quebecers' fault. It is not because they did not say what was on their mind and what was troubling them, it is because nobody wants to listen. People have been disregarding the message not of something that is uniquely Canadian, but from a third or a quarter of the Canadian population, one of the founding nations of Canada, which today has been reduced to something with a unique character.

• (1335)

I would suggest that my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, if in his heart he truly wants to find a solution to save Canada, listen to Quebec.

[English]

**Mr. Keith Martin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Quebec Est. We have had a longstanding debate on this issue for many years and it is one I enjoy tremendously.

If the member wants to talk about listening to the people of Quebec, he would have listened to what was said in the last two Quebec referendums. He would have gone home and tried to build a stronger Canada. The people of Quebec have clearly stated that they want to stay in Canada.

**An hon. member:** For a few years.

**Mr. Keith Martin:** That is the problem. The members of the Bloc do not listen to the people of Quebec. However, I will put that aside because I want to build on something more positive.

The member is partly correct. All people of Quebec have been dissatisfied with the provincial and federal relationship for many years. He will be interested to know that the dissatisfaction is felt by Canadians across the country, by British Columbians, Albertans, maritimers and Ontarians.

The member raised the subject of unique and distinct. The people of Quebec do not give a care about unique and distinct. They want good jobs, strong social programs and a better future.

I would ask the hon. member, if the House were to give the people of Quebec the distinct society clause, would he still want to stay in Canada. I do not think so.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief comment. I hope our Liberal friends across the way have understood, following what Reform members said this morning, that they had better vote against the motion from the Reform Party if they want to keep some credibility in the constitutional debate.

My question is for the Reform member. He gave a poignant, perhaps interesting speech. About francophones, he said "Who cares?" I would like to answer that question. Reform certainly does not care, judging by its anti-francophone campaign during the last federal election. But I would like to ask him how he reconciles the fact he wants to abolish the Official Languages Act with the defence of francophones in Canada.

[English]

**Mr. Keith Martin:** Mr. Speaker, before the last referendum the prime minister said "don't worry, be happy, everything is going to be fine".

The Reform Party said that everything was not fine. Months before the referendum we put together a plan A and a plan B. It is interesting that now the government is articulating a message which is very similar to our plans A and B, one it denigrated before the last referendum. Who cares? The Reform Party cares.

I do not think there is a member in the House outside of the Bloc Québécois who does not care about keeping Canada together. All members of the House and the vast majority of Canadians, including the people of Quebec, want to stay in Canada. We just need a vision. We need to change the federal-provincial responsibilities. The people of Quebec need to understand that they are welcome and loved within the family of Canada. They are an integral part of our history and our future. We need to get that message across. However, it will do no good for this debate to occur just within the House and with the people who are watching

*Supply*

today. The message has to get into the living rooms and kitchens of people across the country, in particular to the people of Quebec.

It is important to have the francophones of northern Ontario, Manitoba, New Brunswick and other parts of the maritimes as allies to keep our country together. Francophones in Quebec must understand that their language is stronger within a united Canada than it would be in a divided one.

• (1340)

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, with some of the Reform messages I have been hearing over the last half hours or so I feel like I am sucking on a very sour candy or a lemon. I am left with a very bitter taste in my mouth.

I hear the words unity and grassroots being spit out like invectives. They are not nice sounding words. I wonder why I am not feeling the warm fuzzy stuff that I am supposed to be feeling from you people. In fact, it does not feel good to me. It feels very suspect. I question your desires to actually keep this country together.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member will address her remarks to the Chair. The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

**Mr. Keith Martin:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member feels that talking about consulting the people through grassroots and talking about national unity is invective and somehow poisonous, I suggest she look at a dictionary.

We have repeatedly tried to put forth plans to keep our country together. In fact, I introduced last year a letter writing campaign between students in Quebec and students in British Columbia. What I hope to do is get the young people of British Columbia and Quebec writing to each other to try to dispel the myths between them, for them to understand each other. If we can get to the youth, when they are confronted by myths put out by separatist politicians, they will say "I have a friend in British Columbia. My friend is a good person who talks sense, who likes me, who has very similar concerns".

That is how we are going to build ties. We are going to build them by building bridges of understanding, tolerance and communication. I have not heard anything from the New Democratic Party, any message whatsoever on how to keep the country together. I strongly urge the member to look at our plans, plans based on keeping the country together on the basis of equality for all.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier today, I congratulate the member for Edmonton—Strathcona for his initiative in presenting to the House of Commons an opportunity to speak on national unity.

This is the type of debate which should throw the clock away. As long as members want to speak on it we should be allowed to keep going.

The objective of the motion I totally support. It may not seem as a surprise to him but I come from a totally different direction on how we resolve the issue of national unity.

I came to this city in 1979-80. I had the privilege and the pleasure of working for the prime minister of Canada at that time, the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. One of the central themes of the prime minister was the Constitution. One of the areas within the Constitution the prime minister was passionately committed to was the whole area of national programs. He believed, and nearly all of us supported him in this House, even many members in the opposition, that national programs create national will. From national will you have a spirit that can promote and bind the country together.

I can remember from 1980-1984 the taxpayers of Canada spent millions of dollars promoting the Government of Canada's presence in every region of the country. In early 1980 there was this great feeling of western alienation, that the Government of Canada did not do anything for the west. We were all surprised because there was billions of dollars, whether in direct grants or programs or services, which went to western Canada, as to other regions. We discovered when we looked closer that the Government of Canada's presence was hidden. It really was not well known. We had to educate and show people what the Government of Canada did in providing service, presence.

• (1345)

Agriculture Canada had 55 research offices across western Canada. Very few people even knew they were there providing a service to farmers and the agricultural community of western Canada.

We tried vigorously to have a Government of Canada presence in anything and everything we were doing, not just in western Canada but right across the country.

Since the election of Prime Minister Mulroney I have noticed something that has not stopped. There has been an almost complete dismantling of the Government of Canada presence in the country. In name of being fiscally responsible or fiscal discipline, we have offloaded, sold off airports, given away properties, have walked away from responsibilities and have given them to the municipalities or the provinces. We have done all this in the name of being fiscally efficient or in the name of it being important in terms of promoting partnership.

With respect and admiration for my friend from Edmonton—Strathcona, I think the pendulum has swung too far. The Government of Canada presence has dwindled to a point where many people are wondering whether we even have the capacity to deliver

on some of the programs and services we should be delivering on if we are to properly manage the country.

By the way, I will be sharing my time with the parliamentary secretary for international affairs.

I said earlier and I will say again that I support the member's objective of talking about national unity. However I do not think we can be in a community or a marketplace if our product is not on the shelf. In the last 10 to 15 years we have removed the the Government of Canada presence from all shelves not just in Quebec but in other regions of the country. I make no apology; I am a passionate believer in the Government of Canada having a major presence in every community and region of the country.

I abhor the fact that the postal service of Canada has practically written off the Government of Canada presence. For many years in many villages and communities across Canada that was the only shelf presence of the Government of Canada. It was the community's only link to this place. When we move from post office to airports to ports, the litany goes on and on and on.

Let us just take a business example. If someone is selling Pepsi-Cola and I am selling Coca-Cola and the only thing in the market is Coca-Cola, what will happen? Will we go to the store and ask for Pepsi even though we never see it?

In my judgment what we have in Quebec is a total lack of Government of Canada presence. We have given the separatists a free ride. Those of us who were in the House in the last parliament, those of us who were here when Lucien Bouchard was here, notice the distinct difference. When Lucien Bouchard was here as the leader of the official opposition they had lots of presence. They owned the market. They controlled the market. Thank God the Reform Party has moved into official opposition, because not only have we lost Lucien Bouchard, who was a charismatic leader, but we now have the Bloc Québécois slipping off the radar screen. The Bloc is starting to slip. Its presence in the marketplace is starting to slip. Its own people are asking what it is here for.

• (1350)

I say to my friend from Edmonton—Strathcona that if we are to have success in pulling the country together it is time for the Reform Party to shift gears a little. It should change its direction of dismantling, offloading and decentralizing national government.

The objectives of members are founded on good will, but perhaps the Reform caucus will say it should be looking at amplifying the Government of Canada presence in the province of Quebec rather than what it says every day. They ask "What are we going to sell off? What are we going to offload? What are we going to give to the provinces?"

### *Supply*

We have 10 different chunks across Canada and the Government of Canada is rendered meaningless. It is off the shelf.

In the last few years we have all been obsessed with putting the fiscal framework of the House back together. Obviously all members have worked hard to achieve that objective.

If we are to hold the country together, Government of Canada presence through proper services for young people, proper services for small business, proper activism and knowing that creativity and activism come from the House, we will have to shift gears and get back into an activism in all markets.

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood on his speech. I enjoyed it. We share many similar ideas and views.

One thing specifically pertains to the motion put forward today by the Reform Party and I would like to ask the member what he thinks specifically about it.

He talked about a greater government presence and a strengthening of government presence in Canada. We have an opportunity, especially from his point of view, to do that now in Quebec with the Calgary declaration. He talked about a product. Here is a chance for the Government of Canada to take a product to the people of Quebec, who will hopefully have a say like the rest of Canadians, and to bring the country together. Surely that is goal of all my colleagues and most members of the House.

What does the member have in mind on behalf of the government, as we suggested in the motion, in terms of taking the Calgary declaration to the people of Quebec? When should we do that or how should we do that?

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills:** Mr. Speaker, I support many items in the Calgary accord, "Framework for Discussion on Canadian Unity". All Canadians are equal and have rights protected by the law. A lot of it is easy to handle.

Point six reads:

If any future constitutional amendment confers powers on one province, these powers must be available to all provinces.

Obviously as a passionate centralist, as a passionate interventionist, I find the pendulum has gone too far the other way. I would have some real difficulty on that point.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the question of the hon. member from the Reform Party to the hon. member from Broadview—Greenwood. He was asking about possible consultations in Quebec.

*S. O. 31*

• (1355)

It seems clear to me that there have been consultations in Quebec about several things within Canada. I would like to ask my friend, whose speech I really enjoyed, whether he thinks it is necessary to have a consultation in Quebec, when the population has already expressed, on several occasions, its dissatisfaction about staying in Canada? Does he really think that it would add something new?

*[English]*

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills:** Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly honest, I would support the Government of Canada being very active in the province of Quebec, but I would go at it differently from the current course we are on.

I would go over the heads of the Bloc Québécois, over the heads of the premier and the legislature of the province of Quebec, and right to the people. The bottom line is that their vision of Quebec is a purely separatist system. If the country is to have a chance, we really should not waste a lot more time with the Bloc Québécois or Lucien Bouchard. We should go right to the people. The proof is in the pudding. When Pierre Trudeau went right to the people he got 74 of 75 seats. That is the way the prime minister should do it.

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the government member actually recognized what we have been saying all along. There is no interest whatsoever in negotiating with individuals who have no interest in negotiating in the first place.

To show the mythology that has taken place, before Mr. Bouchard asked one of his members to do an economic analysis of the consequences of separation, the separatist individual put forth a document that demonstrated very conclusively that separation would cost Quebecers dearly. That document was put underneath the carpet and forgotten.

Will the hon. member request in caucus that the prime minister and his fellow members go directly to the people of Quebec repeatedly and continuously over the next few years to spread a message of unity in the country?

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no. I think we forget the Prime Minister of Canada has been elected six times in the province of Quebec. No one knows how to handle the province of Quebec better than the prime minister.

We have to encourage the prime minister and the cabinet to be much more supportive in grassroots activism in the province of Quebec.

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS***[English]***YOUTH CRIMES**

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, tragically we just heard of the brutal fourth murder in my riding, the one of 14 year old Reena Virk. It is just the tip of the iceberg in youth crimes.

Youth crime has doubled since 1986. The majority of victims are youths and government efforts to try to deal with the problem have been all but impotent. Our usual response of detection, deterrence and detention is simply not working.

Head start programs in Moncton, Montreal, Michigan and Hawaii have demonstrated that dealing with the cognitive and social development of children in the first eight years of life have shown dramatic decreases in juvenile crime, teen pregnancies and drop-out rates. All show savings of \$5 for every dollar invested.

The National Crime Prevention Council and the House of Commons justice committee have recommended that a program be started. I ask and demand that the Minister of Justice, when she meets with her provincial counterparts next month, develop a national head start program—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Cambridge.

\* \* \*

• (1400)

**COUNCILLOR BILL STRUCK**

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week Cambridge lost a very caring and committed councillor who served the community for almost 30 years.

Known as a champion of the average person, Councillor Bill Struck was first elected in 1964.

An air gunner in the Royal Canadian Air Force, Mr. Struck's Lancaster bomber was shot down over occupied Europe in 1944. He spent several days evading the Germans and reached allied lines with the help of the French underground.

Mr. Struck was instrumental in naming new streets after the city's war veterans and regularly spoke to students about the experiences of veterans.

Councillor Bill Struck established the standard for public service in Cambridge. He will be missed by the entire community.

I would personally like to extend my condolences to his friends and loved ones.

[Translation]

### DRUMMONDVILLE

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this House that the area of Drummondville, that I represent since 1993, is a huge economic success story.

Its industrial park contains 430 companies, including 26 new ones launched in 1996. For the last two years, investments have topped \$100 million and they created almost 1,400 jobs per year. This is where the highest proportion of exporting companies in Quebec is. In 1996, the American magazine *Site Selection* ranked the two Drummondville industrial parks in the sixth place in the world for job growth.

The motivation of local business people has created a climate favourable to entrepreneurship. The local Société de développement économique, under the direction of Mayor Francine Ruest-Ju-tras, has been organizing for years Teams Drummondville to travel around the world.

Drummondville is viewed, and rightly so, as one of the engines of economic renewal in Quebec. Congratulations, Drummondville.

\* \* \*

[English]

### HEPATITIS C SOCIETY OF CANADA

**Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the important and outstanding work of the Hepatitis C Society of Canada. I had the honour of being asked to sit as a founding member of the society's board in 1994 and this past Sunday was pleased to participate in its Horizon of Hope Annual Conference in Toronto.

The Hepatitis C Society of Canada is a national organization with a network of more than 20 chapters and telephone support lines across the country. The society provides advocacy and acts as a strong support network for survivors and their families and provides valuable information sharing on such things as treatment and disability issues.

Approximately 300,000 Canadians have tested positive with hepatitis C. Many more have the virus and do not know it. Of those infected, some have not shown symptoms but in others chronic hepatitis C presents itself as serious liver disease.

I want to thank the Hepatitis C Society for the important work it does and for its commitment to increasing the quality of life for the many Canadians who live with hepatitis C.

*S. O. 31*

### RAY SMITH

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the outstanding volunteer efforts of Mr. Ray Smith. Mr. Smith lives in Lindsay, Ontario which is located in my riding of Victoria—Haliburton.

Ray was part of the Canadian Volunteer Advisers to Business organization. This organization is part of Canada's effort to stimulate development in disadvantaged economies. Last year this association provided almost 23,000 days of service valued at \$8 million.

Ray spent four weeks in Roseau, Dominica helping the owners of a property containing natural hot and cold sulphur springs develop a business plan for a spa resort. Ray recognized the potential for both health and tourism purposes and helped the owners achieve it.

Thanks to Ray Smith, disadvantaged countries can gain the tools needed to be successful. Great job, Ray.

\* \* \*

### TELEMARKETING

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, total losses from telemarketing scams are estimated to be around \$4 billion.

Telemarketing scams often target vulnerable people, especially the elderly. From January to September of this year, 56% of victims were over 60 years old and 85% of these victims lost more than \$5,000.

This is a very serious crime that threatens the financial security of our parents, grandparents and all Canadians. Tough new measures have just been introduced to attack these telemarketing scams. Bill C-20 will crack down on criminals by amending the misleading advertising provisions of Canada's Competition Act.

I call on my colleagues in this House to take action against telemarketing crime. I ask them to inform their constituents about programs like PhoneBusters and SeniorBusters, arm them with information to guard against these scams, and support the new crime fighting legislation before the House.

\* \* \*

### CANADA POST STRIKE

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, evidence of the devastating effects of the Canada Post strike can be found by talking to two men in my riding, Randy and Rod Lorenz. They own a mail order business and sell Christian books and material across the country. The month leading up to Christmas is their busiest time of the year. This mail disruption has caused their business to drop by 80%.

*S. O. 31*

• (1405)

Even if back to work legislation is implemented immediately, it may be too late for the Lorenzes. If they lose their business, Rod also loses his homestead which he mortgaged to finance the business.

This disastrous situation was avoidable. Reform has long proposed a solution which would have averted this and all future strikes and lockouts at Canada Post while still honouring the collective bargaining process.

This government has no long term solutions. Even if their business survives the current labour dispute, the Lorenzes can look forward to more labour disruptions in the future.

I challenge the labour minister or any member of the government to look the Lorenzes in the eye and tell them that they care.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### QUEBEC ECONOMY

**Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the finance minister said once again that if Quebec is lagging behind economically, it is because of the political uncertainty.

We would really like the minister to explain to us, if this is the case, why the maritimes are lagging even further behind than Quebec. Yet they do not spend their time wanting to separate from the so-called best country in the world. Could there be other explanations? Could it be that the federal petrochemistry, fisheries or transportation policies have hurt industrial development in Quebec and in the maritimes?

Of course not. What separatist heresy to dare think that the federal government could harm the economy of the provinces. We know full well it is the separatists' fault.

I ask the members opposite to get their heads out of the sand for two seconds, if they can, and listen up: sovereignty is not the problem, it is the solution for Quebec.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### GLOBAL VISION

**Mr. Julian Reed (Halton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member from Nipissing who is the parliamentary chairman for Global Vision, I am pleased to announce the completion of the Global Vision program for 1997 along with the report from junior team Canada.

Global Vision is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing young Canadians with an understanding of international trade and

commerce. Following a series of regional seminars held throughout the country, 25 young leaders of junior team Canada representing 100 Canadian companies completed a successful trade mission to southeast Asia.

I would like to thank the following sponsors for helping to make this program a success: AGRA, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, CIDA, Corel, Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Drake Goodwin Corp., Industry Canada, Laidlaw, Lombard, Microtronix, Mitel, Nova, Remington Energy, Singapore Airlines, Toshiba Canada, Western Star Trucks—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Bourassa.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### QUEBEC GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are told that separatists are playing with the idea of a referendum to ask Quebecers if they consider themselves a people.

It really takes a separatist not to know that there are two founding peoples in Canada, a reality that is recognized everywhere in the country. For separatists to suggest another referendum on a question to which all Quebecers already have the answer shows how out of touch they are with reality.

The last referendum cost Quebecers more than \$80 million, according to *Le Soleil*.

I say to Mr. Bouchard and his henchman of a representative in Ottawa, if you hold a referendum, ask the people if they think that these millions could be put to better use and that asking them silly questions is a good way to manage their money.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### THE SENATE

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today I join a growing number of Albertans who want their next senator elected. Many residents in my riding have called saying they want the Prime Minister to allow the province of Alberta to elect its next senator. But the Prime Minister is not listening.

The poor attendance record of some of the senators, the partisan appointments of this government and the constitutional inability to "dis-appoint" delinquent senators all make the Senate increasingly irrelevant. It is time to change this institution now. The first step toward this move would be by ensuring there is an election in Alberta. This move is nothing new. Precedent has already been set with the election of Senator Stan Waters. So why the hesitation?

I stand before the House today as a representative of thousands of Albertans who want change. Let Albertans elect a senator who will represent them.

\* \* \*

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, some 51% of all Canadian women have experienced at least one incident of physical or sexual assault by age 16. November 25, the international day to end violence against women, has been set aside as a reminder that senseless acts of violence are committed every day against women in every corner of the world. And Canada is no exception.

• (1410)

This day helps to raise public awareness of the damaging consequences of violence against women and girls. Too many women have had their lives and their spirits broken by such violence and attempts to control them. In Canada the annual cost of sexual assault, psychological and physical abuse is estimated at between \$1.5 billion and \$4.2 billion.

We all have a collective responsibility to ensure that women and girls are not subjected to violence because of their gender.

This is a call to action. It is a rallying cry to Canadians to work together to bring an end to these crimes against women.

\* \* \*

### APEC

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, thanks to the People's Summit the issue of human rights and labour standards has not been able to be swept under the red carpet at APEC.

Thanks to the currency crisis in Asia, instead of being able to uncritically celebrate the ecstasies of the market, many at APEC lament the agonies of a global economy in which entire regions and national economies can be ruined by money speculators. Instead of down playing these concerns, the Prime Minister should join the call for a global regime to regulate and tax currency speculations. How many more bail outs will there have to be before we go after the major cause of why these various economies sink in the first place?

The fact is that the Asian miracle was largely built on exploitation of cheap labour. As workers in these countries demand a fair share, international investors and multinational corporations lose their fascination and look elsewhere for people to exploit. Such is the nature of unregulated global capitalism.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

### MONTREAL ECONOMY

**Ms. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we had good news today. Recent data compiled by the development service of the City of Montreal show that job creation for professionals is increasing since the beginning of the year.

The level of employment in services to businesses was 18% higher in the first three quarters of 1996. There is another encouraging sign: the vacancy rate for downtown offices has decreased in a promising fashion. It was 17.7% in the beginning of fall 1997, down from 19.7% at the beginning of the year.

Therefore, I am asking all stakeholders of Montreal's business sector to ensure that consultation and cooperation between all levels of government are maintained to achieve sustainable economic growth.

The Canadian government will continue to be an important ally for all economic partners in all regions of Quebec.

\* \* \*

[English]

### ATLANTIC GROUND FISH STRATEGY

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Human Resources Development defended in the House a \$350,000 training program to help his employees deal with "life threatening, explosive, dangerous situations after the end of the TAGS review".

Does the minister really believe that he is dealing with terrorists or criminals? These fishers and plant workers are honest, law-abiding citizens. These are people who due to no fault of their own have been cut off prematurely from their primary source of income.

Why are there no programs to train fisheries and oceans employees on the west coast to deal with the Pacific salmon demonstrators? The Government of Canada has not proposed similar measures for Canada Post management.

Does the minister believe that fishers and plant workers are more prone to violence? This call for extra security is an insult to all people of Atlantic Canada. As a Newfoundlander I am offended by the proposal. As a federal member of Parliament I am ashamed of the minister's plan.

I call upon all my colleagues in the House to urge the minister to withdraw his proposal and apologize to all Atlantic Canadians.

*Oral Questions***REMEMBRANCEDAY**

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I attended Remembrance Day parades, services and dinners with the legions of Peterborough riding and with members of the Hastings-Prince Edward Regiment.

This year I met only one World War I veteran who was brought by his family to the Norwood Cenotaph ceremony. There was another at the Peterborough Cenotaph.

During World War I there were only eight million people in Canada. However an incredible 620,000 men and women served in the Canadian forces in that war. Of these, 67,000 died and 173,000 were wounded. Thus more than a third of our troops were wounded or killed. Nearly one in every ten Canadians who fought in that war did not return. Such statistics are almost unimaginable today.

Those who served and died in World War I ranged from First Nations people to immigrants who had only been in Canada for a few weeks.

There is a saying that the character of a person or a society has to be forged by fire. World War I was Canada's fire. Let us—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for York South—Weston.

\* \* \*

• (1415)

**AIRBUS**

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, every Canadian, including Brian Mulroney, has the right to due process, which is to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. My constituents are asking why the investigation is ongoing when the Government of Canada approved a settlement a few months ago. For an investigation to be ongoing, it would suggest there is substance to the allegations. Canadians across the country are asking why settle if there is some substance to the allegations?

It seems that investigation is frivolous, vexatious and grounded in politics more than in due process of law. It seems the only fair and just thing to do is to terminate the investigation immediately.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**CANADA POST**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the postal strike has gone on for a full week now. Even if the

government were to legislate the workers back today, it would still take five more days until this legislation could be enacted.

The Canadian public will not put up with this much longer. The minister of public works has gone on record publicly as saying that he would legislate these post office workers back to their jobs. My question for him now is when will he do it. How much longer will this nonsense go on?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that my hon. colleague wants to talk about legislation on a full time basis. I appointed a mediator yesterday named Mr. Edmondson who is one of the best mediators in the country. Let him demand the opportunity to bring the parties together and come up with a collective agreement.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this government has just gone through its third conciliator and mediator. There have been three of them in the past seven months which is hardly a great success that they should be raving about.

The radical union hierarchy is taking charge of this whole thing. Just yesterday the postal union boss said “sisters, brothers, comrades, postal workers will resist”. He threatened to shut down airports and close highways and bridges. This is nothing to brag about. This is a tragedy to this country. I want to know who is in charge here. I ask this minister again. When in the world is he going to get these people back to work and show that he is in charge—

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed at my hon. colleague's silly rhetoric. As I indicated previously, we have appointed a mediator who is quite capable. Let us give the man an opportunity. There is a process to go through. We are following the process. Let us support the process and give the mediator an opportunity to come up with a collective agreement and not continually talk about something that hurts the negotiations.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this government thinks process is going to solve the problem. We have had four strikes in the last 10 years. It has not worked and we need to keep moving. We will never know how many businesses go bankrupt because of this strike. We will never know how many people will be thrown out of work and we will never know how many dreams have been ruined by people. All we will know for sure is that this government had a chance to act and do something and it let the Canadian public down.

My question is for whichever of these two ministers is going to take responsibility for this mess. Why are they taking direction and allowing Darrel Tingley to say these kinds of things? Why do they not move ahead, get cracking and get the postal workers back?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I tell my hon. colleague that I will take care of the collective bargaining process and I will make sure the Canada

*Oral Questions*

Labour Code is adhered to. There is a process to go through. Let us follow the process and let us give Mr. Edmondson a chance to come up with an agreement.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister keeps saying let collective bargaining work. It is not working. We have Canada Post negotiators beating up a CUPW negotiator. We have CUPW president Darrel Tingley writing threatening letters to Canadian business. We have the Minister of Labour on national television claiming the minister responsible for Canada Post mis-spoke and should be chastised.

Not only is collective bargaining not working, Canadians are not working. When is the minister going to invoke legislation and allow these negotiations to still continue under mediation?

• (1420)

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague must have been listening to a different television than I was.

What we have to do is let the process work, as my colleague has indicated. Over 94.5% of the businesses under the federal jurisdiction have settled disputes. That means that we need to let the system work.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a dispute? They are out, for God's sake.

The other day I pointed out to the Minister of Labour that Canadian businesses are losing hundreds of millions of dollars a day and he does not care. I pointed out that tens of thousands of Canadians are laid off and he does not care. We have a Canada Post negotiator beating up a CUPW negotiator and he still does not care. Thirty million Canadians have lost their mail service and he does not care.

What the hell does the minister care about?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**OPTION CANADA**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the heritage minister again refused to answer questions about Option Canada's activities. All we know is that \$4.8 million was taken from the federal treasury and spent to promote Canadian unity. There is no report, no minutes, no activity report. There is only the minister's refusal to answer.

I ask the minister: Why is she stubbornly refusing to talk about Option Canada's activities? Can she tell us how much of that \$4.8 million was spent during the 1995 referendum campaign?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I said yesterday, last week, the week before and last March.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's answers sound like the ones she gave about the GST before she had to resign.

We wonder if this \$4.8 million was used as a slush fund for the Council for Canadian Unity. I ask the minister to tell us unequivocally that the \$4.8 million subsidy was not used in any way to fund the Montreal rally, the love-in that took place on October 27, 1995. Was federal money used to pay for this event?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member, who seems to care so much about how taxpayers' money is spent, that sovereignists spent a large amount of public money provided by Quebecers. They spent the equivalent of the salaries of 2,998 Quebec nurses.

They spent an amount equivalent to the salaries of 2,600 Quebec teachers on the referendum. They—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the heritage minister.

On the eve of the referendum campaign, the heritage minister handed out a \$4.8 million grant to Option Canada.

Does the minister realize that her refusal to answer our questions is leading us to believe that she knowingly and directly violated the referendum legislation then in force in Quebec and that she now refuses to be accountable?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the facts put forward by the hon. member are wrong.

I was not even the minister in charge at the time.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thought there was such a thing as ministerial continuity, but it looks as if she is telling us something new today. There was a referendum law in force in Quebec. The federal government was aware of it and was bound by it.

Are we to understand that through her complicity the heritage minister is putting herself above the law?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfair for Bloc members to accuse me of putting myself above the law. First of all, I was not even a minister at the time the grant was handed out.

*Oral Questions*

• (1425)

Second, the PQ, the separatists spent \$100 million of Canadian taxpayers' money on their option, and they have the gall to stand in the House and accuse me of breaking the law.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FISHERIES**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my questions is for the Minister of Human Resources.

Fishermen and fish plant workers in Atlantic Canada are furious at the government's misplaced priorities. Instead of ensuring families can put food on their tables by extending or replacing TAGS, the federal government is more concerned about crisis management and security measures than securing jobs. Even Newfoundland Premier Brian Tobin has demanded a public apology from the minister for his "disgusting and offensive" affront.

Will the minister apologize today?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. leader of the NDP for giving me the opportunity to correct the record on this very important file.

I understand the fishery workers' frustrations. I want to tell them that the statement that was proposed for the contract was inappropriately worded and it did not go through the proper approval process.

The statement has been withdrawn. It will be rewritten and submitted to accurately reflect the training requirements of our people across Canada.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I think we can take that as an apology, maybe.

I do not know whether what we are seeing here is a major spat between two Liberal leadership contenders, the minister and the Newfoundland premier. What fishery families who are in the crossfire are concerned about is how they are going to feed their families.

In the words of Newfoundland Premier Brian Tobin "When will this government begin planning an appropriate response to a very real problem that afflicts thousands of families?"

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is discussing a post-TAGs review right now. I have appointed one of our very serious and senior official in the department to meet with the provinces and the people to make sure we have the best solutions.

In the meantime we trust Canadians. We trust Canadians from coast to coast. We trust Canadians in Atlantic Canada. We know they will behave correctly and properly because they are Canadians. That is the way we do things.

We are training our people to do the right training, to do the process management, management of crowds, to do the interaction—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Brandon—Souris

\* \* \*

**YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

The Manitoba government has brought to the minister's attention on a number of occasions the effects of the reduction of the federal Young Offenders Act cost sharing program to the provinces.

Current federal contributions will only amount to 33.8% of the total cost in Manitoba, 22% in British Columbia and 30% in Newfoundland.

My question is this. Is the federal government going to put its money where its mouth is and start getting tough on young offenders or is it going to continue to download those costs to the provinces?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very aware of the issues the hon. member has alluded to. That is why we will be discussing that issue among others as it relates to young offenders on December 4 and 5 in Montreal.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly aware of the meeting on December 4 with the provincial ministers and the self-congratulatory fashion in which the minister deals with it.

I would like to ask, however, if those provinces decide not to administer that program on the Young Offenders Act, what contingency plans does the minister have to carry on with those particular programs without the provinces?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is probably very much aware, the provinces and the federal government have worked constructively for many years in relation to the creation of a youth justice system. Despite what some may say, it is the envy of the world.

I have no reason to expect that that level of co-operation will not continue.

*Oral Questions***CANADA POST***[Translation]*

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, ever since this postal strike began all we have been hearing from the minister is wait and see, let the process work.

Let us look at what that policy has done. It has got us seven months of failed bargaining. We have a nation-crippling postal strike on our hands. We have a Canada Post which refuses to budge on its offer. We now have a loose cannon postal president threatening civil disobedience.

• (1430)

This wait and see attitude is not working. When is he going to take his head out of the dead letter chute and see the problems this is causing?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what part of this process my hon. colleague does not understand.

Quite simply, mediation is part of the collective bargaining process and it is my responsibility to see that the process runs properly. That is exactly what I am doing.

What my hon. colleague is suggesting does nothing but hurt the process.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian businesses are looking at this time of the month as their biggest accounts receivable time.

They have payrolls to meet and they cannot meet them. It is easy to see that minister never had to meet a payroll in his life. This strike is costing millions of dollars a day to Canadian businesses.

When is he going to do something? When is he going to recognize that this nation crippling strike is causing extreme havoc and it is his responsibility to fix it? When is he going to do it?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell my hon. colleague I did have to meet a few payrolls and some of them were not all that easy.

I also now have the responsibility to see that Part I of the Canada Labour Code is adhered to. Mediation happens to be part of that process.

All I ask my hon. colleague to do is let the process work. Why the process is having trouble is people doing nothing but talking about bringing in legislation.

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday, in response to a question from the Bloc Québécois, the Minister of Human Resources Development announced a 20 cent reduction in EI premium rates, which represents a \$1.4 billion reduction in the approximately \$7 billion annual fund surplus. In our view, the reduction could have been larger.

Could the minister act on the second part of the Bloc Québécois' recommendation that he use a significant proportion of the annual surplus of several billions to increase protection for the unemployed, who have been reduced to poverty by the reform?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the opposition member should be thanking us for approving, for the fourth year in a row, a reduction in EI premiums that this year will be the largest reduction ever.

We are obviously in the midst of an extremely important EI reform. Naturally our government wishes to be prudent. It is a mark of this government that it has shown fiscal restraint in getting where it is today, and we want to be sure that the EI fund will be there, even if things were to become a little more difficult for workers generally.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are happy that the minister has responded to the Bloc Québécois' demand for lower premiums to offset the increase in QPP and CPP premiums.

Could the minister not take advantage of this clearly improved situation of a fund surplus to return to the families of the unemployed part of these surplus billions?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the House, we have brought about the largest EI reform in 25 years. We are following this reform very closely to be sure that it serves Canadians well.

Of course, we are going to continue to monitor the situation very closely and make adjustments in accordance with what we believe to be citizens' most pressing needs.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**TOBACCO SPONSORSHIP**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on this issue of tobacco advertising on race cars, I have a brand new article here published just a week ago in the prestigious journal the *Lancet*.

This article shows absolutely clearly that the most important influence on young men starting smoking is race cars. Which of the Liberals is going to stand up and finally admit their U-turn on this issue is absolutely wrong?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to reducing the use of tobacco in this country, recognizing that it does have an influence on the health of our young people and Canadians in general.

The minister has responded to this question in a number of venues and circumstances and he, like us all, believes and understands the importance of managing tobacco use in this country.

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity to speak to this researcher in Britain just a few moments ago. She said that this information was so important that she could not even let her study go to the end of its normal lifetime, that she had to put this information in front of the public immediately.

• (1435)

The British prime minister did his U-turn when he got a \$2 million gift. Why has our prime minister made the similar U-turn?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, this government understands the importance of reducing tobacco use among Canadian youth.

We have, in a very focused and clear way, identified and brought forward legislation which will better these circumstances for Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, with the Kyoto conference approaching, Environment Canada's research studies demonstrate that global warming will have catastrophic consequences on the St. Lawrence River, the Canadian north, public health, and much more.

With so many arguments, will the minister admit she showed weakness by failing to convince the western provinces of the need to go further in the fight against greenhouse gas emissions?

[English]

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government has worked very well with all the provinces and territories across this country to discuss the very serious, real issue of climate change.

The provinces gave the federal government flexibility in setting targets and timelines for Kyoto. We will present those targets and timelines before the meeting in Kyoto.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, while all those who oppose restrictions are trying to figure out how much vigorous measures would cost, does the minister not agree that she could make herself more useful by asking her department to figure out how much our inaction would cost?

[English]

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it will cost us quite a bit to take action on this very serious issue, but it will also cost us a great deal if we do not take action on this issue.

It is not just the federal government but provinces, business, industry and municipalities which will take action.

Right now we see, for example, companies in the automotive industry scrambling over each other in competition for future markets. They are producing vehicles with lower emissions.

Municipalities across the country, like Toronto, are taking actions to reduce emissions.

All sectors, including the federal government, will take their part.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, 14 year old Reena Virk was just brutally murdered in my riding by a group of teenagers. This is just the tip of the iceberg. Violent crime among youth has doubled since 1986.

Vancouver Island is in shock and communities and families are destroyed. Yet while this happens the government dithers and the casualties continue to mount.

For the safety of all Canadians, when will the government and the justice minister take action on youth crime?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I

think everybody in this House would agree that the events which took place in Saanich over the weekend are tragic, to say the least, and must be of great concern to all of us.

In addition let me say, as I believe all hon. members of the House know, that I have made it very plain that one of my goals is to reform the Young Offenders Act to deal with serious, repeat and violent young offenders in a way that condemns their activities.

I have made it very plain that I will respond to the standing committee report—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Wild Rose.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, six girls and one boy have been charged with aggravated assault. The maximum penalty for this crime is three years.

This government has been flapping its mouth for four years and has done nothing about the Young Offenders Act. Why does this minister not get up right now and tell the 90% of people who want the Young Offenders Act gone that she loves it, that it is a Liberal document and that it is here to stay? Why does she not tell them that?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that I have said we are in the midst of a consultative process in relation to reforming the Young Offenders Act.

If the hon. member did his homework he would find that 90% of Canadians do not want to have the Young Offenders Act abolished, but they would like it to be reformed to better reflect their values, and that is what this government is doing.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### RAIL TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, in Saint-Jean-Chrysostome, a CN railway car literally split open, spilling 80,000 litres of concentrated sulphuric acid 400 meters away from the downtown core and the Etchemin River. Obviously, the bad state of disrepair of this railway car was the cause of this accident.

• (1440)

My question is for the Minister of Transport who is responsible for the security of the rolling stock. How can the minister explain this accident? Did the accident occur simply because his department did not do its job properly?

#### Oral Questions

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are always concerned when a railway accident occurs or whether there is some problem as happened yesterday.

Safety is Transport Canada's top priority. There are methods of ensuring safety and there are procedures that are put in place. A full investigation is always done when an accident occurs.

I am sure that when the facts are known we will be able to determine the true cause of this particular problem.

\* \* \*

#### HIGHWAY SYSTEM

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

The minister will know that the American government has proposed legislative framework for a NAFTA superhighway running from the Mexican to the Canadian border.

Can the minister tell us what is being done, if anything, to ensure that our highway system is adequate to deal with this American trade route?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of growing importance given the amount of trade between Canada and the United States and of course going into Mexico.

Transport Canada has successfully co-funded projects to automate border crossings at Windsor and Fort Erie and we are also trying to explore the use of intelligent transportation systems to facilitate the movement of goods and people.

When we talk about NAFTA highways we are not just talking about paved asphalt. We are also talking about rail links and the integration, the intermodality between the various forms of transport. This is a priority for our government that we will have to work further on in the months ahead.

\* \* \*

#### JUSTICE

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister and this government have already had four years to do something about the Young Offenders Act. We wait till February and then how long will we have to wait before something is done?

Youth are the primary victims in youth crime. When are members of this House and Canadians going to see this government scrap the Young Offenders Act and replace it with legislation that works?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that my predecessor amended the Young Offenders Act and we should keep in mind that for certain serious crimes he doubled the period of time a young offender could serve in prison.

*Oral Questions*

What we have done is deemed 16 and 17-year olds to be adults for the purposes of transfer to adult court. So in fact this government has acted in relation to some of the concerns surrounding the Young Offenders Act.

If the hon. member is suggesting that more needs to be done, I do not disagree. I would ask him to work co-operatively with me and with the standing committee on justice.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** There she goes again, Mr. Speaker. She is just absolutely losing it because she talks about a great piece of legislation and all the changes, and nothing has changed. It is evident from what has just happened across the country.

While she is wining and dining the elite, she does not talk to the real people to find out the solutions. Why don't you publish their names? Why don't you let the people know who they are? Why don't you put some meaning—

**The Speaker:** My colleague, always address your question to the Chair. The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have no idea to whom the hon. member is referring in relation to the wining and dining of the elite.

Let me assure the hon. member that if he genuinely wants to participate in a discussion around important issues like the naming of young offenders in certain situations, I ask him to work with this government because those are the very issues on which we are working.

\* \* \*

**BANKS**

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Today it was the turn of the Bank of Montreal to reveal record profits of \$1.3 billion. Meanwhile bank services charges have skyrocketed by 25% or more in the last three years and inflation sits at 1.5%.

Enough is enough. Healthy profits are fine but gouging the consumer is not fine.

• (1445)

In light of that, will the minister now screw up his courage and call for a parliamentary inquiry into bank service charges so the banks have to come before parliament and fully disclose and justify their charges to consumers?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could lay a few facts before the House.

I am sure the hon. member would welcome, as his leader already has, reasonable profits for the banks. This is for two reasons. First, profits mean that investors including pensioners benefit. Second, increased profits mean vast increases in revenues from taxes on these profits for Canadians. Last year the banks paid \$4.9 billion in federal, provincial and municipal levies.

If the member is concerned that their profits are too high perhaps he should realize—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

In 1993 the Bank of Montreal wanted to buy the Harris Bank of Chicago. Under the American Community Reinvestment Act, U.S. regulators prevented the Bank of Montreal from closing the deal and getting a charter until the bank committed nearly \$500 million for small business loans and community development.

In light of the record Canadian bank profits we are seeing on a daily basis, when will the minister introduce a community reinvestment act in Canada to make sure small business can access at fair rates capital they need desperately for their business?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the idea behind a community reinvestment act is that deposits taken out of a particular area will be equalled by investments or loans made back into that particular area.

If we look at the figures of the Bank of Canada from last year, seven provinces in Canada would be major losers under that type of proposal, including the four Atlantic provinces.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC):** Mr. Speaker, financial mismanagement at the Oromocto first nation has left a toll of casualties both on and off reserve. Even with the \$500,000 cash advance the band cannot meet its obligations. Band staff is being laid off. Men, women and children have not received a paycheque or support payments in six weeks. Contractual agreements have been broken and have not been honoured.

My question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Will the minister take the necessary steps to ensure that all financial commitments and contractual agreements—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the financial difficulties being faced by the Oromocto first nation. A co-manager has been put in place to assist and to provide advice on the fiscal decisions that are being made there.

The department is watching the results of that intervention very closely. We are committed to ensuring the restoration of fiscal stability to that first nation.

I would ask the hon. member to continue.

**An hon. member:** Mr. Speaker, she is after your job.

**The Speaker:** I sort of like it here.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Charlotte, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I guess I underestimated my own power in the House. I appreciate the minister's concern.

A great deal of hardship is being placed on individuals on and off reserve. That is the point I really want to make.

These financial hardships reach right down into the Fundy region where fishermen in Grand Manan have been left out and financial commitments not kept. Simply put, I would like the minister to act in the best interest of all sides, not only the Indian community but those people who are suffering financial hardship in that area.

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would again indicate that the department is working with the first nation through a co-manager to focus on the need to restore fiscal certainty to that community.

I would just caution the House, however, not to generalize from a particular case. While some first nations need remedial support, the vast majority of them are working within the constraints of their fiscal realities.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL REVENUE**

**Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business has characterized as heavy handed and inflexible Revenue Canada's announcement that even without postal service Canadians still have to make their payments on time.

• (1450)

Given that the postal strike is making it difficult for many individuals and businesses to send their payments to Revenue Canada, is the department prepared to show any flexibility and understanding during the course of this strike for late or missed payments?

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we understand there is some difficulty right now. Revenue Canada has taken the steps necessary to assist Canadians to meet their obligations and to

ensure that we deliver the child tax benefit credits for which we are responsible.

Businesses and individuals can make their payments at any financial institution. They can go to any of our customs offices or our Revenue Canada offices.

I also remind the federation that we have fairness legislation at Revenue Canada. We are fair.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government refuses to take action in the postal strike, which actually affects millions of people. Yet it does not waste any time when it comes to rewarding incompetence with promotions, particularly if it involves the Somalia affair.

Kim Campbell, Consul General in Los Angeles; Bob Fowler, Ambassador to the UN; and now Vice Admiral Murray has landed a whale of a job in the fisheries department.

When will the disgraced Somalia commander, Colonel Labbé, get his reward?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows a proposed promotion is being held in abeyance. The matter is still under review. It will be examined.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**INARI**

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

A few days ago, we learned that INARI, an agency accredited to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, was involved in a fraud case against some business people from Quebec.

What representations does the government intend to make to the UN to ensure tighter control over agencies seeking accreditation and what support does the federal government intend to give to the victims of this fraud?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for the last two years we have been working very actively with the United Nations to ensure that a whole series of financial administrative reforms would be instituted.

For example, Canada led the strong advocacy for zero growth in the UN budget. We have also been leading the support for reorganization, and the secretary general has brought in reforms.

We will continue to work actively. Where there are questions of fraud we will support any action to make sure those are clarified and cleaned up as soon as possible.

*Oral Questions***PORTS CANADA**

**Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, during the past weeks the Minister of Transport has been asked what he knew about alleged wrongdoings by senior Ports Canada police officials.

Within one month of an official complaint being made to the RCMP, the director general of Ports Canada, Sidney Peckford, was removed from his position.

Given that the officials with Ports Canada will not comment, will the minister tell the House why the director was removed and how this relates to the RCMP investigation into the alleged wrongdoings?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, by now the hon. member would have seen a press release from Ports Canada which answers his question. The fact is that the port police across the country are being wound up. The individual in question is terminating his job at the end of this year.

On the matter of the complaints that have been filed, the RCMP has evaluated them and has opened an investigation. It would be imprudent for me to say anything further.

\* \* \*

**FINANCE**

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, we have just learned today that the Bank of Canada has announced a quarter per cent rise in the prime lending rate, supposedly justified by our overheated economy. In this so-called overheated economy there are more than 1.4 million unemployed Canadians.

My question is for the finance minister. How could he support a government policy guaranteed to create more unemployment?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member ought to look at the facts. If he would take a look at what happened to medium and long term interest rates following the last Bank of Canada increase of 25 basis points, he would find that long term rates went down virtually across the spectrum.

They went down because inflationary expectations went down. That is what really important. People invest on the basis of long term rates. Mortgage rates are at a record level. It is because of both the fiscal and monetary policies being pursued by the government and the Bank of Canada.

• (1455)

**MUSEUMS**

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government is proposing a Holocaust display for the Canadian War Museum. To put it mildly, controversy rages around this decision.

Because of the importance of the Holocaust display, why is the minister bearing it at the war museum? She knows full well that the Canadian Museum of Civilization has far more traffic and is a far more appropriate place.

Will she commit today, if the Holocaust display is to go ahead, that it will be put at the Canadian Museum of Civilization so that it gets the exposure it deserves?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am certainly happy to see the interest of the hon. member in the workings of the Canadian War Museum.

He will no doubt be aware that earlier this week the Museum of Civilization, through the board of directors and the war museum, established a consultative process to ensure that every facet of society, and in particular the veteran community, is widely consulted.

They are expecting to have an end to that consultation by their next meeting in February. Whatever they come up with, I am sure the member and I will be working together to ensure the direction set by the board of directors becomes reality.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUEBEC'S PARTITION**

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

On November 21, in Minneapolis, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs stated, and I quote: "Nationalism in Quebec is a civic rather than an ethnic issue".

Why is the minister speaking from both sides of his mouth since he stated the opposite last week, in his letter to Mr. Jacques Brassard, speaking of an ethno-linguistic cleavage to describe Quebec's plan?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for giving me the opportunity to explain to him for the umpteenth time that Quebec society is not the problem. It is a great society that must stay within Canada.

The problem is not Quebec nationalism, which is an open kind of nationalism that can help all Canadians. The problem is the

secessionist option, which is aimed at taking Canada away from Quebecers, when we know that the vast majority of Quebecers want to remain Canadians.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Last week students at Carleton University heard that as many as 13 programs could be cut. Students protested against the cuts yesterday and know the role the federal government is playing in the slow destruction of education.

Since 1995 alone \$1.5 billion has been taken from post-secondary education. Students at Carleton and across Canada want to know when the government will listen to students and restore funding to education.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for giving me the opportunity to discuss in the House this important situation for students. Our government is working very hard on it.

The Minister of Finance has already brought about a number of very important fiscal measures to help students in his budget last year, and we must thank him for that.

We are also working very hard right now on the Canada student loans program. We want to fix it. We want to improve it again. We recognized there is a problem. We are meeting right now with the provinces, with the lenders and with the students' associations that are doing great work.

\* \* \*

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Sixteen and seventeen year olds are old enough to drive, old enough to leave school and old enough to get married. Yet they are not old enough to be held fully responsible for their criminal behaviour.

In view of the fact that 16 and 17 year olds are quite capable of understanding the difference between right and wrong, will the minister undertake in her review of the Young Offenders Act that she will commit to the House that 16 and 17 year olds will be removed from the provisions of the Young Offenders Act and prosecuted in adult court?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I should think the hon. member is aware that my predecessor made an important change

#### Oral Questions

to the Young Offenders Act, which in fact presumes that 16 and 17 year olds for serious crimes are adults.

In fact what we see in many provinces now is a large number of 16 and 17 year olds being transferred to adult court and being dealt with as adults.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

[Translation]

#### AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the secretary of state for agriculture.

There are a lot of farmers in the riding of Beauce and I understand that the Government of Canada and the province of Quebec have come to an agreement to provide Quebec farm producers with a security net.

Can the secretary of state tell the House what our farmers stand to gain from this agreement?

**Hon. Gilbert Normand (Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)(Fisheries and Oceans), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Beauce and take this opportunity to reassure farmers not only from Beauce, but from all over Quebec.

Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture, always sensitive to the needs of farm producers, signed with his Quebec counterpart a \$202 million framework agreement on income protection. Out of this \$202 million, \$146 million will go to income security, \$49 million to crop insurance and an additional \$7 million to vegetable producers.

Co-operation is always reassuring.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I would like to draw to the attention of the House the presence in the gallery of members of the Portfolio Committee on Private Members' Legislative Proposals and Petitions of the Republic of South Africa.

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

**The Speaker:** I have two questions of privilege and two points of order.

I have two questions of privilege to deal with. I received notification from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I also received notice during question period from the hon. member for Burlington. My question to the hon. member for Burlington is does this question of privilege arise from question period today?

**Ms. Paddy Torsney:** No.

*Privilege*

**The Speaker:** I will take the question of privilege from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I would ask the hon. member to give me notification at least one hour ahead of time.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 48, I raise a question of privilege regarding the premature disclosure of a committee report. I base this question on new information obtained through access to information.

On October 1, 1997 I raised a question of privilege on a related matter, namely that a breach of privilege occurred when the industry committee's in camera draft report was released to the public. I indicated then that according to access to information documents the industry minister and industry department bureaucrats were in possession on April 18, 1997 of draft copies of the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Industry.

The final report of the committee entitled "Review of section 14 of the Patent Act amendment, 1992" was reported to the House of Commons on April 23, 1997, five days later. On October 9, 1997 the Speaker ruled that while the matter raised was important, it was not appropriate for the Speaker to intervene at that time and I stress at that time.

• (1505)

Access to information files show that House of Commons legal counsel argued on August 25, 1997 that the release of the draft committee report "could give rise to a question of parliamentary privilege". At the time legal counsel advised that the draft report not be released. The letter and subsequent release of the draft report would indicate there are no formal rules governing the handling of committee documents.

I would contend that if the House of Commons precedent is the guide, the new information obtained through access to information provides the Speaker with the authority to intervene at this time since on August 25, 1997 it now appears House of Commons legal counsel was made aware the draft report would be released.

Responsibility for House of Commons legal counsel lies with the Speaker. This new information indicates the matter should therefore be dealt with by the House of Commons as a whole and not left in the hands of committees themselves.

By the same token a new element to the body of precedent in these matters has been introduced since persons under your responsibility were consulted and their advice on a matter of parliamentary privilege was not followed.

In the October 9, 1997 ruling, the Speaker referenced Speaker Fraser's December 7, 1991 decision indicating the Chair does not intervene in the proceedings of a committee unless a problem has been reported by the committee to the House, or in extremely unusual circumstances. The new information indicates there are indeed unusual circumstances.

For clarity I again refer to Beauchesne citation 877 on page 241 which states that no act done at any committee should be divulged before it has been presented to the House. Beauchesne citation 877 also states that the publication of proceedings of committees conducted with closed doors or of reports of committees before they are available to members will constitute a breach of privilege. Also Beauchesne citation 57, page 18 states "the House has in the past regarded the publication of the proceedings or reports of committees sitting in camera to be a breach of privilege".

Therefore I move that this House refer the matter regarding rules for the handling of committee documents to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

**The Speaker:** First, to the hon. member who has just spoken, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, if I did find a prima facie case for a question of privilege, then I would of course invite the hon. member to make a motion, but the motion is not in order right now.

On the same question of privilege, I will hear from the government House leader.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the Chair has ruled on this point in the past. The new information being raised today does not change the essence of what has been ruled on before. I think there are a number of points for the Chair to consider.

First is that this issue happened in committee and should be raised in committee. The Chair is usually reluctant to interfere with this, save and except for one item, that a report from the committee should of course be made available to this House before being made public. However that is an issue about which the committee itself should lodge a complaint before the House.

The committee in question was in a previous Parliament and because it was in a previous Parliament. That committee and the Parliament in question has ceased to exist with the calling of the election.

The new privileges claimed by this Parliament were claimed by yourself, Mr. Speaker, on the first day that we sat. Therefore any action being raised now has to relate to something that occurred after the date at which you claimed the privileges for this Parliament.

*Points of Order*

• (1510)

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that if the hon. member is claiming that her own privileges have in some way been offended, she was not at the time a member of Parliament when the incident in question was alleged to have occurred.

The Chair might consider those points before adjudicating.

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague's question of privilege with respect to the report being provided outside the committee before it was released to the members.

I was an associate member of that committee, Mr. Speaker, when the House was in session. As you will recall it was leading up to the election campaign. There was a great deal of problem with respect to maintaining a full complement of members in the House the day before they called the election.

With respect to the point of privilege, I want to add two points. The government House leader indicated that the member who just raised the question of privilege was not here and her personal privilege was not in question. She has raised this on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus. We believe that the privileges of all members of the House who were members at that time and continue to be members have been breached. We feel this has to be reviewed by you, Sir, and that you should report back to the House at your leisure.

With respect to whether this happened in committee, obviously there was a request for this information. It really falls outside the realm of the committee because it was external to the committee. The people who requested it were not members of the committee. Therefore the committee is partially responsible but we do not know for sure.

Mr. Speaker, you might recall that the minutes of the industry committee which reviewed this particular document that was leaked in advance of being provided to members of Parliament were in camera and were destroyed when the election was called and dissolution of Parliament took place. We really do not know for sure what happened but that, in my view, is a breach of the privileges of all members of Parliament as it pertains to this issue.

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I well recall the decision I made earlier in this Parliament.

The hon. member has referred to new information. I take it she has documents. I would ask her to table those documents with me. I want to have a look at them and take into consideration what the government House leader has said as well as the comments of the

hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre. I will look at everything and if it is necessary, I will return to the House.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Jim Gouk (West Kootenay—Okanagan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today in question period in frustration I used a word that was inappropriate. I do apologize for that. I hope the Speaker would realize that is not in character with the way I speak in this House.

However I would ask the Speaker if he could enlighten me as to why, when other people use words which are inappropriate, the Speaker rises and tells them that he finds that word inappropriate and asks them to withdraw it and then the question is answered. Why did he not do that in my case but simply passed me over and I did not get a response to my question?

**The Speaker:** Far be it for me to ever pass you over my hon. colleague.

There are very few words, if any, that are of and by themselves unparliamentary. For the most part it has to do with the tone of the delivery. It has to do with the reaction and whether it causes disorder in the House.

I saw that the hon. member was frustrated. I saw that the hon. member used words that he would not, as he has said, ordinarily use in this House. I thought that the words used today and the fashion in which they were used were a bit provocative. I thought they were provocative enough that I would rule the statement out of order.

Another day in my fallibility I may say we will let it go and see what happens. I did not want to put you under the duress of withdrawing words. Sometimes when a member is frustrated like that, I like to give the member a little bit of time.

As the hon. member has stated, I know he has a very wide choice of words he can use. If he would consider not using those words again, it would probably help the House.

• (1515)

However, I thank him for his willingness to apologize to the House. Of course, on behalf of the House, I accept.

**An hon. member:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**The Speaker:** Usually when there is a question of privilege, if it arises out of the question period itself, I will hear it because it is here, this day. However, the rules are that I should have at least one hour's notice if it is a question of privilege which occurred prior to the question period.

*Supply*

I would invite the hon. member to put her question of privilege to me tomorrow, as soon after the question period as we can get to it. If she would give me an inkling of what it is about, I would appreciate that, just so I have an idea of what it is about.

However, I will hear it tomorrow, now that she has given me notice.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### SUPPLY

#### ALLOTTED DAY—CALGARY DECLARATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion; and of the amendment.

**Ms. Claudette Bradshaw (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this proposal and I am happy to be able to describe the vision of our government for a strong and united Canada. I wish to emphasize in this House that our greatest priority is to strengthen Canadian unity. I would also like to say that we are convinced that we will succeed in creating again the sense of purpose that allowed us to build this great country and that has carried it through to what it is today.

[English]

We are trustees of a tolerant society, one that welcomes people of all nations and all races. Canada has earned an international reputation as a champion of human rights. We recognize that “one size fits all policies and approaches” will not work in a country composed of such a rich cultural mosaic and have found ways to accommodate our differences.

Ours is a democracy where we can agree to disagree, but still get along. There is ample room for the provinces to manoeuvre within the framework of federalism while at the same time enjoying all the benefits of this larger, more powerful alliance.

[Translation]

It is exactly because we are Canadians that we have the freedom to maintain different languages and different legal traditions, to celebrate what makes us different in cultural terms and what prevents us from disappearing in a melting pot.

Canada has proven to the rest of the world that it is possible to live together in harmony, mutual respect and mutual trust. It is possible, because we share the same values of peace, generosity and justice, while maintaining our history and our traditions.

On the social union, over the years, we have created a network of policies and social programs that reflect our common values and that form the basis of our common identity.

I would like to add that it is this common experience, this mutual trust that has allowed us, more than legal definitions or constitutional considerations, to stay together and to develop in a country that is the envy of the world. According to the United Nations human development index, need I remind you, our country is listed at the very top among the world's nations.

[English]

I want to highlight several social initiatives which demonstrate that our core values remain the key to national unity and which clearly illustrate that there is more that unites us than divides us. On the national child benefit, the collaborative approach the Government of Canada and the provinces and territories have taken with the national child benefit system is a perfect example. In the summer of 1996 the first ministers made child poverty a priority and agreed to work together with the Government of Canada on an integrated child benefit.

• (1520)

When representatives of the two levels of government focused on the real issue on the table, giving children the start they need to become healthy, happy, educated and productive adults, there was no room for partisan politics. Everyone recognized that investing in children is vital to our collective future.

[Translation]

Whichever government they were representing, all the negotiators realized that what mattered most was not which level of government should be providing the funding or delivering the services. The aim was simply to provide an opportunity for a better future for children living in poverty.

They all recognized that reducing child poverty requires a co-operative strategy, a national effort bringing together federal, provincial and territorial jurisdictions to work towards the creation of constructive partnerships. The fact that we have succeeded in implementing the national child benefit demonstrates how Canada can work better when we work hand in hand.

[English]

Like the national child benefit, the new national children's agenda will also include the well-being of Canadian children and in the process strengthen this country's social union. Launching a national children's agenda is an opportunity to work together across provinces and sectors toward a common goal of building a better future for Canada's children.

We have enjoyed similar success in securing federal-provincial agreements on changes to the Canada Pension Plan. We will jointly shepherd reforms to the CPP to secure a viable and a sustainable public pension system for today's retirees and tomorrow's.

We hope to duplicate this co-operation in the coming months as we work with our provincial and territorial colleagues on other social priorities. Persons with disabilities are a priority of federal-provincial-territorial social services ministers. We will collaborate closely with our partners to develop a shared agenda to better meet their needs. We are currently working with other governments to put in place a replacement program for the vocational rehabilitation for disabled persons program.

In the same spirit we are working with the provinces and territories to create employment and learning opportunities for Canadian young people. For example, we are committed to developing a mentorship program in partnership with provincial and territorial governments and the private sector.

Also, working with our provincial partners we will continue to improve the Canada student loans program to increase access to learning opportunities for Canadian youth.

[*Translation*]

I would like to remind the hon. member that federalism can also adjust to the economic climate. For example, Quebec has long been seeking jurisdiction over manpower training, arguing that local authorities are in a better position to respond to needs for skills development, and are often capable of responding more quickly.

Our offer is without precedent and involves the transfer to the provinces of responsibilities in the area of labour market development. This will allow Quebec to design and manage its own manpower training programs.

Through agreements to develop the labour market, employment programs and services worth \$2 billion annually—funded through the reform of the employment insurance program—will be handed over to the provinces choosing to assume these responsibilities. Up to now, Quebec and seven other provinces have signed agreements on new provisions for the labour market.

Canadians are fed up with federal-provincial squabbling. They want us to work together to create worthwhile and sustainable social programs for the 21st century.

Thanks to the many innovative measures I have mentioned, the Government of Canada has clearly shown its willingness to make the necessary changes to modernize Canada.

• (1525)

We are finding new ways to increase Canada's effectiveness for us all, and the result is not independent governments, but rather interdependent governments.

### *Supply*

[*English*]

This partnership approach offers tangible proof that by working together, governments can strengthen the social union. We can advance a common social agenda and in the process, create more targeted government programs, improve service delivery and achieve significant cost savings.

I am suggesting that if we are willing to give each other a chance and really work at it, Canada can become whatever we collectively make it.

[*Translation*]

If Canada did not already exist, no doubt we would be doing our best to invent it. So let us celebrate Canada as a model nation, one that inspires the international community and that will continue to make a remarkable contribution to the world in the next millennium.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to my colleague's speech. She gives manpower training as an example of successful federalism.

At this time, it can be seen that there is a big problem in that area. When someone says that manpower training is being handed back to the provinces, while at the same time a duplicate youth strategy is being created, that the Federal Regional Development Office is taking steps to encourage young entrepreneurs alongside the economic development corporations already in existence, that millennium scholarships are created, another example of federal meddling in education and a measure designed with the next election in mind, this of course gives government members something to boast about. But all of this is in an area which is not in any way part of its jurisdiction.

With such examples of federal interference coming on top of all the previous failures to change the Canadian federal system, is it any wonder that Quebecers are highly sceptical about the Calgary declaration? I find, moreover, that it contains nothing at all that Quebecers have long been calling for.

Would there not be a way in this House for the federal government to show a real desire to respond to Quebec's demands, which have been expressed for many years, with a position that could at least meet the traditional needs of Quebec?

At the present time, the Calgary declaration does not even contain anything for the Quebec federalists who want to see Canada changed.

Could the hon. member not pass these desires and wishes on to her government in order to convince it to modify its position?

*Supply*

**Ms. Claudette Bradshaw:** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Human Resources Development has said repeatedly, reform in under way and the provinces will be able to make their own decisions. That is what we are doing.

The Prime Minister said he wanted to make youth a priority and that, in the next millennium, the federal government, on this side, will be the one making decisions about grants. That is all right, that is what we wanted it to do.

But this does not make a bit of difference: it seems that, whatever we do, the Bloc always wants more, but not everyone in Quebec agrees. Many people in Quebec tell us they want a federal presence there, they want us there.

In spite of the fact that we give them responsibilities and take major decisions, people in Quebec tell us: "We want you too, we want the federal government as well".

While listening to my friend opposite, I was reminded of Pierre Roy. Every morning for the past 21 months, he has been raising the Canadian flag with some veteran comrades of his. The message Pierre Roy is sending is that he knows what a divided country is like, because he fought for such countries on behalf of Canada.

My hon. friend must understand that the provinces are requesting that we share. They are asking that we have discussions with them and make decisions together.

• (1530)

Things are going well very well with the provinces. Many programs were developed in co-operation with other provinces. But as you all know, it is difficult to get the Bloc Quebecois or Lucien Bouchard to sit down with us so we can work together.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member for Laval East may ask a question, but it must be short.

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised by the answer the hon. member just gave to my colleague.

I will ask her a question along the same lines. When the hon. member says that Quebecers absolutely want the federal government to get involved in areas of provincial jurisdiction, in areas that come under Quebec's jurisdiction, is she implying that every Quebec government in the past 30 years was wrong in making traditional claims regarding Quebec's areas of jurisdiction, including education? Is the hon. member telling us that all Quebec governments of the past 30 years were wrong?

**Ms. Claudette Bradshaw:** Not at all, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to tell the hon. member that Quebecers want the Quebec government to sit at the table, with the federal government and with the other provincial governments, to take part in the decisions being

made. Major decisions will be made over the next five years at the federal and provincial levels. My message was that Quebecers surely want their provincial government to sit at the table with the other provinces.

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the official opposition motion regarding the need for consultation on national unity.

We have the good fortune to live in one of the best countries in the world. Canada, with its prosperous economy, is a stable democracy that respects the values and aspirations of all Canadians. No other country can point to such a free and tolerant society, where diversity and difference are accepted, as witnessed by the languages and cultures of its citizens.

These are all reasons to be proud and to view Canada's future with optimism. Cooperation between the federal government and the provinces can only assure us of a better future by revitalizing our Constitution.

[*English*]

Effort is required to strengthen the Canadian federation. This effort has been made by the premiers of nine provinces who met in Calgary last September. These premiers drafted a declaration which embodies some of the basic principles that all Canadians share to guide future efforts in uniting this country.

What is monumental about the process surrounding the Calgary declaration is its emphasis on consultation. Unlike the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords, the Canadian public is being consulted at the front end of the process about its vision of Canada in the 21st century. We hope that the public, the premiers and this government are listening.

[*Translation*]

The Calgary declaration provides a way to renew the debate on ways of improving our country. It includes principles universally applicable in Canada and not limited just to eastern or western provinces, principles applicable in Quebec, even though the premier of Quebec was not at the Calgary conference.

Mr. Bouchard said he would not take part in any public consultation process. He is not unaware, however, that if the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords failed, it was because Canadians were not consulted. He adds that he has no interest in consulting Quebecers as to whether they truly want to participate in Canadian society. By taking this approach, Mr. Bouchard is standing in the way of democratic debate in Quebec and in the way of Quebecers' right to participate in free and open consultations with their elected officials on ways of becoming their own masters in the Canadian Confederation. The Quebec government alone is preventing Quebecers from having a say in the definition of their future.

• (1535)

These consultations are essential to achieve a proper balance in the Constitution. The Calgary declaration proposes ways to rebalance the sharing of powers and responsibilities.

Of the seven principles found in the declaration, three—Nos. 1, 2 and 6—underline the equality of all citizens and of the provinces. The Reform Party is especially committed to this principle of equality. The first principle ensures that the equal rights and the freedoms enjoyed by all Canadians under the charter of rights and freedoms are recognized as the basis for any constitutional negotiation.

The second principle puts forth an idea that is not new, but that has been neglected in constitutional negotiations over the last 15 years, and that is that all provinces are equal. Canadians have reiterated in all consultations that the provinces are equal and that none is entitled to special constitutional status.

This is stated again clearly in the sixth principle, where it is said that “if any future constitutional amendment confers powers on one province, these powers must be available to all provinces”. Any constitutional amendment that provides more powers to the provinces must do so in a way that benefits equally all the provinces.

This equality is one of the things that unites us as Canadians. The provinces may be equal, but that does not mean that they are all the same or identical.

That is why the declaration contains principles that recognize the diversity of Canada, the differences that make it a great country. Principles Nos. 3, 4 and 5 state the unique character of Canadian society, including its “diversity, tolerance, compassion and equality of opportunity” that allow it to be without rival in the world.

Respect for diversity and equality forms the basis of Canadian unity. The unique character of Quebec society, including its French speaking majority, its culture and its tradition of civil law is a fundamental element of the fabric of Canadian society.

The declaration avoids the basic errors of the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords, which included special treatment for a province or a people. Canadians are opposed to the idea of incorporating in the Constitution a justiciable “distinct society” clause or any other phrase that would contribute mostly to divide instead of uniting the country by giving a province special status or greater powers. The declaration emphasizes the importance of diversity within the framework of equality of status between the provinces, and, in doing so, it offers a clear departure from constitutional phraseologies that have failed in the past.

### *Supply*

This principle defines a framework within which the federal government and the provinces can co-operate to find a new balance for the Confederation by excluding the federal government from exclusively provincial jurisdictions.

The Reform Party has been calling for a long time for a better balance within the Canadian federation between the federal government, the provinces and the population itself. Our party has developed 20 proposals to strengthen the Canadian union. Most of them can be implemented without going through lengthy federal-provincial negotiations or without having to amend the Constitution.

• (1540)

They are calling upon the federal government to withdraw from areas of jurisdiction which are more suited to the provinces and they are calling for the reform of federal institutions like the Senate, the supreme court and the Bank of Canada.

[*English*]

There is a critical role for the federal government in jurisdictions of national and international importance, including defence, foreign affairs, monetary policy, regulation of financial institutions, the development of national standards through interprovincial co-operation and in the areas of criminal law and reform of the criminal justice system.

[*Translation*]

But the federal government ought no longer to have the option of meddling in areas which are the exclusive purview of the provinces. The services and powers of this government must be decentralized so that the government in the best position to serve the population will be the one responsible. The costs and the inefficiencies caused by jurisdictional overlap between the federal government and the provinces is what lies behind most of the frictions threatening national unity.

The Reform Party recommends that the federal government refrain from intervening in areas such as natural resources, manpower training, social services, language, culture, municipal affairs, housing, tourism, sports and recreation. The provinces are in a better position to meet Canadians' needs in these areas.

[*English*]

The federal government should be prevented from using its spending power to intervene in provincial jurisdiction. The federal cash block grants to the provinces should be replaced with tax points at a fixed percentage of federal tax revenue whose value would increase as the province's economy grows to allow each province to enhance social security of its citizens.

*Supply*

Parliament should also pass an amendment unilaterally to the Constitution forbidding future deficit spending and massive increases in spending without approval through a referendum.

Lastly, a constitutional amendment should be passed to abolish the federal government's ability to disallow and reserve provincial legislation and to legislate under the declaratory power in areas of such jurisdiction.

We also believe very strongly there is need for further reform of federal institutions, particularly in western Canada with a growing economy and population. We find institutions like the Senate and the supreme court, the Bank of Canada and the appointment of lieutenant governors increasingly anachronisms that do not represent the growing parts of this country.

We must reform those institutions, among other things, through an elected, equal and effective Senate. Supreme court appointees should be nominated by the provinces, as should directors of the Bank of Canada and lieutenant governors.

Finally, we also believe that any future changes to the Constitution ought to be approved by the people in a referendum first.

[*Translation*]

The renewal of the Canadian federation of necessity involves the reform of federal institutions. We have good reason to believe that Quebecers do not share their leaders' obsession with symbolic gestures. They are demanding significant changes. The citizens of Quebec agree with westerners that the federation must be re-balanced and that real changes must be made. Quebecers and westerners have a great deal in common.

Quebeckers and westerners acknowledge that the federal government is interfering in areas exclusively under provincial jurisdiction by imposing national standards and by using its spending power not as an encouragement but more often as a way of ensuring that the provinces comply with its wishes.

Quebeckers and westerners agree that the provinces are in a better position to govern in areas such as culture, language, manpower, social services, housing, tourism and a good many others.

Quebeckers and westerners agree that the federal government must give up certain powers and give more power to the regions.

There is only one point which Quebecers and westerners do not have in common. Quebecers have been excluded by their government from the process of drafting the Calgary declaration.

• (1545)

Their government denied them the opportunity of working with Canadians to build a better Canada. Quebecers must have a voice. They must be part of this popular initiative, working equally with

Canadians in a positive, creative and constructive effort to build a new Canada that they will be an integral part of.

Quebeckers know all too well the outcome of the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords. Both failed miserably because of a secret process. Quebecers and other Canadians were not really consulted. The two accords were produced by the great decision makers, without real consultation or prior agreement.

[*English*]

We have therefore called on the federal government to take responsibility for what the separatist government has refused to do, namely to involve Quebecers in the Calgary process. But nine weeks have passed since the Calgary declaration and still the federal government has done nothing to seek input from Quebecers on the process. How much longer must we wait? Most other provinces have begun to complete their consultations, yet Quebecers have been locked out and not told honestly what the declaration says to them.

[*Translation*]

As for us in the Reform Party, we cannot be satisfied with the Liberal government's inertia. We will therefore take the initiative in Quebec to show Quebecers that, despite the stereotypes of the Reform Party perpetuated by the Quebec elite, we believe passionately in a Canada that includes Quebec. We believe in a strong and flexible Confederation comprising ten provinces and in which all Canadians can achieve their goals.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the member's comments. There are many items that we could discuss, but I want to raise with him the specific issue about the proposal to convert cash transfers to tax points.

The member will well know that under the former system of CAP, cash transfers were made for health, post-secondary education and welfare. He will also know that the cash was running out in a couple of these areas which would mean that the government would have absolutely no recourse in terms of enforcing any national standards that may be in place. As a result the government converted the former CAP program to the CHST, the Canada health and social transfer, so that there is sufficient cash in the umbrella of the full transfer so that our standards for instance under the five principles of the National Health Act can be enforced as well as other standards with regard to welfare.

The fact is that the cash element of the transfers between cash and tax points is critical to the national governance, to the federal government's ability to enforce national standards. I wonder if the member would care to explain to the House what mechanism the

*Supply*

federal government has available to it to enforce national standards when provinces like Alberta decide to privatize health care.

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, the whole point of a large part of my speech and the platform of the Reform Party with respect to reforming the federation is that we are talking about areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. In their wisdom the Fathers of Confederation assigned certain areas, such as health care, education and welfare as areas best managed by those governments closest to the people. It is called the principle of subsidiarity and it makes a lot of sense.

That is precisely why we propose providing the provinces the flexibility they need to deliver those programs in a way that suits their citizens and not the bureaucrats and politicians here in far distant Ottawa.

• (1550)

The conversion of cash transfers to tax points qualified by national standards agreed upon co-operatively by the provinces would ensure a national network of social programs administered by the provinces but for all Canadians. Let us trust people locally. It does not take bureaucrats and politicians in this town to deliver programs. The provinces can do it for their own citizens very well thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, first, on behalf of my colleagues who are present, I would like to congratulate the member for Calgary Southeast on the quality of his French. We are always grateful in hearing our Reform colleagues speaking French for their open-mindedness in doing so, and we will say this as often as need be.

However, this does not preclude our disagreeing fundamentally with the Reform Party's view of the future of Canada and the future of Quebec within it.

I have two questions for the member for Calgary Southeast. The first is fairly simple. Does the Reform Party agree with the content of the Calgary declaration? Second, does the party the member represents in the House wish the declaration changed to include reference to the Senate and Senate reform?

[*English*]

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for those two very thoughtful questions. I know my French is far from perfect but I promise to continue working on it. I think we all have an obligation to do that as a symbol of our mutual affection for this country.

To the first question, the Reform Party does not formally have a position on the content of the Calgary declaration because we only take positions formally as a party in our assemblies. Our next one will not be held until next June. In the meantime, our leader and our unity critics have commented positively on aspects of the Calgary declaration emphasizing their support for the process of consulta-

tion launched therein. In my speech I personally spoke in favour of all of the elements outlined in the Calgary declaration.

Do we want to see it amended to include institutional reform? I would like to see some inclusion in the Calgary declaration at least a recognition of the need to reform federal institutions to make them more reflective of the new reality of democracy in Canada, the emerging west and the shift in population. However, it is a very tricky balance because as we know the Calgary declaration is not a constitutional vehicle and some would argue that measures like Senate reform do require multilateral agreement on an amendment to the Constitution.

At the very least there ought to be a parallel track of Senate reform, reform with respect to other federal institutions parallel to the Calgary declaration. However, if we can find a way to include it in the declaration so that all Canadians feel that their legitimate aspirations are being represented, I would find that very satisfactory.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We have two more questions. We have a very short time so I would ask that you keep the comments very brief.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Calgary Southeast for delivering most of his speech in French. He did it, I believe, because our friends in the Bloc Québécois do not know there are francophones outside Quebec. I have a short question for the member for Calgary Southeast.

[*English*]

The member suggested that he had an interest in certainly upholding the notion of the principle of equality. I am interested in hearing his definition of equality. Does he refer to equality as equal treatment, equal powers, equal opportunities for each of the provinces?

• (1555)

Because we have very little time, perhaps I could throw into that other question the question of consultation. If the tables were reversed and Alberta for instance had this kind of difficulty, would the member support the federal government getting involved directly with the people of Alberta on an issue that may not necessarily meet with the accord of its provincial government?

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, on the first question, I dwelt at some length in my remarks on what we would consider the equality of provinces. It would be a constitutional framework wherein any powers available to one province would be available to all provinces. We recognize that in the founding of the country this was not necessarily the case. However we believe that in a modern confederation it is appropriate that any new powers made available to one province be made available to them all and that no province be

*Supply*

given any special status or rights, or for that matter obligations in the constitution.

With respect to the second question, it is a hypothetical question which is really not relevant. Albertans are federalists. They believe strongly in Canada. Even though they have sometimes been slapped around by Ottawa, and at times have been treated in a not very pleasant way, Albertans have remained loyal to this country, fortunately. I believe they will continue to remain loyal. The provincial government in Alberta has been committed to the consultation process. I cannot imagine the circumstance.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to congratulate my colleague for speaking French so well, but I would like to remind him that words do not matter any longer, we want action now.

For the past 30, 40 years I have heard fine words: equality, independence, fraternity. That is not what we want. That is just fine for Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Ontario, Vancouver, etc. But that is not what we in Quebec want. We want to be recognized as a people.

We do not want unique society status. We do not want distinct society status. That is not what we want. I am asking my colleague, who is very open-minded, if he is able to recognize us simply as a people, as a founding nation and as a modern people.

[English]

**Mr. Jason Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, we believe that a modern constitution of a modern, liberal, pluralistic democracy does not have a place for ethnic divisions or divisions predicated on nationality, bloodlines or creed. We believe that our Constitution ought to be colour blind, it ought to be blind with respect to race and ethnicity and it ought to incorporate all Canadians within the framework of the provinces.

My response to the member, and I will close with this, is we are suggesting that provinces should have jurisdiction over matters of culture and language so that the francophone majority in Quebec can protect those institutions which are so important to it. We are allies of reasonable Quebec nationalists on that point. I wish the member would open his ears to that.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to split my time with the member for Simcoe North, the parliamentary secretary to the minister.

[Translation]

Regarding the member for Edmonton—Strathcona's motion, I would like to make three points. First, the failure of Meech Lake has left bad scars in Quebec.

The second point is that all surveys show that, if asked a clear question, a vast majority of Quebecers will answer they want to stay in Canada.

The third point is that in spite of all the tricks and mirages used in conjuring up an imaginary partnership as a viable option for Quebec, in spite of all these tricks and the vague questions in two referendums, the majority of Quebecers chose to stay in Canada.

To this we must add another reality. The majority of Canadians outside Quebec definitely want Quebec to remain a vibrant, active and very significant part of Canada.

• (1600)

Outside this majority of people across Canada, and certainly in Quebec, who, provided the option and the question are clear, hope that Canada's destiny will include Quebec, and that Quebec's destiny and that of the rest of the country will complement and strengthen each other, there are two small dissenting groups.

One is the Quebec independentists who want their province to separate at all costs. Regardless of what we could offer, say or do, these people will never accept the idea of a Canadian federation. With them, it is like talking to the deaf. Whatever we say or do, they will never accept it, because they want Quebec to separate from Canada. We have to face this reality and accept it, because it is the option proposed by the Parti Québécois in Quebec and by the Bloc Québécois here.

Similarly, there is another small minority in Canada that will never accept any concession to Quebec and oppose any reasonable and fair arrangement making it possible to include Quebec in the Canadian Constitution.

But there is also a vast majority of Canadians, including Quebecers, who would like to find a fair, reasonable and deliberately made arrangement that would get Quebec to join the Constitution of 1982. In light of this, I think the Reform Party's motion—given its wording and its sober and conciliatory tone—represents a step in the right direction. It is positive and proactive.

However, we would have to be very careful in asking Quebec to urgently hold consultations on the Calgary declaration. It is too soon yet to hold such consultations in Quebec. Let us not forget past failures. We must avoid making the mistakes that were made during Meech and Charlottetown.

The process has only just begun. We must first create a synergy in the rest of Canada and have the provinces, other than Quebec, fully endorse the Calgary declaration, after consulting with their citizens. Then they will be able to tell Quebec "We are now unanimously prepared to accept your fair and clear claims".

[English]

I think we should use the utmost caution and whatever time is necessary before we consult with Quebecers. We must prepare ourselves properly to make sure that we do not repeat Meech Lake and Charlottetown.

I happen to agree fundamentally with the member for Winnipeg Transcona regarding the essential inclusion of our First Nations so that early in the negotiations they should feel they are a real part of the process.

Indeed and ironically, there is a striking correlation between the feeling of First Nations and the feeling of many Quebecers which I share. Just as we tend to ignore our First Nations, in the processes that have taken place before, maybe not enough time and patience was given to listen to the fair demands of Quebec to join the constitution.

[Translation]

Beyond the written documents, the spoken words and the constitutional provisions, there is above all the attitude, the friendliness and the openness to what the other person is saying. There is also the deliberate and genuine desire to show that the other party is not only accepted but welcome as a wanted and needed partner.

If Meech and its aftermath left some scars in Quebec, and it is undeniable, it was not because of the texts and not because of constitutional provisions, which were quite reasonable in my opinion; it was because many Quebecers were left with the feeling that the rest of Canada had closed the door in their faces.

• (1605)

Therefore, the resolution before us must be construed as the will to go forward. It is a positive, proactive measure which goes beyond partisanship. I see it as a positive gesture on the part of a Reform member who, through his attitude, his behaviour and his determination, stepped away from the traditional, rigid position of the Reform Party on these issues. That party is the same one that generated some negative publicity for Quebec's political leaders during the federal election campaign, that voted collectively against distinct society in this House and that would very much like to abolish the Official Languages Act.

At the same time, I think that the motion put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton—Strathcona must be seen as a step in the right direction; it is a positive and proactive resolution that I will support. Therefore, I thank the member for putting it forward.

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I praise the openmindedness of my colleague who was elected to the Quebec National Assembly and who saw the Meech Lake accord die. We were not able to have the Meech Lake accord agreed to,

*Supply*

with five very acceptable conditions that were even more reasonable than what could have been expected from Quebec. Quebecers wanted much more because they want a country.

But even then there was, I would say, a small window of opportunity, and you know how it was rejected. It truly hurts. I do not know what to call this when we see the people who came to tell Quebecers they love them just before the referendum and when we know that these are the same people who rejected the Meech Lake accord. It is nothing but a joke.

My very experienced colleague says everything would be all right if only we could be recognized. But even the Meech Lake accord, as I said earlier, was not acceptable to Quebecers. So how can they accept this unique society concept today, in 1997?

I would like my colleague to explain to me how Quebecers could accept this unique society concept when nobody can say what it means. We first had the distinct society concept, and it means more to me than the word unique because we know everybody is unique. In my opinion, this unique society concept does not mean a thing. I would like my colleague to explain to me how he could convince my colleagues and my constituents in Matapédia—Matane to accept this concept.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln:** Mr. Speaker, I think one has a choice between two positions. One can think that things are set in stone, that they can never change. I personally voted in favour of the Meech Lake accord. Ironically, the Parti Québécois voted against it. And today they complain about the failure of the Meech Lake accord, but it is those same people from the Parti Québécois, the independentists, who were opposed to the Meech Lake accord, every bit as much as Mr. Wells and all those who voted against it.

• (1610)

So, it is a fact that we need to acknowledge, and one cannot say that Meech was rejected by all Canadians. The premier and the people of Ontario vigorously supported Meech, as well as the people of British Columbia and Alberta. At the end of the day, only one province was responsible for Meech going under.

Many Canadians considered Meech a positive initiative, but we failed. There are two ways to react to this failure: since we failed, should we close the book? Should we say that Canada cannot go on, because the Meech Lake and the Charlottetown agreements failed? Of course not. We have to work harder and realize that shifts in position are possible, even in the Reform Party, since one of its members has brought forward today a resolution that might not have been accepted before by his party, which is now taking a new position. Like some of his colleagues have come to realize, we need to take new positions. We have to try to find out what brings us together instead of always looking for what drives us apart and could divide us forever.

*Supply*

Here, today, we have a new openness. We hope that the Calgary declaration can bring us together so that we can explain what the unique character of Quebec means and accept it for what it really means so that Quebec can feel welcome within our Constitution. Maybe we can find the kind of openness that has eluded us up until now. This is why we need to work as hard as we can to encourage such positions.

I hope that the Bloc Québécois will see this as a sign of openness, unless the Bloc members maintain that it is impossible for us to work together. I for one believe that we can work together.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure today that I join in this debate on the motion proposed by the Reform Party. I appreciate the non-partisan spirit in which this motion has been put forward. Certainly I encourage all federalist members of the House to support the motion.

I believe the Calgary declaration goes in the right direction. It is a provincial initiative which nine premiers and two territorial leaders have set out. It is a declaration of principles which I think all Canadians who are interested in the country thriving, growing and remaining united should be prepared to support.

[*Translation*]

There are two major principles in the Calgary declaration that I would like to mention: the first one is the recognition of Quebec's specificity, and the second is the equality of the provinces.

During the 1995 referendum campaign, the Prime Minister made several commitments. Following these commitments, the House of Commons passed a resolution on the recognition of Quebec's specificity, distinct society. Unfortunately, the federal government cannot adopt alone amendments to the Constitution; this requires the participation of the provinces.

To provide for this, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs travelled to all provinces to discuss this issue with the premiers and his counterparts in all the provinces to determine whether amendments could be made to the Constitution so that it would include recognition of Quebec's specificity.

We are pleased to see in the Calgary declaration that the nine premiers and the two territorial leaders are in the process of taking a step forward by determining whether there can be such a recognition. The wording is not the same. The declaration talks about the unique character of Quebec society instead of distinct society, but it is nevertheless the specificity of Quebec that is being described.

• (1615)

As for the equality of the provinces, we have always argued that it is possible to recognize the specificity of Quebec while respecting the equality of the provinces. Equality does not mean sameness. I have three children and I always try to treat them equally, but not always in the same way. They all have their own needs and at times I treat them differently.

[*English*]

Consultations with Canadians are not an invention of the Reform Party. I heard during the debate this morning, when the debate was slipping a bit from its non-partisan nature or intention on behalf of some of the parties, that the grassroots movement was something the Reform Party was promoting.

At the request of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs I have been travelling through practically every province in Canada since my appointment as his parliamentary secretary. I have been meeting with Canadians in all regions of the country at the grassroots level. These Canadians organized themselves into unity groups to try to become engaged in the debate on the future of Canada. A lot of them reached that point by being frustrated with the constitutional wrangling that had been going on up until the Charlottetown accord failed.

These groups of Canadians, grassroots organizations, were very supportive of the fact that their Canada contains a province that is different by reason of its majority language, its institutions and its culture. They are very willing to support and recognize that, so long as it is very clear the recognition does not result in any special rights, powers or privileges granted to any province. In other words, the equality of provinces is respected.

This is essentially what the Calgary accord is speaking about. I am confident from my travels and reports that I have made to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that there is broad support in all regions of the country for recognition of Quebec's differences so long as the equality of provinces is respected.

That is not very different from what exists already. I make reference to a retired chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Mr. Chief Justice Brian Dickson, who said at the present time, prior to any constitutional amendments for the recognition of Quebec, that Quebec's difference is already taken into account by the Supreme Court of Canada when it is interpreting grey areas of the constitution. A whole list of things are taken into account, but the difference of Quebec by reason of its language, culture and institutions is taken into account at the present time.

What is now a constitutional convention, if there is willingness among the provinces and the federal government, could be made a constitutional provision which we hope would give assurances to people in Quebec concerned about their language and culture that within the Canadian federation there is a place for that recognition

and that the other provinces in the Canadian federation are prepared to support them in the maintenance of that position.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Today's motion also requires that the Government of Canada go to Quebec to consult Quebeckers on the Calgary declaration. This is an issue on which the Prime Minister has already spoken and he has said that there is a possibility for such consultations.

I would like to point out also that there are some 30 federal members from Quebec in this House already working on this, returning to their ridings every weekend, and every week when the House is not sitting, and discussing with Quebeckers the Calgary declaration and all other issues that concern Canada and the Constitution.

[*English*]

I hope all members of the House will be able to rise above partisan politics and find a way to support the motion.

[*Translation*]

I can understand that the Bloc Québécois is against this motion, but I ask all members in this House who are federalists to support this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find all-party consent for two motions. If I could present them now, I would be grateful. The first motion concerns the business of the House for tomorrow.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:**

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order, at the time of adjournment on Wednesday, November 26, 1997, there shall be no proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38, but, at that time, a motion to adjourn shall be deemed to have been proposed and the said motion shall be debatable, that during the said debate no member except for the first spokesperson for each party, the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition shall speak for more than ten minutes, with a five minute question and comment period, and that during the said debate no dilatory motion or quorum call

### Supply

shall be received, and that, when no Member rises to speak, the motion shall be deemed to have been adopted.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Does the hon. member have unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

• (1625)

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES, SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS AND LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that my second motion has all-party agreement. I move:

That the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations and the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament, be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Does the parliamentary secretary have unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### SUPPLY

OPPOSITION DAY—THE CALGARY DECLARATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion; and of the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Resuming the question and comment period with the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the parliamentary secretary defend two of the

*Supply*

principles in the Calgary declaration. I cannot help thinking that many Quebecers have already noticed that the notion of distinct society has lost its value after being ruled out through the rejection of the Meech Lake accord by Canadian public opinion, contrary to the claim of the member for Lac-Saint-Louis, who wanted to assign blame for the rejection of the accord to a number of individuals and institutions.

The notion was also rejected by Quebecers and Canadians in their refusal to permit the government to amend the Constitution according to the provisions of the Charlottetown accord.

The notion of distinct society is therefore of little interest now, and it is to be replaced with a notion even less interesting in terms of its content and scope, because it will not be included in the Constitution and given interpretive effect.

I really doubt therefore that Quebecers will accept this notion of unique character, especially since it is not accompanied by a reform in the distribution of powers as Quebecers wanted. Recognizing Quebec only symbolically as a distinct society or a society with a unique character will never satisfy the longstanding claim.

• (1630)

I would therefore ask the parliamentary secretary whether, in his opinion, it is not necessary now to propose a major reform of the distribution of powers for constitutional reform to satisfy Quebecers.

**Mr. Paul DeVillers:** Mr. Speaker, it must be emphasized that as soon as the Liberal government took office in 1993, it started working to renew the federation. There are many examples in the area of manpower and a number of other social programs where we have worked to renew the federation to meet the needs not only of the Province of Quebec but also of the other provinces that felt that federal and provincial areas of responsibility had to be reviewed.

In today's debate, there were some members, even on this side, who criticized the government because it has gone too far. They feel that there has already been enough decentralization in this federation, but I am sure we will be continuing our efforts, because it is always possible to reach an understanding. There will be another premiers conference in December which will deal with the issue of youth employment and other important issues for the provinces and the federal government.

I agree with the member that efforts have to be made to ensure that the Constitution and the sharing of responsibilities will meet the needs of all the regions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Louis-Hébert, International trade; the hon. member for

Fundy—Royal, Search and Rescue Operations; the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton, Privacy.

[English]

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Yellowhead.

The importance of today's motion on national unity is like no other. As this country approaches the beginning of a new millennium, we are increasingly being faced with growing concerns of global proportions, and now more than ever Canada is being asked to play a leadership role in many international organizations and treaties.

From our peacekeeping missions to banning land mines, Canadians have often been hailed for showing leadership. Just yesterday in the House we showed how this country can work together when we dealt with the land mines issue. There was unity within this House.

All these great accomplishments will lose their significance if we are unable to keep this country united. The world has often looked to Canadians for help in restoring peace to troubled nations. But we will be risking this international profile if we cannot manage to put an end to divisive thinking and begin reshaping our federation with one goal in mind, national unity from coast to coast to coast.

Since the signing of Confederation the dynamics of our federation have been tried and tested many times. Our system of federalism has served us well over the last 100 years. However, dynamics change over time and, like the old family car that has safely carried us on many long cross-Canada trips, an overhaul is needed. Keep in mind that the body of this old car is classic and irreplaceable. We have been emotionally attached to it but it is unable in its present condition to get us where we need to go.

Long overdue is the time for tune-ups. In fact, we know we were wrong to not fine tune the old jalopy on a regular basis and now we are faced with two choices. We can put it out to pasture and watch it rust or we can rebuild the framework, overhaul the system to get it running smoother and better than ever.

Last September nine provincial premiers and two territorial leaders started rebuilding the framework of that irreplaceable classic. The work of the provincial premiers is a good first step toward real progress on national unity.

Meech Lake and Charlottetown rejected equality of citizens and provinces and did not solicit the genuine input of grassroots Canadians.

• (1635)

The Calgary declaration, on the other hand, puts the equality of citizens and provinces and the need to engage Canadians in national dialogue front and centre. The Calgary declaration is not

carved in stone but rather is open to changes that may emerge from extensive consultation.

In the past the differences between the provinces and the people have been magnified and we have forgotten some very crucial similarities. For example, regardless of culture and language we all want the best for our children. We all want them to grow up in a country free of political division.

It is a shame that the separatists in Quebec are trying to keep Quebeckers from participating in this meaningful consultation process. This is a great disservice to our fellow Canadians in Quebec. Their input is vital to the process and we want to hear what Quebeckers have to say as we begin this renewal of federalism.

Obvious is the reason the separatist Government of Quebec has chosen not to participate. Any constructive means to solve our unity disputes would douse the fire of separatism, leaving the separatists without a mandate.

Now is the time for Canadians to reach out to one another and embrace our diversity. Unique, yes. Distinct, yes. Equal, yes. We have always accepted that Quebec is unique. However, we believe that all provinces are unique in their own right. We favour a rebalancing of federal-provincial powers to ensure that each province is allowed to nourish its distinctiveness while the federal government's powers are strengthened in the areas of national concern.

In the past politicians have shortchanged Quebeckers with one word phrases in an attempt to appease their dissatisfaction with the federation. Why not give them the tools they require to strengthen their culture? The only stipulation we request is that those same tools be made available to all provinces to use in areas that matter most to them.

Let me emphasize that granting provinces more control over the development of their distinctiveness and the concept of equality are not on opposite ends of the spectrum. In the process of rebuilding the federation, just as the old classic family car needs an overhaul, a realignment of powers of the federal and provincial governments is needed. Instead of focusing on purely symbolic one word phrases which politicians time and again refuse to accurately define, we should focus on presenting provinces with the tools needed to develop that which makes them unique.

The concept of equality does not mean that everyone is the same. At the risk of oversimplifying the situation let me use another analogy. In a classroom if a teacher hands out identical boxes of supplies to each student and tells them they are to make a project using those supplies, it stands to reason that no two projects will be identical. The creative processes vary from student to student as each places different importance on how to use the supplies based on each student's vision of what their project will encompass.

### *Supply*

In the federation equal does not necessitate identical. It would be unrealistic to expect the provinces to exercise their powers uniformly. Rather, the provinces will have equal powers to try what is best suited for their traditions, their character, their education, social services, and the list goes on, all the while keeping in mind adherence to national standards guidelines. Canadians need to feel free to come forward and offer solutions and ideas on how to improve the federation and how their province should diversify and nurture its distinctiveness.

It would be wise for all levels of government to view the separatist movement in Quebec as a wake-up call to improve our federal system. In the spirit of co-operation that was demonstrated in the Calgary declaration, respecting differences and allowing provinces more power to develop their unique societies will foster unity in this country.

Earlier today a member of the Bloc stated that western Canada could not handle Quebec's distinctiveness. I encourage the member of the Bloc to listen to what we are saying. We are well aware that the Bloc and the Parti Quebecois are determined to undermine any national unity plan because that would put an end to their singularly divisive political agenda. I encourage that member of the Bloc to visit our province. He will be pleasantly surprised to find out that we embrace our differences. Perhaps he might like to visit some of our francophone communities.

In my constituency of Lethbridge our school system has a very strong French immersion program. It began in 1975 and continues to teach children the beauty of distinctiveness, distinctive culture and the value of learning new languages, including French.

I recently received a letter from the mayor of Lethbridge regarding a set of resolutions formed by the city council of Lethbridge on the issue of the possibility of Quebec's seceding from the federation. The Lethbridge municipal council has taken an interest in this issue because its sister city is Saint-Laurent, Quebec.

• (1640)

The positive relationship between Lethbridge and Saint Laurent has steadily grown over the years, highlighted by youth, cultural and linguistic exchange programs. As we face the possibility of yet another referendum it is now more significant than ever to reach out to our respective sister cities and remind our fellow Canadians how much we cherish their friendships and the friendships that have developed from these exchanges.

With most of this discussion of separatism focusing on our differences it is imperative that we regain perspective and remember how much we share in common.

*Supply*

The responsibility of conveying this commonality must also be shared by federal, provincial and municipal representatives as well as with individual Canadians who wish to help keep this great country united.

I commend the city council of Lethbridge for presenting such positive resolutions and for acting to help its fellow Canadians in Quebec who wish only for improvements to the federation and not for separation.

In a recent poll in my constituency over 80% of respondents believe that making federal institutions more accountable is the best route to solving Canadian national unity problems. Nearly two-thirds who responded agreed that realigning more powers to the provinces, precisely what Quebec has long asked for, is the key to keeping this country together.

I feel strongly that if we persevere to keep Canada united we will indeed enter the 21st century with new found confidence and prosperity.

I urge all Canadians to contact their municipal, provincial and federal representatives and to continue communicating with our sisters and brothers in Quebec. Let us keep our Canadian family together once and for all.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to our colleague speak about the Calgary declaration. I would simply like to remind him of several points. First of all, the sovereignty of Quebec, once again, is not a problem, it is a solution. I would just like to inform him that Quebec as such is not a province like the other provinces and that it will never be like the other provinces. The Province of Quebec is the cradle of this great Canada. The development of this great Canada did not begin in the west and move east, but began in the east and moved west.

The hon. member says that we are all people who are identical and the same, but there are differences. I would like to point out to him that the difference is greater between Quebecers and anglophones in other provinces than between anglophones in Canada and Americans. Therefore if, according to him, we are all the same and we should all be in the same boat and be identical, I would like him to tell us whether he would prefer that Canada simply join the United States. Why would he not agree that Canada should simply join the United States? Because Canadians are different from Americans, because Canadians want to keep their culture.

If he considers it is good that Canada does not join the United States, why not allow what would be a good thing for us, Quebecers, that is to be who we are and what we want to become?

[English]

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

I think that is what we are trying to get across here. It is that we are not all the same. Every province has its own uniqueness. We are saying that we would like to give the provinces the powers to develop those differences and that uniqueness while staying in Canada.

As the hon. member said, I certainly would not support any move for Canada to join the United States. That is a poor analogy.

We are saying that we are different. Let us give the provinces the power and ability to enhance those differences while staying in Canada.

**Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with intent to the member's speech. I thought he gave a very good speech. Sometimes we do not have the opportunity to praise each other in this House. Perhaps we should do that more often. It is interesting that of all his colleagues, he is one of the few whom I have actually heard defend the concept of having national standards in this country.

• (1645)

I think that sometimes we get involved in the issue of devolution and do not look at what is behind it. Presumably the theory is that the closer the government is to the people, the better the administrative services. Does the hon. member for Lethbridge feel that programs administered out of Edmonton would be superior to a local CEC office in Lethbridge which would deal directly with the people?

I wonder if the hon. member could think of things which are under provincial jurisdiction which would be better handled on a national basis.

I visited a softwood lumber forestry operation in British Columbia which was very close to the Alberta border. I was surprised how every province in this country competed against each other. The net result was that the Americans were able to plot province against province to create a quota system. In fact, what we should have been doing was talking with one voice in international trade.

I wonder if the hon. member could comment on some of those items.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, I will tell the member that my background is in municipal politics. I came through that route to this House. That level of government is closest to the people. We are with them every day. We are not removed from them.

I have always had the feeling that the government which is closest to the people should be the government to deal with them. The government that is most able to deliver whatever service it is, whether it be a social service or a matter having to do with interprovincial trade, should be the government to handle it. I agree with the member that barriers to interprovincial trade is another debate entirely.

*Supply*

There should be a strong central government in Canada to handle national issues, such as defence. However, services should be moved down the line into the provincial realm and even into the municipal realm.

We have municipal councils and governments in this country which can handle a lot of the services which are required. They know the people, they—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I am sorry, but the hon. member's time has expired.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake.

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I was not slated to speak, but I would like to say a few words about this unity issue.

I fully support the motion.

In the riding of Selkirk—Interlake, we have a very significant number of French-speaking people. Manitoba has traditionally had a large French-speaking population and we have always supported national unity.

I guess there are no provisions for me to allow the alternate speaker to speak.

I would like to take this opportunity to give the House an example of what has gone wrong in the unity debate over the years and get back to the idea that consultation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Excuse me. With unanimous consent, any hon. member can yield to any other hon. member. If the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake wishes to sit down and yield the remainder of his time to another hon. member, that can be arranged with unanimous consent.

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask for that because I have made the point that I fully support this motion and I will certainly share my time with my hon. colleague.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Does the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** On debate, the hon. member for Yellowhead.

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Manitoba for giving up some of his time so that I could speak.

I am pleased to speak on the issue of this whole business of uniting our country.

• (1650)

I am greatly perplexed and disappointed that after 30 years of all kinds of wrangling, this whole business has not yet been resolved. Actually, I am not surprised that an agreement to our national

dilemma has evaded us. Hopefully this will become evident in my comments.

After all this time, energy, money spent and lost opportunities, where are we in our national debate? Where are we in our national discourse on the Quebec separation issue? After all these talks, where are the results? After three decades have our discussions led to new goals and a new vision for our country? Have we as Canadians developed a sense of patriotism toward our homeland? The questions beg the answers.

Indeed, our country certainly seems to be in a quandary. For almost two generations our country has been adrift like a rudderless vessel on a stormy sea, tossed hither and yon by the forces of deceit, dishonesty, deception and destruction and all the time undergirded by the contradictions of apathy and appeasement and all the time bringing our nation closer to the brink of disaster where the very fibre of our country is being stretched to the breaking point.

Through all these years what really has the fuss been all about? What has been that elusive thing that seems to be beyond our reach and our grasp? Has the 30-plus years of a one-sided debate centred around the issue of equality, the equality of provinces or the equality of citizens? Has the debate been centred on the devolution of federal powers? Has the ongoing debate been about the building of a new Canada? Or, has this long, drawn out debate, unbalanced I may add, centred around the rebuilding of Canada based on the two founding nations concept and its ill-conceived child, a distinct society?

Is that what the debate has been about? It certainly seems to me that that is precisely what the debate has been about for about 30 years. Debate has been about the notion of two founding nations, two societies based on language and culture, on French and English, on making one language and culture in Quebec, on making Quebec a distinct society.

It should be no surprise, based on these concepts, the concepts of two societies and a distinct society for one of them, that the whole notion was doomed to a dismal failure. The focus has been misguided and the mark was missed completely.

The outcome of the two nations concept was predicted 35 years ago by a former Alberta premier when he stated "You talk about this two nations idea long enough and that is probably what you will end up with". Just look around. Some would say that is pretty much where we are today.

The two nations concept and its manifestation, distinct society, produced the idea that confederation was to serve the ends of two language groups, French and English. If we follow that kind of reasoning to its logical conclusion, what do we come up with? It would mean that Canada would not really be a federation of 10 equal provinces at all but consist instead of two societies, one being a distinct society, Quebec, and the other nine provinces combined to be the other society.

*Supply*

The spokespeople for the old line federal parties argue that to put such a clause in the constitution would be to merely recognize the sociological fact that Quebec is the homeland of the French language and culture and that Quebec has its civil code which is of course distinct from the English common law. No one can dispute these sociological facts. They are there for everyone to see, but that is largely irrelevant. It is irrelevant to the debate on whether this kind of clause ought to be in the constitution.

• (1655)

The problem arises when describing these sociological facts, civil code, French language and culture, denominational schools, with a broad brush definition like distinct society and to put these words in the constitution.

This is the nub of it. If we put Quebec as a distinct society in the constitution, we are then asking the courts to give those words meaning. There is no constitutional basis or constitutional history to give support and credibility to the concepts of two founding nations and distinct society. No Fathers of Confederation, not even the French speaking Fathers of Confederation, said anything of two nations and distinct society. They talked very little of language as well.

There is no ringing declaration in the BNA Act that Canada wants to be a bilingual and bicultural country. Nothing in the Constitution of 1867 suggests bilingualism or biculturalism. There is one important section in that act on language. It is section 133 which states that English and French may be spoken in the House of Commons and in the courts established by the Government of Canada, in other words the Supreme Court and the federal courts, and that the two languages may be used in the National Assembly in Quebec. Subsequent language and cultural laws came much later under the hand of Mr. Trudeau, with little constitutional basis for it until provided for in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982.

Entrenching distinct society in the constitution for Quebec would encourage provincial governments and that province to carve out more jurisdictional areas unavailable to other provinces. For example, Quebec could establish its own radio and television commission.

The great constitutional expert Eugene Forsey wrote that Quebec could assume powers in banking, copyright, patents, railways, citizenship, criminal law, foreign affairs, plus others possibly, if the distinct society clause would be entrenched in the constitution. Legislation will be passed and when challenged by the courts, Quebec will argue "This is a necessary ingredient for us. We must have that because we are a distinct society". Quebec marches onwards toward separation a phenomena dubbed as incremental separatism.

There is a much better resolution to this issue of unity. It will ensure that legitimate constitutional aspirations of Quebec are met.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Your time has expired.

The hon. member for Mississauga South.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in looking at the motion and listening to the member, I think it is clear that the debate which has gone on, particularly by Reform members, has shown their true lack of understanding of Quebec and Canada.

The member well knows that one of the principle features of Canada is our mobility rights which allows all Canadians to travel throughout this wonderful country, to each and every province, and to enjoy all of the things Canada has to offer. This member has defined Canada as a bunch of parts.

I would ask the member whether or not he believes the federal government should have control over the enforcement of national standards to do with our Canada health care system.

**Mr. Cliff Breitreuz:** Mr. Speaker, we have gone from talking about the whole unity issue to the national health standards issue. I really do not know what connection that really has with the whole business of talking about national unity. We support a standardized health care system across the country. We support the Canada National Health Act.

• (1700)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebecers listening to what the Reformers are saying today can rest assured that this gives us further arguments in favour of sovereignty.

As the hon. member's colleague indicated earlier, distinct society does not mean anything to them. I am pleased to hear that. It does not mean anything, it is meaningless. I agree. They have stated in this House—and they took the entire day to say so—that it is meaningless. I must thank my colleagues from the Reform Party. They are giving the riding of Matapédia—Matane one more reason to be in favour of sovereignty.

I have a question for the hon. member. In our region, 64% voted in favour of sovereignty. What does he have to say to these people who sincerely wish for Quebec to become sovereign? What does he have to say to them today?

[*English*]

**Mr. Cliff Breitreuz:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where there were 64% who voted in favour of sovereignty. He also made the statement that we do not put meaning to the whole business of distinct society. Obviously the member has not been listening. We have put a lot of meaning into the whole notion of distinct society

and that is why we do not like to see it entrenched in the Quebec constitution.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I must comment on what the hon. member said about distinct society because the concept of distinct society was diluted to such an extent in both the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords that it was clear, very clear in fact—and that is what ministers and anyone who supported the Meech Lake accord at the time said—that this would not give Quebec any more power. This is one of the many reasons that led Quebecers to vote against the Charlottetown accord.

If today we use a different terminology to describe a notion like the unique character of Quebec, the result will be the same, that is to say that Quebecers will not accept any such proposals because they do not mean anything, they are just empty words that do not give Quebec any real power, when that is what Quebecers want.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the notion the member has put forward. I would agree that the leaders of the day at the Charlottetown and the Meech Lake accords had a tendency to say one thing in one part of the country and another thing in another part of the country. Of course, that is dishonest and deceptive and it is not the way to bring about a unified country.

We have put a lot of meaning into the whole term distinct society.

**Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate, on this side of the House we understand distinctiveness not only in Quebec but throughout our country.

I wish to share my time with my colleague, the member for Mississauga South, although there may not be time.

Only two weeks ago I was at the commemoration of the first time we issued a historical plaque outside of this country at Vimy Ridge. I was taken aback by the ceremony and going through some of the trenches and seeing some of the carvings on the walls that had been done by people who had been shot or killed at Vimy. I realized that both French and English had fought together in that war.

• (1705)

Nobody asked them when they showed up to free France from the invaders whether they were French or English, whether they were Quebecers or Ontarians, whether they came from the west. They fought together as a nation of Canadians, and very successfully.

### *Supply*

Over 3,900 Canadians, if I recall correctly, of all backgrounds lost their lives there. These are some of the histories that we have shared together as a country.

It is with that view in mind that I rise today to speak in favour of not only the Calgary declaration but the motion that has been moved by my hon. colleagues opposite.

We have discussed a variety of issues today and there is this constant issue of decentralization versus centralization. I sometimes do not think that we have given proper address to how our world is significantly changing.

Often the debate is very sterilized because it talks about taking power away from some kind of central authority. I would like to indicate that over the last 10 years Canada has entered into a number of international treaties such as NAFTA, GATT and some of the other treaties that we are now discussing and will be discussing in this House such as the multilateral agreement on investment.

All these treaties, if you will, have resulted in the delegation to a certain degree of authority from the so-called central government to international bodies, often dispute settlement mechanisms.

What I am trying to get at is that we have actually already given up a certain degree of power at the federal level to international institutions to effect more global trade. This is the reality of the world.

If we sit at the other end and constantly try to take power away from this institution that has already given up power internationally, we can understand how we are slowly but surely weakening our system of government and weakening the ties that bind us together.

I was heartened today by the Reform Party's talking about national standards because I very rarely hear it talk about those. I hear it defending provincial rights. Once again, I sometimes do not think we have given enough thought to how our country has changed.

I sometimes wonder if we should be debating provincial versus federal rights or talking more about urban versus rural rights. When we talk about the delivery of services on a local basis, of course large municipalities have the ability to do that.

We have just seen in my own province the amalgamation of the city of Toronto. Whether people like it or not it seems that is a very huge governmental authority that could probably deal effectively with a lot of local issues.

On the other hand, there are communities within our country that have a great deal of difficulty making even the basic services available to their people just because they are few in number or they are spread out over a wide geographical area.

*Speaker's Ruling*

I have often wondered if we should not restructure some of this debate about dealing with how to deliver services directly to the people who require them.

I support the initiative of the Calgary declaration. I think we very much have to continue the dialogue, but I think also we have to start talking about how to build this country. We have to stop talking about how to tear it apart. We have to start talking about how to build a stronger nation as we move toward the 21st century.

We have institutions of government. I have come to believe that there is a role for some kind of reformed Senate. I suspect it has some of the parameters that some of the members are talking about today, guaranteeing some kind of minimum standards and ensuring that our medical system, for instance, in British Columbia is not significantly different in a minimum kind of way from those in other parts of the country.

I have been appalled in some ways to find that people who have a cardiac or a diagnosis cardiac operation in British Columbia have to wait three weeks for an operation, while those in Manitoba only half a week.

Therefore when we talk about things in the Calgary declaration such as equality of people, I sometimes wonder whether we are really addressing those issues and whether, if we are really concerned about the equality of people, we should find ways to ensure there are minimum standards across this country we can all agree to as a nation.

• (1710)

Most people who have studied national unity would say that the things that unite us as a nation are the ways we treat each other. Most people would say one of those things is the health care system. Another is education. Heaven forbid, it says here that belongs to the provinces, but most people would say we should have some kind of minimum standard on which we can all agree that people can move around this country without needing an entry test to discover whether they are in grade two or grade twelve or whatever grade. We should all have some standards recognized which can unite us as a nation.

As my hon. colleague from Mississauga South would like a few words, I will conclude. I am definitely in support of the Calgary declaration initiative and of the motion before us today. More important, we have to find ways to reinvent our country. We happen to think that devolution is the way to do it. There may well be cases where we should be giving power back to the central government in order to create national binding standards in our country.

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Speaker of the House is about to arrive to give his decision on a fairly significant point of

order. Could I get agreement from this House that we have an opportunity to respond to this and not be excluded from that opportunity by virtue of bells?

**Some hon. members:** No.

## MAIN ESTIMATES—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, I am now ready to rule on a point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Albert on Monday, November 24, 1997. At that time the hon. member raised a point of order relating to the following items in the estimates: vote 1, policy and farm programs under agriculture; vote 15, convention refugee determination division under immigration; vote 1, health, environment and safety from environmental hazards under environment; vote 5, lands and trust services under Indian affairs; vote 1, policy and programs and divestitures under transport; vote 35, international trade tribunal under trade; vote 15, supply and services under public works; vote 40, Canada Information Office under heritage.

Supported by the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford, the hon. member argued that the first five items seek to bypass the legislative process because certain bills related thereto are now before the House or died on the order paper in the 35th Parliament. As to the remaining three, he claimed there was no legislative authority at all.

This morning the hon. President of the Treasury Board returned to the House and responded with his explanation of the eight items complained of.

Before I go into the details of my review of this matter, might I suggest with all respect to the hon. member, as have suggested several Speakers before me, that points of order on estimates are usually very serious and almost always very complex. To leave these matters to the eve of the final decision by the House puts the Chair in a difficult position to say the least, if intelligent consideration is to be given to such procedural issues. In the absence of an appropriate procedure to challenge specific items in the House, hon. members should bring these matters forward as soon as they are aware of difficulties.

• (1715)

In presenting his arguments the hon. member for St. Albert made abundant reference to past rulings by Speakers Lamoureux, Jerome and Sauvé. Over the last several hours I have refreshed my memory and reviewed these rulings and in particular Speaker Jerome's ruling of March 22, 1977 and Speaker Sauvé's ruling of June 12, 1981.

The rulings make it clear that the supply procedure ought not to be used to bypass the normal or regular legislative process. In other words, items in the estimates must not attempt to amend existing statutes or be used to obtain authority which normally would be sought through proper legislation.

*Speaker's Ruling*

In order to better understand what on these occasions was the basis on which certain provisions of the estimates were challenged, let me quote two examples of the exact wording used in the estimates as tabled in the House.

The first example relates to industry, trade and commerce, vote 77d of the supplementary estimates (D) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, as referred to in Speaker Jerome's ruling of March 22, 1977. The description of the vote was as follows:

Vote 77d—Export Development

(a) To increase from \$750,000,000 to \$2,500,000,000 the amount set out in Section 26 of the Export Development Act; and

(b) To increase from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 the amount set out in Section 28 of the Export Development Act.

The second example concerns energy, mines and resources, vote 45 of the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, as referred to in Speaker Sauvé's ruling of June 12, 1981. Again the description of the vote was as follows:

Vote 45—Canada Oil Substitution Program—Payments, in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council and payments pursuant to agreements with a province or a person in respect of—

It was based on the wordings as they appeared in the estimates that both examples were ruled out of order.

Having gone back to the basis for the rulings referred to by the hon. member for St. Albert, I then examined the wording used to describe the eight votes which he challenged in his point of order.

In the first five votes grouped by the hon. member, that is, vote 1, agriculture; vote 15, immigration; vote 1, environment; vote 5, Indian affairs; and vote 1, transport, nowhere could I find in the wordings an attempt to bypass the legislative process by seeking approval for funds which have not yet received legislative authority. I therefore cannot agree with the hon. member's conclusions.

In his second group the hon. member included vote 35, Canadian International Trade Tribunal; vote 15, supply and services program; and vote 40, Canada Information Office. Again in examining the wording of these three votes, I cannot conclude that an attempt is being made to amend legislation through the use of an appropriation act.

I want to refer to arguments that were made yesterday and again today that the House is being asked to grant supply before it legislates. May I respectfully remind hon. members that when granting funds through the adoption of an appropriation act, the House is in fact legislating. Again let me repeat that what was objected to in the past and what different Speakers have ruled out of order were attempts to amend existing acts or legislate new programs as part of a legislative measure granting supply.

This morning the hon. member for St. Albert in response to the hon. President of the Treasury Board further argued that the information provided to Parliament in the part IIIs of the estimates requires improvement. The hon. minister himself indeed agreed with such an objective. I should remind the House that part III expenditure plans, if imperfect, are a recent innovation by the government. The content of most expenditure plans goes beyond the next fiscal year and covers several supply cycles. That some projections contained therein are at variance with stated past, present or future government policies is in my view understandable. Things change. Events affect plans. That anticipated legislation or bills now on the Order Paper or bills outstanding at the dissolution of the 35th Parliament be referred to in these documents in no way impacts on the supply proceedings or the legislative proceedings of the House.

● (1720)

What is important and paramount is the accuracy of the votable items reflected in part II of the estimates. Once concurred in, the estimates in part II become the schedule to the supply bill which itself becomes the appropriation act granting authority to spend to the government. This authority must be renewed on an annual basis. As was stated this morning by the hon. President of the Treasury Board, the statutory items are included in the part II for information only so that the House can get the whole picture on spending.

[*Translation*]

In his reply, this morning, the President of the Treasury Board quoted part of a paragraph in the Preface of Part II of the 1997-98 Estimates. I will quote more extensively from page 1-5 under the heading "Changes in the 1997-98 Estimates":

The purpose of this section is twofold. As in previous years, it will describe changes in Vote, Program and other presentations in order to permit the reconciliation of the 1996-97 Main Estimates with the 1997-98 Main Estimates. In addition, this section will detail those Votes that contain specific authority that differs from that included in the previous year's Main Estimates as well as new expenditure authorities appearing for the first time. In light of the House of Commons Speaker's rulings in 1981, the government has made a commitment that the only legislation that will be amended through the Estimates process, other than cases specifically authorized by Statute, will be previous Appropriation Acts.

I used this statement, which is based on Speaker's rulings made in 1981, to review the votes to which the hon. member for St. Albert objected. In none of them was I able to find any violation of the principles established by my predecessors.

Consequently, the said votes are in order and the House can now proceed with the taking of the recorded divisions.

*Supply**[English]*

It being 5.23 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

## ALLOTTED DAY—CALGARY DECLARATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

• (1725)

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1800)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel:** Mr. Speaker, I arrived late, but I would have voted with my party.

*[English]*

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

*(Division No. 27)*

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott  
Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bennett  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Cadman  
Cannis  
Carroll  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Chatters  
Coderre

Ablonczy  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bailey  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellemare  
Benoit  
Bevilacqua  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Calder  
Caplan  
Casson  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Clouthier  
Cohen

Collenette  
Copps  
Cummins  
Dhaliwal  
Discepolo  
Drouin  
Eggleton  
Finestone  
Folco  
Forseth  
Galloway  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Graham  
Grewal  
Guarnieri  
Harb  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Longfield  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchi  
Marleau  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Mayfield  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Mitchell  
Murray  
Nault  
Obhrai  
O'Reilly  
Pankiw  
Parrish  
Penson  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Provenzano  
Redman  
Richardson  
Robillard  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Wappel  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Wilfert

Comuzzi  
Cullen  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Epp  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Gilmour  
Goldring  
Gouk  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hanger  
Harris  
Harvard  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoeppner  
Iftody  
Jaffer  
Johnston  
Karygiannis  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Konrad  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Lincoln  
Lowther  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Manning  
Mark  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Massé  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Minna  
Morrison  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Paradis  
Patri  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Ritz  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Thompson (Wild Rose)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
White (North Vancouver)  
Williams—190

## NAYS

## Members

Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Borotsik  
Canuel

Asselin  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Blaikie  
Brien  
Casey

*Supply*

## MAIN ESTIMATES

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Charest                                | Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) |
| Crête                                  | Dalphond-Guiral               |
| Davies                                 | de Savoye                     |
| Debien                                 | Desjarlais                    |
| Desrochers                             | Dockrill                      |
| Doyle                                  | Dubé (Lévis)                  |
| Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)           | Duceppe                       |
| Dumas                                  | Fournier                      |
| Gagnon                                 | Gauthier                      |
| Girard-Bujold                          | Godin (Châteauguay)           |
| Guay                                   | Guimond                       |
| Harvey                                 | Herron                        |
| Jones                                  | Keddy (South Shore)           |
| Laliberte                              | Lalonde                       |
| Lefebvre                               | Lill                          |
| MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) | Mancini                       |
| Marceau                                | Marchand                      |
| Martin (Winnipeg Centre)               | McDonough                     |
| Ménard                                 | Muise                         |
| Nunziata                               | Nystrom                       |
| Perron                                 | Picard (Drummond)             |
| Plamondon                              | Price                         |
| Proctor                                | Robinson                      |
| Rocheleau                              | Sauvageau                     |
| Solomon                                | St-Hilaire                    |
| St-Jacques                             | Thompson (Charlotte)          |
| Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)              | Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)     |
| Turp                                   | Wasylycia-Leis                |
| Wayne—71                               |                               |

## PAIRED MEMBERS

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baker                       | Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé— |
| Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) | Easter                      |
| Grose                       | Laurin                      |
| Loubier                     | Mercier                     |
| Volpe                       |                             |

**The Speaker:** I declare the amendment carried.

• (1805)

The next question is on the main motion, as amended.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the main motion.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 27*]

(Motion, as amended, agreed to)

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of several recorded divisions on motions relating to the main estimates standing in the name of the hon. President of the Treasury Board.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 1

That Vote 40, in the amount of \$19,440,000 under CANADIAN HERITAGE—Canada Information Office, Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 32, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present tonight will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party will vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I would cast my ballot in the negative.

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

(*Division No. 28*)

## YEAS

## Members

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Adams                            | Alcock     |
| Anderson                         | Assad      |
| Assadourian                      | Augustine  |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bakopanos  |
| Barnes                           | Beaumier   |
| Bélaïr                           | Bélangier  |
| Bellemare                        | Bennett    |
| Bertrand                         | Bevilacqua |
| Blondin-Andrew                   | Bonin      |
| Bonwick                          | Boudria    |
| Bradshaw                         | Brown      |
| Bryden                           | Bulte      |
| Byrne                            | Caccia     |
| Calder                           | Cannis     |
| Caplan                           | Carroll    |
| Catterall                        | Cauchon    |
| Chamberlain                      | Chan       |
| Clouthier                        | Coderre    |
| Cohen                            | Collenette |
| Comuzzi                          | Coppes     |

*Supply*

|                              |                           |  |                                  |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Cullen                       | DeVillers                 | Gilmour                                | Girard-Bujold                    |
| Dhaliwal                     | Dion                      | Godin (Châteauguay)                    | Goldring                         |
| Discepola                    | Dromisky                  | Gouk                                   | Grewal                           |
| Drouin                       | Duhamel                   | Grey (Edmonton North)                  | Guay                             |
| Eggleton                     | Finestone                 | Guimond                                | Hanger                           |
| Finlay                       | Folco                     | Harris                                 | Hart                             |
| Fontana                      | Gagliano                  | Harvey                                 | Herron                           |
| Galloway                     | Godfrey                   | Hill (Macleod)                         | Hill (Prince George—Peace River) |
| Goodale                      | Graham                    | Hilstrom                               | Hoeppner                         |
| Gray (Windsor West)          | Guarnieri                 | Jaffer                                 | Johnston                         |
| Harb                         | Harvard                   | Jones                                  | Keddy (South Shore)              |
| Ianno                        | Iftody                    | Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)               | Konrad                           |
| Jackson                      | Jennings                  | Laliberte                              | Lalonde                          |
| Jordan                       | Karygiannis               | Lebel                                  | Lefebvre                         |
| Keys                         | Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  | Lill                                   | Lowther                          |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Knutson                   | MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) | Mancini                          |
| Kraft Sloan                  | Lastewka                  | Manning                                | Marceau                          |
| Lavigne                      | Lee                       | Marchand                               | Mark                             |
| Leung                        | Lincoln                   | Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)        | Martin (Winnipeg Centre)         |
| Longfield                    | MacAulay                  | Mayfield                               | McDonough                        |
| Mahoney                      | Malhi                     | Ménard                                 | Mills (Red Deer)                 |
| Maloney                      | Manley                    | Morrison                               | Muise                            |
| Marchi                       | Marleau                   | Nunziata                               | Nystrom                          |
| Martin (LaSalle—Émard)       | Massé                     | Obhrai                                 | Pankiw                           |
| McCormick                    | McGuire                   | Penson                                 | Perron                           |
| McKay (Scarborough East)     | McLellan (Edmonton West)  | Picard (Drummond)                      | Plamondon                        |
| McTeague                     | McWhinney                 | Price                                  | Proctor                          |
| Mifflin                      | Milliken                  | Ramsay                                 | Ritz                             |
| Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  | Minna                     | Robinson                               | Rocheleau                        |
| Mitchell                     | Murray                    | Sauvageau                              | Schmidt                          |
| Myers                        | Nault                     | Scott (Skeena)                         | Solomon                          |
| Normand                      | O'Brien (London—Fanshawe) | St-Hilaire                             | Stinson                          |
| O'Reilly                     | Pagtakhan                 | St-Jacques                             | Strahl                           |
| Paradis                      | Parrish                   | Thompson (Charlotte)                   | Thompson (Wild Rose)             |
| Patry                        | Peric                     | Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)              | Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)        |
| Peterson                     | Pettigrew                 | Turp                                   | Wasylcia-Leis                    |
| Phinney                      | Pickard (Kent—Essex)      | Wayne                                  | White (Langley—Abbotsford)       |
| Pillitteri                   | Pratt                     | White (North Vancouver)                | Williams—120                     |
| Provenzano                   | Redman                    |  |                                  |
| Reed                         | Richardson                |  |                                  |
| Robillard                    | Rock                      |  |                                  |
| Saada                        | Scott (Fredericton)       |  |                                  |
| Serré                        | Shepherd                  |  |                                  |
| Speller                      | St. Denis                 |  |                                  |
| Steckle                      | Stewart (Brant)           |  |                                  |
| Stewart (Northumberland)     | St-Julien                 |  |                                  |
| Szabo                        | Telegdi                   |  |                                  |
| Thibeault                    | Torsney                   |  |                                  |
| Ur                           | Valeri                    |  |                                  |
| Vanclief                     | Wappel                    |  |                                  |
| Whelan                       | Wilfert—142               |  |                                  |

## PAIRED MEMBERS

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baker                       | Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé— |
| Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) | Easter                      |
| Grose                       | Laurin                      |
| Loubier                     | Mercier                     |
| Volpe                       |                             |

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be considered as being present for the next divisions and I will be voting with my party.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following:

Vote 15 of the President of Treasury Board under Public Works and Government Services;

Vote 1 of the President of the Treasury Board under Agriculture and Agri-Food;

Vote 1 of the President of the Treasury under Environment;

## NAYS

## Members

|                                      |                               |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Abbott                               | Ablonczy                      |
| Alarie                               | Asselin                       |
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar) | Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) |
| Bachand (Saint-Jean)                 | Bailey                        |
| Bellehumeur                          | Benoit                        |
| Bergeron                             | Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)   |
| Bigras                               | Blaikie                       |
| Borotsik                             | Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)       |
| Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)        | Brien                         |
| Cadman                               | Canuel                        |
| Casey                                | Casson                        |
| Charest                              | Chatters                      |
| Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)        | Crête                         |
| Cummins                              | Dalphondu-Guiral              |
| Davies                               | de Savoye                     |
| Debien                               | Desjarlais                    |
| Desrochers                           | Dockrill                      |
| Doyle                                | Dubé (Lévis)                  |
| Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)         | Duceppe                       |
| Dumas                                | Epp                           |
| Forsyth                              | Fournier                      |
| Gagnon                               | Gauthier                      |

• (1810)

Vote 5 of the President of the Treasury Board under Indian Affairs and Northern Development;

Vote 15 of the President of the Treasury Board under Citizenship and Immigration;

Vote 5 of the President of the Treasury Board under Transport;

Vote 1(a) of the President of the Treasury Board under Agriculture and Agri-food;

Concurrence in Supplementary Estimates (A);

Supply bill of the President of the Treasury Board, the main motion for second reading.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to provide my consent, but the government whip provided me with a list of votes today and it is not consistent with what he has just indicated. He appears not to be following the list.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, there would be a discrepancy if the member went to the second page, to Vote 1(a), under the President of the Treasury Board; the concurrence in Supplementary Estimates (A); and the supply bill under the President of the Treasury Board.

Those items have been marked under different lettering, but upon review it came to my attention that those votes were exactly identical to the votes previously taken, as outlined in my intervention.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but that is not clear to me.

If we were to proceed down the list as provided, I would provide my consent. I just do not understand what he is saying with respect to these votes.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if I followed the list exactly then we would apply the vote just taken to Vote 15 of the President of the Treasury Board under Public Works and Government Services; Vote 1 of the President of the Treasury Board under Agriculture and Agri-food; Vote 1 of the President of the Treasury Board under Environment; Vote 5 of the President of the Treasury Board under Indian Affairs and Northern Development; Vote 15 of the President of the Treasury Board under Citizenship and Immigration; and Vote 5 of the President of the Treasury Board under Transport.

### Supply

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to proceed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** I therefore declare Vote 15 under Public Works and Government Services; Vote 1 under Agriculture and Agri-food; Vote 1 under Environment; Vote 5 under Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Indian and Inuit affairs program; Vote 15 under Citizenship and Immigration, the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada; and Vote 5 under transport carried.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 2

That Vote 35, in the amount of \$6,962,000 under Finance—Canadian International Trade Tribunal—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

[English]

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to proceed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1815)

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on this motion I will be voting in the affirmative, yes.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting in favour of this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present will vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*Supply**(Division No. 29)***YEAS**

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Asselin  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
De Villers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duhamel  
Eggleton  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harvard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lalonde  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marceau  
Marchi  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
Nunziata  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Perron  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Augustine  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellehumeur  
Bennett  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brien  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Copp  
Cullen  
de Savoye  
Desrochers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Duceppe  
Dumas  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guay  
Harb  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lastewka  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchand  
Marleau  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robillard  
Rock  
Sauvageau  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle

Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Turp  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert—183

Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Turp  
Vanclief  
Whelan

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bailey  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Borotsik  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Casey  
Charest  
Cummins  
Desjarlais  
Doyle  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Harris  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Jones  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Laliberte  
Lowther  
Mancini  
Mark  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Morrison  
Nystrom  
Pankiw  
Price  
Ramsay  
Robinson  
Scott (Skeena)  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Thompson (Wild Rose)  
Wayne  
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Benoit  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Cadman  
Casson  
Chatters  
Davies  
Dockrill  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Forseth  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Johnston  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
Lill  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Mayfield  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Muisse  
Obhrai  
Penson  
Proctor  
Ritz  
Schmidt  
Solomon  
St-Jacques  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Wasylcia-Leis  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Williams—80

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Baker  
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok  
Grose  
Loubier  
Volpe

Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—  
Easter  
Laurin  
Mercier

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

The next question is on the Motion No. 3.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 3

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$455,976,000 under Public Works and Government Services—Supply and Services Program—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted

on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on this motion I will be voting nay.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 30*)

**YEAS**

Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Charbonneau  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Coppes  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Finestone  
Folco  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Harvard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Karygiannis  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Cullen  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Eggleton  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harb  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)

Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Redman  
Richardson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Wappel  
Wilfert—143

*Supply*

McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Mitchell  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robillard  
Saada  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Whelan

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott  
Alarie  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bigras  
Borotsik  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cadman  
Casey  
Charest  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Cummins  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Doyle  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Dumas  
Forseth  
Gagnon  
Gilmour  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guimond  
Harris  
Harvey  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Jones  
Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)  
Laliberte  
Lebel  
Lill  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Manning  
Marchand  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Mayfield  
Ménard  
Morrison  
Nunziata  
Obhrai  
Penson  
Picard (Drummond)

Ablonczy  
Asselin  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bailey  
Benoit  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Blaikie  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Casson  
Chatters  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Dockrill  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duceppe  
Epp  
Fournier  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Guay  
Hanger  
Hart  
Herron  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Hoepfner  
Johnston  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lefebvre  
Lowther  
Mancini  
Marceau  
Mark  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Muise  
Nystrom  
Pankiw  
Perron  
Plamondon

*Supply*

|                           |                            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Price                     | Proctor                    |
| Ramsay                    | Ritz                       |
| Robinson                  | Rocheleau                  |
| Sauvageau                 | Schmidt                    |
| Scott (Skeena)            | Solomon                    |
| St-Hilaire                | Stinson                    |
| St-Jacques                | Strahl                     |
| Thompson (Charlotte)      | Thompson (Wild Rose)       |
| Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean) | Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  |
| Turp                      | Wasylycia-Leis             |
| Wayne                     | White (Langley—Abbotsford) |
| White (North Vancouver)   | Williams—120               |

## PAIRED MEMBERS

|                            |                              |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Baker                      | Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—) |
| Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok | Easter                       |
| Grose                      | Laurin                       |
| Loubier                    | Mercier                      |
| Volpe                      |                              |

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 4

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$564,428,000 under Agriculture and Agri-Food—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

Motion No. 5

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$407,212,000 under Environment—Department—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

Motion No. 6

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$195,678,000 under Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Department—Indian and Inuit Affairs Program—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

Motion No. 7

That Vote 15, in the amount of \$68,183,000 under Citizenship and Immigration—Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

Motion No. 8

That Vote 5, in the amount of \$106,193,000 under Transport—Department—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 030*]

(Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 agreed to)

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998, except any vote disposed earlier today and less the amounts voted in interim supply be concurred in.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 030*]

(Motion agreed to)

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the recorded division on motions relating to supplementary estimates (A) standing in the name of the hon. President of the Treasury Board.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

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

Motion No. 1

That Vote 40, in the amount of \$19,440,000 under Canadian Heritage—Canada Information Office—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply) be concurred in.

**The Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on this motion I will be voting nay.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party caucus in the House this evening will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 030*]

(Motion No. 1 agreed to)

• (1820)

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the following: concurrence in supplementary estimates (A) and supply bill main motion for second reading.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Supply*

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that supplementary estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1998, except any vote disposed of earlier, be concurred in.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 030*]

(Motion agreed to)

**The Speaker:** I declare that a bill entitled an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for financial year ending March 31, 1998, be read the first time and printed and also read a second time.

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that Bill C-23, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1998, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 030*]

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

**The Chairman:** The House is in committee of the whole on Bill C-23. Shall clause 2 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 3 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 4 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 5 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 6 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall schedule 1 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall schedule 2 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall the preamble carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall the title carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Title agreed to)

**The Chairman:** Shall I rise and report the bill?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Bill reported)

• (1825)

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the Reform Party will be voting no, except for the members for Calgary West and Red Deer who have had to absent themselves from this vote.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present this evening will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, our party will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of York South—Weston I will be voting in favour of the motion, voting yea.

*Supply*

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

*(Division No. 31)***YEAS**

## Members

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Adams                            | Alcock                       |
| Anderson                         | Assad                        |
| Assadourian                      | Augustine                    |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bakopanos                    |
| Barnes                           | Beaumier                     |
| Bélaïr                           | Bélangier                    |
| Bellemare                        | Bennett                      |
| Bertrand                         | Bevilacqua                   |
| Blondin-Andrew                   | Bonin                        |
| Bonwick                          | Boudria                      |
| Bradshaw                         | Brown                        |
| Bryden                           | Bulte                        |
| Byrne                            | Caccia                       |
| Calder                           | Cannis                       |
| Caplan                           | Carroll                      |
| Catterall                        | Cauchon                      |
| Chamberlain                      | Chan                         |
| Charbonneau                      | Clouthier                    |
| Coderre                          | Cohen                        |
| Collenette                       | Comuzzi                      |
| Copps                            | Cullen                       |
| DeVillers                        | Dhaliwal                     |
| Dion                             | Discepola                    |
| Dromisky                         | Drouin                       |
| Duhamel                          | Eggleton                     |
| Finestone                        | Finlay                       |
| Folco                            | Fontana                      |
| Gagliano                         | Galloway                     |
| Godfrey                          | Goodale                      |
| Graham                           | Gray (Windsor West)          |
| Guarnieri                        | Harb                         |
| Harvard                          | Ianno                        |
| Iftody                           | Jackson                      |
| Jennings                         | Jordan                       |
| Karygiannis                      | Keys                         |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)         | Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Knutson                          | Kraft Sloan                  |
| Lastewka                         | Lavigne                      |
| Lee                              | Leung                        |
| Lincoln                          | Longfield                    |
| MacAulay                         | Mahoney                      |
| Malhi                            | Maloney                      |
| Manley                           | Marchi                       |
| Marleau                          | Martin (LaSalle—Émard)       |
| Massé                            | McCormick                    |
| McGuire                          | McKay (Scarborough East)     |
| McLellan (Edmonton West)         | McTeague                     |
| McWhinney                        | Mifflin                      |
| Milliken                         | Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  |
| Minna                            | Mitchell                     |
| Murray                           | Myers                        |
| Nault                            | Normand                      |
| Nunziata                         | O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)    |
| O'Reilly                         | Pagtakhan                    |
| Paradis                          | Parrish                      |
| Patry                            | Peric                        |
| Peterson                         | Pettigrew                    |
| Phinney                          | Pickard (Kent—Essex)         |
| Pillitteri                       | Pratt                        |
| Provenzano                       | Redman                       |
| Reed                             | Richardson                   |
| Robillard                        | Rock                         |
| Saada                            | Scott (Fredericton)          |
| Serré                            | Shepherd                     |
| Speller                          | St. Denis                    |
| Steckle                          | Stewart (Brant)              |
| Stewart (Northumberland)         | St-Julien                    |
| Szabo                            | Telegdi                      |
| Thibeault                        | Torsney                      |
| Ur                               | Valeri                       |
| Vanclief                         | Wappel                       |
| Whelan                           | Wilfert—144                  |

**NAYS**

## Members

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Abbott                                 | Ablonczy                         |
| Alarie                                 | Asselin                          |
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)   | Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)    |
| Bachand (Saint-Jean)                   | Bailey                           |
| Bellehumeur                            | Benoit                           |
| Bergeron                               | Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)      |
| Bigras                                 | Blaikie                          |
| Borotsik                               | Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)          |
| Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)          | Brien                            |
| Cadman                                 | Canuel                           |
| Casey                                  | Casson                           |
| Charest                                | Chatters                         |
| Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)          | Crête                            |
| Cummins                                | Dalphond-Guiral                  |
| Davies                                 | de Savoye                        |
| Debien                                 | Desjarlais                       |
| Desrochers                             | Dockrill                         |
| Doyle                                  | Dubé (Lévis)                     |
| Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)           | Duceppe                          |
| Dumas                                  | Epp                              |
| Forseth                                | Fournier                         |
| Gagnon                                 | Gauthier                         |
| Gilmour                                | Girard-Bujold                    |
| Godin (Châteauguay)                    | Goldring                         |
| Gouk                                   | Grewal                           |
| Grey (Edmonton North)                  | Guay                             |
| Guimond                                | Hanger                           |
| Harris                                 | Hart                             |
| Harvey                                 | Herron                           |
| Hill (Macleod)                         | Hill (Prince George—Peace River) |
| Hilstrom                               | Hoeppner                         |
| Jaffer                                 | Johnston                         |
| Jones                                  | Keddy (South Shore)              |
| Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)               | Konrad                           |
| Laliberte                              | Lalonde                          |
| Lebel                                  | Lefebvre                         |
| Lill                                   | Lowther                          |
| MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) | Mancini                          |
| Marceau                                | Marchand                         |
| Mark                                   | Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  |
| Martin (Winnipeg Centre)               | Mayfield                         |
| McDonough                              | Ménard                           |
| Morrison                               | Muise                            |
| Nystrom                                | Obhrai                           |
| Pankiw                                 | Penson                           |
| Perron                                 | Picard (Drummond)                |
| Plamondon                              | Price                            |
| Proctor                                | Ramsay                           |
| Ritz                                   | Robinson                         |
| Rocheleau                              | Sauvageau                        |
| Schmidt                                | Scott (Skeena)                   |
| Solomon                                | St-Hilaire                       |
| Stinson                                | St-Jacques                       |
| Strahl                                 | Thompson (Charlotte)             |
| Thompson (Wild Rose)                   | Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)        |
| Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)              | Turp                             |
| Wasylcia-Leis                          | Wayne                            |
| White (Langley—Abbotsford)             | White (North Vancouver)          |
| Williams—117                           |                                  |

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baker                       | Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé— |
| Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) | Easter                      |
| Grose                       | Laurin                      |
| Loubier                     | Mercier                     |
| Volpe                       |                             |

*Supply*

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, our party will be voting in favour of this motion.

**Hon. Marcel Massé** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion for third reading.

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

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House?

(*Division No. 32*)

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## YEAS

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 031*]

## Members

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

\* \* \*

## TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

The House resumed from November 21 consideration of the motion that Bill C-17, an act to amend the Telecommunications Act and the Teleglobe Canada Reorganization and Divestiture Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-17.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yea on this motion.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will be voting yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will be voting in favour of this bill.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote no on this motion.

|                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Abbott                           | Ablonczy                         |
| Adams                            | Alarie                           |
| Alcock                           | Anderson                         |
| Assad                            | Assadourian                      |
| Asselin                          | Augustine                        |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)    |
| Bachand (Saint-Jean)             | Bailey                           |
| Bakopanos                        | Barnes                           |
| Beaumier                         | Bélair                           |
| Bélanger                         | Bellehumeur                      |
| Bellemare                        | Bennett                          |
| Benoit                           | Bergeron                         |
| Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)      | Bertrand                         |
| Bevilacqua                       | Bigras                           |
| Blondin-Andrew                   | Bonin                            |
| Bonwick                          | Borotsik                         |
| Boudria                          | Bradshaw                         |
| Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)          | Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)    |
| Brien                            | Brown                            |
| Bryden                           | Bulte                            |
| Byrne                            | Caccia                           |
| Cadman                           | Calder                           |
| Cannis                           | Canuel                           |
| Caplan                           | Carroll                          |
| Casey                            | Casson                           |
| Catterall                        | Cauchon                          |
| Chamberlain                      | Chan                             |
| Charbonneau                      | Charest                          |
| Chatters                         | Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)    |
| Clouthier                        | Coderre                          |
| Cohen                            | Collenette                       |
| Comuzzi                          | Copps                            |
| Crête                            | Cullen                           |
| Cummins                          | Dalphond-Guiral                  |
| de Savoye                        | Debien                           |
| Desrochers                       | DeVillers                        |
| Dhaliwal                         | Dion                             |
| Discepola                        | Doyle                            |
| Dromisky                         | Drouin                           |
| Dubé (Lévis)                     | Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)     |
| Duceppe                          | Duhamel                          |
| Dumas                            | Eggleton                         |
| Epp                              | Finestone                        |
| Finlay                           | Folco                            |
| Fontana                          | Forseth                          |
| Fournier                         | Gagliano                         |
| Gagnon                           | Galloway                         |
| Gauthier                         | Gilmour                          |
| Girard-Bujold                    | Godfrey                          |
| Godin (Châteauguay)              | Goldring                         |
| Goodale                          | Gouk                             |
| Graham                           | Gray (Windsor West)              |
| Grewal                           | Grey (Edmonton North)            |
| Guarnieri                        | Guay                             |
| Guimond                          | Hanger                           |
| Harb                             | Harris                           |
| Hart                             | Harvard                          |
| Harvey                           | Herron                           |
| Hill (Macleod)                   | Hill (Prince George—Peace River) |
| Hilstrom                         | Hoeppner                         |
| Ianno                            | Ifody                            |
| Jackson                          | Jaffer                           |

*Private Members' Business*

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Jennings                               | Johnston                     |
| Jones                                  | Jordan                       |
| Karygiannis                            | Keddy (South Shore)          |
| Kenney (Calgary-Sud-Est)               | Keyes                        |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)               | Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) |
| Knutson                                | Konrad                       |
| Kraft Sloan                            | Lalonde                      |
| Lastewka                               | Lavigne                      |
| Lebel                                  | Lee                          |
| Lefebvre                               | Leung                        |
| Lincoln                                | Longfield                    |
| Lowther                                | MacAulay                     |
| MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough) | Mahoney                      |
| Malhi                                  | Maloney                      |
| Manley                                 | Marceau                      |
| Marchand                               | Marchi                       |
| Mark                                   | Marleau                      |
| Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)        | Martin (LaSalle—Émard)       |
| Massé                                  | Mayfield                     |
| McCormick                              | McGuire                      |
| McKay (Scarborough East)               | McLellan (Edmonton West)     |
| McTeague                               | McWhinney                    |
| Ménard                                 | Mifflin                      |
| Milliken                               | Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  |
| Minna                                  | Mitchell                     |
| Morrison                               | Muise                        |
| Murray                                 | Myers                        |
| Nault                                  | Normand                      |
| Nunziata                               | Obhrai                       |
| O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)              | O'Reilly                     |
| Pagtakhan                              | Pankiw                       |
| Paradis                                | Parrish                      |
| Patry                                  | Penson                       |
| Peric                                  | Perron                       |
| Peterson                               | Pettigrew                    |
| Phinney                                | Picard (Drummond)            |
| Pickard (Kent—Essex)                   | Pillitteri                   |
| Plamondon                              | Pratt                        |
| Price                                  | Provenzano                   |
| Ramsay                                 | Redman                       |
| Reed                                   | Richardson                   |
| Ritz                                   | Robillard                    |
| Rocheleau                              | Rock                         |
| Saada                                  | Sauvageau                    |
| Schmidt                                | Scott (Fredericton)          |
| Scott (Skeena)                         | Serré                        |
| Shepherd                               | Speller                      |
| St. Denis                              | Steckle                      |
| Stewart (Brant)                        | Stewart (Northumberland)     |
| St-Hilaire                             | Stinson                      |
| St-Jacques                             | St-Julien                    |
| Strahl                                 | Szabo                        |
| Telegdi                                | Thibeault                    |
| Thompson (Charlotte)                   | Thompson (Wild Rose)         |
| Torsney                                | Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)    |
| Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)              | Turp                         |
| Ur                                     | Valeri                       |
| Vanclief                               | Wappel                       |
| Wayne                                  | Whelan                       |
| White (Langley—Abbotsford)             | White (North Vancouver)      |
| Willfert                               | Williams—246                 |

## NAYS

## Members

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar) | Blaikie    |
| Davies                               | Desjarlais |
| Dockrill                             | Laliberte  |
| Lill                                 | Mancini    |
| Martin (Winnipeg Centre)             | McDonough  |
| Nystrom                              | Proctor    |
| Robinson                             | Solomon    |
| Wasylycia-Leis—15                    |            |

## PAIRED MEMBERS

|                             |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baker                       | Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé— |
| Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok) | Easter                      |
| Grose                       | Laurin                      |
| Loubier                     | Mercier                     |
| Volpe                       |                             |

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

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

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** It being 6.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.)** moved that Bill C-206, an act to amend the Criminal Code (prostitution), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my private member's bill is deceptively simple. It in itself is a minor technical point in the Criminal Code, but it is my belief that the clarity and improvement it makes can bring a significant positive result, for communities to take back their streets, for local merchants to have their sidewalks back again and for parents to renew their confidence in the safety of local school yards.

My bill amends section 213 of the Criminal Code to change the available upper penalty but more importantly the kind of process available against a person charged with talking in a public place about buying or selling sex. It changes the street prostitution section.

In Canada it is a Criminal Code offence, a crime to try and sell or buy sex, prostitution in a public place such as a street corner, a taxi cab, a bar, a pub, or the lobby of a hotel. That is the law. We have had the national conversation about whether that kind of activity should be controlled by criminal sanction, and it is a crime. It is also a crime to live off the avails of prostitution, to be a helper or employer to benefit from the trade, or to keep a place of prostitution. Of course involving juveniles is a very serious crime.

However the private act of prostitution itself is not a crime. I do not know why it is not a crime as the history of abuse, exploitation and degradation associated with those who tend to become sex trade workers appears to be condoned in a double standard. However that is a completely different debate and is beyond the

*Private Members' Business*

scope of what I am trying to do today. I have observed that what is helpful procedure is to more directly respond to the street trade in prostitution.

We have a social problem in our society for if there were no buyers there would be no sellers. That is a societal problem. Nevertheless mitigating against exploitation is historically the Canadian way. We must provide the legal symbols which provide the appropriate social context for citizens to voluntarily do the right thing while we defend the helpless and minister to them rather than allow them to be exploited.

• (1835)

My proposed change is important for broad societal reasons. There is also a national problem of street prostitution across this country that did not exist in such a pervasive manner just a few years ago. However since the advent of the charter and also the repeal of vagrancy laws, the legal capacity has created its own demand. Whenever we create a loophole for the perverse, the legal vacuum will soon be filled.

Street prostitution goes far beyond just being a local nuisance. Wherever it takes a foothold, the surrounding communities soon learn that the drug crowd follows, as does breaking and entering, theft from cars and an attraction of those with criminal histories becomes entangled in the culture of the street. These trends develop wherever prostitution is openly traded.

Mothers do not appreciate walking their children to school over needles and condoms along the school yard fence. Merchants should not have to patrol their front sidewalk and doorways cleaning up from the night trade.

However the fundamental point I observed as a probation officer before I came to this Parliament attempting to bring social services to bear to individuals caught up in this sad cycle is that street prostitution itself is the wide open door for the young to become involved. Runaway children can so easily stand on a street corner and get involved in prostitution as a way to support themselves on the street. The wide open door and the legal and social tolerance of street prostitution is a major source of the national problem, how it is fed and kept going.

My experience in attempting to help young people in conflict with the law and those who are on the street made me acutely aware of how the summary conviction status of communication for prostitution was so much in conflict with all of our concern and expenditure to help street kids and preserve the peace and safety of our neighbourhoods.

Politicians of the Liberal government side have in the past been very sanctimonious about juveniles and prostitution. NDP members also talk about the awful violence against sex trade workers and claim to be concerned about children on the street. Yet historically they have resisted suggestions to mitigate against

allowing kids to be on the street and supporting themselves through the sex trade.

This is not a new problem, yet today we in Parliament after years of talk are still dithering about this matter. The justice minister said to me just a few days ago that consultations are still continuing and that any legislation will be "done right". That is the same put off and delaying answer I received from the previous justice minister back in 1994. And the Conservatives were no better in that there were reports and plenty of consultation but during their tenure the whole prostitution file was not effectively dealt with. Even worse, the NDP has appeared to support prostitution itself through its advocacy of what it affectionately calls street trade workers. I think the NDP would like to unionize them.

I come from a different perspective, one that is rather pragmatic. We may not like prostitution in society. We also may not like the overwhelming violation of rights it might take to eliminate most of it. Nevertheless, as parliamentarians we also do not need to pave a golden street for the sex trade to flourish. Therefore as an interim measure we need to pass my bill so we can get on with the more important comprehensive measures that the government claims it is considering and that the justice department has been studying for years.

Prostitution is exploitive and a lot of other crime and degradation seems to go with it, especially all of what is commonly known about the drug trade and drug abuse. All these tragedies are tied together, so there are practical reasons to have the public communications section of the code made as flexible as possible in its application.

The police are also using section 503 of the code to issue what is called no go orders to keep repetitious, obnoxious and aggressive prostitutes who are leading the trade and shepherding others into the trade to be subject to geographic prohibitions of not entering into common strolls. If the recognizance is breached, that becomes an offence and is easier to enforce that gathering new evidence under section 213 every time. However these restrictions are time limited and are tied to the process of other charges so they are of limited value.

Although section 213 is gender neutral, gathering evidence against buyers is difficult. Police are unlikely to assign much of their precious police time resources to suppress a problem if the offence is only a summary one and after the expenditure of thousands of dollars in enforcement routines only results in a few charges and nets the perpetrators a \$100 fine which becomes just another nuisance cost of doing the job.

• (1840)

Flexibility rather than just a heavy-handed approach is what I am promoting. The change would allow, if needed, to fingerprint and photograph if some cases were proceeded with through the

*Private Members' Business*

optional indictment process. It would be used as needed and would form part of a broader tool kit of resources that would support crime prevention objectives. It would greatly enhance breaking the cycle of lifestyle for some youths and more effectively get them into community remedial programs.

We must have the political courage to intervene so that the inherent discretion that lies throughout the system can flexibly respond to the individual need.

In the 1995 interim report of the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Prostitution, the results of national consultations indicated several recommendations to combat prostitution, one of them being to change section 213. The deputy minister of justice established the working group in 1992 from the federal, provincial and territorial governments. With regard to the recommendation, the most important factor for change was not to punish prostitutes but rather for identification purposes. In many cases, prostitutes use false identification.

The Identification of Criminals Act states that fingerprints and photographs cannot be taken when a person is charged summarily. With fingerprints and photographs, police would be able to track down runaways and to clear the backlog of outstanding arrest warrants of prostitutes who have used false identities. It would also solve some serious crimes. It would send a most necessary and needed message to the community, to both the customers and sellers, that such acts are not to be taken lightly and they are not in society's interest.

The response from the working group stated that identification of prostitutes along with the use of false identities was considered a serious problem by law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, one which might be solved with such amendments. The ability to fingerprint and photograph would make it easier to identify and prosecute repeat offenders.

Something most people are not aware of is the fact that many street prostitutes are runaways living under false names and identities. They become involved and perhaps trapped in a dangerous subculture. Parents of these children desperately want to find a way of tracing their child's whereabouts but because of false identities little can be done. They desperately want to find a way to bring their children home.

The research that has been done on street prostitution suggests that decisions to enter into the prostitution trade are decided in the time of youth. In fact in 1984 the Badgley Committee on Sexual Offences Against Children and Youth found that of all the prostitutes interviewed, 93% of females and 97% of males had run away from home. In another report in a 1990 journal of *Canada's Mental Health*, authors Earls and David found that the average age of female prostitutes leaving home was 13.7 years.

People who support the sex trade say that it is really not a big problem and that politicians are just blowing it out of proportion, but here are three comments from those affected by street prostitution. The first is from a Vancouver resident, the second by a Toronto resident and the third from the former mayor of Toronto and current minister of defence.

First: "When prostitutes operate openly in a neighbourhood, all women in the area become targets for cruising johns in cars or on foot. Soon every female from 8 to 60, from your daughter to your mother, will have been on the receiving end of some sort of disgusting advance from a stranger while walking to the store or playing in the park".

The second quote: "My apartment has become a refuge from streets which become enemy territory every night, streets where I am approached by drug traffickers, accosted by cruising johns and insulted by hookers; streets where menacing groups of young people take over the corners to haggle over drug prices and yell out to people in passing cars".

Appearing before a parliamentary committee in 1989, the current minister of defence stated: "I support these changes to Bill C-49 as well as other recommendations our police are putting forward to help us once again regain control of our streets, namely that this offence be changed from a summary offence to a hybrid offence requiring that those arrested be fingerprinted and photographed, which is important in dealing with runaways who can change their identities and their names, and others who are trying to avoid prosecution, and that it remains, in addition to that, within the absolute jurisdiction of a provincial court judge".

The minister of defence clearly stated that such a small change to the Criminal Code could make a huge difference in the fight against street prostitution. I hope he will be a man of principle and lean on his cabinet colleagues to help me so that we can all do the right thing.

• (1845)

In 1995 the Minister of Justice introduced an omnibus bill that touched on the Criminal Code changes to prostitution. Unfortunately, section 213 was not changed but still today communication offences are mere fines and slaps on the wrist.

Street prostitutes are not afraid of getting caught, nor are they deterred in any way to give up this dark and sad way of living.

In summary, I advocate the passage of my bill for several broad reasons. There are symbolic sociological and national policy reasons why we should do this. Also on behalf of local communities most effected, they are aghast at the lack of action to preserve the safety of their neighbourhoods. We can do it for them.

*Private Members' Business*

Important, on behalf of victims, whether it is those who get trapped in the lifestyle or the community as victim, we need to act. Administratively we also need to provide more flexible tools for the police so they may exercise discretion in dealing with local variances and emerging problems.

Moreover, we need to narrow the door that permits kids from getting involved in prostitution in the first place and have another legal way to get them into social services.

In closing, I ask other members of this House to not obfuscate and confuse what I am talking about, get off track and start talking about the generalities of prostitution in society or violence against women or developing legalized brothels or any number of related topics not appropriate to wind into the narrow proposal I brought forward today.

My bill is a small technical amendment which could help victims and bring safety to our neighbourhoods. I hope it will receive non-partisan support in that light. It is time for action. Our communities which have sent us here expect no less.

**Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on Bill C-206.

The purpose of this bill is to make hybrid offences the offences that are provided for in section 213 of the Criminal Code. These offences relate to prostitution, as the hon. member said.

[*Translation*]

At the moment, section 213 of the Criminal Code calls for an offence punishable on summary conviction. The sentence set out is either a maximum of \$2,000 or maximum imprisonment of six months, or both.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member in Bill C-206 would have the effect of transforming this offence into a hybrid one.

[*English*]

When the legislation on section 213 was introduced in the House of Commons, the then minister of justice stated that the purpose behind the legislation was not an attempt to deal generally with all the legal issues connected with prostitution but a limited attempt to address the nuisance created by street soliciting.

The legislation sought to balance the concerns of law enforcement agencies, citizens groups, women's groups and civil libertarians. It made criminal the public activities most frequently engaged in for the purpose of offering or purchasing sexual services.

Since the street soliciting offence of section 213 is intended to assist in dealing with the social problems experienced by neigh-

bourhoods affected by street prostitution, making this offence punishable by 10 years would seem disproportionate in light of the purpose of section 213, when similar offences such as causing disturbances in a public place are summary conviction offences.

Another possible purpose for making this offence a hybrid offence is to permit the fingerprinting and photographing of any person charged under section 213, this because the identification of criminal acts allows fingerprinting and photographing only in the case of offenders accused of committing an indictable offence pursuant to the federal Interpretation Act.

Some may feel fingerprinting and photographing may act as deterrents for prostitutes and their customers. However, experience has shown that this is not necessarily so.

[*Translation*]

There are already few repeat offenders among clients of prostitutes, even without fingerprinting and photos. For example, the statistics show that in Vancouver, for the period between 1986 and 1992, 2,045 men were charged with the offence covered by section 213 of the Criminal Code. Of that number, only 44, or 2%, were being charged with the same offence for a second time.

It seems that the mere fact of being arrested the first time is enough to discourage a repeat offence.

• (1850)

As for the prostitutes, most are photographed and fingerprinted, often early in their career, because they are often involved in more serious offences, such as drug-related crimes.

[*English*]

I am aware that a group of federal, provincial and territorial officials has been working since 1992, as the hon. member mentioned, to review legislation, policy and practices concerning prostitution related activities and to bring forward recommendations in relation to street prostitution and the involvement of youth in prostitution.

At the request of ministers responsible for justice issues, the working group consulted broadly with key stakeholders. Participants in the consultations included representatives of citizens groups, justice workers, current and former prostitutes, municipal and provincial officials, community service providers, educators, clergy, aboriginal groups, child welfare and health workers, and women advocacy groups. There was a very wide consultation.

An interim report of the consultation was issued by the working group in October 1995. The final report is scheduled for release sometime next month.

I will be interested, as I am sure all members of this House will be interested, in studying the report. I am sure the Minister of

*Private Members' Business*

Justice and her provincial and territorial colleagues will also study the recommendations with great interest.

I would like to add that, unlike the Reform Party, we do not make changes to the Criminal Code based on the sensational news story of the day or the exceptions to the rule, but with a balanced, collaborative and consultative process. Then we act.

Let me assure the hon. member that we will be acting on the recommendations of the working group.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with the hon. member's bill, I first want to congratulate him for trying to find a solution to a problem in his riding and in his province.

This being said, I do not think the amendment proposed in Bill C-206 will achieve its purpose. Prostitution is indeed a very serious problem, but amending the section to provide for a longer prison term will not achieve the goal sought by the hon. member.

It is true that prostitution brings along various negative things on a street, in a municipality and in a province. Associated with this type of illicit trade are all sorts of illegal activities, such as drug trafficking, various types of offences, theft, violence, etc.

I am convinced that providing for stiffer penalties will not solve the problem. This was tried before by our predecessors. The hon. member is right when he says he is proposing a technical amendment. He is not proposing anything innovative.

Section 213, which deals with prostitution reads as follows:

Every person who in a public place or in any place open to public view

(a) stops or attempts to stop any motor vehicle,

(b) impedes the free flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic or ingress to or egress from premises adjacent to that place, or

(c) stops or attempts to stop any person or in any manner communicates or attempts to communicate with any person for the purpose of engaging in prostitution or of obtaining the sexual services of a prostitute is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Section 213 has evolved over the years. At the very beginning, it primarily dealt with communicating. Following recent changes, it now also deals with soliciting.

● (1855)

I think the section was amended appropriately and that, in its present form, it addresses the problem. The member's amendment merely adds to what I read. He would add the words "an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years or is guilty" to the first sentence.

As for the rest, I understand that the member is happy with the wording of the section. He finds the sentence inadequate and he would like to see it increased to ten years. But, as I was saying earlier, it must be understood that in Canada, and this may seem strange, prostitution itself is not illegal. It is brothels and the prostitution trade that are illegal. To go from there to wanting to criminalize these individuals at all costs and sentencing them to ten years in jail is quite a leap.

When I heard the parliamentary secretary say that it was a disproportionately harsh sentence, I am forced to agree with her. If the sentence for prostitution is ten years, what will it be for rape? What will it be for the violence we see on a regular basis? I think the sentence has to increase in proportion to the crime.

I know that prostitution is wrong and immoral. I know all that. We must, however, compare this offence with other offences in the Criminal Code. I sincerely believe that this is not the way to resolve the problem of prostitution and, as the member who introduced the bill said, clean up our streets. This is not the way to go about it. Nor will we clean up our streets by gathering up syringes and other assorted objects from the sidewalks the next morning. Increasing the sentence is not the answer.

There is a problem, however. There is obviously a problem because, although prostitution is said to be one of the oldest professions in the world and to have been around forever, we can see that it is not on the decrease. Should there be more policing? Maybe. Should preventive efforts be stepped up? Of course. Education also comes into it, as does the tolerance of certain communities for this sort of activity. I think there has to be a global approach, with adequate enforcement of the legislation, zero tolerance, and youth education and prevention activities.

The member said earlier that young women, and even young men, were leaving home, assuming a new identity, and so on, to go into prostitution. I think that if young people do, they do so because of a much more important underlying reason, which is not prostitution. Prostitution is the result, not the source of the problem, which we have to look for in our society. If any energy is to be invested in this issue, I think it should be concentrated mainly on the source. It should be concentrated on young people.

This same party has been arguing against the Young Offenders Act for the past few days. There are all kinds of things we can do to ensure that timely action is taken to help young people, to educate, reform and rehabilitate them so that they do not end up on the street, using an assumed name to live off prostitution.

● (1900)

By now, you will have figured that I am opposed to this bill. I think that Reformers are trying to address problems that do not really come under section 213. This section deals with sexual solicitation or communication: stopping or attempting to stop any motor vehicle; impeding the free flow of pedestrian or vehicular

*Private Members' Business*

traffic; stopping or attempting to stop any person or in any manner communicating or attempting to communicate with any person.

In an instance the one mentioned earlier by the hon. member, where there is prostitution but drugs are also involved, as he seemed to indicate, I think that, then again, the Criminal Code contains provisions to deal with drug related offences, be it trafficking, use or what not. If violence was used, then again, I think that there are sections in the Criminal Code that deal with assault and violence. That too is provided for.

What I would like all parties to do more than anything else is for members each in their riding to bring pressure to bear so that the authorities, the community, the people in the area where there is a problem show zero tolerance and strongly support the police in properly enforcing the legislation.

[English]

**Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C-206, an act to amend the Criminal Code with respect to a situation in our society, prostitution. I believe my comments will generally reflect the sentiments of members of the New Democratic Party caucus.

The issue of prostitution is certainly one that many in this Chamber face on a day to day basis. My constituency of Winnipeg North Centre is very much an inner city, north end community in Winnipeg. This issue has been before us for years. There has been much community work, much active participation by citizens to address this issue. Community members have come together. Members of the aboriginal community, members of other ethnic groups, members involved in trying to seek some sense of quality of life in our community have come together to try to address a very serious issue.

In the context of this debate we all acknowledge this is a serious issue. But if I went back to those groups that have been working on this problem for so many years and presented this option, this solution from the Reform Party, I think I would be greeted with "oh no, not again, here we go, another attempt to try to solve this problem through legal provisions, another attempt to spend more money, more time, more effort on Criminal Code sanctions, another attempt to scratch the surface of this issue and never go beyond".

I know members in my community want to see this Parliament for once take this issue seriously by getting at the root causes of the problem. Reform Party members can make all the disparaging comments they want about the New Democratic Party and our policies on this issue, but I suggest that if we do not start to address

the root causes of prostitution then we will never get a handle on this issue.

We have been dealing with legal matters and Criminal Code sanctions in this Chamber for over two decades. It goes back to 1970. I have read through some of the efforts. There have been committees and studies on this matter. The list is endless. The time, the effort, the money that has gone into the study of legal provisions or Criminal Code sanctions to deal with prostitution is endless and there is hardly any time devoted to getting at the root causes of this issue.

● (1905 )

If we had just spent a fraction of the time and money that has gone into this issue in terms of legal sanctions and put the effort into matters of poverty, despair, loneliness and deprivation that force people into prostitution, maybe today we would be able to say we made a difference and that we have begun to crack down on the problem. That is something we all want to see. But no, we have spent all this time looking for an easy fix.

Today's proposal from the Reform Party is just that, a simple solution, a quick answer to something that is far more complex than is acknowledged.

There have been a number of studies dating back to 1970, justice committee reports, independent commissions and legislative proposals, changes to the Criminal Code. I do not think that we can conclude from all of this that we have made much of a difference. I do not think we have really done anything to reduce the incidence of prostitution in our communities today.

Most of the studies suggest that the problem is actually getting worse. If we go through some of the literature, and I refer specifically to the good work done by our own parliamentary research branch, a February 1997 study of street prostitution by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics shows a sharp increase in the number of prostitution related incidents recorded by police since 1995.

I have not studied all the reasons for that sharp increase, but I dare say that it is not because of all the time we have spent studying the legal and Criminal Code provisions that surround the issue. It is because we as a society have not really addressed the cause at the root of it all. How are we going to stop people from being forced into prostitution or taking advantage of vulnerable people if we do not look at the situation?

It is interesting that Reform presents this quick fix, this simplistic solution. When we have tried to convince members of the Reform Party to get serious about the root causes of prostitution, they refuse to get involved. When we on this side of the House presented a motion for the government to set targets to reduce unemployment and poverty, where were Reform members on the

*Private Members' Business*

issue? What did they do? They voted no. They would have nothing to do with that kind of proactive approach which does address the very root causes of prostitution.

Other studies show how serious the situation is and the problem is not going away. Much as the Reform Party would like to get it out of sight so it is out of mind, it is not going away because we have not dealt with it in a systematic way by looking at the systemic roots of the problem.

My colleague from Vancouver East has reported to me that very recently the Positive Women's Network in Vancouver reported a 160% increase in the last two years in its membership, most of whom are women living in poverty, many involved in the sex trade and many facing addiction.

Those kinds of statistics showing an increase in street solicitation, the sex trade, prostitution, are related directly to the economic situation, growing poverty, despair, loneliness, isolation and deprivation, a sense of no hope in terms of future economic opportunities. They are tied directly to the economic situation in this country. We have seen for the 85th month in a row unemployment above 9%.

With all those factors, growing unemployment, growing poverty and a growing gap between rich and poor, more and more people turning to undesirable ways to stay alive out of desperation, it does not take a lot to figure out that unless we deal with those root causes we are not going to make prostitution go away.

● (1910)

I know that the communities that I work with in Winnipeg North Centre would like us to look at the root causes, to address poverty, to address the hopelessness among children and young people who are lured by the unscrupulous behaviour of pimps in our society, taking advantage of everyone who is desperate to survive in this world.

I know the sense of desperation that single parent women feel just trying to make sure they can put food on the table.

I know how people are trying to stay alive in society today and what desperate means they will turn to.

I would suggest to the Reform Party and to all members of the House that if we could turn our attention to the very issues that give rise to prostitution in our society today, maybe we could make a difference. Maybe we could change things for the better so that people are not forced to resort to something as horrible as prostitution, selling their bodies to make money.

Who in our society today would do that willingly, unless out of desperation and absolute despair about how they will survive?

Let us put our energies into the roots of the problem and not deal with the superficial symptoms of something as serious as prostitution in our communities today.

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-206, which requests that amendments be made to the Criminal Code of Canada.

I agree with much of the commentary I have heard from all hon. members of the House about the seriousness of this offence.

It saddens me to look around this Chamber and see the youth of some of the pages here, knowing that there are prostitutes out on the street younger than they who are engaging in this trade out of necessity. I agree with the comment of the hon. member from the New Democratic Party that it is poverty and unemployment which are, no doubt, at the very root of this problem in Canada.

However, I must disagree with her premise that this motion is a simple approach to the problem. Perhaps simple is a good word, but in a positive sense, in the amendment which has been put forward. The reason I say that is this. There is no question that an amendment to the Criminal Code can be cumbersome. However, I suggest that the reason it has been put forward is very positive. That is why I support it. The reasons I will put forward for supporting it are equally simple.

The hon. Reform member has suggested that this would broaden the ability of the police, and I would suggest the judges as well, in their approach to this most serious matter. It does so for a number of reasons.

By making this a hybrid offence which would include an indictable offence it does a number of things, to which my friend has referred.

First, it gives the police the ability, under the Identification of Criminals Act, to fingerprint and take photographs, which could be used for a broader purpose in terms of children who have been abducted or children who are runaways. It could also be used for the purpose of deterrence.

Deterrence is a whole philosophy and we could speak at length on the issue of deterrence, but let me say this. A person who is charged with an indictable offence must appear in court. I have seen it at the provincial court level. With prostitution being a summary offence, it becomes essentially the price of doing business. Young prostitutes, or prostitutes of any age, will come into court or have a lawyer appear on their behalf, pay the fine and waltz out the door. They can amass a lengthy criminal record which, in essence, will result in perhaps a higher fine the next time.

Making this an indictable offence would allow judges, in their discretion, to impose a more lengthy term of incarceration, if necessary, or at least to apply conditions in a probation order that would include treatment type programs. It would treat this matter in the serious fashion in which it should be treated.

*Private Members' Business*

That is the main reason for which I, on behalf of the Conservative Party, am in support of this motion.

Luckily I can say that prostitution is not a major problem in my constituency in Nova Scotia. However, there is always the difficulty and the problem that arises when youth, for whatever reason, take to the streets in the bigger metropolitan areas or, in more serious cases, when young people are abducted and forced into this particular trade.

• (1915)

Saying that it is the oldest profession in the world is not to trivialize the problem at all. I do not want to draw too fine a point on it but slavery was around for a long time too and it was the laws that essentially brought about the necessary change, along with the efforts and work of people against that particular problem.

Prostitution is not going to be solved by simple amendments to the Criminal Code. I think we can all say that quite simply. However there is no question that this is a step in the right direction. It saddens me to think that this can become a partisan issue. Like a lot of justice issues, this is something the House should be unanimous in its efforts to work toward solutions.

The hon. parliamentary secretary for the justice minister has stated that there is a report pending. I would hope and encourage her to keep this particular motion in mind and not to simply dismiss it. What if the report comes back and there are suggestions which move the Criminal Code in the very direction the hon. member from the Reform is suggesting? I reiterate it is very unfortunate that we see this forum being used again as a means to get up and simply dismiss the idea outright because it happens to come from one party or another.

I think it is a good suggestion. It is something that at least moves us in the direction of addressing the issue in a positive way. It improves discretion on the part of the police and judges to act in a definitive way by imposing more innovative sentences that might include treatment. It also allows the police to treat the matter in a more serious way.

Also, I would reiterate the comments made by the hon. member from the Reform. I would suggest that the perception of justice in Canada is extremely important as to how the community views how those actors who are imposing our criminal laws are viewing the problem. It gives the perception that we in this Chamber and in the justice departments around the country are looking at this problem and looking for solutions. Not simple solutions, but solutions that are aimed at moving in the right direction.

I am not suggesting that raising fines and putting people in jail in itself is going to solve this problem. But it certainly is a move in the right direction in increasing the ability of those people charged with the enforcement of the law and giving them a greater ability to

do something about this crime. It is not going to, as my friends from the New Democratic Party and the Bloc suggested, get needles off the streets. It is not going to eradicate this problem in its entirety, not by a long shot, but it will increase the ability to act in a proactive way.

That is how I view this particular piece of legislation. It is proactive. It is preventive. It is doing something early in the process. This again is something which is tied in with the changes that need to come about under the Young Offenders Act.

It is doing something early at the front end. It is loading the resources at the beginning where the problem starts and doing something before we get further and further down the road where someone has been engaged in prostitution for whatever reason, poverty, drug addiction, all sorts of reasons, a forced situation where pimps are forcing young people into this area.

This is something that we should embrace within this House. It is something I am supporting and I would encourage all members to do so.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member from Calgary Centre.

To remind the hon. member for Calgary Centre, if as is the usual practice, the mover of the motion would like to sum up, it would mean the member for Calgary Centre would have seven minutes.

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for that clarification. I very much appreciate that.

I also very much appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-206. I had prepared a few more comments than the time will allow, so I may have to pause at a few opportunities and correct accordingly.

I am particularly interested to speak to this bill. It is important. Sometimes in this House we get so distant from the people we represent that we need to bring forward some real live people who have to live in the environment which we are trying to change.

I am reminded of an elderly lady with whom I was recently in contact in my riding. This elderly lady lived in the inner city community that is plagued with prostitution. She has been there for over 10 years. She is now afraid to go out of her house at night because of the violence outside her door that is related to street prostitution. She pleaded with me to find a way to make a change that would allow the police, who have become complacent with the issue outside her door, to find a way whereby they would have new tools that would allow them to impact the street prostitution that she has to live with.

• (1920)

This lady has seen the violence outside her own door. She has watched the drug trade that has come with prostitution in her

*Private Members' Business*

community. She is aware of the health risks that have escalated because of the increase in street prostitution.

I have also met with the community association of this community. Their number one issue is street prostitution trade in their community. They recognize that it is a multifaceted problem. There is not a single silver bullet that is going to solve this.

At the same time, they are calling for elected officials and people within the community to come up with a series of strategies that will help to resolve this problem for them.

One of the major concerns that my constituents have is the age at which some of the young girls are getting caught up in this industry or in prostitution. It is one of the reasons I will be proposing a private members' bill to address this issue in the days to come.

What is ironic here is that the majority of the effort that police apply to affect street prostitution is targeted toward this very activity that this bill is trying to address, the activity of communicating for the service of prostitution, to obtain the sexual service of a prostitute.

That is where the majority of their effort goes. Yet, the result is a summary offence, a fine and often police are frustrated because they continue to see a cycle of the repeat offenders.

Changes to the act to make the possibility of an indictable offence the result of prosecution will allow for, as has been stated, the identification of the people who are involved, a record to be established and potentially a jail term.

We focused on the 10-year maximum but that is obviously not going to be the norm. That is the maximum. That should be made clear here.

This is really not a terribly new precedent. In section 212 of the Criminal Code, there are already indictable offences that apply to prostitution.

Someone inciting someone else to get involved in prostitution or someone who is living off the avails of prostitution of someone else who is under the age of 18 are already indictable offences.

We are really not breaking tremendous new ground here. We are just applying a correction and providing the police with a new tool that they really could take advantage of.

Beyond these new tools to police, I am even more concerned about some of the other benefits that flow out of this proposed bill. The member from the Conservative Party made some reference to it. I certainly concur with his disappointment that we would make this a partisan issue and not have unanimous support around this kind of initiative.

Some of the other benefits I want to speak to, particularly in my riding, are some of the young girls who are caught up in this

activity who are runaways from home. Many of us do not realize that prostitutes do not stay in their same community. They are moved around to many communities across Canada. Perhaps members do not have this problem in their own riding but some of the people from their riding may be caught up in it and moved to other centres.

The ability to identify these people is critical to the police in order to track these runaways and reunite them with their families.

I have in my possession a list of 14 young prostitutes who have been killed in the last 10 years. They were identified and I will get to the identification process in a minute. I wonder how many more have just disappeared.

The greatest difficulty the police have today in these kinds of crimes and violence against these women who are involved in prostitution is the difficulty of identification.

• (1925 )

There are often time delays when a murder is committed before the body is found and identification is that much more complex. The johns of course keep a low profile. They deal with strangers normally and there is no identification. Often they use an alias and do not use the same name twice.

In my riding there is a charity that works with street teens and girls who are on the streets to try to get them off the streets. They get to know who the girls are on the streets. The police come to that charity in order to find out who the girls are. I think it is tragic that our police are forced to go to a charity to identify these girls who have been tragic victims.

In summary, I think the key point of this simple piece of legislation is that it provides better protection for our communities, like the elderly lady I made reference to, and allows for family reunification for those who have been caught up in it and have run away. It allows for the prosecution of potentially violent johns who could impact on the girls who are caught up in this trade. It allows for improved deterrents for those who may elect to get into it and generally safer neighbourhoods.

If we cannot support a bill that serves to provide safer neighbourhoods for the people we represent then I think we really have to examine our effectiveness here.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member for New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby will sum up.

**Mr. Paul Forseth:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly would have liked to have heard more positive comments than what I got to hear. I think the parliamentary secretary for the government is sadly misled.

When I was talking about deterrents, it was not the main issue. Identification and prevention are. The resistance to what I am proposing flies in the face, I think, of what average Canadians

want from Parliament. The Liberals are out of touch on this issue and of course the NDP are not even in the game.

The arguments advanced against this are completely fallacious. What we get with it is a condescending attitude that frustrates the public will. That is absolutely incredible.

The NDP then come along and talk about root causes and insult the poor and associate poverty with root causes of prostitution. We have to think about that combination of where it keeps coming from. Round and round we have heard the arguments now and enough of the basis of the general arguments of why we are in Canada today where we are. The representative arguments that we have heard in the last hour are reflective of years and years of hand-wringing and doing absolutely nothing. The public has heard enough. I do not think we need to hear any more that we cannot do anything.

I am going to summarize clearly that there are broad societal reasons why we should do this. We need to do it on behalf of local communities and on behalf of victims. Whether it is those who get trapped into the lifestyle or the community that is the victim, we need to act.

Administratively, we also need to provide more flexible tools for the police so that they may exercise discretion in dealing with local variances and emerging problems. Moreover, we need to narrow the door that permits kids from getting involved in prostitution in the first place and have another legal way to get them into social services.

My bill is a small technical amendment which could help victims and bring safety to our neighbourhoods and bring a change which has been both recommended by national consultation and by local police forces. I wanted to see more common sense and support for this idea. The people of the country are watching.

### *Private Members' Business*

We went to a committee and this bill was deemed non-votable, which is really an offence. In any case, we have covered the arguments and the people listening will be able to hear. However, I want the members of this House to pay attention to what I am about to move and not make a mistake. It is important that this issue be debated fully. Therefore, I appeal to the members of this House for unanimous consent to move:

That Bill C-206 be withdrawn, the order for second reading discharged and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

• (1930 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Does the hon. member for New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby have the unanimous consent of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Unfortunately the hon. member's motion has not received unanimous consent.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being 7.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.30 p.m.)





# CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 25, 1997

## Points of Order

### Main Estimates

|                                      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Mr. Massé .....                      | 2141 |
| Mr. Williams .....                   | 2142 |
| Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) ..... | 2144 |
| Mr. Massé .....                      | 2144 |
| The Speaker .....                    | 2144 |

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Environment

|                                     |      |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... | 2144 |
|-------------------------------------|------|

### Government Response to Petitions

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Adams ..... | 2145 |
|-----------------|------|

### Proportional Representation Review Act

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Bill C-287. Introduction and first reading .....                     | 2145 |
| Mr. Nystrom .....  | 2145 |
| (Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ..... | 2145 |

### Broadcasting Act

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Bill C-288. Introduction and first reading .....                     | 2145 |
| Mr. Gallaway .....   | 2145 |
| (Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ..... | 2145 |

### Bank Act

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Bill C-289. Introduction and first reading .....                     | 2145 |
| Mr. Ménard .....   | 2145 |
| (Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ..... | 2145 |

### Petitions

#### Criminal Code

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) ..... | 2145 |
|--------------------------------|------|

#### Highways

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Blaikie ..... | 2146 |
|-------------------|------|

### Questions on the Order Paper

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Adams ..... | 2146 |
|-----------------|------|

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Supply

#### Allotted Day—Calgary Declaration

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Jaffer .....                        | 2146 |
| Motion .....                            | 2146 |
| Mr. Jaffer .....                        | 2146 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                      | 2147 |
| Mr. Jaffer .....                        | 2147 |
| Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....   | 2148 |
| Mr. Jaffer .....                        | 2148 |
| Mr. Mark .....                          | 2148 |
| Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) ..... | 2149 |
| Mr. Mark .....                          | 2150 |
| Mr. Belhumeur .....                     | 2150 |
| Mr. Mark .....                          | 2150 |
| Mr. Dion .....                          | 2150 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2152 |
| Mr. Dion .....                          | 2152 |

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2152 |
| Mr. Dion .....                            | 2152 |
| Mr. Benoit .....                          | 2153 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2153 |
| Mr. Dion .....                            | 2155 |
| Mr. Belhumeur .....                       | 2155 |
| Mr. Dion .....                            | 2155 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2155 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                          | 2155 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2155 |
| Mr. Blaikie .....                         | 2156 |
| Mr. Lebel .....                           | 2157 |
| Mr. Blaikie .....                         | 2157 |
| Mr. Dion .....                            | 2158 |
| Mr. Blaikie .....                         | 2158 |
| Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) .....   | 2158 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2159 |
| Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) .....   | 2159 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                        | 2159 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                        | 2160 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                          | 2160 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                        | 2160 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                          | 2160 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                        | 2160 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                          | 2160 |
| Mr. Borotsik .....                        | 2161 |
| Mr. Goldring .....                        | 2161 |
| Amendment .....                           | 2162 |
| Mr. Muise .....                           | 2162 |
| Mr. Goldring .....                        | 2162 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2162 |
| Mr. Belhumeur .....                       | 2162 |
| Mr. Brien .....                           | 2162 |
| Mr. Goldring .....                        | 2163 |
| Mr. Harris .....                          | 2163 |
| Mr. Lincoln .....                         | 2164 |
| Mr. Harris .....                          | 2164 |
| Mr. Marchand .....                        | 2165 |
| Mr. Harris .....                          | 2165 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2165 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2166 |
| Mr. Marchand .....                        | 2166 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2166 |
| Mr. Belhumeur .....                       | 2166 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2166 |
| Mr. Rocheleau .....                       | 2166 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2166 |
| Mr. Belhumeur .....                       | 2167 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2167 |
| Mr. Harvey .....                          | 2167 |
| Mr. Duhamel .....                         | 2167 |
| Mr. Myers .....                           | 2167 |
| Mr. Marchand .....                        | 2169 |
| Mr. Myers .....                           | 2169 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2170 |
| Mr. Myers .....                           | 2170 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2170 |
| Mr. Mahoney .....                         | 2172 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2173 |

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Marchand .....                        | 2173 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2173 |
| Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska) .....   | 2173 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2173 |
| Ms. Lill .....                            | 2174 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2174 |
| Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....     | 2174 |
| Mr. Jaffer .....                          | 2175 |
| Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....     | 2175 |
| Mr. Marchand .....                        | 2175 |
| Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....     | 2176 |
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2176 |
| Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....     | 2176 |

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Youth Crimes

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2176 |
|---|------|

### Councillor Bill Struck

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Perić ..... | 2176 |
|-----------------|------|

### Drummondville

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mrs. Picard ..... | 2177 |
|-------------------|------|

### Hepatitis C Society of Canada

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Ms. Bennett ..... | 2177 |
|-------------------|------|

### Ray Smith

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. O'Reilly ..... | 2177 |
|--------------------|------|

### Telemarketing

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Lastewka ..... | 2177 |
|--------------------|------|

### Canada Post Strike

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Benoit ..... | 2177 |
|------------------|------|

### Quebec Economy

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| Ms. St-Hilaire ..... | 2178 |
|----------------------|------|

### Global Vision

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Mr. Reed ..... | 2178 |
|----------------|------|

### Quebec Government

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Coderre ..... | 2178 |
|-------------------|------|

### The Senate

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| Mr. Obhrai ..... | 2178 |
|------------------|------|

### Violence against Women

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Mr. Lee ..... | 2179 |
|---------------|------|

### APEC

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Mr. Blaikie ..... | 2179 |
|-------------------|------|

### Montreal Economy

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Ms. Jennings ..... | 2179 |
|--------------------|------|

### Atlantic Groundfish Strategy

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Power ..... | 2179 |
|-----------------|------|

### Remembrance Day

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| Mr. Adams ..... | 2180 |
|-----------------|------|

### Airbus

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Nunziata ..... | 2180 |
|--------------------|------|

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Canada Post

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Miss Grey .....    | 2180 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2180 |

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Miss Grey .....    | 2180 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2180 |
| Miss Grey .....    | 2180 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2180 |
| Mr. Gouk .....     | 2181 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2181 |
| Mr. Gouk .....     | 2181 |

### Option Canada

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. Duceppe .....   | 2181 |
| Ms. Copps .....     | 2181 |
| Mr. Duceppe .....   | 2181 |
| Ms. Copps .....     | 2181 |
| Mrs. Tremblay ..... | 2181 |
| Ms. Copps .....     | 2181 |
| Mrs. Tremblay ..... | 2181 |
| Ms. Copps .....     | 2181 |

### Fisheries

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Ms. McDonough ..... | 2182 |
| Mr. Pettigrew ..... | 2182 |
| Ms. McDonough ..... | 2182 |
| Mr. Pettigrew ..... | 2182 |

### Young Offenders Act

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Borotsik ..... | 2182 |
| Ms. McLellan ..... | 2182 |
| Mr. Borotsik ..... | 2182 |
| Ms. McLellan ..... | 2182 |

### Canada Post

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Mr. Harris .....   | 2183 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2183 |
| Mr. Harris .....   | 2183 |
| Mr. MacAulay ..... | 2183 |

### Employment Insurance

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Mr. Crête .....     | 2183 |
| Mr. Pettigrew ..... | 2183 |
| Mr. Crête .....     | 2183 |
| Mr. Pettigrew ..... | 2183 |

### Tobacco Sponsorship

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| Mr. Hill (MacLeod) .....   | 2184 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) ..... | 2184 |
| Mr. Hill (MacLeod) .....   | 2184 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) ..... | 2184 |

### The Environment

|                                     |      |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Mr. Bigras .....                    | 2184 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... | 2184 |
| Mr. Bigras .....                    | 2184 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... | 2184 |

### Justice

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2184 |
| Ms. McLellan .....                        | 2184 |
| Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....            | 2185 |
| Ms. McLellan .....                        | 2185 |

### Rail Transportation

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| Mr. Guimond .....    | 2185 |
| Mr. Collenette ..... | 2185 |

### Highway System

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| Mr. Gallaway .....   | 2185 |
| Mr. Collenette ..... | 2185 |

### Justice

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... | 2185 |
|---|------|

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Ms. McLellan .....                         | 2185 |
| Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose) .....             | 2186 |
| Ms. McLellan .....                         | 2186 |
| <b>Banks</b>                               |      |
| Mr. Nystrom .....                          | 2186 |
| Mr. Peterson .....                         | 2186 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                          | 2186 |
| Mr. Peterson .....                         | 2186 |
| <b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>                  |      |
| Mr. Thompson (Charlotte) .....             | 2186 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....                 | 2187 |
| Mr. Thompson (Charlotte) .....             | 2187 |
| Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....                 | 2187 |
| <b>National Revenue</b>                    |      |
| Mrs. Longfield .....                       | 2187 |
| Mrs. Barnes .....                          | 2187 |
| <b>National Defence</b>                    |      |
| Mr. Hanger .....                           | 2187 |
| Mr. Eggleton .....                         | 2187 |
| <b>INARI</b>                               |      |
| Mr. Bergeron .....                         | 2187 |
| Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... | 2187 |
| <b>Ports Canada</b>                        |      |
| Mr. Mancini .....                          | 2188 |
| Mr. Collenette .....                       | 2188 |
| <b>Finance</b>                             |      |
| Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) .....      | 2188 |
| Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....           | 2188 |
| <b>Museums</b>                             |      |
| Mr. Abbott .....                           | 2188 |
| Ms. Copps .....                            | 2188 |
| <b>Quebec's Partition</b>                  |      |
| Mr. Brien .....                            | 2188 |
| Mr. Dion .....                             | 2188 |
| <b>Post-Secondary Education</b>            |      |
| Ms. Davies .....                           | 2189 |
| Mr. Pettigrew .....                        | 2189 |
| <b>Young Offenders Act</b>                 |      |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                         | 2189 |
| Ms. McLellan .....                         | 2189 |
| <b>Agriculture</b>                         |      |
| Mr. Drouin .....                           | 2189 |
| Mr. Normand .....                          | 2189 |
| <b>Presence in Gallery</b>                 |      |
| The Speaker .....                          | 2189 |
| Ms. Torsney .....                          | 2189 |
| <b>Privilege</b>                           |      |
| <b>Standing Committee on Industry</b>      |      |
| Ms. Wasylycia-Leis .....                   | 2190 |
| Mr. Boudria .....                          | 2190 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                          | 2191 |
| The Speaker .....                          | 2191 |

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| <b>Points of Order</b>      |      |
| <b>Oral Question Period</b> |      |
| Mr. Gouk .....              | 2191 |

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Supply</b>                           |      |
| <b>Allotted Day—Calgary Declaration</b> |      |
| Motion .....                            | 2192 |
| Ms. Bradshaw .....                      | 2192 |
| Mr. Crête .....                         | 2193 |
| Ms. Bradshaw .....                      | 2194 |
| Mrs. Debien .....                       | 2194 |
| Ms. Bradshaw .....                      | 2194 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2194 |
| Mr. Szabo .....                         | 2196 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2197 |
| Mr. Turp .....                          | 2197 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2197 |
| Mr. McTeague .....                      | 2197 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2197 |
| Mr. Canuel .....                        | 2198 |
| Mr. Kenney .....                        | 2198 |
| Mr. Lincoln .....                       | 2198 |
| Mr. Canuel .....                        | 2199 |
| Mr. Lincoln .....                       | 2199 |
| Mr. DeVillers .....                     | 2200 |
| Mr. Adams .....                         | 2201 |

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Business of the House</b>   |      |
| Mr. Adams .....  | 2201 |
| (Motion agreed to) .....   | 2201 |
| <b>Committees of the House</b>   |      |
| <b>Official Languages, Scrutiny of Regulations and Library of Parliament</b> |      |
| Motion for concurrence .....   | 2201 |
| Mr. Adams .....  | 2201 |
| (Motion agreed to) .....   | 2201 |

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Supply</b>                                 |      |
| <b>Opposition Day—the Calgary Declaration</b> |      |
| Motion .....                                  | 2201 |
| Mr. Turp .....                                | 2201 |
| Mr. DeVillers .....                           | 2202 |
| Mr. Casson .....                              | 2202 |
| Mr. Godin (Châteauguay) .....                 | 2204 |
| Mr. Casson .....                              | 2204 |
| Mr. Shepherd .....                            | 2204 |
| Mr. Casson .....                              | 2204 |
| Mr. Hilstrom .....                            | 2205 |
| Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....              | 2205 |
| Mr. Szabo .....                               | 2206 |
| Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....              | 2206 |
| Mr. Canuel .....                              | 2206 |
| Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....              | 2206 |
| Mr. Turp .....                                | 2207 |
| Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....              | 2207 |
| Mr. Shepherd .....                            | 2207 |
| Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) .....          | 2208 |

|                         |      |
|-------------------------|------|
| <b>Speaker's Ruling</b> |      |
| The Speaker .....       | 2208 |

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Supply**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Allotted day—Calgary Declaration</b>         |      |
| Motion .....                                    | 2210 |
| Mr. Lebel .....                                 | 2210 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2211 |
| (Motion, as amended, agreed to) .....           | 2211 |
| <b>Allotted Day—Main Estimates</b>              |      |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2211 |
| Motion No. 1 .....                              | 2211 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2211 |
| Mr. Strahl .....                                | 2211 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....                              | 2211 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                               | 2211 |
| Mr. Harvey .....                                | 2211 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2211 |
| Mr. Charbonneau .....                           | 2212 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2212 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2213 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2213 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2213 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2213 |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2213 |
| Motion No. 2 .....                              | 2213 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2213 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2213 |
| Mr. Strahl .....                                | 2213 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....                              | 2213 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                               | 2213 |
| Mr. Harvey .....                                | 2213 |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2214 |
| Motion No. 3 .....                              | 2214 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2214 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2215 |
| Mr. Strahl .....                                | 2215 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....                              | 2215 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                               | 2215 |
| Mr. Harvey .....                                | 2215 |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2216 |
| Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 .....             | 2216 |
| (Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 agreed to) ..... | 2216 |
| Motion for concurrence .....                    | 2216 |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2216 |
| (Motion agreed to) .....                        | 2216 |
| <b>Supplementary Estimates (A)</b>              |      |
| Mr. Massé .....                                 | 2216 |
| Motion No. 1 .....                              | 2216 |
| Mr. Kilger .....                                | 2216 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....                              | 2216 |
| Mr. Strahl .....                                | 2216 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....                              | 2216 |
| Mr. Solomon .....                               | 2216 |
| Mr. Harvey .....                                | 2216 |
| (Motion No. 1 agreed to) .....                  | 2216 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Mr. Kilger .....   | 2216 |
| Motion for concurrence .....   | 2216 |
| Mr. Massé .....  | 2216 |
| (Motion agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| Bill C-23. First reading .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Massé .....  | 2217 |
| (Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time) .....   | 2217 |
| Second reading .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Massé .....  | 2217 |
| (Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair) ..... | 2217 |
| (Clause 2 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Clause 3 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Clause 4 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Clause 5 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Clause 6 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Schedule 1 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Schedule 2 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Clause 1 agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Preamble agreed to) .....   | 2217 |
| (Title agreed to) .....  | 2217 |
| (Bill reported) .....  | 2217 |
| Motion for concurrence .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Massé .....  | 2217 |
| Mr. Kilger .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Strahl .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Solomon .....  | 2217 |
| Mr. Harvey .....   | 2217 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....   | 2217 |
| Third reading .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Massé .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Kilger .....   | 2219 |
| (Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) .....  | 2219 |

**Telecommunications Act**

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Bill C-17. Second reading .....                               | 2219 |
| Mr. Kilger .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Nunziata .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Strahl .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Bergeron .....  | 2219 |
| Mr. Solomon .....   | 2219 |
| Mr. Harvey .....  | 2219 |
| (Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..... | 2220 |

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Criminal Code**

|                                  |      |
|----------------------------------|------|
| Bill C-206. Second reading ..... | 2220 |
| Mr. Forseth .....                | 2220 |
| Ms. Bakopanos .....              | 2223 |
| Mr. Bellehumeur .....            | 2224 |
| Ms. Wasylycia-Leis .....         | 2225 |
| Mr. MacKay .....                 | 2226 |
| Mr. Lowther .....                | 2227 |
| Mr. Forseth .....                | 2228 |
| Motion .....                     | 2229 |

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**03159442**

**Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

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 Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**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 :**

**Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**