



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 145 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, October 29, 1998**

**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

Thursday, October 29, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

### PRIVILEGE

CANADIAN MILLENNIUM SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised by the House Leader of the Official Opposition on October 19, 1998, concerning the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

First, I would like to thank all the hon. members who made comments on this matter: the Leader of the Government in the House, the hon. member for Calgary-Nose Hill and the hon. member for Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys.

[*English*]

The House leader of the official opposition has recalled a matter which had been previously raised by the hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill on February 26, 1998 concerning the Canada millennium scholarship foundation.

In his submission the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford argued that an issue relating to the February 26 question of privilege remained unresolved. That issue was the allocation of money for the establishment of the foundation before parliament had the opportunity to consider the matter. He deplored the fact that there had been no legislation setting up this foundation, nor had the budget announcement allocating \$2.5 billion to the foundation been adopted. In his opinion this constitutes a contempt of parliament.

[*Translation*]

It has been several months since this matter was first raised and I took it upon myself to refresh my memory as to the sequence of events.

The Millennium Scholarship Foundation was referred to in general terms in the Speech from the Throne in September 1997, and was subsequently a provision of the Budget presented on February 24, 1998. This Budget was adopted by the House on March 10, 1998, and Bill C-36, the legislation implementing its provisions, was introduced on March 19, 1998, and was given Royal Assent on June 18, 1998.

[*English*]

Budgets by nature refer to actions the government intends to take and often include the proposed amount of money to be allocated. The announcement of such policies does not preclude parliament from making a decision on the subsequent implementing legislation.

In support of his argument the hon. member referred to new evidence relating to this matter. In particular, he alluded to the auditor general's report to parliament as well as an article that appeared in the *Ottawa Sun* on October 18, 1998. The member quoted from this article in support of the view that the government had not followed proper accounting practices when it charged the costs for the millennium scholarship fund to fiscal year 1997-98 when the expenditures would not take place until a year later. The hon. member noted how this action by the government was being portrayed as a contempt of the House. The member went on to state correctly that contempt of the House is a matter that must be resolved here in the House of Commons and nowhere else.

• (1010)

[*Translation*]

The Chair always takes very seriously any allegation of contempt. On the subject of contempt, Maingot states at page 229 of the 2nd Edition of his work, *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*:

"Any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his "parliamentary" duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly to produce such results may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent for the offence."

[*English*]

My colleagues, in the matter before us the hon. member argues that the government by its accounting practice of charging the costs of the millennium scholarship foundation to fiscal year 1997-98 before legislative action is taken by the House is making a mockery of our parliamentary system and that this constitutes contempt of

*Routine Proceedings*

the House. However, as Maingot indicates, the test is whether the action of the government obstructs or impedes the House in the discharge of its parliamentary duty.

I do not believe the House has been obstructed or its members impeded in the discharge of their parliamentary duties. Members have not been prevented from debating the matter at issue here, nor has the authority of the House been brought into question or circumvented. Indeed the auditor general's reports on these matters are permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(e) and that committee can pursue these matters at length and report to the House thereon if it so wishes.

Whether or not the accounting practices of the government are appropriate is a matter for political debate and it is also a subject that members may choose to raise. Notwithstanding the previous debates on the budget and the implementation legislation, members are not precluded from bringing up this issue for consideration by the House through the usual procedures available.

In my view it is not the Speaker's role to comment on the government's accounting practices and interfere thereby with matters which the House has given to the auditor general by statute and to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts by standing order.

In my opinion the information offered by the hon. member for Langley—Abbotsford does not represent evidence, *prima facie*, of a contempt of parliament or a breach of privilege.

I thank the hon. member for having brought his matter to the attention of the House.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### MANAGING FOR RESULTS 1998

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, as a result of a comprehensive effort to inform parliamentarians and Canadians of the government's record, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a report entitled "Managing for Results 1998", the annual report of the President of the Treasury Board to Parliament.

I also have the honour to table the 80 reports on the performance of government departments and agencies.

[*English*]

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1998-99

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (B) for the financial year ending March 31, 1999 was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Speaker to the House.

• (1015)

#### REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 81(5) and 81(6), I wish to introduce a motion concerning referral of the estimates to the standing committees of the House.

Therefore, I move:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, laid upon the Table on October 29, 1998, be referred to the several standing committees of the House in accordance with the detailed allocation attached.

There is a lengthy list associated with the motion. If it is agreeable to the House I would ask that the list be printed in *Hansard* as if it had been read.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: List referred to above is as follows:*]

To the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

—Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Votes 1b, 5b, 6b, 10b, 15b, L20b, L26b, 30b, 40b and 45b

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

—Agriculture and Agri-Food, Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, 20b and 25b

To the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

—Canadian Heritage, Votes 1b, 5b, 20b, 25b, 30b, 40b, 50b, 60b, 65b, 70b, 75b, 80b, 85b, 90b, 95b, 105b, 110b, 120b, 125b and 135b

To the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

—Citizenship and Immigration, Votes 1b and 5b

To the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

—Environment, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b and 15b

To the Standing Committee on Finance

—Finance, Votes 1b, L11b and 35b  
—National Revenue, Votes 1b and 10b

To the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

—Fisheries and Oceans, Vote 1b, 5b and 10b

To the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

—Foreign Affairs, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 20b, 25b, 40b and 45b

To the Standing Committee on Health

—Health, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b and 25b

To the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

—Human Resources Development, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b and 35b

*Routine Proceedings*

- To the Standing Committee on Industry  
—Industry, Votes 1b, 5b, 20b, 25b, 30b, 35b, 50b, 55b, 65b, 70b, 75b, 85b, 90b, 95b, 100b, 110b, 115b and 120b
- To the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights  
—Justice, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 25b, 35b, 40b, 45b and 50b  
—Solicitor General, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 25b, 30b, 45b and 50b
- To the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs  
—National Defence, Votes 1b, 5b and 10b  
—Veterans Affairs, Votes 1b and 10b
- To the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Government Operations  
—Canadian Heritage, Votes 130b  
—Governor General, Vote 1b  
—Natural Resources, Votes 1b, 10b, 20b, 25b and 35b  
—Parliament, Vote 1b  
—Privy Council, Votes 1b, 5b, 35b and 46b  
—Public Works and Government Services, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b and 21b  
—Treasury Board, Vote 1b and 10b
- To the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs  
—Parliament, Vote 5b
- To the Standing Committee on Public Accounts  
—Finance, Vote 30b
- To the Standing Committee on Transport  
—Privy Council, Vote 15b  
—Transport, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 27b and 30b
- To the Standing Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament  
—Parliament, Vote 10b
- To the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages  
—Privy Council, Vote 25b

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### PETITIONS

BILL C-68

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today on the issue of firearms registration. The petitioners call on the government to repeal Bill C-68 and to redirect the hundreds of millions of tax dollars being wasted on the licensing and registration of legally owned guns by responsible firearms owners to things proven to be more cost effective, such as reducing violent crime and improving public safety, having more police on the streets, particularly in British

Columbia, having more crime prevention programs, more suicide prevention programs, more women's crisis centres, more anti-smuggling campaigns and more resources for fighting organized crime and street gangs.

These petitions come from my constituents in the riding of Medicine Hat.

### CHILD PROSTITUTION

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition signed by some 1,200 residents of the lower mainland of British Columbia.

Child prostitution is a blight on our society and these petitioners request parliament to raise the age of sexual consent between a young person and an adult from 14 years to 16 years.

BILL C-68

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have three petitions to present which are identical in form and content. They come from the communities of Bengough, Ogema, Melville, Canora, Kamsack and St. Wallburg in Saskatchewan. They bear a total of 372 signatures.

These petitioners are concerned with the effects of Bill C-68 which will come into full force on December 1.

● (1020)

They state that there is no evidence that this legislation will be beneficial and that the search and seizure provisions of Bill C-68 would constitute a breach of traditional civil liberties and be an affront to law-abiding Canadians. They humbly pray and call upon parliament to repeal Bill C-68 and all associated regulations with respect to firearms or ammunition and to pass new legislation designed to severely penalize the criminal use of any weapon.

This brings the total number of signatures that I have received on petitions of this nature in the last few months to 4,398.

### MARRIAGE

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by members of the towns of Wetaskiwin, Millet and Leduc in my riding who want to call the attention of parliament to the following: "Whereas the majority of Canadians understand the concept of marriage as only the voluntary union of a single, that is, unmarried male and a single, that is, unmarried female, it is the duty of parliament to ensure that marriage, as it has always been known and understood in Canada, be preserved and protected".

Therefore, the petitioners pray that parliament enact legislation such as Bill C-225 so as to define in statute that marriage can only be entered into between a single male and a single female.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**NUNAVUT ACT**

The House resumed from October 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-57, an act to amend the Nunavut Act with respect to the Nunavut Court of Justice and to amend other acts in consequence, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The question is on the motion for second reading of Bill C-57. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES ACT**

The House resumed from October 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to express my support for Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Parkdale—High Park.

Revenues from the sale of advertising services are part of the economic fabric and the very foundation of the Canadian periodical

industry. They play a pivotal role in supporting and guaranteeing the survival of the Canadian periodical industry, and of its Canadian content.

They are also one of the primary means of ensuring the vitality and viability of this Canadian cultural resource.

[English]

In the 1950s less than a quarter of all magazines circulating in Canada were produced by Canadian publishers. Today that number is nearly three-quarters.

A provider of over 6,000 Canadian jobs and more than \$194 million in salaries, wages and fees, the Canadian periodical industry is comprised of over 1,000 small and medium sized companies.

[Translation]

The bill will help make Canadian advertising revenues accessible to more Canadian publishers, a group which includes a growing number of young Canadians, all of them creative and talented.

The Canadian periodical industry is an important vehicle for Canadians' ideas, values, dreams, and pride.

• (1025)

[English]

Without continued access to revenues from the sale of advertising services, this success could be seriously eroded. Low incremental costs would allow foreign publishers to sell advertising services directed at the Canadian market at discount rates.

Foreign publishers simply do not incur the costs of Canadian publishers because foreign publishers do not invest in producing content for the Canadian market. Foreign publishers do not hire Canadian writers, engage Canadian photographers or other Canadian creative talents.

[Translation]

As members of parliament and as Canadians, we have the duty to ensure that our children and grandchildren see, hear, read and discover the stories of their country.

[English]

The bill before the House today meets a pivotal challenge in our pursuit of that important promise. The foreign publishers advertising services act establishes a fair and effective framework for the distribution of advertising dollars in the Canadian markets. It will ensure that Canadian publishers continue to have access to the advertising revenues they need to thrive. It will guarantee that only Canadian publishers will be able to sell advertising services aimed at Canadians. It will put in place tough penalties for foreign publishers who attempt to go against the regulations flowing from this proposed legislation.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

Today, in Canada, general interest periodicals bring in only about 7% of the total advertising revenues available in the Canadian market, the lowest share of all advertising revenues of the various media. This situation is due in part to the presence of foreign periodicals in Canada and to the fact that Canadian advertising goes to foreign periodicals.

If foreign periodical publishers were given unlimited access to the Canadian market, Canadian content periodicals would become considerably less visible.

[English]

Clearly we need to put in place advertising measures that will give our periodicals a fair shake. Clearly we must do what we can to enable our Canadian storytellers to tell our Canadian stories. Clearly we must see to it that Canadian readers have the greatest access possible to those stories.

As the Prime Minister and the Minister of Canadian Heritage have stated time and again, Canadians must be able to see themselves in the stories we read and in the stories we share with the world.

[Translation]

That said, Canada intends to play by the rules. So, the measure proposed is in keeping with our commitments to international trade. Canada is a bridge builder. Our commercial and economic markets are among the world's most liberalized.

[English]

Through this legislation Canada is upholding these roles and responsibilities to the fullest. In no way will this bill affect the importation of foreign magazines into Canada. In no way will this bill impede the access of foreign magazines to the Canadian market. In no way will this bill target current advertising operations of foreign publishers already in the Canadian market.

Word for word, the foreign publishers advertising services act is consistent with all of Canada's international advertising service obligations under the general agreement on trade and services.

[Translation]

We are reconciling align Canada's cultural objectives and its trade objectives. We are reconciling our roles as citizens of Canada and of the world.

Canadians want to read more than just the articles appearing in *Maclean's*, *L'Actualité* and *Châtelaine*, and they also want greater access to more periodicals such as *Garden West* and *Safarir*.

[English]

It will help maintain a level playing field in Canada to preserve a prominent place for Canadians to see their own reflection.

Canada's periodical industry was built by creative and talented individual Canadians and it has been driven to success by the powerful collective will of our nation.

The foreign publishers advertising services act honours that strength and that drive. It pays homage to past successes and draws strength from that force of will. The foreign publishers advertising services act will guarantee a prominent and sustained place for the ideas, dreams and vision of our Canadian children and grandchildren.

Therefore I move:

That the question be now put.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is the House prepared to accept the motion?

**Some hon. members:** No.

• (1030)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** On questions and comments, the hon. member for Medicine Hat.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, my question for the parliamentary secretary has to do with the likely retaliation we will get for continually beating our head against the wall with this legislation. We know it was substantially defeated the first time it went before the WTO. Now we are trying a back door approach which we know will fail again. All we are going to do is incite problems with our biggest trading partner, a country we trade with to the tune of \$1 billion every day.

Can the hon. member tell us why he thinks we are not going to face reprisals as we have faced in the past, perhaps in other areas such as farming where we already have a huge crisis in this country? Why would the government risk that type of reprisal to push through legislation it knows will ultimately fail?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger:** Madam Speaker, I have to disagree totally with the member's premise that this will fail. We believe this will sustain any test of the world tribunals for exchange in respect of our general agreement on services. The notion that we as a country should not proceed because of the threat that our neighbours to the south may not like it is a rather sheepish way to deal with our own sovereignty.

Canada has negotiated international trade agreements that have excluded cultural matters entirely. It is in keeping with this strategy that as a country which is somewhat smaller in terms of population than our neighbours to the south, our cultural sovereignty is not to be put at risk. It is not to be put on the table. It has been excluded from these agreements. This is in keeping with that strategy.

The government is quite comfortable that with this legislation we will continue to have a thriving periodical industry which we would not have if we did not act.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is quite clear what the government is attempting to do with this bill. It is attempting to redefine advertising as a service instead of as a good. It is trying to go through the back door with this legislation. It is very clear.

The hon. member mentioned that this bill is consistent with Canada's trade obligations. How in the world can he justify that comment given the facts mentioned by my colleague and that this legislation in its previous life had no success at the WTO? It is simply bad legislation. How can he say this is consistent with Canada's trade obligations when it goes against NAFTA, an agreement this government applauds?

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member is mistaken to say this goes against NAFTA. Cultural matters have been excluded from NAFTA. Whether or not this is referred to the World Trade Organization is a decision our neighbours to the south will make. It would be a rather sheepish way to run a country to cover because they threaten to do that. We are not prepared to do that.

If the member is not prepared to understand that there is GATT, and GATS where we are talking about services and not products, then that is where he is mistaken. It is the belief of this government that this will withstand the test wherever. Canada's cultural sovereignty has to be protected, defended, encouraged and promoted. That is what this government has done and will continue to do.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I find it rather strange that the word culture keeps being used when we are talking about advertising and revenues. This is commerce. Through this back door legislation the government is trying to bend the intent of NAFTA and other trade organizations.

• (1035)

The member talks of cowering. It is not cowering to maintain good faith in international trade regulations. That is not cowering; that is being honest.

I would like the hon. parliamentary secretary to tell us if he does not feel that Canada is a big enough kid in the world to at least behave decently in its trade relations.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger:** Madam Speaker, first regarding this notion of the back door, if the member equates the floor of the House of Commons as the back door, then he has a problem. The government is not attempting to use any back door here. It is presenting legislation on the floor of the House of Commons, the Parliament of Canada. That is far from a back door, number one.

Number two, if the member is not prepared to understand that the cultural industries need support such as advertising services

which could be scooped up by foreign publications, then obviously he is out of tune and is not in touch.

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to speak on behalf of Bill C-55, an act that will ensure that a vibrant and successful Canadian magazine industry continues to provide Canadians with stories that reflect our values, our culture and our points of view.

I also rise to speak on behalf of all those Canadians who want to see themselves, read about themselves and learn about each other from other Canadians and not to do so vicariously through others, most notably the Americans.

Bill C-55 is in keeping with the longstanding policy of this government of promoting and investing in Canadian culture. It is a policy that over the past 40 years has clearly been a success as there are currently 1,500 Canadian magazines on the market.

It has often been stated that the question is not whether we ought to support Canadian culture, but how best to support it. As the Right Hon. Kim Campbell, our current consul general in Los Angeles said in a speech in March 1997, "Cultural industries are our national defence. A country must be able to articulate its own reality in its own voices and it is not always easy in Canada".

Support for culture is needed in Canada as the U.S. and Canada share the world's largest bilateral trading relationship at over \$1 billion a day, 365 days a year and the world's longest undefended border.

As Robert Lantos, the former chairman of Alliance so eloquently stated last Monday evening, "We must never forget that our economic and cultural sovereignty are inextricably intertwined".

Yet 95% of Canadian movie screens are showing American films. It is almost impossible for a Canadian film to be shown on a Canadian movie screen. Eighty per cent of English magazines on Canadian newsstands are American.

Bill C-55 ensures that Canadian magazine publishers continue to have access to Canadian advertising dollars. Advertising revenue is the lifeblood of this industry, with advertising accounting for an average of 60% of total revenues in the magazine sector. This is an economic fact. At the same time, Canadian publishers are using advertising dollars to produce Canadian stories for Canadians. If this revenue were to decline, it would not be long before Canadian publications and the Canadian magazine publishing industry would suffer and become less viable.

If this bill were not in place, Canadian magazines would not be able to compete with split-run editions of foreign magazines that have no editorial costs. This gives foreign publishers an unfair competitive and economic advantage. These foreign magazines would be in a position to scoop up Canadian advertising dollars by offering lower advertising rates than their domestic competitors.

*Government Orders*

Canadian magazines simply cannot survive without sufficient advertising revenues.

One must not take a short-sighted view of this issue. If this situation were to perpetuate, this would inevitably lead to a reduction in the number of Canadian magazines. A reduction in the number of magazines would also lessen competition and could lead to higher advertising rates in the future.

• (1040)

Those who advocate a completely unfettered free market should consider the potential long term implications on Canadian culture and on our economy. We care about the survival of our culture and our economy.

Last spring in a mailing survey of 50,000 Canadians conducted by 12 magazines, 84% of respondents said that it is important to them to read Canadian stories. This government wants to ensure that Canadians continue to have access to their own ideas, stories and information. This is why Bill C-55 is so important.

The act will only prohibit foreign publishers from supplying advertising services directed primarily at the Canadian market to a Canadian advertiser. Canadian governments have long maintained measures to prevent this from happening. As a result of these measures, U.S. publishers have not had access to the Canadian advertising services market for over three decades.

Some U.S. publishers are not satisfied with their already very generous share of the Canadian magazine market. They also want to dominate our advertising services market by producing split-run advertising editions of the magazines they already sell here.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that this measure deals only with supplied advertising services to Canadian advertisers. It will not affect the importation of foreign magazines. It will not affect any Canadian reader's ability to purchase foreign magazines at newsstands or through subscriptions. The Canadian market will continue to be among the most open in the entire world.

In addition foreign publishers such as *Time* magazine currently operating in Canada will be exempt from this new bill. They will be able to maintain their current level of activity.

My colleague was absolutely correct that this bill is fully consistent with our international trade obligations under GATS, the agreement on services. Yet culture, as this government has said many times, cannot be seen as simply another trade issue. This bill is about preserving a Canadian voice in a country that shares the world's largest bilateral trading relationship with the United States.

This bill does not affect the content of magazines. Publishers will continue to produce editorial content that they consider attractive to Canadians. Nor does Bill C-55 affect the price of

magazines. Canadians will continue to enjoy access to foreign and domestic magazines that are competitively priced.

Bill C-55 provides a mechanism to promote and support Canadian culture with no new cost to taxpayers. Bill C-55 has also received strong support from the Canadian Magazine Publishers Association and the Canadian Business Press, which together represent some 450 consumer magazines from across the country.

For over 40 years measures have been in place to prevent split-run editions of foreign magazines. New measures have been announced, not new policy. This law is in keeping with longstanding cultural policies. It ensures that Canadian magazine publishers have access to the funds that they need to survive.

This bill takes nothing away from Canadian advertisers. Advertisers will continue to have all the advertising opportunities they had in the past, including the right to purchase advertising services from foreign publishers, as long as the advertising service is not directed primarily at the Canadian market.

In closing, Bill C-55 will guarantee that Canadians continue to have access to stories about Canada, written by and for Canadians and confirms this government's commitment to, and investment in Canadian culture.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member mentioned a minute ago that magazines such as *Time* will be grandfathered in this legislation and therefore will not have to comply with these new rules that the government would propose to push through. I wonder if the member can explain why, if the principle of having American magazines in Canada not being allowed to pick up Canadian advertisers, she thinks that principle of allowing them to have Canadian advertising is wrong.

• (1045)

How in the world can she justify grandfathering in a magazine like *Time* which obviously would pick up a tremendous amount of Canadian advertising? How can she justify the double standard? If it is wrong, it is wrong.

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Madam Speaker, the legislation is aimed at split-run magazines like *Sports Illustrated* which basically takes Canadian advertising dollars with no Canadian content. *Time* is an exception. *Time* has been in Canada for years. *Time* has Canadian content. *Time* is not a split-run edition. *Time* cares about Canadians. *Time* continues to tell Canadian stories.

This is aimed at split-run magazines that are beamed in by satellite without any need, any want or any desire to speak to Canadians about themselves.

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question about the member's comment that there would be no new cost to taxpayers.

*Government Orders*

I checked with the heritage department about the removal of postal subsidies. It made the point that as a result of the changes required by the WTO, Canada Post would eliminate the international publication rate which was higher than the domestic rate. Foreign publishers would therefore benefit from reduced postal rates to a tune of an estimated \$18 million.

Where does the mailing cost come from if not from the taxpayer?

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member is correct that there will now be a level playing field between foreign magazines and Canadian magazines.

I do not believe there will be additional tax costs for the taxpayers of Canada.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member seems to be talking about split runs. When she talks about *Time* magazine it is more like the splitting of hairs.

Could the hon. member inform the House if she is in general support of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or perhaps the Canadian bill of rights? Does she believe in freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of association or the right to deal in property?

Does the hon. member take seriously, agree with or support any of these principles or concepts?

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Madam Speaker, yes, I do.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, if the hon. member believes in free speech, why are they putting up protective barriers on a split-run issue in Bill C-55?

**Ms. Sarmite Bulte:** Madam Speaker, we are not putting up protective measures. Let us stop talking about protection. Let us talk about what we are doing.

We are promoting and investing in Canadian culture. We are not protectionists. Where is protectionism when 95% of our films are American and 80% of our magazines are American? It is not protectionism. It is investment and it is promotion of Canada's cultural industry and arts.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to address Bill C-55. I am a bit familiar with the bill. It first came into being three or four years ago in a different version. At that time I was critic of the Department of Canadian Heritage so I had the chance to explore what the government was up to at that point. As the Reform Party predicted, that legislation was ultimately defeated at the WTO.

• (1050)

I will go out on a limb and say that this will be pounded down again by the WTO, which will leave Canada wide open to retaliation on all kinds of trade fronts. I cannot believe the

government is so imprudent that it would allow the legislation to go through and threaten in many cases other industries that are already in great peril. For instance, I point to the farm industry which is important in my riding. I will get to that in more detail later.

I want to address a couple of remarks made by my colleague who just finished speaking a minute ago. She mentioned that *Time* cares about Canada. I point out that it is the Time Warner corporation of the United States. I do not think anyone really believes that Time Warner Inc., a huge media conglomerate, cares about Canada. It cares about making money for its shareholders.

Incidentally that is exactly the same thing that drives Ted Rogers and the Canadian Magazine Publishers Association that are naturally in support of the bill. They do not care about Canada. They want to make a profit. If the government ensures that they can make a profit by protecting them with huge fines, contrary to what the member said we should not be very surprised. They do not care about Canada. They want to make a lot of money. That is their right and we understand it. We do not think there should be government intervention that allows them to do it. Let us see some real competition in this country.

I want to expand on that point for a moment. Recently the *National Post* was launched in Canada. It will be Canada's second daily national newspaper, which means that the *Globe and Mail*, an excellent newspaper, has some tough competition.

The *Globe and Mail* has improved a lot over the last several months as it has geared up for this launch. The *National Post* is producing an excellent newspaper. What we are seeing are the benefits of competition.

When we have competition, we have better newspapers all of a sudden. It is amazing but it happens over and over again. Everyone has to get better. I see the same thing happening on TV. We had News 1 launched on CTV and all of a sudden we see Newsworld is improving its set and changing its hosts. What would happen in Canada if we had wide open competition in our magazine industry? Canadian magazines would improve.

My hon. colleagues across the way know this is true. Otherwise they would not have reversed their stand on NAFTA. They know that real competition makes everyone stronger. They completely changed their stripes on NAFTA because they know that is true.

Now they want to have their cake and eat it too with protectionism of an industry as my colleague from Swift Current pointed out. They can cloak it in language about our sacred culture all they want, but this is about making money and my colleagues across the way know it.

I want to expand on a point I made at the outset. Under the WTO rules if a piece of legislation is struck down, goes back for a second time and is struck down, the field will be wide open for retaliation

*Government Orders*

from the country which was the target of the legislation. In this case it is the United States.

My colleagues across the way have had some experience in dealing with the United States and trade problems in the past. It was not very long ago when we saw Canada get into some trouble with the U.S. over protection for poultry and dairy. As a result what did the United States do? It capped exports for durum in the west. It did not go after the industry it was concerned about. It picked another weak spot, one that it knew was politically sensitive.

What will happen when this is ultimately defeated again at the WTO? Will the Americans say they will ban our magazines coming into the United States? I do not think so. That would not be very much. They will go after wheat exports, cattle or something that has a profound impact on Canada. The government knows that. It has been warned about it for the last four or five years.

The government is going ahead anyway because the minister is so stubborn. Because she cannot spend a bunch of money any more on Canadian heritage she has to justify her existence somehow. She is going into this area willy-nilly, not caring one bit about the damage it will ultimately do to the rest of the country. She knows exactly what the outcome will be but she does not care.

• (1055)

When I go back to my home town of Brooks and sit in the coffee shop, in Aces Cafe; when I go to Bow Island and sit in Grandma's Kitchen; or when I go to Medicine Hat and sit in the co-op, I sit around the table with my constituents. We do not talk about the horrible tragedy of *Sports Illustrated* coming into Canada with Canadian advertising. They talk about the fact that they will not be able to make their payments for fertilizer, fuel and such things.

They understand what the government does not understand, that people have to make a living. When they see legislation like this which threatens their existence at a time when they are already in tremendous danger, they wonder what goes on in Ottawa. They call it the puzzle patch. I do not blame them because I am pretty puzzled about what the government is up to.

It is beyond absurd that the Liberals are preparing to endanger trade with the United States, a billion dollars a day, at a time when according to the finance minister we are facing an economic meltdown, an apocalypse of some kind. On the other hand they are endangering trade with the one partner we can count on. Eighty-five per cent of our trade is with the United States. Yet the government is setting us up for a trade war with the United States. How ridiculous can that be?

I wonder if my friends across the way, who are laughing right now, would like to come back to Brooks, Alberta, to Bow Island or to Vauxhall and sit and laugh when my constituents tell me they

will not make it through the winter or be able to sow their grain in the spring. It is not a laughing matter; it is deadly serious.

The Liberals across the way had better wake up and understand that the bill has implications far beyond magazines. It does not make sense to subsidize Ted Rogers. He already has enough millions in the bank. We do not need to subsidize Philippe de Gaspé Beaubien. He already has enough money.

It is ridiculous that the government has to try to justify its existence as a player in Canadian culture by putting in place a foolhardy piece of legislation like this one. It is absurd. It is no wonder Canadians are so cynical about this place.

I encourage government members to wake up, especially rural members who know how much this can damage their own constituents. I see the industry minister here. In the past he has had some knock-down, drag-'em-outs with the cultural minister on this issue because as a businessman he knows that this is bad business.

I encourage members across the way to wake up, defeat the legislation and ask the minister not to pursue it because it will damage Canada a lot more than it could ever help it.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I want to point out some of the contradictions the member across does not shy away from. He claimed at one point that people have to make a living. We all agree with that. However he would discard, out of hand, without a second thought, the 6,000-plus Canadians who work in this field. He does not seem to care about that field.

We care. A government has to be responsible and take a balanced approach. The government has an incredible reputation worldwide as a trading nation. We have participated in international treaties to allow free trade. We have respected those treaties. We have been consistent in saying that cultural matters are not to be included. We protect, enhance and promote Canadian cultural industries.

There does not seem to be a problem over there with people making money except when it comes to people working in the cultural fields. There are 6,000 people working in those fields. What about the people working in the film industry, the TV industry, the book publishing industry and the music industry? They would discard them out of hand. They say that they cannot make money. They say it is okay for others to make money but not for people in the film industry, the publication field or in periodicals.

• (1100)

Such inconsistencies speak exactly of the attitude of this party. It cowers in front of the Americans. The Americans say boo, it sheepishly says it cannot do this.

*Government Orders*

This government is standing up for Canadian cultural industries and will continue to do so.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Madam Speaker, I do not know what to say to that other than that is absolute rubbish.

If the government really is as brave as the member suggests, why is it putting up huge protection barriers around the magazine publishing industry in Canada? He just said we were cowering. It is his government that is putting up the barriers. It is going to impose huge fines on *Sports Illustrated* or whatever because the government would dare to allow Canadian advertisers to advertise in those magazines.

It is ridiculous. The member argues on the one hand that the government is going to protect Canadians. On the other hand it is denying Canadian advertisers a vehicle by which to promote their goods and services. He cannot have it both ways. We want these people to make money too. We do not make money by giving them a subsidy and protecting them from competition. That is how we kill industry. My friend should know that.

We had protectionism in this country for years. As an example, we had textile producers in southern Quebec. What happened to them? Ultimately they could not compete when the barriers came down. We need to get rid of those protectionist walls. We want Canadian cultural industries to make money.

I encourage the government to take some of its own advice and allow them to make money by allowing free competition so they can export around the world. What we want is to see lower taxes so they can compete. We want to see those people succeed like they have already done in other areas of Canadian culture where there is no protectionism.

I point out to my friend that we have many great Canadian novelists. They send their products far afield. They do extraordinarily well. We do not have protectionism for them. When they produce a novel they sell it around the world and those novels come back here. That is not what the government is proposing for the magazine industry. It wants to create a problem not only for the magazine industry by allowing it to atrophy because it does not have competition but ultimately it will cause all kinds of problems for the rest of the country by creating a trade war with our biggest trading partner. It is ridiculous that the government would do that.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Medicine Hat will know where I am coming from when I talk about one of the cultural things on the prairies, weekly newspapers.

Everybody looks forward to a weekly newspaper. Because of the sparse population one of the biggest cost factors this cultural avenue has is the high cost of Canada Post. The hon. member in the NDP asked a question about this. Now we are going to give special

reductions to some newspapers coming into the country. I cannot wait until my weekly newspapers that have been fighting with Canada Post forever about special rates to get their cultural piece of information out find out about a special Canada Post regulation to bring magazines into Canada. Every small paper struggling to survive is going to damn this government if this proposal goes through.

I would like the hon. member for Medicine Hat to comment on our cultural activities.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

This government thinks Canadian culture is what a lot of people might call high culture. Most people today make connections with their neighbours around their province and around the country through weekly newspapers and little publications like that. One of the things that works against them is the exorbitant prices they have to pay for postage today. The member is absolutely right.

The other point is that these companies are just like any other company. They struggle to make it with crippling payroll taxes. In many cases they have a lot of employees. It is labour intensive.

• (1105 )

They sit and they stuff flyers in newspapers. I have a good friend who is the publisher of the *Brooks Bulletin*. They have a big staff. This publisher would love to see EI premiums go down by \$500 per employee. Those employees would like to see their premiums go down by \$350 which is entirely within this government's ability to do if it would obey the law.

But sadly this government thinks the answer is to protect these businesses by putting up these high protective walls which ultimately are going to be challenged and defeated at the WTO. We are going to pay a huge price for it when we are retaliated against. Unfortunately the retaliation will not be in magazines. We will be hit where it hurts, in the big industries such as agriculture and lumber. My colleague shakes his head but I will bet him \$20 that is exactly what is going to happen.

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have heard about political interference today and it bothers me greatly. I challenge the member for Medicine Hat.

He talked about political interference and about retribution. Indeed that goes on. He talked about regulation and protectionism and the Liberals in this country being wall builders. But the thing the member did not touch on, the thing the member left out of his speech, was the type of corporate welfare we have in this country, the type of corporate welfare the Liberals have been engaging in. The Liberals cut health care and education and they give billions of dollars to their friends such as Bombardier.

*Government Orders*

I would like the hon. member for Medicine Hat to touch on what goes on in this country in terms of corporate welfare and subsidies.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Madam Speaker, the member threw me a hardball but let me see what I can do.

I have noted that Bombardier gets a little help from this government. I also noted that Bombardier made a profit last year in the range of \$235 million. But we also know, thanks to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, that but several aerospace concerns have received not hundreds of millions but over \$1 billion in subsidies. To me that is unbelievable.

How much of these repayable loans have been paid back? I see the minister of industry is in the House. A fraction get paid back, 2% or 3%. I think it is unbelievable that this government will slash health care, attack all the programs that are extraordinarily important to Canadians but still pump billions of dollars into corporate welfare for companies such as Bombardier and many others.

I hope I have adequately answered the question from my colleague for Calgary West.

**An hon. member:** Tell us about Ted Rogers.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** The member mentions Ted Rogers. I am glad he pointed that out because under this legislation what this government is doing is pumping more money into the pocket of Ted Rogers, a media mogul in this country, a multimillionaire who hardly needs the help.

I wonder why it is that when the chips are down this government has to help out its billionaire friends? I think it is unbelievable.

**Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP):** Madam Speaker, as my party's critic for culture and communications I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to the contents of Bill C-55, an act representing advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

I was not able to be in the House to speak on this bill on first reading last Thursday but our member for Winnipeg—Transcona with his usual eloquence and clarity spoke to the bill so I will, in my own fashion, try to add to that.

To refresh members on the contents, Bill C-55 will make it an offence for a publisher to provide advertising services aimed at the Canadian market to be placed in foreign periodic publications except for those currently receiving Canadian advertising.

The offence is enforceable by a Canadian court after an investigation ordered by the Minister of Canadian Heritage using powers of investigation borrowed from the Criminal Code. The penalties range anywhere from \$20,000 to \$250,000 for a corporate offender on indictment.

The offences that take place outside of Canada by foreign individuals or corporations are deemed to have taken place in Canada for the purposes of endorsement of the act.

What we have here in effect and without doubt with Bill C-55 is an eleventh hour effort to protect the Canadian magazine industry from being truly swamped and I would say possibly sunk by the thousands of shiny, glossy, glitzy, sexy American magazines which we all see row by row, bicep by bicep, cleavage by cleavage in our airport bookstores and in the chains of American bookstores we now have all over our country.

• (1110)

It is not that I do not like American magazines. I like them a great deal and I have a tremendous admiration for American writers, the political commentators, the satirists, the sports writers, the poets and the playwrights. I like a whole lot about the United States and its talent and its spirit. But it is the volume and the velocity of the American product and the unrelenting manner with which it floods the Canadian shores which concerns me. It obviously concerns the Minister of Canadian Heritage as well or she would not be putting forward Bill C-55.

It is not the first effort and I doubt it will be the last effort to protect the Canadian magazine industry from the American tidal wave of publications. Nor is it the last effort probably to keep Canadian advertising dollars in Canadian publications.

In 1976 passage in parliament of Bill C-58, a statute which disallowed tax deductions by Canadian companies for their advertising expenditures in foreign periodicals and broadcasting outlets, obviously enhanced the attractiveness of advertising in Canadian media.

In 1982 postal subsidies instituted for Canadian magazines helped to stabilize Canadian periodical competitive position vis-à-vis American magazines whose overrun copies were simply dumped in the Canadian market.

In 1982 the Canadian Periodical Publishers Association termed the postal subsidy not only the oldest but in some ways the most effective of all the many kinds of cultural assistance created by the taxpayers of Canada. Postal subsidies were considered a true grant in the public interest.

Now it is 1998 and a lot of water has gone under the bridge. Now we have Bill C-55 and it is a direct result of a GATT panel overturning the Canadian policy on split run magazines, magazines which contain mostly American content but run in separate editions for Canada containing Canadian ads. *Sports Illustrated*, *Readers' Digest* and *Time* magazine are the best known examples.

Eighteen months ago a Canadian conference for the arts report on this ruling on the GATT case said: "World trade organization decision on magazines advances the cultural sovereignty doomsday clock". What an ominous concept. The CCA strongly recom-

*Government Orders*

mended immediate action in a number of areas and it is still very relevant to today and I am going to quote some. Number one is, not surprisingly, fix the magazine industry policy.

Second, Canada must aggressively promote and secure an effective and durable cultural exemption in all existing and proposed international agreements. Third, develop a systematic understanding of the constraints and challenges in cultural sovereignty posed by existing trade agreements.

It is clear that the federal government understands the impact of international trade agreements on culture as poorly as the rest of us. Who can forget the assurances that the former minister of Canadian heritage, the Hon. Michael Dupuy, gave to the Senate that officials in his and other departments assured him that C-103, the split-run legislation, was fully consistent with our international trade obligations. This has proven to be far from the truth.

The nature of the case made by the international trade officials at the WTO appears to provide abundant evidence that the situation has not improved. The government must move with dispatch to ensure that we have a clear and solid appreciation of the constraints and opportunities presented in the full network of international trade agreements and their impact on cultural sovereignty. We must develop a solid base of knowledge and talent in foreign affairs and international trade as well as within all government departments active in this area and the cultural sector itself.

• (1115)

Those were some comments from the CCA bulletin, the Canadian Conference of the Arts bulletin, of July 1997.

Eighteen months later I look at those cautionary remarks and I would say that we still have not gained the kind of understanding and self-knowledge that we need to pull this critical cultural issue out of the fire.

Instead, with Bill C-55 we see the failure of the Liberals to adequately protect the Canadian magazine industry under international trade agreements or admit, more to the point, where the problem lies.

Since the panel has proclaimed that Canadian policy cannot discriminate against foreign-owned goods, such as the product on paper of split-run magazines, the government will now try it under the definition of services such as the placing of advertising.

Will it work? Will it save the Canadian magazine industry? I am afraid this bill will likely be challenged as well, possibly under the NAFTA or under the FTA. I might add that it would definitely have been disallowed under the MAI which the Canadian government fought to keep alive until the end, which came last week.

With Bill C-55 we see the disappearance of the postal subsidies for Canadian magazines which were described in 1982 as a true grant in the public interest. As a result of the changes required by the WTO, Canada Post will eliminate the international publication rate which was higher than the domestic rate.

Foreign publishers will therefore benefit from reduced postal rates. There will be an estimated \$18 million reduction in mailing costs.

The last section of the bill, section 24, the grandfather clause, is a legal surrender to American magazines which have already broken into the Canadian market. The NDP will closely examine that exemption in committee with a view to opening up new opportunities for Canadian publications.

In effect, this bill entrenches the status quo. There is nothing in the bill to promote Canadian content, to encourage more community periodicals or to bring forward new Canadian or regional voices. But it is an effort by the government and any effort cannot be spurned.

However, I would like to reiterate the central point made by my colleague from Winnipeg—Transcona that this is an effort to please, to kowtow to trade agreements and not, first and foremost, to protect and nurture our culture.

I would also like to reiterate his point that government members are not critical enough of the agreements in which they find themselves. I am talking particularly about the WTO.

There is a fundamental contradiction between the ideology, the world view embodied in the WTO, and the whole notion of protection of culture.

There is the fundamental contradiction between culture and free trade as it is understood by the WTO and the NAFTA. The fact is that our previous policy has been tested against the ideology and the world view of the WTO and has been shot down.

It is important for our government and our Minister of Canadian Heritage to admit to the fact that there are fundamental problems with these trade agreements. It is important that they recognize that their hands are tied by the rules of trade agreements which they were deeply involved in formulating.

The Liberals are in a box right now. The country and our culture is now in a box which is of our own government's making.

Now we have Bill C-55, a quick fix which will likely be challenged as well by the trade agreements which the Liberals and Tories before them were intricately involved in formulating.

The government is trying to provide a quick fix for a much larger problem which it had a hand in creating, the sacrificing of culture at trade negotiation tables.

Bill C-55, inadequate as it is, does represent a small effort on behalf of the government to protect our magazine industry, an

industry that supports thousands of cultural workers, writers, publishers, copy editors, photographers and many others.

It is an industry that continues to go a long way, despite the onslaught of American magazines, to tell Canadian stories to Canadian people.

In conclusion, the NDP will support the principles of the bill and we will be voting in favour of it at second reading.

• (1120)

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Dartmouth for her comments. I welcome some of the criticisms, some of which may not be as accurate as one would like. However, I welcome the constructive approach and I look forward to looking at this legislation in greater detail with her at committee.

I will correct one of the slight inaccuracies. The member was essentially saying that this government was insisting that cultural matters be within the MAI. I not only have to disagree, but the minister who was spearheading the Canadian efforts vis-à-vis the MAI was quite explicit a number of times in this House that culture was to be excluded from it. It would preferably be a sector exclusion and it would certainly be a Canadian exclusion. To say that the government was trying to put culture on the table with the MAI is not quite accurate. I hope the member will accept that.

I will return to comments made by Reform about postal subsidies for small newspapers. This government supports that. We support small newspapers, in some cases to the tune of 75% of the cost of their postal rates. Postal subsidization is one of the ways the Government of Canada supports the periodical industry.

Would the members of the Reform Party have us continue in one case and not in the other? Surely to goodness they do not support such double standards.

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for his comments. I agree that the minister of heritage has a real commitment to preserving culture. I believe she was carrying the flame in that respect with regard to the MAI negotiations.

However, I asked the Minister for International Trade twice in this House to be very specific about the wording around "Would you guarantee a complete cultural carve-out?" One day the answer was yes and then two days later, when I read the script of a dinner speech made by the minister, the wording was quite different. It had sort of backed down on cultural exemption.

I think that the devil is in the wording. That is what has been confounding this whole issue all along. Whether we are talking carve-out or exemption, at the 11th hour at these tables what exactly is given away? I do not believe for a minute that the spirit

### *Government Orders*

of the MAI is dead, but I am still not convinced that if the MAI had continued on in the present realm of negotiations that we would have had what we wanted at the end of the day in terms of real cultural protection.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, many more people in Canada subscribe to the weekly newspaper industry than they do to magazines. I want to make that clear. I am talking in particular about my province, but no matter what province people live in, most get their culture from the weekly newspaper.

The hon. member mentioned that Canada Post was going to relinquish something in the order of \$18 million to drop the rate of postage for items coming into Canada. Because of Canada Post some weekly newspapers have to drive or truck their papers to different locations. Through Canada Post it would take a week or so before the papers reached their destination. Those sending items to Canada have to pay the same rate as if they were mailing it at a local post office. Why? There is an inconsistency in losing \$18 million. The answer was that it will not cost the Canadian taxpayers. Canada Post is losing \$18 million and there will be no cost to the Canadian taxpayers?

• (1125)

Where does the hon. member think they are going to find this \$18 million? Will it be done by putting a higher postage rate on our weeklies?

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, I too have some concerns about where the \$18 million will come from. I will turn that question back to my hon. colleague opposite.

I am still not clear. That \$18 million will not come out of the air. It obviously will come out of Canada Post, and we know who pays for Canada Post. Maybe the parliamentary secretary could answer that question.

**Mr. Roy Bailey:** They cannot answer it.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger:** Madam Speaker, what I find interesting in this debate is that the Reform Party, on the one hand, is saying that we have to respect our international trade obligations and, on the other hand, is saying that we cannot do that. This is indeed the result of a decision made at the WTO. The postal rate on foreign magazines will reflect the WTO decision.

The point is that the government is respecting all foreign decisions of the WTO, which is why Bill C-55 is before us. Will it have an impact? Of course it will have an impact. Of course there will have to be adjustments made.

Will it be done on the backs of small newspapers? I think not.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, I am worried about the word “adjustments”. That is a word that usually means job losses. It means money being taken from places that are not immediately evident.

With respect to this whole bill, I must say that it still looks to me like a quick fix and an effort in some respect to save the magazine industry. In many ways it is still in denial of the root causes of the problem that we are now facing, which has to do with our engaging in trade agreements without sufficiently understanding the impact they are going to have on our cultural industries.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger:** Madam Speaker, in response to the comments from the member, it is indeed a difficult situation.

There is one country that is essentially dominating in many areas, such as the movie industry, magazines, television and so forth. The government is perfectly aware of that. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Canadian Heritage as early as last June—and the member might recall because she attended some of the functions—welcomed a delegation from some 20 countries to discuss this very difficult situation. It is not unique to Canada. It is a situation that is also of concern to France, Greece, Mexico, Italy and a number of countries around the world.

This monoculturalism, if you will, is a reflection of the strength of American cultural products which are swamping, in some areas, certain countries’ attempts to have their own culture reflected in their own vehicles. The Government of Canada, through the Minister of Canadian Heritage, is tackling that. It is very difficult and it will be a drawn out effort which we will not be able to achieve alone as a country.

Other countries which have that same preoccupation are now joining hands to make sure that indeed their cultural sovereignty, which in some cases is seriously threatened, is protected, encouraged, defended and promoted. This government fully intends to be intrinsically involved in that effort.

We welcome comments from the member opposite, who is perfectly aware of the difficulties that this kind of effort involves. We will welcome her continued support and the continued support of her party in attempting to resolve, in perhaps a larger fashion, this whole difficulty.

• (1130)

**Ms. Wendy Lill:** Madam Speaker, I would have to say that our party is on record as not being in favour at all of the MAI in its present configuration. When I say I am in support of cultural carve outs in terms of international trade agreements, I would have to say that this is in terms of a new kind of international trade agreement which in fact supports environmental concerns, labour concerns and social concerns, as well as cultural concerns.

I wish that our government had been right in front of the Government of France in pulling out of the MAI negotiations and killing that particularly egregious trade agreement. Unfortunately that was not the case, but I wish it had been.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

In giving an historic overview of the issue before us today, we should point out that, since 1965, the Canadian magazine industry has always enjoyed the support of the federal government.

Indeed, the Royal Commission on Publications, set up in 1961 under the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker, recommended that measures be taken to protect the Canadian magazine industry against dumping. To that end, measures prohibiting the import of split run magazines were finally implemented in 1965.

Measures were also taken to provide reduced postal rates for Canadian magazines, thus helping them lower their shipping costs.

I should point out that the Progressive Conservative government promoted strong growth for the Canadian owned magazine industry. Indeed, during the negotiations on the Free Trade Agreement, we made sure that an exemption provision would be included for the cultural industry as a whole. A similar provision was also included in the North American Free Trade Agreement.

However, in 1993, the magazine *Sports Illustrated* managed to circumvent the ban on imports by electronically transmitting a split run edition to a Canadian printer. The Progressive Conservative government took speedy action, forming a task force to bring policy into line with the electronic era.

In response to the recommendations contained in the task force’s interim report, the Hon. Jean Charest, then the minister responsible for Investment Canada, issued ministerial directives under the Investment Canada Act that eliminated the loophole by which Time Warner had introduced a split run of *Sports Illustrated* into Canada.

The final report of the task force led, in 1995, to Bill C-3, the purpose of which was to strengthen the position of the Canadian periodical industry by means of measures to discourage split run editions of periodicals, particularly American ones, in Canada.

These measures included an excise tax of 80% on the total value of advertising space in split run editions, and a customs tariff making it illegal to import split run periodicals.

Unfortunately, in October 1997, the World Trade Organization ruled that levying customs and excise taxes on split run periodicals went against international free trade agreements. Canada was given until the end of October 1998 to bring its policy into line with

*Government Orders*

the provisions of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, failing which the United States would take retaliatory measures.

Publishers of Canadian periodicals maintain that American publishers, who cover their costs in the United States, can offer lower advertising rates to Canadian business. Canadian periodicals depend heavily on advertising revenue, which is estimated at \$350 million.

The government has therefore introduced this bill as a response to this request, taking care to protect Canadians' ability to express themselves through Canadian cultural vehicles, such as those offered by this country's periodical industry.

Incidentally, the World Trade Organization's decision did not challenge the ability of member countries to take action to protect their cultural identity.

• (1135)

The proposed measures provide among other things that only Canadian periodical publishers will be able to sell advertising services aimed primarily at the Canadian market and that stiff fines as high as \$250,000 will be imposed on foreign publishers who contravene this legislation.

The bill before us also specifies that both the customs tariff preventing split runs magazines from entering the country and the excise tax on the distribution of such magazines in Canada are removed. From now on, foreign publishers will have access to the postal subsidy program, and commercial postage rates for Canadian and foreign publications will be harmonized accordingly.

This concludes the historical overview. Now I would like to remind the hon. members that the party I have the honour to represent in this House has always been committed to ensuring future of the Canadian publishing industry, which is closely tied to advertising income. It is indeed essential that this industry be promoted and protected.

That having been said, the government must give Canadian publishers the assurance that the new measures will not result in another trade crisis. Canada cannot afford another fiasco like the one caused recently by the flip-flop over MMT.

Bill C-55 is a very important piece of legislation. Aside from providing much needed support to our Canadian magazine publishers, it shows publicly that we are intent on protecting and maintaining our cultural sovereignty in the midst of ever-increasing pressures from global forces.

Protecting our cultural integrity in Canada has always been a major priority of any trade discussion Canada participated in. Just think that plans for the multilateral investment agreement are being

wrecked in part by the fact that both Canada and France refuse to put cultural industries on the table.

The previous Progressive Conservative government was deeply committed to the protection of cultural industries. In negotiating the Free Trade Agreement, we ensured all cultural industries were excluded from the operation of the FTA, an exclusion that was carried over into NAFTA.

It is very important to note that the WTO in its decision was not questioning Canada's right to protect its cultural industries; it objected to a policy that directly targeted U.S. magazines. So, rather than specifically target U.S. magazines, Bill C-55 seeks to put restraints on advertising services.

Essentially, Bill C-55 will restrict the sale of advertising directed at the Canadian market to Canadian publications. It should be noted that U.S. magazines will still be able to sell advertising aimed at the Canadian market. However, these advertisements will have to appear in all North American publications. They cannot appear solely in magazines aimed at the Canadian market.

Some people may wonder why we should impose measures to protect our Canadian magazine industry. There are very important reasons for us to do that. The Canadian magazine industry employs thousands of Canadians and pumps millions of dollars into our economy. Many distinguished Canadian writers publish in our magazines insightful and interesting articles on people, places and things that reflect our unique culture.

The Canadian market is one of the most open markets in the world for imported magazines. According to the Canadian Magazine Publishers Association, imports account for 50% of magazine sales in Canada and over 80% of newsstand space. Despite this intense competition from foreign magazines, Canadian magazines continue to attract their share of readers, allowing them to hold their own in a very competitive industry.

The Canadian magazine industry plays an important cultural role in helping to define who we are as a people and where we stand as a nation. Culture defines our beliefs and our values. We are not automatically born with a culture. We may be born into a culture, but it is something we learn. We need Canada's magazine industry, so that future generations have the opportunity to learn and appreciate this culture that distinguishes us and that is the envy of the rest of the world.

• (1140)

As I mentioned earlier, for some thirty years now, government after government in Canada has passed laws designed to help Canadian publishers earn enough in advertising revenues to remain competitive on the Canadian market.

*Government Orders*

When *Sports Illustrated* managed to circumvent import restrictions by electronically sending its publication to a printer in Canada, it basically opened the door to unfair business practices by American publishers, who began to produce their magazines with split runs and to reap the benefits of bundling the editorial content of their American editions with Canadian advertising, which they could sell at a much better price than their Canadian competitors.

Canadian publishers count on advertising to generate 65% of their revenues. It is therefore urgent to act to protect them against the possibility of unfair business practices by their American competitors.

Advertising has not just recently become a powerful influence on the course of our society. Before printing was invented, criers were hired to announce upcoming events. I know of a member of government who would have made an excellent one had he been born a few centuries ago.

Prior to the advent of radio and television, magazines drew most of their revenues from advertising. Since then, they struggle to create their own niche and ensure their survival. Advertising has changed more in the past 10 years than in the past 60 years because of new technologies and market developments.

Advertising revenues amount to over \$350 million annually. Canadian publishers depend on these revenues to survive. A stop must be put to any threat of unfair and grasping practices. Canadian publishers need our support in order to remain competitive in the new world economy.

This bill is far from perfect. Even after a full year to consult with international trade experts, countless legal advisers and representatives from Canada's publishing industry, a number of issues still need to be clarified.

First, as I mentioned earlier, the postal rate changes could have adverse effects on small community based publications. Legion branches, which previously enjoyed postal rate subsidies, could be in danger of losing this assistance.

The same could be said for church organizations that provide their congregations with regular updates of church activities. Because these organizations are not charging their members for their materials, they are no longer entitled to preferential postal rates as are other Canadian magazine publishers. This issue must be addressed by the minister either through amendments or regulations.

The last section of the bill, which relates to the grandfathering clause, must be more clearly defined. As it stands, the bill appears to restrict important contributors to our Canadian magazine industry, such as *Reader's Digest* and *Time Warner*, from expanding their present interests, including future investment possibilities.

While I realize that was not the intent of the bill, the wording could lead to such an interpretation.

I am afraid the bill might not survive another WTO challenge. I also wonder about a possible challenge under the Canadian charter of rights by the advertising industry.

Even though I was told by Heritage Canada officials that all possible avenues had been properly explored, I simply cannot forget the government's incompetence in the MMT issue, the gasoline additive, which is now costing Canadian taxpayers \$13 million U.S. Canadian taxpayers cannot afford another costly mistake by the government.

In conclusion, even though Bill C-55 is far from perfect, we should support it at second reading, so that it can be immediately referred to a committee for further review.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Shefford for her comments. She covered the issue and its background very well. She has raised legitimate concerns and I hope that the committee will be able to shed some light on them.

That having been said, I urge the House to return the bill to committee after passing it, in principle, at second reading, so that specific aspects can be considered in greater depth. I am looking forward to some good discussions with her colleague from West Nova in committee. Again, I thank her for her comments.

• (1145)

[English]

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member.

We have something here that goes beyond what this bill attempts to do. If my figures are correct, 80% of all Canadians live closer to the United States than they do their neighbouring province. As a result of that population to the south, we have always been in a war with our struggle to prevent the sellout of Canadian culture. To many Canadians, culture means different things.

This bill needs total re-examination. Just as sure as what happened a few months ago in a retaliatory measure by the U.S. farmers against allegations that this government dumped wheat illegally into the United States all of which took place within my constituency, and as sure as I am standing here, the World Trade Organization is going to strike this bill down. In doing so, some Canadian industry somewhere is going to pay the price. I am getting tired of this.

*Government Orders*

We produce commodities which are superior in every detail; we produce better wheat; we produce better durum; we produce better hogs; we produce better cattle. All of those things are in my area of the country. The retaliation will probably not fall against anyone but western Canada and we will pay the price.

Let us put this back. Let us see if we cannot come up with something in negotiations before passing legislation that irritates the World Trade Organization and we in western Canada take it on the nose again.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments. I note that, like us, he is concerned about certain aspects of the bill.

We would like to see it passed at second reading and referred to committee for further consideration.

[English]

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, to set off my comments I would like to read an article that appeared in today's *Ottawa Citizen*. It is by Terence Corcoran, the editor of the *Financial Post* under the headline that the minister's bill kills magazines:

During the next 48 hours, (the minister) will charge about Ottawa executing her duties as Minister of Illegal Protectionism. To meet a world trade deadline Friday, she will formally announce the end of Ottawa's illegal 80 per cent excise tax on advertising in split-run magazines.

Then she will redirect Ottawa's illegal \$50 million annual magazine postal subsidy so that it falls right into the hands of Ted Rogers, Philippe de Gaspé Beaubien and other needy Canadian magazine publishers. Simultaneously, (the minister) will be pushing Bill C-55, her illegal ban on Canadian advertising in foreign magazines, through second reading tonight in the Commons.

It's a lot of lawlessness for one minister to handle, but if any minister is up to the challenge of breaking constitutional and trade law, it's (this minister). In the course of making a hash of her stint as environment minister, (the minister) orchestrated Ottawa's illegal ban on the export of PCBs for incineration. The sole purpose of the export ban was to force Canadians to destroy PCBs at high cost in Canada rather than cheaply in the United States.

Another adventure (of the minister) in trade protectionism was an attempt to ban the use of the gasoline additive MMT. In the MMT case, (the minister) was in the pocket of the big auto firms, on whose behalf she parroted the claim that failure to ban MMT would add \$3,000 to the price of new cars sold in Canada. No such price increase materialized. In the end, the illegal MMT ban cost Canadian taxpayers \$13 million, money Ottawa had to pay in compensation to Ethyl Corp., the U.S. maker of MMT.

The Minister of Illegal Protectionism is in the pocket of Canada's two major magazine publishers, Ted Rogers' Maclean Hunter and Philippe de Gaspé Beaubien's Telemedia. Their magazines—*Maclean's*, *Chatelaine*, *TV Guide*—and the

publications of a couple of other companies account for an estimated 50 per cent of the \$350 million Canadian magazine advertising market.

The bill (the minister) is pushing through second reading today is the latest in a string of mostly unlawful federal measures to restrict the freedom of Canadian advertisers to use and journalists to produce magazines, and of readers to read more Canadian content. The (minister's) bill, however, is the most Draconian. It gives the minister power to send out magazine police to seize documents and make sure Canadians are not placing ads in foreign publications.

To justify the magazine laws, Heritage Canada spins a contradictory story. On the one hand, it claims the years of protectionism have been hugely successful, with the proportion of Canadian magazines rising from 25 per cent of sales and circulation in the 1950s to 65 per cent today. Then it claims that the industry is still being swamped with foreign magazines and needs more protection and subsidy.

But what the government's own studies actually show is that the Canadian magazine industry has been crippled by the magazine laws. Growth in magazine advertising has been stagnant for years compared with other markets and other countries, mainly because there are not enough Canadian magazines or magazine advertising opportunities. A government-sponsored study conducted by outside consultants concluded that if Ottawa allowed U.S. magazines to develop Canadian versions, or split-runs, the total volume of advertising dollars going to the English magazine market would jump 60 per cent from \$212 million to \$342 million.

In other words, if Ottawa lifted the ban on split-runs, magazine advertising by Canadian firms would jump 60 per cent. Where would the money go? The government study said most of it would probably go to U.S. magazines, although that's debatable. But even so, the split-runs would generate more Canadian journalism, more work for writers, more Canadian content, and more business for Canadian ad creators.

It is also far from certain that all the money would end up in the hands of U.S. publishers. The real crimp in the Canadian magazine market has been a failure to develop Canadian magazines in key growth fields. The government study (by Harrison Young Pesonen and Newell Inc.) identified four key magazine sectors—men's, sports, fashion and youth—that Canadian publishers have ignored. Why? Because the advertising flow is cut off by Ottawa, and because the existing Canadian giants—Maclean Hunter and Telemedia—have a stranglehold on most of the existing ad market. They and others have no competitive incentive to develop new Canadian magazines. And foreign magazines are banned from actually serving Canadian interests.

Magazine protectionism has killed growth in the Canadian magazine advertising market, and thereby has hampered magazine growth. What is supposed to be saving magazines in Canada is actually crippling the industry. This new law (by the minister) the Commons is expected to vote on tonight will continue to prevent growth in the industry.

● (1150)

So says Mr. Corcoran. Quite frankly it is pretty obvious the reason why I have read the article is that I happen to agree completely with the content of what Mr. Corcoran has said.

I had the privilege of being on the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage in the last parliament. I was involved in what became the copyright war. I can mention one of the poorly thought out sections of copyright law that was perhaps sold to the Liberal members, although I expect that they would have voted according to the minister's wishes in any event. It was sold to them and sold to Canadians on one level and it turns out that it is totally different.

*Government Orders*

I refer to the blank tape levy under copyright law. The blank tape levy was designed to say that Canadians who purchase blank tapes will in all likelihood be using them for illegal purposes. Rather than being innocent until proven guilty, a fee is going to be charged on these blank tapes because naughty Canadian people are going to be using them to illegally copy things that are subject to copyright. This goes completely and totally against anything in Canadian law. We should be deemed to be innocent until found guilty.

• (1155)

The minister attempted to sell this on the basis that it was only going to be 25 cents. Perhaps members can help me here. Was it 25 cents or 35 cents? Now it turns out it is going to be dollars per tape, not 25 cents per tape. This is fairly typical for the minister; \$1 billion here, \$1 billion there might add up, but a dollar here, a dollar there does not really make any difference.

Let us look at this specific legislation. I know in terms of relevance the Speaker would want me to do that. The redefinition of advertising as a service instead of a good is contrived.

My background is in sales and marketing. I am very well aware of the fact that one may purchase some plastic and put some lights behind it and that is called an illuminated sign. One may go to a magazine or a newspaper publisher and purchase a certain amount of blank space and then go to an advertising agency which will perform the service of actually creating what is going to be going on that piece of paper. To suggest that it is a service to provide a piece of blank paper that will appear with whatever one chooses to put on it is such a stretch, that the bill falls on its nose right there.

Most onerous though in this bill is the fact that it creates a new class of investigator. The province of Quebec has language police. I guess the minister has learned something from the province of Quebec because now under this legislation we are going to have a magazine police force. This is really beyond the pale.

As I mentioned with respect to the blank tape levy, the legislation the minister managed to push through did say that all Canadians who purchased blank tapes obviously were going to be doing something illegal and therefore they were guilty and should pay a fee. In this particular case the minister goes one step further and actually creates a magazine police force.

Into the hands of this minister, providing she does not get her UNESCO appointment before this comes through, we find that the minister will also be able to make trade law by order in council. That is a direction the Liberals absolutely love. The Liberals do not like the inconvenience of the democratic process which takes place in this House. The Liberals like to pass legislation so that they will be able to go behind cabinet doors, behind closed doors, with advice from nameless bureaucrats and concoct whatever laws they want without having to come back to this place where the people of

Canada through their elected representatives such as myself and the other 300 members in this House, have a say in the democratic process.

In addition this bill puts print media under federal jurisdiction. It is ultra vires of parliament. We cannot just simply say that in 1867 we happened to forget that what we wanted to do was to put print media under the control of parliament so therefore we are going to arbitrarily do that with this particular law.

This law, if it was not so serious, would be funny. This law is ultra vires of the fundamental freedoms of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, sections 2, 7 and 8 and the Canadian Bill of Rights 1960, section 1. This law violates especially the freedoms of expression, the press and association provided for in both statutes and the enjoyment of property provisions in the Canadian Bill of Rights 1960 and common law.

• (1200)

It also violates charter security rights under sections 7 and 8. The freeze on business in clause 21 deprives affected corporations of future property and the effect of the entire bill is to hobble publishers' ability to enter into contracts.

The minister really enjoys her version of Canadiana. She certainly comes across as a very sincere and earnest person. With a feeling of generosity I am prepared to give that the minister actually believes in what she is doing. I think she really does believe in what she is doing.

The difficulty is that we are not in 1867. The last time I looked the date on the calendar was 1998. This government and its predecessor the Conservatives have entered into international trading agreements that impact my friend's wheat, the auto pact and the entire trade we do around the world.

It should be noted that we trade on a daily basis with the United States alone over \$1 billion a day back and forth. What is the size of the cultural trade? The size of the cultural export in Canada is slightly under \$1 billion. I am not talking about only magazines. I am talking about television, recordings, publishings, our authors and everything in the entire cultural component. By taking this one tiny section, \$350 million of revenue, what this minister is doing is throwing it to the wind.

As I understand it, not if but when this bill is trashed by the World Trade Organization because it is so flawed, we will end up with the situation that we will have punitive action against us by our most significant trading partner. It will be able to take that punitive action in whatever field it so chooses. It could be against steel from Hamilton. It could be against computers from Kanata. It could be against wheat from the west. It could be against softwood lumber from British Columbia. It could be against nickel in Newfoundland if it every gets going.

The point is that this bill is so egregiously flawed. There can be no question that this bill will be struck down. What we are doing is inviting retaliation against the entire package of imports and exports that Canada is involved in. For what? For a misguided attempt on the part of the heritage minister to protect something that cannot be protected in this way.

I reflect back on Mr. Corcoran's column. If we take a look at what has happened historically in Canada, when we have permitted true free trade we have ended up seeing what Canadians are capable of doing which is to rise to the top to become the best in the world.

As an example, the revenue minister might recall that in the Okanagan Valley there was subsidy on subsidy and protection for the wine industry. Some of our friends from Niagara will also remember that. At that time under the North American Free Trade Agreement or the FTA we ended up with having to trash those subsidies. The sky was going to fall. Everything was going to fall apart. Canadians are so good at anything we set our mind, hand and resources to that we now have quality wine in Canada that will compete with any wine anywhere in the world.

• (1205)

Why? Because we were forced away from the subsidies. We were forced away from the protection and we gave Canadians the opportunity to rise to the occasion and create the very best in the world.

It is this kind of protectionism by the Liberals who say my goodness, if we are not protecting, if we are not making sure there are subsidies or the government can have some control because after all the government knows best, it is this kind of smother love that creates mediocrity.

We have a very fundamental difference. The Reform Party of Canada believes in the excellence and the superiority of Canadians in anything they set their hands to. Just get the government out of their face. Get the government out of trying to smother, control and protect them.

Given the document the minister has brought forward, how in the world can that happen? First, she has come forward with legislation that is fundamentally flawed because she calls advertising a service instead of a good. The bill should fail on that one right off the bat. Second, she is coming forward with a magazine police force. I cannot imagine anything worse than having a bunch of cops around.

The minister may make trade law by order in council. She can go behind closed doors and make those laws. I hope she does get her UNESCO appointment before that happens. It is ultra vires of parliament. Nothing in section 91 of the Constitution Act, 1867 or

### *Government Orders*

case law puts print media under federal jurisdiction. She is reaching beyond the power of parliament. She is reaching beyond the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I cannot imagine any right thinking person who would come to this House, unless they happened to be taking lessons from the animals that were grazing in the front yard of this building yesterday, who would end up voting in favour of this legislation.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to my colleague's most excellent speech.

Earlier we heard from the parliamentary secretary that there was nothing in this legislation which would inhibit Canada from fulfilling its international trade obligations.

Does my colleague agree or disagree with what the parliamentary secretary said earlier on whether this bill does in fact affect Canada's opportunity to meet its international trade obligations?

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Mr. Speaker, this bill is a result of the World Trade Organization's striking down previous legislation. The bill does not fill the bill of being able to get around the restrictions of the World Trade Organization in any way, shape or form.

There can be no other answer than the bill will be struck down as being outside the control or ability of Canada to act in this way. The problem with that, in my limited knowledge of the World Trade Organization and the way these activities happen, is that if a bill or legislation is struck down and the affected country comes back with another piece of legislation that is also deemed to be inappropriate then the complainant, in this case the United States, would be able to pick off Hamilton steel, wheat, softwood lumber or be able to interfere with the auto pact.

Considering the severity of that, the challenge from the United States in the face of this unbelievably weak legislation leads me to a very deep level of concern.

• (1210)

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are a number of fallacies we just heard that I think ought to be corrected.

First, it should be noted by all members that even the WTO recognizes that advertising is a service and is to be treated as such. It falls under that agreement. To say otherwise is simply inaccurate.

Second, it was rather interesting that the member would mention the article that appeared in one of the dailies today. The author uses a government study and accepts one of its conclusions that such a scenario would generate so much more revenue. The same study reaches a conclusion that he does not share, therefore he does not agree with it. He cannot have it both ways.

*Government Orders*

Someone either accepts what a study says, all of it, or not. The person cannot pick and choose, which is what the author was doing to justify his premise. The member shares the premise that if foreign magazines were allowed to purchase advertising services in the country they could not or would not offer deeply discounted service. Therefore they would essentially skim that industry and cripple the Canadian periodical industry which is exactly what this bill intends to prevent.

I found it rather interesting that he would bring up the copyright matter. The matter of tape levy has not been decided by the copyright board. The member should be aware of that. To say otherwise is just not accurate.

What I found most fascinating about his raising the copyright legislation, Bill C-32 at the time, as he will remember from committee, is that what happened then is happening again here today.

The Reform Party of Canada, as he was talking about smother love, is so enamoured with things American that it builds a bogeyman and says if we do this, they will do that. They will quash us here and they will do this and that to other industries. It is prepared to treat cultural industries as second class industries in favour of others. We are not prepared to do that. As government, we will stand for Canadian values and Canadian culture with respect to our trade agreements.

The most fascinating thing about the member's bringing up the copyright debate is that the Reform Party, as today, was then isolated. It could not see beyond its blinkers that there are industries that have to be protected and promoted in this country.

When the crunch came, it was not even at the table. It left the table. It was isolated then. I suspect we will see through the committee studies of this bill it will be isolated then as well.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party was right on the split-run bill before it. We opposed the split-run bill and we were right, therefore we may be isolated but that does not stop us from speaking about what is the truth and what are the facts.

Second, with respect to the study, every study goes through a certain number of processes but a study arrives at a conclusion. It does not mean that a person cannot take a section of the study that is a valid exploration of certain detail and report on that exploration of detail and not arrive at the same conclusion as the authors of the study. The member's point is not well taken.

With respect to the issue of copyright and being isolated, I can report to this House very clearly that what occurred in that instance, because of the support of the Bloc Quebecois as the official opposition for the government of the day, it was in a position of having a hammer.

There was a collusion between the parliamentary secretary to the minister of the day and the lead hand for the Bloc Quebecois where there were meetings. This member will recall that there were informal meetings occurring in the hallway. What are we going to do now? They came back to the table. They would then go through a little tap dance and then they would go back into the hall again.

I reached the point of absolute frustration because of the collusion between the Liberals and the Bloc Quebecois to see that bill go through. It was one of the low points of my time in parliamentary life.

They did not even have the decency to go around the corner. They just went out of earshot to concoct what was going on.

● (1215)

Fortunately for the House the constituents of both those former members saw fit not to return them to the Chamber. I do not know whether it had anything to do with the kind of activity that was going on in the hallway, but the point is that I was not going to be part of that process. It was slanted in favour of the minister jamming Bill C-32 through the House.

The bill before us is cut out of exactly the same piece of cloth. The minister will see her backbenchers acting like grazing animals to make sure she gets the bill through.

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately Bill C-55 is all about regulation. It is about Canadian content "Copps". It saddens me to think that a fine Canadian performer like Bryan Adams, due to Canadian content rules brought down by the minister of heritage, is not considered a Canadian artist because he has produced in the United States. Shame on the minister. The government does not have the decency to recognize Canadian artists who are well known around the world because they produce in the United States or some other such thing. Enough of the Canadian content "Copps". No more regulation. It does not help Canadian artists.

**Mr. Jim Abbott:** Mr. Speaker, I will state again, as I did in my speech, that the Reform Party is absolutely committed to the fundamental concept that Canadians as a nation and as individuals are the greatest nation and the greatest people in the world. Given a challenge, Canadians will always rise to the top. Canadians will always be superior. Canadians will always perform at a level far beyond what they even imagine.

All we need is for the Liberals to get out of smothering the initiative of Canadians with all sorts of unnecessary protection. We should be given freedom so that we can get on with the job of being the great people and the great nation we are.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to address Bill C-55 which reminds me of eating too much spicy sausage. It keeps coming back again and again. Just when we think cooler heads have prevailed and the Pepto-Bismol of the World Trade Organization has soothed the savage lining of the Liberal tummy, we find that it regurgitated. It comes back up from the bowels of somebody's desk. Here we are again in parliament debating a bill with new a number and a bit different tangent, Bill C-55 which was formerly Bill C-32.

We must do something. We must protect something. If we are honest about it, we all know in our hearts that Canadian culture does not need protection. It needs promotion. In this case we are discussing Canadian magazines but not just them. It is a broad cultural issue.

We need to understand that Canadian culture is worth promoting. It is worth unshackling from government regulation. This great country with its multitude of cultural facets is worth selling to the world. It is worth bragging about. It is worth telling others in the world that if they want a cultural experience par excellence Canada is a good place to find it.

Instead of a Canadian cultural minister admitting that she does not even know what Canadian culture is, Liberal members need to say that we have great Canadian culture. It has much variety. It goes from bagpipes to traditional dances, to native ceremonies, to opera, to whatever. We have the whole smorgasbord. It does not scare us on this side of the House to think that a smorgasbord is hard to digest. We think it is a wonderful thing. Canadians and others in the world think it is something to be proud of. It is a good thing. It does not give me indigestion and the rest of the world finds it very palatable.

• (1220)

I am in support of the Canadian cultural industry. It is a wonderful industry. It produces lots of jobs with a good future. They are not just hewers of wood or carriers of water. It is an expanding market. It has huge potential.

Whether it is in the computer industry, the animation industry, the newspaper industry as we are seeing on the front pages of our papers today, or the magazine industry, people want to come here and invest their money not because of protection but because they see it as a viable growing industry with a Canadian flavour that sells not only in Canada but around the world. My hat is off to this industry. Good for it. It is doing its job and I appreciate it.

We want to see this industry blossom and thrive, but what is the government's response? A press release of the minister indicated that only Canadian periodical publishers would be able to sell advertising services aimed primarily at the Canadian market to

Canadian advertisers. In other words, any split-run magazines like *Time* or *Sports Illustrated* whose editorial content is similar to their foreign original will not be able to bring their wares into Canada and solicit advertising space to Canadian companies. That is pretty ironic.

I will leaf through the latest edition of *Maclean's* magazine. Let me just crack it open. This is supposedly our national magazine. On the first full page is a Jaguar commercial, one of those great Canadian corporations, I guess. Then there is the next one, a full page Toyota ad. That is good. I do not mind that. There is one from Sheridan, a good Canadian company. Then there is one from Continental Airlines Express and a full page for Scotch whiskey. That is good. Anyway on and on and on it goes.

The magazine attracts international advertisers with headquarters that may be in other countries. Why? It is not because they are forced to advertise. They are not forced to advertise. If they want to address Canadians they had better speak to Canadians and use Canadian magazines to do it. Nobody could tell Jaguar that if it wants to sell Jaguars to Canadians it should advertise in the Los Angeles *Times* or a Los Angeles daily newspaper.

People advertise in Canadian products because they think that somebody will read it and that somebody will be Canadian. They do not need to be told about that. It is just a natural business decision and that is what they are doing.

If we want to help *Maclean's* or any other magazine, we should make it so attractive to advertise and do business in Canada that no one in their right mind would consider not spending a portion of their international dollars on Canadian run magazines. We want to be able to convince them that doing business in Canada is good. That is the way to help the Canadian cultural industry.

A committee has been travelling around and meeting for months. It is wringing its collective hands about the future of professional hockey in Canada. We could argue it is a sporting event which is sort of cultural. I have always thought it was pretty much a part of the Canadian mosaic. I love Canadian hockey.

If we wanted to hurt Canadian hockey how would we do it? Over the last 25 years through successive free spending governments we have managed to drive the value of the Canadian dollar down to 64 cents. I use the royal we here. I am including myself only because, I guess, I was a voter at that time. As much as many Canadians were upset about it, the spiral of debt and deficit financing for years and years and years created an atmosphere in Canada that has driven our dollar down to 64 cents.

Guess what? Some Canadian businesses are in trouble over that. A hockey player has to be paid in American currency. What will happen? Canadian hockey teams, the ones situated in Canada, cannot hang on to their best players. They are paid in American

*Government Orders*

dollars. Our dollar is in the toilet. Their dollar is sky high because of differing policies.

• (1225)

In this sense our cultural activity is heading south. What a shame. One after the other Canadian markets are being shut down. We cannot compete primarily because of the dollar. Our arenas are full. Hockey programs are full. Television networks are willing to sell it. The bottom line is we cannot compete because our business structure is so out of whack in Canada that people cannot refuse a much better offer in the States.

Earlier we talked about the wine industry in my province. It wins awards around the world, not because it is subsidized. In fact it did not happen until the subsidy was removed. It tore out all the old grapes. It tore out all the old orchards that were heavily subsidized. It planted a market driven grape, if we want to call it that, which I am told produces a wine that is—and I am not a wine drinker—one of the best in the world. British Columbia is sold and touted around the world as one of the finest places to grow wine. That is not a cultural activity but it is another example of people going where the good product is, not necessarily where the subsidies are.

Again and again when Canadians are allowed to trade freely and are unencumbered by government they do pretty well. We are not going to win all the battles. It is not like 100% of the game is always won 100% of the time by Canadians.

Another prime example is the softwood lumber agreement. The parliamentary secretary mentioned earlier that the Reform Party was isolated on the softwood lumber agreement. We were the only party in the House that stood and said “Warning, if you follow through on this you are going to put hundreds and thousands of people out of work”. Nobody listened. We were told we were all by ourselves over here and asked if we understood that the magnanimous government was to put together some trading, not free trade but an agreement that restricts trade to a few quota holders and so on. The government was to manage it and tell us what could be sold.

In my riding every innovative softwood mill will be shut down. Most of them are shut down now and they will all be shut down within a year. It is a sad prediction. Every time they create a new value added product they are told “Sorry, you cannot sell it because of the softwood lumber agreement”, no matter what they do or how inventive they are.

They have even tried to saw boards into boards for little retaining walls to hold landscaping in place. There is a huge market for them in the United States. Even though it is a new product and a value added product, because they are joined together and treated, guess what? “Park it in your warehouse as you are not allowed to

sell it”. Why? Because the government tells them what they can do.

It is not free trade. It is not access to a market with 300 million people. It is a market that says the government knows best. The mills in my riding have been told one after another “So, you have millions of dollars invested. So, you are opening markets in new value added products. We will shut all that down”.

What we end up with is a guy who saws 2x4s and ships them in bulk. He gets to keep shipping. However, the fellow that is putting energy and creativity into the value added product and doing what we have been told is the future, the right thing to do, has been told to shut down his business down and lose his investment. That is what happens when there is interference.

To get back to the example on the cultural side, the federal government is saying that to promote Canadian culture and to make it stronger it has to use its legislative muscle to keep Canadian magazines from international competition, which we believe Canada can and has met in the past and will again in the future.

I would argue that Bill C-55 is not needed. I cannot in my wildest imagination think that because of some advertising content or a split-run edition I am going to rush off and change my subscription to Canada’s national magazine because somebody from Los Angeles has a magazine with Wayne Gretzky on the cover.

• (1230)

Do Canadians not have enough grey matter to understand the difference between advertising and what they want to read? When I look at the table of contents I want to read how things affect Canadians. I am not going to find an American magazine that states “Canada, the high stakes tug of war on the environment. Nova Scotia’s Liberals on shaky ground”. I kind of like that one. I read it twice because it was a good one.

Canada’s involvement in Kosovo, what is our future in Kosovo? What is going to happen to businesses like Northern Telecom and Nortel? Those are Canadian questions I would like to have answered. What is happening in health care with the waiting lists and so on, which was largely caused by this government? I would like to read about that.

I would like to read book reviews about Canadian authors and Canadian subjects. The reason I get that magazine is it deals with Canadian issues. I do not dial up CNN on my television because I think it would be great to listen to some announcer from Chicago tell me about the weather patterns in Florida. I dial in Canadian programming because I want to listen to Canadian stuff that affects me as a Canadian. I do not need advertising dollars to make me do that. I do it because it is the right thing to watch.

*Government Orders*

As I mentioned earlier, guess what happens in this magazine? International organizations repeatedly advertise in a Canadian magazine with Canadian content not because they are told they have to but because they realize that Canadians read it. If it is garbage it should not be subsidized or protected. It basically can put out the same magazine 12 months of the year because nobody reads it anyway. If that what we have here it does not matter how much regulation is put on it because it will not sell. Canadians will not buy it and advertisers will not advertise in it. Nobody will care because the magazine is not worth reading.

However, if the magazine deals with Canadian issues the advertisers will advertise. If you build it, they will come, culturally speaking. That is what will happen. They are looking for good quality magazines so they can say show us the product and we will advertise in it. Anybody who thinks differently has not looked at the latest *Maclean's* magazine. They are certainly not thinking on a whole realm of things, why, for example, *Canadian Gardener* might be of more interest to the latest gardening schemes in southern Florida.

Since that stuff does not grow in my garden I will not buy that magazine because I want the magazine to deal with Canadian stuff. Most Canadians understand the difference between reading about the latest adobe styles in southern California and the fact that west coast architecture is a little different. They understand it and gravitate to it because it is what they want to read. It is not because it is supported by advertisers.

One wonders why the federal government is putting so much energy and resources into this kind of initiative, an initiative that unfortunately may backfire again at the World Trade Organization as it did last time. One wonders why this government thinks that putting this misplaced energy into protecting the split-run magazines is a vote getter or whatever.

We have a \$1.4 billion a day trade deal with the Americans and it has been growing rapidly since NAFTA and the free trade agreement and now expanded to the WTO. They are our best trading partners. Contrary to what the Liberals tried to sell us in 1993, they realized as soon as they were in power, within about two weeks they signed an agreement saying that Canada's economic well-being was based on access to the 300 million person U.S. market. They signed the agreement, as we knew they would and as we said they would in 1993 when we campaigned against them.

I remember the Liberals standing at an all-candidates meeting and saying—in our case it was article 2(c) of the World Trade Organization agreement which dealt with supply management—“we will never sign that without a strengthened article 2(c), you can count on it”.

• (1235 )

The Liberal candidate I was running against said “I would lay on the railroad tracks and stop the trains before we would sign that”.

Two weeks after the Liberals were elected in 1993 guess what? The Liberals signed the agreement. Guess what? Article 11 (2)(c) is just the way it was when the Conservatives negotiated it. I warned our farmers not to trust these guys. As it turned out I was absolutely right. This government did exactly as I knew it would and it signed the agreement.

Why? Because we live in an international rules based trading economy. The government is half way there, half pregnant. The government sort of wants to go but does not know what the gestation period is. This government wants to do it but does not want to admit it. It is sort of free trade but it cannot simply come out and say it.

It is like the reciprocity campaign of 1911. Interestingly the Liberals at that time said the future lies in reciprocity. The future lies in free trade because Canadians can take on the Americans at their game and can win our share and more. We have enough assets to pull it off, human and otherwise.

There is \$1.4 billion of trade between Canada and the U.S. and what are we doing? In one minute we are poking the Americans in the eye. We are saying “oh yeah, watch this”. We are telling the Americans let's go, let's go. We are taking on our best trading partner and saying let's go to the WTO. They are going to win again. The Americans will come back and kick our sorry economy all over the map because of this.

When the Americans win this the second time, the second time means they come back and the softwood lumber industry in my riding could be affected. It could be grain shipments into the States. It might just be magazines and cultural activities. But it could be anything.

I can imagine the American negotiators saying “Oh boy, the election is coming up. Get a little presidential butt kicking going here. Let us see what we can do to those Canadians because we won it again. Let us pick our spot. What is the best vote getter? Let's knock the snot out of those Canadians for being lippy again for the second time when they knew full well and they were warned by the official opposition that this was going to happen”.

Some American presidential candidate is going to use the opportunity of a WTO ruling on this bill and they are going to come back and hurt Canada bad for political reasons. That is a shame. It is unnecessary and should not be happening. This bill should not pass.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague was getting to a very important part of his speech regarding what might happen in retaliation to this law which will obviously be struck down.

The member mentioned the softwood lumber industry. I know there are other industries as well. I and the official opposition are concerned about that as well. We are on record as forewarning the

*Government Orders*

government it is venturing out on very dangerous ground by proceeding with this bill.

I and members of the opposition cannot understand why it is that the government would take this measure. I am wondering if my colleague might comment on some of the other industries as well as the softwood industry that he feels might be affected by this agreement if it is defeated again, and it likely will be.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, one needs a crystal ball to know what the WTO might rule. The WTO might say it has had a complete change of heart. All the rationale it used before will just be thrown out and suddenly it will have an epiphany, a change, a road to Damascus experience. The WTO might but I do not think so.

The WTO body has said argue as you might, folks in Canada. It is unfair to treat people differently on your trade laws.

• (1240)

It is not an industry that needs protection. It is going to rule the same way again.

It is interesting how we want to have our cake and eat it too. There is a reciprocity agreement over there. They want a free trade agreement except they do not want a free trade agreement.

One Canadian publisher, the proprietor of *Saturday Night*, said this about Bill C-55: "I have been a relentless opponent of these restrictive rules all the time. I have been in business nearly 30 years. I am opposed to the restrictions that representatives of the magazine are advancing on American publications. We have been well received in those foreign countries, the U.K., the U.S.A. and Israel, where we do business. Canada should behave as those other countries do".

Other countries say to Canada "If our guys want to advertise in your magazines and you want to sell into our markets go ahead. It is not a bad magazine and you are going to penetrate our market a bit, but some of our people like to read about Canadian stuff. Some of them are transplanted Canadians. Some of them want to go to Canada". There is a market. Sell into that market. What an opportunity.

We have 30 million people, a little country by world standards. Somebody says to us that in their country there are 200 million, 300 million or a billion people like in India and they will let us sell into their market. What we should be saying is thanks for the opportunity to expand our business. Thank you for letting us sell into their market. Let us hope for a .5% market penetration. All of a sudden the circulation on the Canadian magazine goes through the roof.

With a free trade access like that there is access to billions of people.

Instead, Canada wants to keep Canadian magazines in Canada and get a 10% market penetration on 30 million people. There will be three million people who have ever seen the magazine. It will never be more than that. The business is restricted. It cannot expand. We will not let it expand. It is the tit for tat thing in international trade. If they will not let us go into their markets we will not let them come into ours. That is the deal.

Worse than that, under the WTO arrangement it understands that other countries may choose to retaliate, but not on the magazine. They might say they were willing to let the magazine come in. It is not that big of a deal and there will be some market penetration. But may the best magazine win. They are willing to try that. They are willing to offer that. They may come back and say they have had trouble with our textile industry because it takes them on and beats them half the time. So they get back at the Canadian government for its intransigence by countervailing on textiles. Or they might come back to the softwood lumber agreement that has already put thousands of people out of jobs in my province and expand it a little. They might put another tariff on top of all of that.

Because the Asian market has gone into decline, our primary market is in America right now for software lumber and a lot of our grains. What if they came up and said that the wheat does not go south of that border, that imaginary 49th parallel on the map? They tell us to keep our wheat. They give their subsidies to their farmers, pump them up and get them in business. But that industry is going to suffer because of a magazine bill.

What kind of a strained logic on that side over there would say they are going to take this to the WTO, poke the people in the eyes until they get them nice and mad like boiled owls. They are going to be all claws, beaks, feathers and scratches. They are going to come out of there like a broken helicopter. They will come out of there mad. They will say "did we not deal with the split-run issue once already?". A similar panel is going to get this. It will not have an epiphany, a road to Damascus experience.

• (1245)

It is going to wake up with the same logic that was brought into that next one. It is going to crack open the magazine and say "Guess what folks, the rules are the same as the last time and will be the same the next time, but there will not be a next time because we ruled in favour of the plaintiff".

Instead of creating jobs in Canada and encouraging diversity and saying to the world "Come on world, we are ready. We can take you on, on our terms", we will catch it in the ear in an industry that is innocent of what the government is doing. Industry will take the retaliation. What a shame. If it comes on one of the industries in

*Government Orders*

my riding, I do not know what it will do to the federal buildings in my riding as there are not many left in my riding anyway because they have all been transferred to Liberal ridings elsewhere. They will be some upset and I understand why.

Maybe the minister of culture figures she has not had enough of the spotlight lately. Maybe she wants to by all stretches of the imagination make a run at the Liberal leadership one day or maybe she is trying to get her name in the paper, who knows?

**An hon. member:** This is as good as the MMT legislation.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. It reminds me of another time when the official opposition was isolated. It had to do with the MMT legislation.

We sat on this side of the House and begged the government not to put restrictive legislation on that octane enhancer for those who are not familiar with the issue. We said that if the government did that, the government would be taken to court and would have to pay because it had not tabled the evidence in this place which showed that it should be restricted. What did the government do? It thumbed its nose at the official opposition. That is fine.

Liberals do not agree with us because they like to be wrong a good part of the time. They did not agree with us and what happened? I wonder if the Liberal caucus even had a discussion about this. Guess what happened. Back it came. It did not go to court though. We settled out of court. Tens of millions of dollars were given to the Ethyl Corporation, an American corporation.

The government said that for whatever these dollars were worth, and the dollar is not worth that much, it being down to 64 cents, as much as we can gather together we will throw at Ethyl Corporation. Why? Because members over there do not believe in free trade. They mouth the words when it suits them and the rest of the time they restrict business; they put them under their thumb. Business that could be thriving and adding value is told it is not welcome in Canada.

Tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars went to pay Ethyl Corporation in an out of court settlement. I wonder if the Liberal caucus had a little talk about that with their minister. I wonder if they said that the Reform Party was right, again. Yes, we were isolated on that and we were right again.

On Bill C-55 and the split-run magazine issue, we will be proven right again. The Liberals will come whining back into this House. The favourite whine on the Liberal side is "I want to tax and put on some more red tape".

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to enter into this debate on this piece of legislation which has been so clearly illustrated by the official opposition as lacking in so many ways and so many areas. I will focus my comments on a few points. There are so many comments I would like to get on the record that I am afraid I might not have a chance to get them all on but I will try.

Some particular portions of Bill C-55 should be very alarming for everybody in this place, particularly the section which goes into establishing an investigative branch that can explore people who violate this law. That violation would be Canadian advertisers selling advertisements to American magazines and things of that sort.

• (1250)

There are a lot of problems in our country. There are a lot of things happening. I know that this government wants to address the serious issues in our country. We would think and hope that. After all, it is the Government of Canada.

Instead what we see is a bill being presented which simply addresses one issue of magazines. We can only imagine that it might be because the minister of heritage is not getting into the spotlight very much in the last little while and needs, as one of my colleagues pointed out earlier, a reason to justify her department and what she is doing there. Perhaps that is why she has created this bill.

I know that in Vancouver there are some serious problems going on. This bill would introduce some police force powers to individuals to investigate the selling of advertising in magazines. I do not think that is an issue that is resonating across the country. I am not getting calls in my office about this issue. I am getting calls about a lot of other issues. I am getting calls in my office about a serious drug problem happening in Vancouver, about problems with the immigration system and the government's refusal to address those kinds of problems. I am getting calls in my office about cuts to the RCMP budgets in British Columbia and how that is having a profound impact on every citizen in British Columbia and across the country.

Yet this government sees fit to introduce a bill that was defeated once already by the WTO ruling. This government knows that, yet it is proceeding with this. It does not make any sense as to why the government would clearly go ahead again with this type of bill which cannot stand on its own merits. That has been proven and it is going to happen again.

If a government brings forward a bill, we would expect it would check into what might be the ramifications of enacting the legislation. The government knows that a similar bill was defeated once before. It knows what the ramifications were when it was defeated, when it was appealed and lost at the WTO. Yet the government has gone ahead again. We would think the government might have

*Government Orders*

caught on that this is not a bill that is going to be able to do what it is intended to do.

The government says that we need to protect Canadian culture. We say we need to promote Canadian culture. We have heard government members who want it both ways.

Members of the Liberal government who were in opposition at the time spoke long and hard against free trade. Yet when they formed the government in 1993 they rapidly signed that agreement. We see here with this bill the true colours of where the Liberals stand on trade. They are not really supportive of a free trade agreement that would allow for the movement of goods and services across the border to our biggest trading partner and we are trading over \$1 billion per day. In this bill the minister of heritage is putting forth a protectionist act.

It is very clear and it has been demonstrated before. We have been pointing it out all day long and in past days as well. We will continue to say it and forewarn the government of what might happen by the actions of this bill. The government has to get the message on this.

If the heritage minister really wanted to do something for Canadian magazines she would listen to one of her colleagues. The minister of defence said in a speech on January 27, 1997, "Perhaps in the new digital world policies of cultural promotion make more sense than traditional policies of protection". What a surprise. One of the minister's own colleagues gave some good advice which she obviously has not heeded.

Perhaps there is quite a stir going on in cabinet. We can only imagine what is happening. The Minister for International Trade, the Minister of Industry and perhaps the Minister of Finance in talking to the Minister of Canadian Heritage might be saying "What in the world are you doing with this? We lost it once before. We are going to lose it again and there are some pretty serious ramifications". But no, she is going ahead with the bill in the face of its obvious inadequacies.

• (1255)

The minister is putting at risk industries in our country, people in our country, workers in our country who face possible retaliation when this is struck down once again by the WTO. We heard the parliamentary secretary say that this will go through the WTO, that we have met all the obligations, that everything is fine and not to worry about it. I would disagree.

I will mention a few remarks in response to this bill when it was introduced. These remarks were released in Geneva by the U.S. trade representative in response to Bill C-55, the bill we are debating today which was introduced by the minister of heritage. He said:

On October 8, the Canadian government introduced a bill in parliament that, if enacted, would ban foreign-owned publishers from using the magazines they publish to carry any advertisement aimed primarily at Canadian consumers.

Unfortunately, it leaves foreign-produced split-run periodicals precisely where they have been for the past 30 years—shut out of the Canadian market.

What is also disturbing about the bill is that it apparently represents Canada's idea of compliance with the panel and Appellate Body reports on this subject.

Canada seems to believe that while it may violate the GATT for a government to confiscate 80 percent of the advertising revenues generated by imported split-run magazines, it is perfectly acceptable to ban those advertisements altogether.

That was the trade representative for the United States. We are not looking into a crystal ball and saying that we think this might happen, that the Americans might voice opposition to this bill. One of their senior people is saying what they are going to do, yet this government still proceeds with this bill. I will continue to quote this representative:

Canadian officials are justifying their new bill on the grounds that it is governed by the anti-discrimination provisions of the GATS rather than the GATT. Conveniently, Canada has made no commitments regarding advertising under the GATS.

It is surprising that Canada would believe its GATT v GATS argument which the panel and the Appellate Body so soundly rejected in 1997 has taken on credibility in 1998.

Why are the same arguments which were defeated previously now being put forward as valid? The U.S. trade representative mentioned this. He continued:

The clear and intended effect of Canada's proposed legislation is to prevent imported magazines from being used to carry advertisements aimed at the Canadian market.

This is precisely what Canada's 80 percent tax prevents as well.

Taken together, the bill introduced on October 8, and the perpetuation of Canada's postal subsidy scheme, which the Canadian Government has also announced, send a very troubling signal regarding Canada's seriousness in abiding by its international obligations and, in particular, in observing both the letter and spirit of the WTO's dispute settlement rules.

For well over a year Canada steadfastly refused to disclose any of the alternatives it was considering or to consult with interested governments regarding its compliance.

Then, after dragging out its response for almost 15 months, the Canadian Government has suddenly announced proposed replacement measures that are still discriminatory and protectionist.

We strongly urge Canada to reconsider the course it has chosen. The United States intends to react vigorously if that is not the case.

If this government will not listen to members of the opposition, perhaps it will listen to the American representatives who have the power and the ability to go ahead and challenge the WTO agreement. They have announced—

*Government Orders*

**An hon. member:** Phone the ambassador.

**Mr. Grant McNally:** Mr. Speaker, members opposite are not interested in listening. They do not want to listen to advice. They want to heckle; they want to read papers. They are not interested. They are not interested in the concerns of Canadians. They do not want to listen to any advice because they think they have it all worked out. They say "Everything is fine, throw us the keys, we will drive the bus, do not worry about it".

We on this side of the House are not going to do that. We are not going to toss them the keys and let them drive the car off the road as they have done the last 30 years, with a few intermissions. No, we are going to point out the deficiencies in their bills.

• (1300)

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Grant McNally:** The member says "Go ahead". If he had put his paper down long enough he might have heard some of the earlier comments.

There are obviously problems with this bill. They have been pointed out by members of the opposition, and not just by the official opposition but by other parties as well. U.S. trade representatives have said that there are problems with this bill. They have clearly signalled their intention to challenge it.

When they challenge this and win is when the trouble will start for the industries across this country. We do not know where the retaliation will take place, whether it will be western Canadian grain producers or an industry in Ontario.

There are over 100 members of the Liberal caucus representing Ontario. I would have thought they would have some concerns about this. I do not see members standing on the opposite side voicing their concerns. They will have to pay the price when this legislation goes through, when the challenge is made and this bill is soundly defeated in the World Trade Organization as being unfair, discriminatory and protectionist, as it most obviously is.

It is the members opposite who will be responsible. They will have to answer. They have been forewarned, as they have been forewarned on many things before but have not taken the advice. Unfortunately, they do not like to take advice from members of the official opposition. We know that.

However, we would hope that in the interests of Canada, in the interests of their constituents, in the interests of all of our industries across this country that they would have a plan of action before putting something in place. We would hope that they would take a look at the legislation they are bringing forward to see how it will impact the people of this country and the economy of this country.

I might add that we are seeing the Canadian dollar dropping.

The government is responsible in a large way for providing an economic climate to allow industries to grow.

We see this government introducing this type of bill rather than dealing with some other major priorities that we have been asking it to address.

I have to remind my colleagues opposite that this bill is badly flawed. I think members opposite know that.

It is one thing to proceed on a course of action, whatever it might be, if we truly believe something to be so, and to proceed on that course of action that will provide some benefit in the future. It is another thing to proceed on a course of action when we know full well that that course of action is not a good course of action, that there are obstacles in the way, that it will not be of benefit. There are other terms to describe that way of thinking.

I cannot understand why the government is proceeding in this manner, with this legislation, in a way that will imperil Canadians working in many other fields across the country. We do not know what the retaliation is going to be.

I simply do not understand why it is that we would proceed to try to disrupt, maybe unintentionally—and I will give the government the benefit of the doubt—and to aggravate our biggest trading partner on this issue. They can obviously retaliate in a number of ways. It could affect the softwood lumber industry in my province of British Columbia. It could affect those involved in farming, in the prairies in particular.

My father-in-law is a former farmer. These are the people who are talking about what it is we are dealing with in this place. What are the government's priorities? That is what I hear from people when I talk to them about what is happening in this place.

They do not ask me about the minister of heritage and Bill C-55, and what a great impact that will have on their daily lives. They are not raising those concerns.

• (1305)

It is just unbelievable that in the face of good advice somebody would proceed in a way that would not benefit the country. The governing party is responsible for setting out a course for the country. I do not see that happening in this piece of legislation. What I see is exactly the opposite.

I can only encourage the members of the government who are here today and the government in general to re-look this piece of legislation to see the potential damage that it could cause. They should do the right thing and not proceed with it, but proceed in other areas of priority across this land.

*Government Orders*

We hope that members of the government will reconsider moving on this bill and not stubbornly move ahead on a piece of legislation that is doomed for failure.

I hear loud heckling from members opposite. I am sad to say that, once again, it looks as though a few of the members are not even willing to listen. That is upsetting, not to me because I am used to it, but it is upsetting to the people of Canada, their constituents.

This bill is just not going to work.

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

**Mr. Grant McNally:** The members continue to heckle. They seem to have no interest in wanting to listen to good advice, but that is their prerogative. They laugh at good advice. They laugh at a serious issue that is going to affect a lot of industries, not just in my riding but in their ridings right across this country. What do they do? They sit in their seats and laugh. We must surmise that they are laughing at Canadians because this bill will impact Canadians across the country.

I would hope that instead of laughter we might hear intelligent debate in this place from members on the other side, because we know it is coming from this side. We would like to hear some other ideas from members opposite because this one is simply not a good idea.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where to start. That was one single argument, repeated 1,500 times. I guess repetition does not necessarily make an argument any better, but we will leave that for another day.

I want to comment a bit on some of the comments made by the member for Fraser Valley. He was touting a magazine and quoting from it, telling us that he liked to read Canadian stories in Canadian magazines. We all agree. He then made a statement to the effect that he does not need advertising. We all know that, but that is the point of the bill.

For him to be able to read those Canadian magazines and read those Canadian stories, those magazines need advertising dollars. That is the point of this legislation. I think he might be starting to understand.

One of the longstanding policies of the Government of Canada has been to help the magazine industry in securing enough advertising dollars by not helping split runs. If we allow foreign magazines without any Canadian content, without any expenses on that side, to come and skim advertising dollars and services, then we will indeed cripple our Canadian magazine industry.

It is rather heartening to see that one of the members of the Reform Party understands that somebody might need advertising dollars in order to put out these magazines. That is the purpose of the bill. We hope to get it through second reading and to committee and, with the help of the opposition parties, we will move on.

I have listened to all of the speeches from Reform members and there is a theme coming out. I thought initially it might have been sheepishness on their part in that they were raising these bogeymen. They say that we are poking our American neighbours in the eye and they are going to retaliate. They say that we should aggravate them because they will then come around and kill our wheat industry, the hog industry and softwood lumber. They threw in hockey and a lot of other things.

• (1310)

Maybe I was not accurate about them being sheepish, because the more I listened the more things came out, such as "We should listen more to the American trade secretary saying this and that. We will not win. We will go to the WTO and they will quash it". It seems that members of the Reform Party are not here to defend Canadian interests. They seem to be here to defend American interests. They seem to be defending anything that is foreign, but not Canadian.

We want to help an industry that has grown over the past 30 years, an industry which consists of 1,000 small businesses and employs over 6,000 Canadians.

Reform members are giving me the impression that they may not be sheepish, but they seem to be Americans in sheep's clothing.

**The Speaker:** I know with all of those sheep in there that there was a question. I am going to give the hon. member a chance to comment.

**Mr. Grant McNally:** Mr. Speaker, I was trying hard to detect a question, as I know you were.

The hon. member mentioned that I repeated things several times. I must admit that I did repeat things several times because I was hoping that the message would get through. Obviously it has not.

What we are talking about here is a protectionist measure that the government is putting in place. The parliamentary secretary, and I think he knows it, tries to paint Reform in a light that is just simply not accurate.

With respect to my comments about the American trade representative, in fact this is something that he stated will happen. This is a high ranking official saying that they are going to go ahead and challenge this. It was defeated once before. To not address that, to not give that some weight in their considerations before moving ahead I think is just unwise. That is why I made the comment. It was made to let the government know that this is a weak piece of legislation. It is going to be challenged. The government is going to lose. It lost once before. That is the reason I mentioned it.

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, very quickly, Canadians value freedom of contract. This bill authorizes the Minister of Canadian Heritage to make trade law without going through regulation.

*Government Orders*

I am looking at this from the standpoint of an advertiser. An advertiser wants certainty in terms of planning their advertising dollars. There is no certainty when we have a ministerial prerogative such as that. Besides not liking it as a parliamentarian, I am thinking of it as an advertiser.

I would like my colleague to comment on that aspect of the bill.

**Mr. Grant McNally:** Mr. Speaker, that is a concern. This bill of course limits who Canadian advertisers are going to be able to put their advertising dollars with. I do not understand that principle. That is a principle that seems contrary to other government policy, particularly in light of free trade. So I simply do not understand.

I mentioned that the bill is weak in a number of areas. The area that my colleague points out I did not mention. Absolutely it is a problem. There should be freedom of the press and freedom of individuals to go ahead and advertise with whomever they like.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will just make a few comments and ask a short question to conclude this debate.

This debate really is about democracy, freedom of speech and freedom of expression. On the opposition benches it is about trying to keep the government out of trouble. We have heard the arguments that were aired in terms of retaliation.

• (1315)

The reality of North American society is that we depend on the Americans for a healthy economy. There are two things we agree on. One is that Canadians love Canadian content in whatever they hear, read or watch. I am sure all sides of the House agree to that. The other statement I can make is that our economy depends on that of the United States. We are fortunate with the Asian flu that the American economy probably shelters us from a greater impact in light of the weak dollar in this country. Those are the two points that I am sure we all agree on.

On the issue of freedom of speech I believe that when the bill becomes law it will be subject to the courts' judgment. As soon as it becomes law the private sector will take it to the courts. There is no doubt about that.

**Mr. Grant McNally:** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to comment on the important points made by my colleague. I hope the government is listening to them.

As I mentioned earlier, the bill is weak and my colleague has pointed out another weakness. I know he is the critic for the area. He has studied the legislation in depth. He has tried to make interventions with the minister to advise her that this is not a good way to proceed. It was not for his own gain but because he sees this piece of legislation as flawed. This is another flaw.

There will be problems with the legislation. There will be some court challenges because the bill limits the rights of Canadian advertisers to advertise where they would like to advertise. That is clearly infringing on people's freedoms. We hope the government will listen to the points that we make before proceeding on this course.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, for the last hour or so I have been somewhat appalled by the cavalier attitude of the parliamentary secretary and some of his yappy cohorts toward the well-being and the opportunities that may be lost to earn a living by tens of thousands of Canadians who will be affected if we get ourselves into a trade war over this stupid piece of legislation. This is not a joke.

People are frightened as to what may happen if this position is overturned by the WTO, and I think it probably will be. We will be vulnerable. We will be open. To use a certain amount of care is not, with due respect, being sheepish. It is being sane and sensible. The bill can really hurt.

The parliamentary secretary says that 6,000 people will be directly affected by the legislation. I question that. There are 6,000 people working in the industry. There are not 6,000 people who will be directly affected by the legislation because we are dealing with a rather small segment of the magazine market. This is not as big an issue as the parliamentary secretary would like to make out. The potential for damage from this unimportant piece of legislation is enormous.

It behooves the parliamentary secretary to be a little more thoughtful and respectful of the hundreds of thousands of people employed in basic industries such as the agricultural industry. They are vulnerable. They have been attacked before by the Americans under trade rules. In some cases those who study this sort of thing are quivering in their shoes.

I used to have a very large German shepherd—this is a true story by the way, not a parable—that I kept fenced in my backyard. There was a little boy in the neighbourhood, who was not a bad kid, who could not resist tormenting my dog. He would go down the ally on his bicycle, run a stick along the fence and rattle the boards. Then he would get off his bicycle, look through the fence and torment my dog. One day he did that but did not realize that the back gate was open. This big dog ran out, grabbed the poor kid by the leg and gave him a pretty serious bite.

• (1320)

The United States is a very mean big dog. We should not torment this beast, unless we see some real benefit or some potential advantage in doing so, because he will bite. He has bitten us before and he will bite us again. We should not mess around for a trivial reason and endanger something which is terribly important to ordinary working people in this country. We can make light of this

*Government Orders*

problem as much as we want, but it is not something to be taken lightly. These are very serious concerns.

We have walked down this road before on the split-run issue. We lost. If we lose a second time, the game is over and we are vulnerable for retaliation. Those guys play rough. I think a bit of common sense should be used.

Apart from the practicalities of the question, I get a little tired of members opposite who seem to believe that Canadians are children, that Canadians are incapable of managing their own affairs, that Canadians left to their own devices will buy out all the *Playboy* magazines in the cornerstore but will not read *Saturday Night*. This is rather a low view of our population but it seems to be what drives the government.

The hon. member beside me made a comment a little earlier about smother love. This is a typical example of smother love, trying to control what people read and what people hear. It is thought control. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* may not be very long behind us, but we still seem to have some of the ideas Mr. Orwell brought forward in his book.

Free speech, freedom to do business with whom we wish, freedom to own property and control it any way we like, free press by all means and freedom of contract, do these things not matter at all? Why are we throwing out these important aspects of our culture ostensibly to protect our culture? It is a contradiction of terms and I will not accept it.

I noticed earlier the hon. member for Brampton Centre, while my colleague was speaking, was very busily reading a newspaper. I did not notice what newspaper it was. However it occurred to me that hon. member probably would not be too happy if the media police or "Copp's" cops were to say to him that he could not read that paper any more because it was published in the wrong city, never mind country. If they said they wanted him to read the Toronto *Star* whether or not he liked it and would pass legislation which would make, for example, the Ottawa *Citizen* sit up and take notice because it is not always very nice to the government, how would he feel?

I would like people to think about such things. Sure, it is a stretch but not a very long one because this is the sort of thing the government is proposing to do. It is telling Canadians what they may or may not read by using the big economic hammer on advertisers. This is shameful.

• (1325)

Extraterritorial legislation, which is what this is if we look at it closely, has a very bad smell in this country. Do members remember the Helms—Burton bill and how everyone from all parties was up in arms about it? Now we are coming up with our very own version of extraterritorial legislation and it is okay in the eyes of the Liberals.

Where are they coming from? Where is the consistency? Where is the basic concept of free trade which members of the government, having had their epiphany, claim now to support? They support it when it is convenient to them, but when it interferes with some of their elitist ideas they say "None of this free trade stuff". That is bad.

I would like to relinquish the rest of my time to hear a little more from the hon. parliamentary secretary. I hope he will rise to the bait and debate.

**Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was deeply affected by the story the member told about the little boy and the dog, but he left us dangling. My question to the member is very simple. What happened to the dog?

**An hon. member:** He shot the dog.

**Mr. Lee Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, actually I did not put the dog down. The parents of the boy were very understanding. They realized that the boy had been doing something he should not have been doing. He had been tempting fate so they said "It happened, it happened". The dog lived to a ripe old age.

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question for my colleague deals with the way in which the bill changes how we look at split runs as opposed to the previous legislation.

The crux of the way the bill is different from the previous one in many respects is the changing of a definition by legislation. Indeed this is a very weak way to redefine something and ultimately very challengeable.

The bill has the effect of changing advertising from a service to a good. It is very construed and artificial. Would the member like to comment on that in an intellectual spirit?

**Mr. Lee Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, we talked a few minutes ago about stretching things. I would submit that calling advertising a service rather than a good is an extremely long stretch.

I have purchased a lot of advertising and I never thought of it as a service. I was buying space in a piece of paper. That is a good. That is the principal reason that the legislation will be thrown out when it is challenged as it unquestionably will be challenged by the WTO.

We are trying to rewrite the English language by legislation. We cannot do that. Language is something fluid, but we cannot change the rules. We cannot change the language. Advertising is not a service. Advertising is a good. It is something we buy. We can touch it on the printed page. I am sorry, but I would have to say to my hon. colleague that this is the biggest weak point in the bill. This is why it is subject to challenge.

• (1330)

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question for the member opposite. Is he aware that the WTO recognizes that advertising is a service?

**Mr. Lee Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, the WTO recognizes that advertising agencies provide a service. The WTO does not recognize an advertisement, which is what we are talking about. That is what we buy. We buy an advertisement in a magazine. That is not a service. That is a good. The hon. member is equivocating.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, under subclause 20(c) of this bill the minister is authorized to make regulations respecting “criteria to determine whether advertising services are directed at the Canadian market”. This amounts to authorizing the Minister of Canadian Heritage to make trade laws without passing them through parliament. Will this undermine the authority of the House?

**Mr. Lee Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, my response to my colleague is, what else is new?

When in living memory has this government ever passed any legislation that could not be abused in that way? Passing legislation with clauses that allow bureaucrats or people in the minister’s department to step in and do whatever they please is the Liberal way.

I would not even answer my colleague’s question directly except to say that the principle of what he is describing is despicable.

**The Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Speaker:** The question is on the motion that the question be now put.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions with representatives of all parties. I believe you would find consent to defer the recorded division requested on

### *Government Orders*

the motion of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage concerning second reading of Bill C-55 to the expiry of Government Orders on Tuesday, November 3, 1998.

**The Speaker:** Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### MARINE CONSERVATION AREAS ACT

**Hon. John Manley (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage)** moved that Bill C-48, an act respecting marine conservation areas, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Parks), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the motto “from sea to sea” is a fitting description of the country’s geography. We are bounded by three of the great oceans of the world, the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Arctic. Much of our southern border is demarcated by the world’s largest freshwater inland lake system, the Great Lakes.

• (1335)

With 243,000 kilometres of ocean coastline and an additional 9,500 kilometres along the Great Lakes, Canada has the longest coastline of any country in the world. This coastline includes some of the most spectacular scenery in the world.

Along the west coast there are endless miles of long, deep wilderness fiords. The bays and coves of the Atlantic shelter the fishing outports and villages of the maritimes. The Arctic although cold, barren and windswept is nonetheless strikingly beautiful. It includes some of the least visited and unspoiled natural areas in the world.

The clear waters and rugged inland strewn shores of Canada’s Great Lakes attract recreational sailors from around the globe. They have also served as a backdrop for the famous paintings of the group of seven. Dramatic cliffs, the highest tides, spectacular icebergs, majestic fiords and the overall timeless essence of the sea are ours to enjoy as Canadians.

Canada’s oceans and Great Lakes have played a large role in shaping the country’s economy, culture and identity. They contribute not only to our economic prosperity but also to our spiritual well-being.

An act respecting marine conservation areas fulfils two commitments made by the government.

The first commitment was made by the Prime Minister to the 1996 congress of the World Conservation Union which was held in Montreal. The Prime Minister stated “Our government will introduce legislation for the creation of a national marine conservation system, the marine equivalent of our land based national parks system”.

*Government Orders*

In "Securing Our Future Together" which set out this government's plans for this mandate, the government made the commitment "to establish new marine conservation areas and develop legislation and policies for a marine conservation system".

The marine conservation areas act will protect and conserve for all time marine areas that are representative of Canada's Arctic, Atlantic and Pacific oceans and the Great Lakes. It will also encourage public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of our marine heritage.

I wish to highlight some of the reasons why it is important for Canada and indeed for the world that we move forward as quickly as possible with the establishment of a system of marine protected areas and how we are responding to that challenge.

We are, after all, a maritime nation. The vast marine ecosystems off Canada's coasts are precious, varied and highly productive. Given this rich diversity, Canada has a responsibility both nationally and internationally to protect examples of this marine heritage for present and future generations.

There is growing concern about the health of the planet's oceans and inland seas. There is concern that our efforts to protect and conserve marine environments are out of step with our dependence on them. There is concern that these waters remain largely out of sight and out of mind, and for too long a convenient place to dispose of our wastes.

Marine conservation areas have a role to play in striking a better balance between the protection and use of our marine environment. Equally important, they have a role to play in increasing public understanding and appreciation of the importance of maintaining healthy lakes and oceans for the well-being of the entire planet.

Canada with its extensive coastline and the second largest continental shelf has much to gain from a comprehensive system of marine protected areas.

Marine conservation areas will join our cherished national parks, historic sites, canals and rivers in representing our rich collective history and culture. They will add to our sense of national identity.

The creation of marine conservation areas responds directly to several national and international calls for action. For example, the establishment of marine protected areas is an important strategic direction in the 1995 Canadian biodiversity strategy. This strategy, endorsed by federal and provincial governments, will guide the implementation of the 1992 United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity.

A resolution of the 1994 general assembly of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and its action plan call on coastal nations to establish representative systems of marine protected areas under national legislation.

• (1340)

The establishment of marine conservation areas will make a significant contribution to implementing the sustainable development strategy of the Department of Canadian Heritage. That strategy, "Sustaining our Heritage", was tabled in the House of Commons in December 1997.

Marine conservation areas established in Canada's exclusive economic zone will help to fulfil Canada's obligation in international law to take steps to protect and to preserve our marine environment.

Let me now explain how Canada is meeting these calls to action.

Canada is committed to the establishment of a system of marine conservation areas that will provide a representative sampling of the full range of marine environments found in Canada's Pacific, Arctic, and Atlantic oceans and in the Great Lakes. To accomplish this, Parks Canada has classified Canada's marine environment into 29 distinctive regions. The long term goal is to establish a system of marine conservation areas that represent each one of these regions.

Parks Canada through its programs and in partnership with others will ensure that high quality marine interpretive programs and visitor facilities are provided to the public.

The establishment of these areas will signal to Canadians and international visitors alike that these sites are the best that Canada has to offer, world class ecotourism destinations for those who wish to experience firsthand our unique marine natural and cultural heritage.

Bill C-48 includes strong protection measures. These are in keeping with international standards to ensure that marine ecosystems remain healthy and intact while at the same time allowing for the sustainable use of renewable resources.

There will be places where through collaborative research programs special efforts will be made to understand the nature of marine ecosystems and the effects of human activity on them. The research results, together with the traditional knowledge of local people, will be used to better manage our use of marine resources both within marine conservation areas and elsewhere. In this way, it is expected that marine conservation areas will serve an important function as models of ecologically sustainable use of marine resources.

Parks Canada is the ideal organization to play the lead role in establishing and managing a national system of marine conservation areas in which all Canadians can take enormous pride.

Parks Canada already manages a wide range of national parks and historic sites including 19 national parks on our coasts. Parks Canada is an organization with considerable knowledge and expertise to apply to the protection and presentation of Canada's

natural and cultural heritages. Just think of our national parks so admired around the world.

However, Parks Canada cannot plan and manage these areas alone. To ensure success, Parks Canada must work with many government and non-government agencies that have responsibilities or interests in the planning or management of these areas.

Let me assure Canadians that the shared stewardship in the planning and management of marine conservation areas has been a key consideration in drafting the legislation before the House today. Extensive public consultation has been central to the approach taken by Parks Canada for years.

For instance, the first policy on the planning and management of these areas was tabled in this House in 1986, more than 12 years ago after much public discussion. Similarly, current policy direction contained in the "Parks Canada Guiding Principles and Operational Policies" benefited from public input. These were tabled in the House in March 1994.

Parks Canada also held wide ranging discussions with stakeholders prior to the implementation of Bill C-48. In February 1997 "Charting the Course Towards a Marine Conservation Area Act" was released and invited public comments and suggestions from a variety of stakeholders.

• (1345)

Taking a proactive approach, this discussion paper was sent to more than 3,000 stakeholders. Those consulted included provincial governments, aboriginal organizations, environmental groups, fishing and shipping associations, unions and the oil, gas and mining sectors.

In addition, Parks Canada held a number of public meetings, as well as meetings with provincial governments and stakeholders. Drafting of the legislation benefited greatly from the presentations made at these meetings and the written briefs which we received.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that this government is firmly committed to the establishment of new marine conservation areas. The passage of Bill C-48 is essential for us to fulfil this commitment. Establishing a system of marine protected areas is central to the achievement of several national and international obligations of this government.

The marine conservation area program is a new and challenging initiative for us and for all Canadians. It was through a process of extensive consultation with Canadians that we were able to develop this legislation.

I therefore urge all hon. members to support this bill. I urge all hon. members to work with us on the government side to ensure

### *Government Orders*

passage of this bill, to work toward ensuring that what we have been able to accomplish with our terrestrial parks, beginning over 100 years ago with Banff, the tradition of protection, the tradition of foresight, the tradition of presenting Canadians with the very best that we have to offer can be brought forward in terms of our marine conservation areas.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to intervene as critic for Canadian heritage on behalf of the official opposition on Bill C-48, the marine conservation act at second reading.

I will begin by saying that we oppose this bill.

The secretary of state has certainly painted a beautiful picture of a country called Canada which all of us in this House love and hold dear.

We in the opposition agree with the principle of ecosystem protection. That is not the issue and not the problem. What we disagree with is the process and how it is being done. This bill is poorly written.

The secretary of state has indicated that he feels this bill belongs to parks, but there really is no connection between land, parks and water and marine conservation districts or areas. When most people hear about parks they think about places they can go to and experience with their families. They think about protected areas that will be around for centuries so that all future generations will benefit from them.

What we have here is a marine conservation act that is really about the conservation of marine areas. In other words, it really should be in the hands of the environment minister.

This bill is also about fulfilling, in a rushed manner, the obligations this country has in terms of United Nations initiatives on ecosystem protection. Australia has quite a comprehensive program and plan, but it spent a lot of years doing extensive consultation, study and research. This government, I believe, is rushing it this time to fulfil a requirement on its part.

The biggest reason we object to this bill is that it is really a grab for power again. We find that a lot of bills that come before this House, after reading them, have too many places where the minister has the power by order in council to change the bill. This bill is another one.

I will debate this a little later, but I am surprised that there is no schedule in terms of the areas that the government wishes to establish. In other words, we need to be more definitive in terms of what will happen if this bill becomes law. There is no doubt that this is another bill that will leave Canadians with the short end of the stick while the government will end up with most of the stick.

*Government Orders*

• (1350)

Consultation is another problem. Consultation is quite a word. Everybody has a different definition of consultation. The secretary of state indicated that they sent out 3,000 pieces of mail to various groups in the country. It would be interesting to see the types of responses they received. It is all right to consult people, but let the people you are consulting know what the results are. If this is the same kind of consultation that the former justice minister had with Bill C-68, I am afraid I do not have a lot of faith in this government's consultation process.

I travelled extensively throughout the summer. I talked to people from different parts of the country. I was asking them about this government's consultation process. Lo and behold I found out that people are invited to meetings, but they get responses like "Sorry you cannot make it in the middle of the week because you have a job" or "It is too bad it is snowing. There is a storm, but the meeting has to take place anyway". A lot of questions were raised over the summer that made me believe people do not have a lot of faith in the consultative process of this government.

We appreciate the amount of work done by the Secretary of State for Parks, his officials and staff in preparing this bill. The senior minister, the Minister of Canadian Heritage, really cares about parks. Banff is probably a good example. She makes comments here and there in her travels. She has travelled extensively on the issue. I assume that is why she travels all over the world. During the first six months of this year she must have been preparing herself and her department. The minister must have thought it so important that she and her staff used one of the Department of National Defence Challenger jets.

On February 6 and February 7 the heritage minister travelled by Challenger corporate jet from Ottawa to Charlottetown and back at a cited cost of \$7,439 and at an extended cost of \$31,933. The cited cost is what National Defence gives as a cost apart from all the overhead and capital costs of maintaining the jet. The extended cost takes into account maintenance, salaries, overhead and other expenses.

On February 12 and February 13 the heritage minister travelled by Challenger jet from Ottawa to Winnipeg and back at a cited cost of \$26,000 and at an extended cost of about \$54,474.

On March 25 and March 26 the heritage minister, or should I say the minister of Challenger jets, travelled from Ottawa to that great national park of Toronto at a cited cost of \$4,157 and at an extended cost of \$17,845.

On May 1 through May 4 the Challenger jet minister travelled from Ottawa to Hamilton to see the hockey coliseum of the famous name. She went on to Barbados, to Recife in Brazil, back to Barbados and back to Ottawa. This little fact finding tour set

taxpayers back a cited cost of \$45,510 and an extended cost of \$195,354.

I am doing this to show that we need more accountability and more credibility from the minister of heritage.

On May 9 the minister travelled from Ottawa to Yarmouth, to Greenwood and back at a cited cost of \$7,658 and at an extended cost of—

• (1355)

**Ms. Beth Phinney:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if the Chair feels that the words being expressed now by the hon. member have anything to do with the topic of the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I know that the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River will want to ensure that his remarks are relevant to the bill. I think he is attempting to draw them into the bill and I am sure he will do that in the course of his remarks. I would invite him to do that as he proceeds.

**Mr. Inky Mark:** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that I am trying to connect the bill with the minister. We are talking about credibility. We are talking about the government side wanting the opposition benches to believe in the information presented in the bill. I am saying, let us first look at the credibility of the department before I lead into the bill. I certainly will be addressing the bill as soon as I go through this short exercise.

From May 14 to May 17 the minister travelled, the jet set again, from Ottawa to Cork, on to Tunis and Santa Maria and then back to Ottawa. That jaunt around the neighbourhood cost Canadians a cited cost of about \$43,979 and an extended cost of \$188,779.

Ironically, the parks are crying about funds. They cannot find enough funds to operate our national parks. Here we have a minister basically travelling around the world.

On June 5 the minister winged her way to St. Catharines at a cited cost of \$3,720 and at an extended cost of \$15,966.

On June 7 and June 8 the minister found her way to Calgary by Challenger, the western hub of air travel, at a cited cost of \$16,629 and at an extended cost of \$71,379.

On June 18 the Challenger minister found her way to Winnipeg, in the best province of Canada, at a cited cost of \$10,940 and at an extended cost of \$46,960.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I believe it is time to proceed with Statements by Members.

S. O. 31

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

## NATIONAL RAILWAYS

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to the good work of the Alberta provincial government and Canada's rail industry.

Premier Ralph Klein and transportation minister Walter Paszkowski have helped to make Alberta the railroad nerve centre of North America. Balanced budgets, low taxes and skilled labour, that is the Alberta advantage and it is working for the rail industry.

Canadian National announced today the opening of its new network operation centre in Edmonton, building on its long and proud history in the city I call home. Canadian Pacific continues to provide quality national railroad services from its headquarters in Calgary. RaiLink is Canada's third largest and fastest growing short railroad with its operations based in my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona.

With the Alberta advantage and competitive and innovative rail industry, it is time for the federal government to do its part so Canada can be on track for the future.

\* \* \*

## PARLIAMENTARIANS ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian Association of Parliamentarians on Population and Development celebrated its first anniversary with a forum focused on adolescent reproductive health and children's nutrition.

The purpose of the forum was to raise the awareness of parliamentarians on this important issue. Panellists from CIDA, UNFPA, UNICEF and others shared their expertise on the subject.

Young people will account for one billion of the world's population by mid-1999. These teenagers will be of reproductive age, yet many will not learn about sexual health. Without information they are at risk of unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV-AIDS. Every year over 7.5 million children around the world die due to poor maternal health and inadequate nutrition.

I call upon all of my colleagues to support the principles of the ICPD, an advocate for education on adolescent reproductive health.

## WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

**Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the month of October is a month of recognition and education. It is Women's History Month in Canada, a time to celebrate the accomplishments of women throughout Canadian history.

It is an opportunity to learn from the past and to encourage women of the present and future to get involved in the development of Canadian society. The federal theme for Women's History Month has ranged over the past seven years from women's education to women in technology and their role in history. This year the theme focuses on the business of women and their ever evolving role.

In 1882 E. Cora Hind taught herself how to type. She then entered a male dominated profession and made a place for herself in the journalistic world.

In the 1920s Dr. Elsie MacGill was the first woman to get a degree at the University of Toronto and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. She was also the first woman to design, patent and test an airplane and was a friend of my mother's.

They are just two Canadian women who faced these challenges and overcame them. I am proud to rise and express the government's commitment in celebrating their achievements and the achievements of all women.

\* \* \*

## SPACE SHUTTLE DISCOVERY

**Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this morning I spoke with Dr. Kevin Forkheim from Mission Control in Cape Canaveral who was anxiously awaiting the launch of the space shuttle *Discovery*.

Dr. Forkheim, a resident of Saanich—Gulf Islands, is a 27 year old graduate student at UBC who has had his research project chosen by NASA to be part of the shuttle mission. Dr. Forkheim's research will prove invaluable in the fight against osteoporosis, a degenerative bone disease common in the aging population.

The occasion also marks the first ever joint space project between Canada and Israel. Dr. Forkheim is very excited about his rare and prestigious honour. Canada can be proud of Dr. Forkheim's achievements and his continuing goal to counteract the negative effects of aging.

It is my pleasure to salute Dr. Forkheim and to wish him well in this and future achievements, whether they be deep in the vastness of space or at home in British Columbia.

Canada can stand proud today.

*S. O. 31*

### THEATRE COLLINGWOOD

**Mr. Paul Bonwick (Simcoe—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Theatre Collingwood is a non-profit organization dedicated to the performing arts.

Since its incorporation in 1984, Theatre Collingwood has been a major contributor to the arts community in my riding of Simcoe—Grey. The performing arts have long been recognized as an important industry in Canada.

As a non-profit organization Theatre Collingwood relies on the revenue from ticket sales, fundraising and corporate support to reach its financial and artistic goals. One of its fundraising efforts is scheduled for tomorrow evening as it will be hosting a masquerade ball. The evening is going to be filled with fun and revelry.

Theatre Collingwood is thriving. Over 4,000 seats were filled by enthusiastic patrons during the 21 performances produced this summer. Next summer's productions will be even more successful.

On behalf of the participants I would like to invite the Prime Minister, my colleagues and you, Mr. Speaker, to attend a great evening in Collingwood either tomorrow night or next year.

**The Speaker:** I am going to book that.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### LEADER OF BLOC QUEBECOIS

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Quebecois leader came out with quite a comment yesterday "A vote for the PQ is a vote for a referendum". His boss in Quebec must be very proud of him.

For weeks now, Premier Bouchard has been wriggling out of saying that his government will hold a referendum during a future term of office.

What a momentous statement by the Bloc Quebecois. The sovereignists can now thank the leader of the Bloc Quebecois for finally letting the cat out of the bag.

Because of his sincerity and sense of direction, everyone is now on the same wavelength. A vote for the PQ is a vote for a referendum, and therefore a vote to throw Quebec into uncertainty once more.

\* \* \*

[English]

### SPACE SHUTTLE DISCOVERY

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, students from the city of Calgary will share an historic experience with U.S. Senator John Glenn when the famous astronaut is

launched into space today. The signatures of 500 Calgary students will accompany Senator Glenn on the space shuttle *Discovery*.

Today students from G. W. Skene Community School, James Short Memorial Elementary School and Saint Peter Elementary School are thrilled to be part of space history. These young Calgaryans are taking part in the Student Signatures in Space Program. It is not inconceivable that some of the students watching today will find themselves on a space mission one day.

I would like to thank the Penbrooke Community Association and the Penbrooke Boys and Girls Club for their support of this initiative and congratulate the students of Calgary for being part of this historic event. I say well done to those boys and girls.

\* \* \*

• (1405)

[Translation]

### ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN QUEBEC

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Quebecois are nervous these days. Since yesterday, we know where the sovereignists stand. If the Parti Quebecois is reelected, there will be a referendum on the future of Quebec.

That is what it boils down to, despite the Quebec premier's hesitations and backtracking on whether or not he would hold a referendum. The Leader of the Bloc Quebecois, for his part, could not have made it clearer. Yes, if a sovereignist government is elected, Quebecers will once again be called upon to decide their future in a referendum.

Now we know, and so do the people of Quebec: a vote for the PQ is a vote for a referendum.

\* \* \*

### QUEBEC ELECTION CAMPAIGN

**Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the leader of the Bloc Quebecois enlightened us: a vote for the PQ is a vote for a referendum. Finally, Quebecers now know what to expect. A vote for the PQ is a vote for the separation of Quebec.

The people of Quebec will have a golden opportunity, on November 30, to make clear their support for a united Canada and a stronger Quebec. Quebec will choose the real priorities when it opts in favour of continuing its dialogue with Canada. It will have an opportunity to vote in support of its values of belonging, of sharing and of openness, elements of its Canadian and Quebec identity.

We thank the leader of the Bloc Quebecois, who brought the real issue of the upcoming election to light. On November 30, let's vote for a stronger Quebec. Let's vote Liberal.

**SOCIAL PROGRAMS**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, by reducing Quebec's traditional demands to a shopping list and by claiming they can be met in his general store, the senior manager has shown his utter scorn for Quebec.

I would remind the Prime Minister that his government continues to reject the legitimate demands of Quebec, which wants to withdraw with full compensation from the national child tax benefit program. This same government continues to refuse to allow Quebec to use the money allocated for parental leave.

The senior manager heaps further scorn by preparing to sell off products he has no license to sell, in family matters, for example, by sponsoring a conference on childhood related problems in an area of jurisdiction that is Quebec's alone.

Out of concern for Quebeckers, the Bloc rejects the moves by this senior manager, who is using parents and children to defeat family policy in Quebec.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH**

**Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month we are paying tribute to women who have worked to improve the lives of women and of all Canadians, women who have been pioneers in their fields and who opened doors for the women who came after them.

At a women's career day at Malcolm Munroe Junior High School in Sydney River I was reminded of the progress women have made. The women who spoke ranged from an archaeologist to an RCMP officer, jobs which not so long ago were closed to women.

These victories have come through the efforts of millions of faceless women who have stayed at home in their roles as wives and mothers. We are removing some of the barriers which used to restrict women. Seventeen years ago women and labour activists had to strike for maternity leave. Today it is becoming our right.

Women's History Month is a time to recognize those who have kept up the fight for equality in the face of tremendous odds. For 14 years the federal government has done everything it can to delay or prevent a fair pay equity settlement. Women in the public service have refused to give up.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

**GROUP OF PARLIAMENTARY FRIENDS OF UNESCO**

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, at an organization meeting held yesterday, 75 Canadian parliamentarians from all the political parties represented in both Houses set up a group of parliamentary friends of UNESCO.

This main objectives of this new parliamentary friendship group are to provide its members with more information on UNESCO programs throughout the world, particularly those that relate to North American realities, and to support Canada's participation in UNESCO, which includes taking part in the activities of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO.

The parliamentary group appointed an executive made up of eight members of Parliament and three senators. As chair of this new parliamentary friendship group, I am pleased to see the strong interest generated among our colleagues by this UNESCO contact group. We will now develop a plan of action to support UNESCO's major commitments in the areas of education, culture and science.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

[English]

**ST. JOHN'S HARBOUR**

**Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC):** Mr. Speaker, on April 23 I was present with Premier Tobin and other dignitaries celebrating the start-up of the St. John's Harbour clean-up. At that time \$4.5 million had been committed, one-third each by the municipal, provincial and federal governments involved. At that ceremony Premier Tobin announced the commitment of the provincial and municipal shares to the next phase of the project.

Noticeably missing on the platform that day was the minister of the federal cabinet. Also missing from the speeches was a further federal commitment to the project which, when completed, will have cost in excess of \$140 million.

St. John's is one of Canada's 11 capital cities. If the federal government can spend \$78 million a year keeping Ottawa beautiful, surely it can also help keep the other capitals clean and beautiful.

Today I call upon the federal government and the minister for Newfoundland to make funding available for the St. John's Harbour clean-up.

*S. O. 31*

### SMALL BUSINESSES

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, October 25 to 31 is Small Business Week in Canada. Small business represents one of our most important areas of economic activity. In fact small business is responsible for 43% of private sector output.

Small business is also a major job creator. More than 50% of private sector employment comes from small business. In the past year 430,000 new jobs have been created. Over 70% of these jobs were created by small business.

The federal government has an important role to play in supporting small business in Canada. Across the country we have set up Canada community investment plans, held local small business info fairs, opened one stop shop business service centres and supported projects under the industrial research assistance program.

These programs support the small business people and entrepreneurs who create economic growth and jobs in Canada. I salute them for their efforts.

\* \* \*

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to tell the House and the Canadian people about the beginnings of a new grassroots organization. The purpose of this organization is to enhance democracy, the cornerstone of any society where all members are treated equitably.

These people see their elected officials abusing their authority, conducting elections with serious irregularities and becoming wealthy on moneys that were meant to be equally shared in the community. I am talking about the First Nations Accountability Coalition of Manitoba which is associated with like organizations in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

On October 31 the coalition will be holding its first national grassroots accountability summit in Winnipeg, Manitoba. As host of this summit I invite everyone who is interested in aboriginal affairs to attend.

If this group is successful in effecting change, today's generation of aboriginal children along with future generations will be the main beneficiaries.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CAMILLE LAURIN

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal emotion, and from a historical perspective, that I would like to pay tribute to Dr. Camille Laurin, who just announced that he was leaving public life for health reasons.

A page of history was written by the one who was called the "father of Bill 101", or Quebec's charter of the French language.

We can never truly measure the energy, perseverance, receptiveness and generosity displayed by Dr. Laurin in achieving this resounding success in spite of numerous efforts made to downplay, if not destroy, his achievement.

Quebeckers of all political stripes recognize the courage—motivated by a deep love for his people—of this humanist, who always managed to maintain very good relations with his fellow citizens.

As editorial writer Murray Maltais points out in today's edition of *Le Droit*, "Today's Quebec society owes 101 thanks to Dr. Laurin".

\* \* \*

[English]

### RAILWAYS

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today over 100 railway industry representatives have been meeting with MPs, senators and officials to discuss issues vital to the Canadian economy.

Canada's railways play a vital role in the country's economy. Some 40% of the nation's efforts depend on safe and efficient rail transportation.

Today Canada's railways represent a combined investment of more than \$12 billion in track, roadway, facilities and equipment. In addition to 46,000 railway employees, some 30,000 workers in communities across Canada are employed directly or indirectly by those companies which supply the rail industry.

• (1415)

I would encourage all members to meet with the representatives at a reception this afternoon in room 200 in the West Block beginning a 5 p.m.

\* \* \*

### FRED GILLIES

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the outstanding volunteer efforts of Mr. Fred Gillies.

Mr. Gillies lives in Minden, Ontario which is located in the beautiful riding of Haliburton—Victoria—Brock. Fred 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 organization provided almost 23,000 days of service valued at \$8 million.

Fred, accompanied by his wife Goldie, spent 12 weeks in Georgetown, Guyana assisting proprietors of a specialty food processing company. Fred trained quality control personnel in

*Oral Questions*

microbiology and employees in sanitation procedures and processing techniques.

Thanks to Fred Gillies, disadvantaged countries can gain the tools needed to be successful. Great job, Fred.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister would have Canadians bow and scrape before him because he has tinkered over the last while with employment insurance premiums.

However, he knows that insurance premiums are still way too high and the average Canadian worker is paying \$350 per worker per year too much. The average business is paying \$500 a year too much every single year.

The Prime Minister knows it is against the law to use this in general revenue. The Employment Insurance Act states this.

Canadians and I want to know from the Prime Minister why he is planning to skim the employment insurance fund when the law states that he is not allowed to do it.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since our first budget, our policy has been to reduce the EI premium. We did not follow the advice of Reform Party members who were telling us at that time to use the surplus to reduce the deficit.

Despite our deficit, we reduced EI premiums every year in a systematic, reasonable and responsible way.

The EI surpluses have come into the government's consolidated revenue fund since the time the auditor general asked—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Fraser Valley.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad the Prime Minister wants to listen to the auditor general. The auditor general says that it is illegal, and he will report to parliament that it is illegal, to use the employment insurance funds for general revenue. He says that money has to be used for insurance reasons and if it is not he will report it as illegal.

The auditor for the EI fund says that it is wrong to use the funds this way. The auditor general says it is illegal to use the funds this way. Why is the Prime Minister going to use the EI funds illegally when Canadians deserve a break and deserve it today?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear the auditor general say that it is illegal to do what his predecessor asked the previous government to do. We will wait for the report.

We have a policy of not listening to Reform members because they always change their policy. When we first used the money to reduce the premiums, they wanted us to use the surplus to reduce the deficit.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what the Reform Party has said is that those premiums and those benefits belong to Canadian workers and Canadian businesses and that the Prime Minister should keep his claws off them. Every single paycheque workers have EI reductions which amount to \$350 a year. This is too much taken from their paycheques. Every year businesses have \$500 in deductions. This is too much taken off those paycheques.

Organized labour and the Canadian Federation of Independent Business want a cut in employment insurance premiums.

Why does the Prime Minister not quit breaking the law and give a break to businesses and Canadian workers who deserve a break today?

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, the word "illegal" was a bit close but "breaking the law" I think is over the line. I would prefer that we not use it anymore.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, we have BCNI and other business organizations telling us that rather than reducing the EI premiums we should give a tax reduction to the public. They are telling us that rather than deducting money for corporations, it would be better deduct money for the employees.

• (1420)

We are listening to representations from everybody. One thing is for sure. In the last five years we did not follow the advice of the Reform Party. We did not use the EI surplus to reduce the deficit. We have used it to reduce the premiums.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this Prime Minister, this man of great deception—

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

**The Speaker:** I ask the hon. member to withdraw those last few words.

**Mr. Dick Harris:** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw with respect.

**The Speaker:** I ask the hon. member to go directly to his question.

**Mr. Dick Harris:** Mr. Speaker, the fact is no matter what the Prime Minister says and no matter what kind of rosy picture he paints, workers are being looted \$350 a year out of their pockets.

*Oral Questions*

Why does the Prime Minister rank spending almost \$3 billion for a personal millennium monument higher than giving workers \$350 a year to buy school supplies and snow boots for their kids?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be a lot, of the 100,000 students, who will be receiving in the next 10 years a bursary from this government because of the millennium scholarship program who will think that we have not acted in the best interests of preparing the young people of Canada to be best equipped to face the challenges of the 21st century.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, 5% of Canadian post-secondary students are far more important than millions of Canadian children.

Canadian workers need a break. The Liberals have taxed away 155% of any wage gains they have had in the last five years. Now they want to take another \$350 a year from their EI surplus.

Will the Prime Minister give Canadian workers a raise by letting them keep their money?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I said and I repeat the Reform Party was asking us not to reduce the premiums but use the money to reduce the deficit and eventually the debt.

As usual it has changed its position. What is unbelievable is that when we are preoccupied with making sure the young people of tomorrow will be able to earn a good living because of good education, I note with pleasure the Reform Party is opposed to that.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### ELECTION CAMPAIGN IN QUEBEC

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last weekend, the Prime Minister said that he had met all Quebec's traditional demands.

Then, the day before yesterday, he did a complete about-face, opened up the door to the general store and said that, if Quebeckers voted for Jean Charest, he might have some constitutional amendments to offer them.

How does the Prime Minister explain that his recent message of support for Quebec's Liberal Party has apparently not reached Jean Charest, who this morning was calling for the Prime Minister to change his attitude or quit?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I like is that, since yesterday, when the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and I said we had made changes, the Leader of the Bloc Québécois and the Leader of the Parti Québécois have been taking the credit. The same people who say we are not making any changes are now taking the credit.

What is good about this election campaign is that finally the truth is coming out. Yesterday, the Leader of the Bloc Québécois said that a vote for the PQ was a vote for a future referendum in Quebec. Quebeckers are glad to see that the old tricks are over and the truth is coming to light.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I said that there would be a winning referendum because there will be winning conditions and because the PQ will win the election.

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

• (1425)

**The Speaker:** The hon. leader of the Bloc Québécois has the floor.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, after the election, Canadians will realize that the Prime Minister is once again deluding himself with his predictions that sovereignty is headed nowhere. It is not the old tricks that will disappear, it is this Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister may well brag about everything he has done for Quebec, yet even his ally, Jean Charest, is calling for him to quit. He has had enough too. What does the Prime Minister make of that?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that an election has been called, because now the truth will begin to come out. Yesterday, he talked about a referendum, but now he says only if the conditions are right.

If Quebeckers truly want to have winning conditions in order to have the wishes they have expressed in the last two referendums respected, in order to bring about real changes, they should vote for a Liberal government that wants to remain in Canada and not for a party that wants Quebec to separate.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a serious problem.

His ally in Quebec, his protégé Jean Charest, the one all the ministers want to canvas for, the one the Prime Minister again yesterday described as reasonable, wants him to adapt or leave. What has he to say?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister has to say is that he, in this House, had a resolution passed on distinct society, which the members of the Bloc Québécois opposed.

We had a law passed in parliament giving a veto to all the regions in Canada, including Quebec, and the Bloc Québécois opposed it.

Each time we have made changes in order to improve things for all Quebeckers who want to remain Canadian, the Parti Québécois has opposed a true presence for Quebeckers within Canada.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's memory is fragile. Not even Jean Charest came to vote for his empty resolution.

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

**Mr. Michel Gauthier:** We have a Prime Minister who says he has met Quebec's demands. He has just said so again. Then we have Jean Charest, his ally, who says, on the front page of the *Globe and Mail*, that if the Prime Minister blocks change, he must leave. The two of them are contradicting each other.

Who is really speaking for the federalists?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are the ones making the changes. For 30 years we had problems with manpower in Canada. Who managed to resolve this problem? Our government.

**An hon. member:** It was the PQ.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien:** Quebec, for 30 years, wanted to resolve the problem in education, which required a constitutional amendment. Who helped Quebec resolve this problem by changing the Constitution? It was the federal Liberal Party, here, in parliament.

\* \* \*

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Canadian farmers are in crisis. Prices are down, input costs are up and droughts are taking their toll. U.S. farmers have just received \$6 billion in additional farm aid. European farmers are getting twice the support of Canadian farmers but this government has cut agricultural support by two thirds.

Lloyd Pletz, a Saskatchewan farmer, says "I'm finished in the spring. I've got no way to hang on". Has the Prime Minister nothing to say to Lloyd Pletz and other farm families like his?

• (1430)

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have had continuing discussions with the farm leaders over the years and the provincial governments. We have put in place a very thorough safety net system in the country.

At the present time we are reviewing that. I have called a meeting of the key farm leaders and the provincial agriculture ministers for next week to discuss where we are and the management tools that are there and how we might better use them to address this serious situation of the Canadian farm income.

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis. We are talking about a crisis and in a crisis Americans do

not just talk, they put their money where their mouths are. Congress has just approved \$6 billion more for emergency farm aid while this government says to Canadian farmers "You are on your own".

When will this government ensure a level playing field for Canadian farmers? When will this government begin to respond to the serious crisis on Canadian farms?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been working with Canadian farmers to get prepared for this unfortunate circumstance that happens periodically in commodity prices throughout the world.

It is interesting and I might inform the hon. member that the United States Department of Agriculture has been and continues to be in Canada to look at the system we have put in place for our farmers so that they would not have to do what they are doing now when the situation gets like it is.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the defence minister says that pilots who are not comfortable flying Labradors have been told they do not have to. But retired Lieutenant Colonel Dennis Hopping, a former Labrador pilot and CFB Greenwood base commander, said "It is very difficult as a member of an air crew team to say no, I won't launch an operational mission to save someone's life. What a terrible position to put a professional pilot in".

How can the minister put these pilots in that position? If one of them gets hurt flying the aging Labradors before the final report comes in as to what happened with that Labrador crash in Quebec, will he accept full responsibility for it?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the safety of our aircraft and our crews as well as the safety of Canadians is our utmost concern.

We will not fly unsafe aircraft. Air crews will not be forced to fly the Labrador. We are sensitive to their concerns. If personnel are not comfortable with flying the Labrador helicopters, they will not be forced to do so.

We are developing plans to bring in substitute crews if necessary to conduct the missions of any search and rescue squadrons whose crews are anxious about flying the Labrador.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, they are going to put substitute crews in but you are not bringing in the new helicopters. You are not bringing in the helicopters that were offered to you from the United States.

**The Speaker:** The member must direct her question through the Speaker.

*Oral Questions*

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Mike Dorey, the current base commander at CFB Greenwood says “There is still the perception that everybody else is flying. There is a perceived pressure to get back flying”.

The defence minister said on Tuesday that Canada has other aircraft to do search and rescue. Why then is the minister willing to put lives at risk by returning the Labradors to active duty when the cause of that crash is not yet known?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, even if the cause of the crash is not known, there is no positive evidence to support a finding of any systematic failure in the Labrador fleet.

The responsibility to provide Canadians with effective search and rescue and the need for our air crews to maintain their skills is at a safe level.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the *Defence Policy Review* magazine is reporting that Brigadier General Walter Holmes, the military’s central area land forces commander, told a meeting last weekend that the army is running a budgetary shortfall of \$170 million. It is impossible for the military to operate even on the budget it has been given.

My question for the defence minister is, how much of this shortfall is a result of excessive government cutbacks?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Department of National Defence, like all other government departments, has experienced significant budget reductions throughout this decade as a result of the government’s commitment to fiscal restraint.

• (1435)

These reductions have had an impact on all budgets within the department, including that of land forces. This has meant that all elements of the Canadian forces and the department have faced significant funding pressures and have been required to reduce expenditures to match available funding.

As part of the overall resource planning process within the department, we aim to achieve a better balance between programs and resources.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the problem gets worse. Brigadier General Holmes also said that the overall national defence budgetary shortfall for the next fiscal year will amount to \$1 billion.

In my way of thinking, the minister has a choice to make. He can commit the necessary resources for a combat capable defence

force, or he can tear the heart out of the Canadian military even further with manpower cuts. Which is it going to be?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the comments from the member across the way. Everybody knows we tabled our report yesterday in the House of Commons. The—

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

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** The parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Robert Bertrand:** Mr. Speaker, in the report tabled yesterday in the House, we made a lot of recommendations in order to improve the living conditions of our armed forces.

What I do not understand with the Reform Party is that, in their famous report, they wanted to cut \$1 billion from the national defence budget and here they are today telling us to increase spending.

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

**The Speaker:** The leader of the Bloc Québécois.

\* \* \*

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this government’s constitutional track record is assessed very differently depending on who makes the assessment: the Prime Minister or the Liberal leader in Quebec. One says that all of Quebec’s demands have been met, while the other maintains that everything remains to be done.

Could the Prime Minister tell us what message his ministers will convey to Quebec voters when they go door to door: that all of Quebec’s demands have been met or that everything remains to be done?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that, in the past few years, the agent of change in Canada and Quebec has been the federal government.

Indeed, the federal government passed a resolution recognizing distinct society and gave back to Quebec the veto the PQ was responsible for losing. Finally, people in Quebec will have a real choice: the PQ and the Bloc Québécois, which plan to hold yet another referendum that will surely kill investment and economic growth, or the Quebec Liberal Party, which stands for economic growth and job creation.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member believes his own words.

*Oral Questions*

Federalist spokespersons in Quebec say that the Prime Minister must change or quit. Is it not disturbing to see that even his federalist allies in Quebec are prepared to let him down?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, those who have betrayed Quebecers' confidence in recent years are clearly the Bloc Québécois and the PQ, which would have Quebecers believe that they have generated economic growth, when in fact all they have produced is more unemployment and fewer investments, precisely by doing what the leader of the Bloc Québécois mentioned yesterday. They have been playing the referendum card. They are losing their energy. They are misleading Quebecers and consequently hampering growth and job creation.

\* \* \*

• (1440)

[English]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let me set the record straight for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence. The Reform Party has always advocated increased defence spending. Now, back to the question. What choice will the Minister of National Defence make? He can commit the necessary resources for a combat capable force to cover the shortfall of \$1 billion, or he can tear the heart out further from the military by cutting back on manpower. What is it going to be?

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, something is not right here. The Leader of the Official Opposition, the hon. member's boss said on February 25, 1998 that Reform's alternative budget plan calls for holding the line on government spending for three years while dedicating the entire budget surplus to lowering the debt and tax relief. Which is it going to be?

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence should get his facts straight and maybe hire a new researcher. His man does not know what he is talking about. The parliamentary secretary is lying.

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

**The Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member for Calgary Northeast to withdraw those words.

**Mr. Art Hanger:** Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw those words.

**The Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member to put his question.

**Mr. Art Hanger:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence has a choice to make. He can either tear the heart out of the military

further by reducing manpower, or commit the appropriate resources for a combat capable force. Which is it going to be?

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government's position has always been to have a very competent army that was combat capable. That is what we want and that is what we will continue to strive for.

\* \* \*

• (1445)

**QUEBEC ELECTION CAMPAIGN**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the federalist forces in Quebec noted that the Prime Minister's one-step-at-a-time strategy is completely unacceptable and ineffective.

Has the Prime Minister's very credibility not suffered a blow when the rest of Canada realizes today that even Quebec's federalists want nothing to do with him?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we were successful at having a resolution on distinct society passed, establishing a veto for the regions, resolving the manpower problem, resolving the problem of Quebec's school system by means of a constitutional amendment, and clarifying the situation with respect to mining, forestry, tourism and other areas.

We have made much progress. There are far fewer disagreements between the leader of the Quebec Liberal Party and myself than there are between the member for Roberval and the leader of the Bloc Québécois.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I did not think the Prime Minister would drag out the resolutions again.

I remind him that even Jean Charest, a former federal member of parliament, preferred to be away from the House partying rather than have to vote on these resolutions the Prime Minister is boasting about. That is the fact of the matter.

Given the turn events are taking between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Quebec Liberal Party, does the Prime Minister not find himself in a paradoxical situation promising us four years of bliss with his friend Mr. Charest?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are making considerable progress. That is why I am happy.

We see that Mr. Parizeau, who is back, told Mr. Bouchard that what was needed was a clear, not an ambiguous, question. That is what we are calling for.

We want people to know very clearly that the Bloc Québécois and the Parti Québécois want to hold a referendum, whereas two thirds of Quebecers are opposed, because they know that a

*Oral Questions*

referendum is bad for economic growth and employment, and means less revenue to put towards health and education.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEALTH CANADA**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there are new allegations about the paper shredders working overtime at the health protection branch. This time it is over the controversial milk drug BST. After all of the other foul-ups at Health Canada, what are they trying to cover up now?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware that that complaint has been made. I understand that the information commissioner is looking into the matter. I am told the deputy minister has instructed the staff of the department to co-operate in every way. I am sure that the information commissioner will get to the bottom of it.

I might add that these are serious allegations. If they are proven to be true, then there will be steps taken that are appropriate.

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it started with shredded documents over tainted blood. Now we have allegations about shredded documents over tainted milk.

There is rot in the health protection branch. It is interesting, is it not?

What is it about this health minister that wherever he goes, in justice or in health, incompetence just seems to follow him around?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member would not want to mislead the public into thinking that BST has been approved in Canada. It has not been approved in Canada. It may have been approved in the United States, but in this country we take our time to examine an application for approval. BST will not be approved in this country unless and until it is proven to be safe. We have been looking at it for nine years. We are looking at it very carefully. We will not approve BST in this country unless we are satisfied it is safe for use.

\* \* \*

• (1450)

[Translation]

**DATURA STRAMONIUM**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a potentially deadly hallucinogenic fruit was recently introduced on the black market. In the past month, Quebec's poison control centre recorded about 45 cases where people had to be hospitalized.

Will the Minister of Health act quickly to prohibit the sale of datura stramonium?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the hon. member and her colleagues for raising this issue yesterday. I raised the issue with my department and I can tell you that we are considering measures to prevent this problem on our city streets. I hope to soon be able to provide a more detailed reply.

\* \* \*

**CANADA POST CORPORATION**

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Canada Post Corporation.

How does Canada Post use its network of rural post offices to provide more services to Canadians living in rural areas and to contribute to the future strength of Canada's rural communities?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada Post is at the crossroads of our rural communities and it will not only continue to provide traditional services to the public, but also introduce government services, thanks to the new technology. For example, we are currently setting up DHRD employment and training information booths, in Quebec and in Newfoundland, and we will soon be announcing other additional services throughout the country, to serve Canadians wherever they live.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE**

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the drug problem in the lower mainland of British Columbia is out of control.

Crack cocaine pushers have been busted in Vancouver. They have moved down into Burnaby and now they are in New Westminster and crossing the Fraser River into my constituency of Surrey North.

The Surrey RCMP tell me that due to underfunding they have neither the resources nor the manpower to meet this onslaught.

What is this government going to do about the drug pushers; not the addicts, the pushers?

Will it restore RCMP funding, put the handcuffs on the drug dealers and take the handcuffs off the RCMP?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his question.

Very specifically, we are working, as I have said many times, on organized crime. It is the law enforcement priority of this govern-

*Oral Questions*

ment. As it happens, we are meeting with the attorney general of British Columbia tomorrow on this very subject.

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in my riding there is a standoff between police and drug dealers.

Children as young as 11 years old are selling drugs. The government says that it is just a police problem, yet the solicitor general has cut police funding. The evidence of government failure is right on the streets of my riding.

When will the government act? Will it restore police funding, stop the drugs and not the police?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the member had listened to the previous answer he would understand that organized crime and drugs are the law enforcement priorities of this government.

We are meeting tomorrow with the attorney general of British Columbia and other attorneys general and solicitors general on this very subject.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

The minister will know that in 1993 Canada agreed to reduce its subsidies under the WTO by 20% over six years, but instead of doing that we gutted our farm support program by more than 60% in that period of time.

The result is that U.S. wheat farmers now receive five times more in subsidies than Canadian farmers, making it impossible for our farmers to compete.

When is the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food going to admit that there is an honest to goodness crisis on many farms in this country and announce a new emergency relief program?

**Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that particular member cannot get his facts straight. He tries to do that in other areas.

The work that was done on the WTO, the World Trade Organization, which reduced a number of tariffs to 85%, referred specifically to our supply managed area. In the other areas we worked in conjunction with the industry.

• (1455)

As I said earlier today and many times in this House, we worked with them to put a safety net program in place. There is one. We are reviewing it at the present time. I am meeting with the industry. I am meeting with my provincial counterparts. We will work to get—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government got suckered by Europe and the Americans at the international trade talks. They raced right home to chop farm subsidies and the Crow rate while the Europeans and Americans chopped nothing.

This government's gullibility would be laughable if the consequences were not so serious for our farmers. European parliamentarians told me there was no way they were sacrificing their farmers.

Why is this government sacrificing our farmers? Why is it hanging Canadian farmers out to dry?

**Mr. Bob Speller (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in fact that is not right. As a government we have begun consultations with all of our farmers across the country to make sure that we have a very strong independent position when we go to the new talks coming up.

The hon. member should know coming from western Canada that the Canadian government has well represented the farmers of western Canada on the trade front.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH CANADA**

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the only line of defence the health minister has for what has been going on in the health protection branch is that BST has not yet been approved. "Don't worry".

Unfortunately, when the government says "Don't worry" it always sweeps it under the rug. In this case, the government swept it into the shredder. The minister obviously misses the point. The point is about public disclosure.

Why is the minister allowing the approval process to be tainted with the destruction of information in his department? Or are those orders coming from the top?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member did not hear my earlier response when I said that it is true a complaint has been made. I think in fact it was a Tory staffer in the Senate who made the complaint to which the member has referred.

The information commissioner is looking into it. The deputy minister has instructed the department to co-operate fully. Therefore, matters will be clarified in due course.

I also stress that this is a very serious allegation. If indeed it is substantiated, then I assure the House that appropriate steps will be taken.

*Business of the House*

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very serious matter. It is like shutting the barn door after the horse has run away when the deputy minister now suggests that no documents be destroyed.

Monsanto has contacted departmental officials with concerns that the Senate committee disclosed confidential information. The company has also commented on leaks of confidential information.

Is the minister taking matters into his own hands and making sure Monsanto's information turns into dust?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what that means but I can tell—

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

**Hon. Allan Rock:** All the noise coming from the various parts of the House tends to obscure a simple fact. All the noise about inappropriate influences and pressures obscures the fact that BST has been under study for nine years at Health Canada.

It has not been approved. BST will not be approved for use in this country unless and until we are satisfied that it is safe and appropriate for use in Canada.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

On the recent visit of the President of Ireland, Mary McAleese, reference was made to the excellent trade relations between Canada and Ireland.

Can the minister tell us how important these investment and trade links are to the Canadian economy?

**Mr. Bob Speller (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in fact the hon. member is right. Trade relations between Ireland and Canada are excellent.

In 1997, over 1996 figures, trade increased some 50%, reaching \$1.1 billion. High tech and other finished products are the primary trade products, but there is room in many other areas.

I might add that Canada values its historic ties with Ireland and values Ireland as a very important trading partner.

\* \* \*

**APEC INQUIRY**

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general's denial of any knowledge of the internal RCMP report on pending charges is unbelievable. The RCMP commissioner reports to the deputy solicitor general. Is he saying his deputy kept him in the dark?

He did say that he had not seen the report. Let me be very specific. Is he telling us that he had no knowledge of this report, yes or no?

• (1500)

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can say with great confidence I had no knowledge of this report.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency, Mr. Sekiya, Minister of Construction for Japan.

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

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as deputy opposition House leader today is my first question to the government House leader. I am sure he will give me a good answer and not disappoint me.

What is the agenda of the House for next week and the remainder of this week that Canadians should be looking forward to?

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to answer the question generally, Canadians will look forward to the entire legislative package of the government, but more specifically today we hope to complete the second reading of Bill C-48, the marine parks bill.

If there is any time left this afternoon and continuing Friday and Monday, we will return to measures on which debate has begun but is not yet completed. We will take up these items in the following order: Bill C-54, respecting electronic exchanges of information; Bill C-48 if it is not completed today; Bill C-49, the first nations land bill and adding if necessary Bill C-56, the Manitoba surface rights bill. Next Tuesday shall be an allotted day.

I will give the business to the conclusion of next week because the week after we will not be sitting. Here is the order as can be determined at the present time.

On Wednesday we expect to be in a position to consider the report stage and third reading of Bill C-51 which amends the Criminal Code. We shall then resume our list, bearing in mind that if and when Bill C-37, the Judges Act amendment, is returned from the other place, we would take up any amendments thereto at the earliest opportunity.

Similarly, if Bill C-53, the small business bill, were to be reported from committee, we would also give it priority over other business listed earlier.

*Government Orders***POINTS OF ORDER**

## REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence was reading from two documents when he was answering questions from the opposition. I would seek to have those documents tabled in the House.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know that one of the documents from which the hon. member was reading was the cabinet briefing note to which parliamentary secretaries and ministers refer to and which are not tabled in the House.

There was another document from which he was quoting. It was a press release from the leader of the Reform Party. I will endeavour to have that press release tabled forthwith, because I know that all members will want to see very clearly the cutbacks the Reform Party wanted to inflict upon the Canadian people.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I trust that settles the matter. Given the undertaking of the government House leader, I assume the point of order has been answered.

• (1505 )

**Mr. Art Hanger:** Mr. Speaker, far be it for me to determine whether or not that was a briefing note through his office. I seek to have both those documents on the table because he was reading directly from both of them.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I think hon. members know that documents of this sort are not normally tabled in the House. I agree that if a member is reading from a document it should be tabled. The government House leader indicated what the parliamentary secretary referred to. I suppose it might be helpful if the parliamentary secretary himself clarified the position, but we have the word of the minister and I think that should end the matter for the moment.

We will see what document is tabled as a result of the undertaking given. If that is not satisfactory to the hon. member for Calgary Northeast, I am sure he will raise the matter again and we will hear from him at that time.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**MARINE CONSERVATION AREAS ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-48, an act to respecting marine conservation areas, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, prior to being interrupted by question period, I was giving members of the House examples of irresponsibility on the part of the minister in terms of how she travelled around the world and around the country in Challenger jets.

Canada is hurting for financial support. Taxes are being raised through people who use national parks to make up for the government's shortfall. We just need to ask park employees about the cuts in the maintenance schedules, programs and infrastructure upgrades.

Here we have a minister who spends tonnes of money utilizing corporate jets that are a lot more expensive than the way most members in the House travel. I have said enough today about the minister's travels and would like to move on.

I applaud the Secretary of State for Parks for having spoken to many users of the parks system this summer. He does a good job, but the problem is that there is very little linkage between his efforts and those of the minister and the bureaucracy. I applaud the secretary of state for doing his best to resolve problems.

The purpose of Bill C-48, the marine conservation areas act, is to establish marine conservation areas and reserves under the authority of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the minister chiefly responsible for national parks.

I made comment earlier in my debate that the bill had no business being under the Minister of Canadian Heritage. It is not about parks. It is about conservation areas. In principle all Canadians believe that our ecosystems need protection on both land and on water.

I would like to make a number of observations on the bill. It is not properly a parks bill but an environmental bill. Bill C-48 seems to be the Government of Canada's response to the convention on biodiversity. The government signed the convention on biodiversity in 1994 in the last parliament when the heritage minister was the minister of the environment.

Although I was not a member in the last parliament, the voters of Dauphin—Swan River very kindly sent me here in June 1997. I understand the heritage minister did not have an easy time as minister of the environment. I even heard that a minister of the government had to resign because of her government's policy on the GST.

I understand the minister had trouble getting along with her counterparts in provincial governments. I heard that when the heritage minister was the environment minister she got very little done. I am not against a minister getting very little done if a minister is trying to do the wrong things. It is better to do nothing than to do the wrong thing.

I would like to know why the Minister of Canadian Heritage is pushing a bill on the environment. Where is the current Minister of the Environment? To paraphrase a great Chinese playwright, "a rose by any other name is still a rose" and an environment bill by

*Government Orders*

any other name is still an environment bill, not a parks bill. With this bill the heritage minister expands her domain and encroaches on what is more properly the responsibility of the minister of environment, her old portfolio.

• (1510)

The official opposition believes in balance. The official opposition wants a balance in the management of the environment to preserve biodiversity and to conserve the environment for the enjoyment of all Canadians balanced with sustainable development. The bill has not balanced these priorities in any way, shape or form. Frankly the bill is preservationist.

The bill takes no account of future needs for development of resources in a marine environment. The bill would even require fishermen to seek and get special permission to carry on their work in areas designated under the bill. The bill controls not only the water but the air above the water and everything below the water. The bill would require special licensing for recreational activities and academic research in designated areas.

Given that the designated areas would no longer be available for sustainable resource development and given all the hoops through which fishermen, recreational users and academic researchers would have to jump, Canadians might assume that before the heritage minister designated a marine conservation area the minister would have to do so by amendment of the act with debate at all stages in parliament.

A change in the use of marine territory should be fully reviewed by parliament. However the heritage minister does not want a full review by parliament. The minister has instructed her officials to write what is known in legal circles as Henry VIII clauses.

Henry VIII seems to have so shaped the minister's approach to parliament that she has included three Henry VIII clauses. I will have more to say on that if the bill passes second reading. The heritage minister is already well aware of Henry VIII and his attitude toward parliament. I am sure some members of parliament will be interested to hear that. They will not be pleased, however.

Henry VIII believed in the divine right of kings. His motto was "God and my right". Henry VIII did not like parliament since it tended to get in the way of what he wanted. Whether it was marrying wife number two, three or four or raising taxes, Henry VIII did not want to be bothered with parliament and the House of Commons. He looked for ways to side step parliament and its authority to pass laws.

The minister has learned a lesson well from old Henry Tudor about how to side step the proper law making authority of parliament. We wish she would learn some lessons on democracy.

It is hard to learn anything these days about democratic rights in the Liberal Party. The minister wants to side step the proper role of parliament with the insertion of Henry VIII clauses that allow the cabinet to amend the act more or less at will.

It is bad enough that the heritage minister is still trying to be the environment minister. The minister's attitude toward parliament is even worse. What is left? Too much, far too much. Bill C-48 would shrink the federal crown territory available for ordinary use or occupation, for resource exploration and for extraction for dumping any substance. The bill requires specific authorization by permit for any activity in the areas.

There is an old joke that goes something like this. How many Canadians does it take to change a light bulb? The answer is one but she has to have a licence. If there is one thing that makes Canadians less competitive and lowers their standard of living it is overregulation. The bill would create yet another layer of regulation between Canadian resources and the ability of Canadians to do research, to fish, to create tourist recreation venues, and to engage in sustainable development of resources.

Bill C-48 seems to make clear there is not a regulation the minister has seen but does not like. There is one thing I would like to know. What is the minister telling the steel industry situated in her riding on the edge of one of the largest marine environments in North America? What is she telling the steelworkers will keep their industry from being shut down? One of her officials or a future heritage minister decided at whim that the western end of Lake Ontario should become a marine conservation area.

• (1515)

Yet this is the kind of bill the heritage minister has brought to this House. In fact, they have not scheduled any areas that would become effective immediately. They basically took a big swath of all the coastal areas east, west and north and all the inland waters as well.

This bill fails to balance preservation of biodiversity with the principle of sustainable development. This bill sidestepped the proper role and authority of parliament. Even if there were not problems with the bill on those counts, this bill is not properly a parks bill, it is an environment bill.

Let me repeat very slowly for the heritage minister's benefit she is no longer the minister of the environment. She should stop trying to enact environmental legislation and should withdraw this bill.

With that in mind I would like to propose the following reasoned amendment which I believe you will find completely in order. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-48, an act respecting marine conservation areas, because the bill fails not only to strike a proper balance between the preservation of 'bio-diversity' and sustainable development, but takes no account of future sustainable development in designated marine conservation areas.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to my Reform colleague's amendment to Bill C-48, the Marine Conservation Areas Act, at second reading.

Earlier in the week, I ran the Bloc Québécois' draft amendment by my Reform colleague, who was considering not moving an amendment if ours suited him. Obviously, he changed his mind, but our goal is basically the same: that the bill not be debated at second reading.

The Bloc would have requested that the objectives of the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. The Reform Party is taking a different approach by asking that the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-48 as it does not take into account a number of fundamental elements that the Reform Party considers important.

So, let us take a closer look at this bill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a legal framework for the establishment and eventual development of 28 marine conservation areas, including eight in Quebec, representing each of the ecosystems identified to date in Quebec and Canada.

The Saguenay-St. Lawrence marine park is the 29th marine conservation area, but this park is not included in this bill because it is covered by ad hoc legislation both in Canada and in Quebec.

• (1520)

The bill before the House today, Bill C-48, is part of a commitment made by the Prime Minister of Canada at the 1996 convention of the World Conservation Union, held in Montreal.

For the benefit of the members of this House, I will digress to say a few words about this World Conservation Union. It is an organization representing 74 governments, 105 government agencies and more than 700 NGOs. It was founded in France in 1958 and will soon establish its first permanent secretariat in Montreal, which is already home to a number of international environmental agencies.

At its annual convention in 1996, as was the case in 1994, the World Conservation Union passed resolutions asking all coastal nations to put marine conservation measures in place quickly. For

### *Government Orders*

its part, the UN decreed that 1998 was the year of the oceans, and so exceptional acts were required in recognition of this event.

The most significant initiatives—some of them should be recalled—include, first: the world's fair in Lisbon, Portugal, held from September 22 to 30, 1998, the last great international exposition of the 20th century. This celebration coincided with the 500th anniversary of the voyage to India of the great Portuguese navigator Vasco de Gama and its theme was "The Oceans, a heritage for the future".

Second, we must take note of UNESCO's adoption of the ocean charter. This charter was presented to the summit on the seas held in St. John's, Newfoundland, in September 1997. The document is not legally binding, but as we see in it at the UNESCO web site, it is a statement of principle, a commitment to undertake and continue co-operative efforts to preserve the oceans and coastal regions.

In this context, the creation of marine conservation areas meets an objective put forward in many international forums and documents, such as the World Conservation Strategy, which appeared in 1980, the report entitled "Caring for the Earth", which was released in 1991 and drafted by the World Conservation Union, the UN program for the environment and the Worldwide Fund for Nature, funded in part by the Government of Quebec.

It should therefore be very clear that the Bloc Québécois supports measures to protect the environment. I would remind you that the Bloc Québécois did not hesitate to support the government when it proposed passing mirror legislation to create the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park and to establish a legal framework to ensure co-management by the two levels of government.

Moreover, the Bloc Québécois knows that the Quebec government is launching initiatives aimed at protecting the environment, particularly the marine floor. The Quebec government is also open to working in co-operation or in partnership with the federal government, on any project designed to ensure or promote the protection of the environment, as evidenced by the agreement signed by the two governments on the third phase of the St. Lawrence action plan.

However, the Bloc Québécois is opposed to Bill C-48 for the following reasons: first, instead of relying on dialogue, as in the case of the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park, the federal government wants to create marine conservation areas, regardless of the fact that Quebec has jurisdiction over the protection of its territory and of the environment.

Second, the Department of Canadian Heritage is proposing the establishment of a new structure, the marine conservation areas,

*Government Orders*

that will duplicate the marine protected areas of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Environment Canada's protected off-shore areas.

In short, the federal government, which claims to have met all of Quebec's demands, and which states in its Speech from the Throne that it is putting an end to overlap and to interference in areas of provincial jurisdiction, has now found a way to divide itself into three components and to actually overlap itself, so as to be absolutely certain to meddle, in one way or another, in areas that come under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the other provinces.

• (1525)

Bill C-48 fails to respect the integrity of the territory of Quebec and the other provinces.

One of the conditions essential to the establishment of a marine conservation area is federal ownership of the land where the conservation area will be established.

Subclause 5(2) of the bill provides that the minister can establish a marine conservation area only if he is satisfied "that clear title to the lands to be included in the marine conservation area is vested in Her Majesty in Right of Canada, excluding any such lands situated within the exclusive economic zone of Canada".

Subsection 92(5) of the Constitution Act, 1867, recognizes that the management and sale of crown land are matters of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

Quebec legislation on crown lands, passed by the Quebec National Assembly, applies to all crown lands in Quebec, including beds of waterways and lakes and the bed of the St. Lawrence river, estuary and gulf, which belong to Quebec by sovereign right.

In addition, this legislation provides that Quebec cannot transfer its lands to the federal government. The only thing it can do within this legislation is to authorize, by order, the federal government to use them only in connection with matters under federal jurisdiction. However, the protection of habitats and fauna is a matter of joint federal and provincial jurisdiction, and the Government of Quebec plans to establish a framework for the protection of marine areas in the near future.

According to the notes provided us by the Minister of Canadian Heritage with regard to Bill C-48, marine conservation areas are planned for the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence estuary and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. These are three areas in which the ocean floor is under Quebec's jurisdiction.

Also, co-operative mechanisms already exist to protect ecosystems in the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park, and in the St. Lawrence River under the agreement entitled "St. Lawrence action plan, phase III" which was signed by all federal and provincial departments concerned, and which provides for an investment of

\$250 million, over a period of five years, in various activities relating to the St. Lawrence River.

Why is the Department of Canadian Heritage acting with such arrogance this time, by claiming to own the marine floor where it wants to create marine conservation areas, instead of resorting to bilateral agreements with the Quebec government and thus avoiding having Canada once again trample Quebec's areas of jurisdiction?

The environment is a jurisdiction shared by the two governments.

Under the Constitutional Act of 1867, the governments of Canada and Quebec share responsibility for the environment. Under paragraphs 10, 11, 12 and 13 of section 91, the federal government has control over a number of areas.

Under section 91, the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the following classes of subjects: navigation and shipping, in paragraph 10; quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals, in paragraph 11; sea coast and inland fisheries, in paragraph 12; and ferries between a province and any British or foreign country or between two provinces, in paragraph 13.

Quebec's exclusive powers are also recognized in the British North America Act, 1967, under sections 92 and 92A.

Section 92 provides that, in each province, the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the following classes of subjects: the management and sale of the public lands belonging to the province and of the timber and wood thereon, in paragraph 5; property and civil rights in the province, in paragraph 13; and generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province, in paragraph 16.

• (1530)

Section 92A(1) provides that, in each province, the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to: (a) exploration for non-renewable natural resources in the province; (b) development, conservation and management of non-renewable natural resources and forestry resources in the province, including laws in relation to the rate of primary production therefrom.

Accordingly, section 2 of the legislation passed by Quebec's National Assembly with respect to conservation and development of wildlife sets out the role of the province's minister of the environment and wildlife, and I quote:

The minister of the environment and wildlife is responsible for the conservation and management of wildlife and its habitat.

Under Quebec's legislation, the minister also has authority to appoint conservation officers.

By refusing to follow the example of the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park Act and by making ownership of the territory an

essential condition for the creation of marine conservation areas, the federal government is behaving, as Robert Bourassa used to say, like a centralizing government that wants control over everything, regardless of recognized jurisdictions.

Bill C-48 creates overlap within the federal administration itself. Let us look at how ridiculous it gets.

Through the Department of Canadian Heritage, the federal government intends to create marine conservation areas. Through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, it has already created marine protected areas. Through the Department of the Environment, it wants to create marine wildlife reserves.

It should be noted that a single site could find itself protected under more than one category. The Department of Canadian Heritage sets out its reasons for creating marine conservation areas in the preamble to the bill. Heritage Canada is establishing marine conservation areas to protect natural, self-regulating marine ecosystems for the maintenance of biological diversity; establish a representative system of marine conservation areas; ensure that Canada contributes to international efforts for the establishment of a worldwide network of representative marine areas; provide opportunities for the people of Canada and of the world to appreciate Canada's natural and cultural marine heritage; and provide opportunities within marine conservation areas for the ecologically sustainable use of marine resources for the lasting benefit of coastal communities.

As for Fisheries and Oceans Canada, it proposed the establishment of marine protected areas. However, in a discussion paper released by Fisheries and Oceans in January 1997 and entitled "An Approach to the establishment and Management of Marine Protected Areas under the Oceans Act", the purpose of marine conservation areas is described as follows.

These zones are established to ensure the conservation of: commercial and non-commercial fisheries resources and their habitats, endangered or threatened species and their habitats, unique habitats, productive ecosystems and biodiversity, any other marine resource.

In both documents, departmental officials indicate that local people will have a significant involvement in the establishment of marine protected areas. The Bloc Québécois wonders how many information or organization meetings local people will be invited to, serving bureaucracy instead of democracy.

Following DFO's consultation meetings on marine protection zones in Quebec in June 1998, federal officials wrote the following in their minutes of these meetings:

There is still a great deal of confusion among stakeholders regarding the various federal programs on protected marine areas (marine protection zones, national marine conservation areas, wildlife marine preserves, etc.). The departments

concerned should harmonize their actions and co-operate to create protected marine areas.

The Bloc Québécois shares the view of those who participated in those meetings and feels that this is an abuse of democracy that will be prejudicial to the public which, incidentally, is not at all reassured by the existence of an interdepartmental committee made up of officials from these various departments. Indeed, we know from experience that having a number of departments involved in the same project makes it difficult for them to work together and ends up costing taxpayers a lot of money.

• (1535)

The government would have been better advised to have a single department oversee the protection of ecosystems and the departments concerned conclude a framework agreement delegating their responsibilities to the one chosen to be accountable in this matter.

Now, Environment Canada is proposing to establish marine conservation zones, that could also be called natural marine reserves, expanding the notion of the national wildlife sanctuary beyond the territorial sea to the 200 mile limit within the exclusive economic zone under the Canada Oceans Act. These zones are also subject to the Canadian Wildlife Act, but require a different set of regulations.

In short, let us summarize, because the triple federal overlap at the federal level—setting aside its overlap with provincial jurisdictions—becomes almost a federal maze where people can get lost.

Therefore, under the various laws, the Government of Canada is proposing to create marine conservation areas, marine protection zones and natural marine reserves. The same territory could, according to Fisheries and Oceans, be zoned in various ways and subject to various regulations that could simply confuse users.

All that remains for me to do is extend to the ordinary citizen a most cordial welcome to the real world of Kafka.

Is even more confusion really possible? The answer, unfortunately, is yes.

In fact, the bill provides that each federal department retain jurisdiction over its own marine conservation areas. However, when Heritage Canada deems it appropriate, it may, in co-operation with the minister concerned, pass regulations regarding a marine conservation area that differ from the existing provisions.

In this case, the amendment agreed to between Heritage Canada and the minister concerned takes priority over the regulations under other legislation: the Fisheries Act, the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, the Canada Shipping Act, the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, and the Aeronautics Act.

Although this might seem normal in other circumstances, the difficulties can only increase when Heritage Canada regulations are

*Government Orders*

enforced in marine protected areas, marine wildlife reserves and marine conservation areas, each with their own regulations.

Preliminary consultation on the bill was a resounding failure, but Heritage Canada points to it as proof that it has public support to go ahead with the bill. Here are a few facts.

In February 1997, Heritage Canada released a consultation document entitled "Charting the Course—Towards a Marine Conservation Areas Act". This document was sent to 3,000 groups across Canada.

In June 1998, Heritage Canada boasted about its consultation in the document "Towards a Marine Conservation Areas Act." It wrote, and I quote: "The discussion paper was circulated to over 3000 stakeholders across the country— Over 300 sheets and briefs were submitted providing comments and suggestions".

The Bloc Quebecois requested copies of these 300 sheets, which really fill only 73 pages that I have right here. The vast majority of these pages are nothing more than the reply coupon attached to the discussion paper.

Under the Privacy Act, the names and addresses of respondents cannot be disclosed, and Heritage Canada rightly withheld this information. However, of the 62 replies we received from the department, only one was in French.

• (1540)

Would it be unreasonable to conclude that Quebec did not participate in the consultations conducted by Heritage Canada? After looking into Heritage Canada's consultations on its draft bill, the Bloc Quebecois came to the conclusion it was a miserable failure and it was really too bad that, with all the resources at its disposal, the department did not see fit to conduct real consultations, which would have exposed all the flaws in the bill.

The consultations conducted by Fisheries and Oceans Canada in Quebec on the establishment of marine protected areas were also a miserable failure. According to the report on the working sessions on the marine protection zones program, prepared by officials of Fisheries and Oceans Canada in January 1997, the working document was sent to 650 organizations in Quebec. Working sessions were planned in a variety of cities in Quebec. A number had to be cancelled because of the considerable tension in the fishing industry at the moment. In the opinion of the officials, participation at these sessions was low—5% on the average.

In the fishing sector, nothing is resolved. The Heritage Canada bill arrived at the moment Fisheries and Oceans and Human Resources Development Canada raised an outcry over their streamlining of the fishing industry, which is out of synch with the needs

and the reality of the industry and the communities affected by the moratorium on fishing.

The industry still does not know the plans of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for its future and the number of fishers who will remain active. In addition, the industry claims the federal government has badly handled the fishing industry and criticizes it for its part in the collapse of the groundfish stocks.

So as relations between the coastal communities and the federal government are strained with respect to the livelihood of these communities, especially in Quebec, where there is a dispute over our right to our historical fishing quotas, the Bloc Quebecois fails to see how the federal government will be able to convince these people to co-operate in the establishment of marine conservation zones, marine conservation areas or marine wildlife reserves.

Since co-operation with coastal communities is essential to protect ecosystems, the Bloc Quebecois urges the government to find workable solutions to the economic woes of coastal communities, if it really wants to eventually co-operate with them to protect the environment.

What are the Bloc Quebecois' objections to this bill? The Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park is a model. In 1997, the governments of Quebec and Canada agreed on an act to create the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park. This resulted in the creation of Canada's first marine conservation area.

One of the main features of that legislation is that the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park is the first marine park to be created jointly by the federal and Quebec governments, without any transfer of territory. The two governments will continue to fulfil their respective responsibilities.

The park includes only marine areas. It covers 1,138 square kilometres. Its boundaries may be changed through an agreement between the two governments, provided there is joint public consultation in that regard.

In order to promote local involvement, the acts passed by the Quebec and federal governments confirm the creation of a co-ordinating committee, whose membership is to be determined by the federal and provincial ministers. The committee's mandate is to recommend to the ministers responsible measures to achieve the master plan's objectives. The plan is to be reviewed jointly by the two governments, at least once every seven years.

Any exploration, utilization or development of resources for mining or energy related purposes, including the building of oil lines, gas lines or power lines, is prohibited within park boundaries.

By means of regulations, the governments of Quebec and of Canada will be able to determine measures for protecting the park's ecosystems and resources and for protecting the public. More

specifically, they will be able to define how each category of area will be used and for how long such use shall apply.

This first partnership initiative should have served as a model to the federal government for the creation of other marine conservation areas. Rather than demonstrating open-mindedness and co-operation, the federal government is still taking an arrogant, aggressive, invasive approach that overlaps other jurisdictions and that is hardly calculated to encourage us to work with them another time.

• (1545)

Phase III of the St. Lawrence action plan could have served as another model. Let us look at what actually happened.

On June 8, 1998, the environment ministers of Quebec and of Canada announced phase III of the St. Lawrence development plan, representing a total bill of \$230 million to be shared equally by both levels of government.

One of the objectives of this action plan is to increase the area of protected habitats by 100% from 12,000 hectares to 120,000 hectares.

Phase III follows on the first two phases, in which both governments invested over \$300 million.

But the Government of Canada is not happy when everything is running smoothly. They prefer to stir up trouble, ill feelings and even discontent in the population. They do not understand that Quebecers have had it with their arrogant policies that cost a fortune, and the people will let them know unequivocally in a very short time.

Another example of abuse of power is the incredible arrogance displayed by Heritage Canada in stating in the bill that it will have a say in the selection of advisors.

Clause 11 provides for the establishment of advisory committees for each marine conservation area. Subclause 11(3) reads as follows:

(3) The minister shall consult with such ministers or agencies of the government of Canada or a province or other persons or bodies as the minister considers appropriate with respect to the composition of advisory committees.

Given this government's centralizing view, all these or's do not sound very good. The minister made sure she could consult whomever she wishes.

We have a number of concerns about this bill. Clause 11 provides that the federal government will establish the boundaries of the marine conservation areas in each region of Canada in consultation with the local communities. We know what kind of "consultations" they conduct.

### *Government Orders*

Clause 9 states that "The minister shall, within five years after a marine conservation area is established, in consultation with any . . . parties that the minister considers appropriate"—I repeat, any parties that the minister considers appropriate—"prepare a management plan". This plan is reviewed every five years.

Clause 9(4) states:

(4) Provisions of a management plan respecting fishing, aquaculture, fisheries management, marine navigation and marine safety are subject to agreement between the minister and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Here, I must point out that, in our experience to date, this sharing of responsibilities by two ministers has always proved catastrophic in this government.

Every two years, the heritage minister will table a report on the state of marine conservation areas. The minister establishes a management advisory committee for each marine area created. Since, as it will be recalled, clause 11 allows her to consult whomever she wishes, the department will, once again, be able to appoint whomever it wishes to its management committees to suit its own purposes.

One of the prerequisites for creating a marine conservation area is ownership of the territory by the federal government. According to preliminary information we have obtained, the federal government would own the ocean floor in areas 7, 8 and 9 of the Arctic Ocean and area 1 of the Atlantic Ocean. The Government of Quebec, however, owns the ocean floor in areas 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Atlantic Ocean region, that is to say the region taking in the St. Lawrence Estuary, the Gaspé and the Magdalen Islands.

The bill gives the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the ministers of Fisheries and Oceans and Canadian Heritage, the right to limit or prohibit activities in commercial zones in order to protect the resource.

Given the relations that now exist between the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and fishers, there is reason for concern about the enforcement of this clause of the bill.

The bill also gives the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the ministers of Transport and Canadian Heritage, the right to limit or prohibit transportation in marine conservation areas.

Given all the pressure to keep airplanes out of certain areas, there is also reason to be concerned about relations between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Department of Transport with respect to these marine conservation areas.

The bill also makes provision for orders-in-council regarding public safety, research activities and so on in these territories. All government orders-in-council are suspect in principle.

The bill provides that anyone who pollutes these marine conservation areas will have to pay clean-up costs.

*Government Orders*

• (1550)

Obviously, we cannot, in the limited time at our disposal, mention all the concerns we have regarding this bill.

Unfortunately, the Bloc Québécois will have to oppose the amendment proposed by the Reform Party, because it does not deal with issues we feel are truly important. Our reading of the act, in fact, leads us to believe that the reasons mentioned by the Reform Party are not acceptable. In fact, I was even surprised that the amendment was deemed in order, because it is not consistent with the legislation.

We will also oppose the bill, primarily because it is an intrusion into the jurisdictions of Quebec, and of the other provinces, when they are concerned. Quebec cannot function in that system. We were very open with the federal government when we dealt with managing the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park, and we regret that the government did not act in a similar fashion this time.

In a way, we are pleased about that, because it gives us yet another reason to want to leave this intrusive country.

[English]

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):**

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

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I will be dividing my time with my colleague, the member for Halifax West.

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

[English]

I rise today on behalf of the riding of Churchill River in Saskatchewan, and the New Democratic caucus, on Bill C-48, an act respecting marine conservation areas. The bill provides legislation to establish and manage a system of national marine conservation areas representative of the 29 marine areas in Canada. The 29 conservation areas represent unique biological and oceanographic features. These areas include fresh and salt waters.

A Parks Canada systems approach has identified 29 areas within Canada's Great Lakes, internal waters which are tidal, and the territorial sea and also the exclusive economic zone known as the EEZ 200 mile limit.

The process to establish the conservation areas began in 1986 with ministerial approval to establish national marine parks. This decision led to a 1987 agreement with Ontario to establish Fathom Five in Georgian Bay; a 1988 agreement with British Columbia for

a marine park at South Moresby in the Queen Charlotte Islands, the Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area. An agreement with Quebec to examine the feasibility of a federal-provincial marine park at the confluence of the Saguenay fiord and the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park, became Bill C-7. The New Democratic Party supported this bill which established the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park.

The years of consultation between governments and communities were successful. Consultation is a major part of creating conservation areas in the future.

As my colleague from Sackville—Eastern Shore noted, a hallmark of intergovernmental co-operation took place when Bill C-7 was under way. The Government of Quebec and the federal government both looked at their unique responsibilities and jurisdictions in dealing with the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park and came up with the unique opportunity to have a consultation that looked at the tourism aspect, the economic aspect and the environmental aspect of the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park.

Bill C-7 was an important step toward fulfilling a commitment to future generations. Today we mark the next step in the marine ecosystem protection, Bill C-48. This bill will set the template for marine conservation areas for future generations.

Several key points that the New Democratic Party has raised throughout the parks and environment debates and the legislation are contained in Bill C-48. There are two main parts we can focus on.

• (1555)

The precautionary principle and ecosystem protection are specifically defined in this bill. This is an improvement over previous legislation introduced by the Liberal government, bills which affect all Canadians in all regions of this great country where an ecosystem approach, the precautionary principle and ecological integrity were barely mentioned, if even described at all. It is nice to see that the precautionary principle and ecosystem protection are major components of this bill. This shows progress which we must acknowledge as parliamentarians. We must ensure the goals of sustainability, conservation and preservation of Canada's vital marine areas are achieved.

Through Bill C-7 the New Democratic Party raised the issue of monitoring in the Saguenay-St. Lawrence, monitoring where necessary the pollution impacts of critical areas and the flow of the rivers. We must be willing to monitor the pollution impacts of industries further upstream on the Saguenay and further upstream on the St. Lawrence. Pollution will impact this conservation area. The monitoring aspect must not be taken lightly. These noble conservation objectives can be met but they must be monitored.

Adequate resources must be defined and committed to pollution monitoring. The Liberal government's repeated statement to Cana-

dians that the high standards of environmental protection are being met is not true. There is continued devolution and abdication of environmental responsibilities. This government can sign a piece of paper and have a photo opportunity for the news. Then the government has a program review and always cuts the budget and at the same time says that things are going great. This cannot continue with Bill C-48.

Adequate resources for feasibility studies must be defined and allocated to the marine sciences, to community consultation and to education and interpretive programs. All these issues require adequate resources. Will this government commit to additional resources? Will this government commit to action on Bill C-48, or will it sign this bill, establish one or two conservation areas and rely on skimpy laurels and continue to mislead Canadians?

Our communities need a future based on sustainable development. Communities depend on our marine environment for income, for food sustenance and as a source of our biological diversity. This is for our physical and spiritual well-being.

Bill C-48 provides the opportunity to reverse the outrageous decimation and degradation that mismanagement has created. Unsustainable practices destroy Canadian communities; they do not build and strengthen them.

The New Democratic Party calls on the Liberal government to prove that this bill is not simply paper in the next budget. Proof of the Liberal government's commitment to marine conservation and preservation and sustainable practices does not mean continued cuts to a once proud Canadian Coast Guard. It does not mean continued cuts to the pollution prevention capabilities of the environment department. These budget cuts have been cloaked in the auspices of program review.

Commitment is not the continuance of understaffed, overworked and rarely appreciated departments with the major responsibilities of the atmosphere and ocean sciences. Commitment is not continually ignoring advice that is based on scientific evidence or the precautionary principles in favour of a political agenda. The DFO is a fine example of this.

The marine conservation areas will be a key component of the proposed representative system of marine protected areas. Three departments have been identified as working on the marine protected areas, the departments of fisheries, environment and Canadian heritage. This system could be in place along all of Canada's coasts and the Great Lakes by the year 2010.

We hope this bill is not another noble opportunity lost by lack of leadership and commitment. Lost but not forgotten, such as another Liberal promise to complete our national parks system with 39 representative terrestrial zones by the new millennium. This is far

### *Government Orders*

from being complete. They are big words that create big hopes but Canadians are used to dashed hopes with this Liberal government.

• (1600)

Through the committee of the New Democratic Party we will raise a number of concerns that will improve Bill C-48. Some concerns are minimum protection standards to include prohibition of fin fish aquaculture and bottom trawling, ballast water dumping and recreational artificial reefs, better controls for outfalls of waste discharge and pollution prevention, and complete consultation with communities, provincial jurisdictions and aboriginal territories and communities.

We must define and identify the issue of no take zones within marine boundaries, critical zone 1 areas to be expanded to reduce impacts through calving, spawning and nursing periods.

The issue of DFO and parks is a major concern. Both are going to be participating in conservation areas but one of the worst histories and a major area of concern is the history of DFO in terms of mismanagement regarding resources. The NDP will be raising these and other concerns forwarded by Canadians through the committee process.

A key question we will also ask is why there was the exclusion of other great inland Canadian waters such as Great Bear lake, Great Slave lake, Lake Athabasca and Lake Winnipeg. These are unique waters and require protection and conservation measures.

I would like to speak on the additional challenges Reform Party members mentioned but we cannot lend our support to their motion.

I look forward to empowering our youth and look toward conservation for them.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, in light of the comments he just made, I want to ask the hon. member if, as a member from British Columbia, he has consulted his province, and whether his province agrees with this federal intrusion in an area that comes exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories.

Does he also agree with the maze that Parks Canada and the Department of the Environment—another federal department—want to create? I would appreciate an answer from the member who spoke just before me.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Laliberte:** Madam Speaker, I cannot speak specifically on British Columbia. My home province is Saskatchewan.

Reflecting on a federal government initiative, the fisheries minister announced that the race rocks in Gabriola passage were on

*Government Orders*

the way to becoming Canada's first marine protected area. All this was well and good for the federal government to identify but Chief James Johnny of the Nanaimo First Nations said there was no consultation through the band which has aboriginal title to the Gabriola passage.

When we speak about consultation, I believe that is what the hon. member was alluding to. The federal government has to have a full consultation process with provincial governments, with communities and impacted areas along with aboriginal territories and communities that have title for regions and waterways in this country.

**Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of my constituents of Halifax West to speak on an act respecting marine conservation areas.

Halifax West, as we know, is a riding that embodies many coastal communities, Portuguese Cove, Hatchet Lake, Peggy's Cove, Ketch Harbour all the way down to Sambro right through to Hubbards.

These coastal communities know full well the importance of marine conservation. Being a people by the sea, we recognize the importance of having a pristine environment and keeping it that way for our children and our children's children.

This bill is designed to provide authority for the establishment of marine conservation areas with the objective of protecting and conserving a variety of aquatic environments.

This bill also confers a range of regulatory powers for the protection of living and non-living marine resources and their management and use in a sustainable manner.

• (1605)

That is a very important feature for those of us living in the Atlantic provinces. We realize it is important to have a sustainable environment.

There are important principles embodied in this bill. The preamble talks about establishing a representative system of marine conservation areas that are of sufficient extent and such configuration as to maintain healthy marine ecosystems.

Halifax where I grew up we have a beautiful harbour. It is a harbour that is sheltered and does not freeze during the winter. It is ideally situated for shipping and transporting goods and yet this beautiful piece of nature is being polluted daily by many runoffs of raw sewage and effluent being dumped directly into it. This has gone on for years and years.

It is hard to imagine in this day and age that we would allow such a thing to continue. There have been studies on the shelf and off the shelf, back and forth, about how to clean up the harbour and yet today we still remain with that very serious problem.

It is important that we look at marine conservation. Anything that can be done to improve those situations is certainly going to be welcome in the Atlantic provinces.

The preamble further talks about ensuring that Canada contributes to international efforts for the establishment of a worldwide network of representative marine protected areas. It emphasizes the globalized nature of our society today.

We know that what happens in one part of the world certainly affects what happens in another part of the world. We have to be able to share our environment and to look after our environment in a way that will benefit all.

It talks about considering implications for ecosystems in the planning and management of marine conservation areas to provide opportunities for the people of Canada and of the world to appreciate and enjoy Canada's natural and cultural marine heritage, and provide opportunities, and this is important, within marine conservation areas for the ecologically sustainable use of marine resources for the lasting benefit of coastal communities.

In Atlantic Canada we are a people who live by the sea so I rise on behalf of Atlantic Canadians because we know full well from past experiences what can happen from resource exploitation.

We know about the overfishing off the Atlantic coast. We know how the large trawlers have been allowed to come in and deplete the fishing stocks. We know about the mismanagement of the fisheries. We see lost stocks and we see the impact on the communities in these areas, people who have come to rely on subsidy programs and so forth, people who are unable to find new occupations because their livelihood has been destroyed and yet they know of no other than fishing.

We know full well that the environment must be managed in a sensible way. The marine conservation areas provide opportunities for Atlantic Canadians through preservation and conservation.

If this bill is implemented properly with some of the improvements that have been mentioned by my hon. colleague, we know that such things as ecotourism and research will provide opportunities for Atlantic Canadians. There will be opportunities in the field of marine biology and the ocean sciences and so forth. We would welcome those opportunities in Atlantic Canada.

The Atlantic Ocean has 10 identified marine conservation area natural regions. These are Hudson Strait, Labrador shelf, Newfoundland shelf, the north gulf shelf, St. Lawrence estuary, Magdalen shallows, Laurentian channel, the Grand Banks, Scotian shelf and the Bay of Fundy.

My hon. colleague has already mentioned the experience of the Saguenay—St. Lawrence marine park, Bill C-7, which the NDP supported last fall. This was indeed a wonderful example of the possibilities of co-operation between governments and community consultation.

*Government Orders*

I can assure my colleagues that the NDP will be encouraging community participation on this bill because it is very important that we have true consultation, not just a quick hello, how do you do with the communities involved but true consultation to receive the input from the communities that will be affected by this bill.

• (1610)

The sea is very important for people in Nova Scotia.

I can recall as a young lad going to the sea with my parents and grandparents and digging clams along the seashore, fishing off wharfs, that type of activity. We did not worry about whether fish were contaminated, if we could eat the fish we caught or whether to be concerned about the clams.

But nowadays the first thing we think about if we go fishing is whether the area is polluted. It is a shame that our society has come to that stage. Certainly we want to encourage marine conservation and do everything possible to present a pristine environment for people.

I could talk a bit about some of the successes that have taken place around this issue. We have the Bonavista and Notre Dame Bay project which requires the participation of 32 diverse and proud communities with a wealth of experience.

Following the memorandum of understanding signed between the federal and provincial governments there was a number of feasibility studies done and there was initially some skepticism around this. But eventually this was followed by acceptance and hope. There has been a lot of local input and ideas that are now being listened to.

It is remarkable about face on fisheries and ocean matters in Newfoundland, a region that has been decimated by government interference and bungling. Indeed the entire Atlantic region has been interfered with and bungled in terms of the fisheries.

We can see why this initial skepticism in that area was warranted but now we see that things are starting to turn around as a result of consultation and community input. Local fishers in the community came up with an idea related to local lobster. They started the East Port Lobster Conservation Authority and designated some of the best lobster areas within the bay as no take zones. These types of measures are being taken.

We see this type of community co-operation and this community based program works. Catches are up by 97% through proper resource management. It is a combination of conservation and common sense based on science. These successes can be carried forward through the legislation that is being looked at here.

While this progress is being made in Newfoundland we have to ask ourselves what is stopping this government from proceeding with consultation and identification of specific conservation areas for the remaining natural marine regions.

Comments that have been received by the New Democratic Party on Bill C-48 carry a common theme, conservation and preservation and good stewardship of our marine areas. This is a necessity. It is a requirement for our future generations of Canadians.

As noted by my hon. colleague, this process began 10 years ago but much more needs to be done as we enter the next century. We would trust that this legislation will be carefully examined at committee stage. We trust there will be appropriate improvements made and that hopefully at that stage there will be more community input, more opportunity for aboriginal people who may be affected by these areas, to have their say around what is happening as well as others who are concerned.

Working together we can come up with something that is going to make our environment something we will be proud of, something we will be pleased to leave to succeeding generations.

I call on my colleagues to look at this bill, seriously examine it, give input to improvements and do not, once it is passed, allow the government to delay when royal assent is given. Move quickly. Atlantic Canadians deserve our best efforts.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. H  l  ne Alarie (Louis-H  bert, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened to the advice of my colleagues and I examined the bill. I will speak on two points of it.

First, there is not a lot of collaboration in this Bill C-48. Worse yet, and I would like my colleague's opinion on this, one of the prerequisites to the government's establishing a marine conservation area is its ownership of the land where the conservation area will be established.

My colleague was talking earlier about a coastal region and about the regions near the major Atlantic ports. There is another interesting clause in this bill, which gives the governor in council as well, on the recommendation of the transport and heritage ministers, the right to limit or prohibit transport activities in marine conservation areas.

I do not know whether he looked at that in detail, but near the ports—even if he and I both would like to see all of us live in a healthy environment—there may be a problem that needs to be considered and resolved.

• (1615)

[*English*]

**Mr. Gordon Earle:** Madam Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague from the Bloc Quebecois that there are some problems with the bill. At the outset I said we approved the bill in principle and went on to explain the kinds of things we want to see for the Atlantic region.

Certainly there are some obstacles that have to be overcome. The hon. member has identified some of them as has my hon.

*Government Orders*

colleague. We hope that these can be worked through at the committee stage to the point where we are satisfied that what moves forward will be in the best interest of all.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Madam Speaker, I have to admit I stepped in a bit late and only heard the end of the statement made by the hon. member for Halifax West.

Just for the record I would like the hon. member to tell me if I heard correctly that he was actually making a statement in support of conservation measures taken in the Newfoundland lobster fishery and that they could be applied perhaps in Nova Scotia. I would like some clarification of that.

Specifically I would like to know if he is supportive of the recent conservation measures that have occurred in district 33 and of which he would hopefully be aware. If he is supportive of those measures I would like to know why.

**Mr. Gordon Earle:** Madam Speaker, the member has asked a number of questions and I do not know if I will be able to address all of them.

The point I was making when I spoke about the Newfoundland experience was co-operation. I was talking about the consultation process and the process of people working together to try to find a solution. I was indicating that it must be a central part of the bill if we are to move forward.

I was not particularly endorsing the specifics of any kind of agreement, but I was talking about the co-operation principle as being necessary.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Halifax West for his comments, as well as his colleague from Saskatchewan, for their constructive approach to this bill, which is an important one.

Like them, I am eager for this bill to be referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage so we can hear testimony, continue consultation, examine our colleagues' suggestions and improve the bill if necessary. If improvements are needed, we will try to acknowledge this and to make the required changes.

I hope he will convince our colleagues in the other opposition parties to refer the bill to committee so we may begin to examine it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gordon Earle:** Madam Speaker, with regard to influencing members of other parties, I firmly believe that each individual must

decide for himself or herself as to which direction they go and how they see it in representing their constituents.

I would certainly put forward any suggestions we receive from our constituents that might help to improve the bill.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the House to address Bill C-48, an act respecting marine conservation areas. I speak to the bill on behalf of the member for West Nova who like myself represents many of the coastal communities in Nova Scotia.

The proposed piece of legislation is designed to protect and conserve representative areas of Canada's marine landscape for the benefit, education and enjoyment of all Canadians and the world.

The Progressive Conservative Party has always maintained a keen interest in helping protect the environment for future generations. Having been born and raised in Nova Scotia, I quickly came to appreciate the importance of our natural environment and the importance that this environment plays in our everyday lives.

• (1620 )

Many of my constituents depend upon the ocean or natural resources for their livelihood. Many of our early settlers were attracted to this great land by the abundance of fish. Our aboriginal peoples fished these waters long before the arrival of any European settler.

Nova Scotia promotes itself as being the ocean playground of Canada. Deriving one's living from the ocean is a cultural way of life for many of us. We depend upon the preservation of this large habitat, not only for our survival but for the survival of the next generation. It is incumbent upon us all that we begin taking immediate steps toward protecting this ecosystem.

We do not have to look very far to see the devastation that can be caused when we take our natural resources for granted. The maritime provinces, in particular Newfoundland, have been decimated by the serious downturn in the fishery. Tens of thousands of fishers have been forced out of this industry because of government mismanagement. Cod stocks have been destroyed. There can be no telling how long or if they will ever rebound to previously sustainable levels.

Our marine environment is always under constant use from local fishers and under constant threat particularly from foreign fishing. Our efforts to protect our marine ecosystem will prove fruitless unless we stop foreign overfishing.

Recently our coastal regions have been faced by another menacing attack. This time it comes from illegal lobster fishers who have been pillaging the ocean floor almost unabated by Department of Fisheries and Oceans officials. In Nova Scotia, specifically in St. Mary's Bay, this lucrative lobster fishery could be in danger if strong measures are not immediately taken to put an end to this

illegal activity. The federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans has an obligation to everyone in Nova Scotia to enforce its regulations on behalf of conservation and on behalf of the families which this fishery supports.

The Progressive Conservative Party has long been concerned with preserving our ecosystem. In 1986 the PC government approved the national marine parks policy. In 1987 the country's first national marine conservation area known as Fathom Five in Georgian Bay was established. Unfortunately it has yet to be proclaimed. There are still outstanding issues to be addressed in this regard.

In 1988 the government signed a federal-provincial agreement with the province of British Columbia to create a national marine conservation area in the Queen Charlotte Islands. On April 6, 1990 the Progressive Conservative government signed an historical and unique agreement between Canada and Quebec to create a marine park at the confluence of the Saguenay estuary and the St. Lawrence River.

In December 1996 the government introduced Bill C-78, an act to establish the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park and to make a consequential amendment to another act. Finally the agreement and the legislation were given royal assent, culminating with the proclamation of the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park on June 8 of this year.

I gave that little history lesson to try to explain to the House how long legislation takes and how important it is to begin it now.

The bill will provide the legislation needed to establish and manage a system of marine conservation areas representative of the 29 marine areas in Canada, reflecting the relevant Parks Canada guiding principles and operating policies for them. The 29 distinct conservation areas identified by the legislation represent four broad and very distinct areas of Canada's marine ecosystem.

There are 10 specific areas associated with the Atlantic Ocean including the Bay of Fundy, Scotia shelf and Labrador shelf. The Arctic Ocean consists of nine specific regions including Hudson Bay, Beaufort Sea and Baffin Island shelf. The Pacific Ocean includes such areas as the Vancouver Island shelf and the Strait of Georgia. Finally we have Canada's Great Lakes.

It is important to note that although the proposed legislation is designed to establish and manage a system of marine conservation areas representative of the 29 marine areas, it does not specifically identify a precise geographic location to be protected. These sites will have to be chosen through much consultation with members of the general public, provincial governments and obviously those individuals who earn their livelihood from these distinct waters.

### *Government Orders*

I cannot stress the point strong enough that much consultation must be undertaken before any particular area is singled out for protection. There must be a balanced approach taken when exploring any area. The interest of our fishing community must be protected before any agreements on locations are finalized. Conservation is vitally important to all of us but particularly to those who make their living on the water.

• (1625)

We cannot simply target a location without exploring the long term effect it will have on the fishing industry. Our fishers must have a direct say in the management of their industry. We have already witnessed the disaster that can occur when they are excluded from the decision making process. It is also important that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans be involved within the consultation process.

Earlier I briefly mentioned our aboriginal people's dependence on these waters for their food fishery. It is important that the aboriginal peoples be involved in the negotiations. With many land claims still to be resolved, it is imperative that they be consulted on creating any new marine reserve areas.

Under the bill there are restrictions on non-renewable resource extraction. I believe careful examination of any proposed site must be explored as to its potential for oil and gas exploration.

Nova Scotia is finally going to receive the economic benefits of the Sable oil exploration. This economic boom for our province would not have been possible if the Sable area had been previously designated as a marine protected area. That is a thought that all of us in the House should carry with us. That is why I propose that as much consultation as possible is undertaken with all those who have a vested interest in our ocean floors in terms of both renewable and non-renewable resources.

I am encouraged by the fact that the department circulated discussion papers to over 3,000 stakeholders across the country, including fishing and shipping associations and unions; the oil, gas and mining sectors; aboriginal and environmental groups; and the academic community. This represents a very strong beginning in the consultation process.

In conclusion, the government had set a goal for itself of establishing 10 marine parks by the year 2000. The clock is ticking, but as we approach the new millennium we cannot afford not to carefully examine this undertaking. If it takes longer than the year 2000 then so be it. If we put the legislation in place and we actually go out there and establish some marine protected areas, let us do it so we do not have to revisit it again, renew it or change it in 10 years time.

Once we actually make a national park of a marine protected area it may be very difficult to get out of it. I do not feel there

*Government Orders*

should be a deadline in this regard. It is something we should move slowly and carefully but distinctly toward.

It is important to send the bill to committee. Our party intends to support it. I am sure the committee will want to hear experts from every sector involved in the process. Hopefully at the end of the day we can put the bill before the House, have it voted on, approved, and have a better country because of it.

[Translation]

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks my colleague, the member from the Progressive Conservative Party, just made.

He seems to stand up for the fisheries in his region, but there is so much duplication in Bill C-48 between Heritage Canada's marine conservation areas, Fisheries and Oceans' marine protected areas and Environment Canada's marine and wildlife reserves that one can wonder who will have the largest jurisdiction and be able to protect fisheries the best.

He also mentioned the critical situation resulting from the miscalculation in assessing fish stocks.

Does he feel safe knowing that the Minister of Canadian Heritage is the one who will be selecting the advisors and advisory committees on the management of the main resource in the Atlantic region?

[English]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Madam Speaker, those questions from the hon. member are very good ones. On her first question on the overlap of jurisdiction, I think that is an issue we cannot put aside and one that requires further study. Her main question was whether or not it should be the responsibility of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Because it is a heritage bill I see no other way to do it.

Certainly our member for West Nova has been very closely monitoring the bill. We feel comfortable with it because of his assessment. It would be incumbent upon each party in the House, all of the opposition parties and the government as well, to make sure that they are comfortable with all of the details of this bill.

• (1630)

In answer to the hon. member's question, I would suggest that it would be incumbent upon the Minister of Canadian Heritage to confer with her colleagues, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister of the Environment. It would be a very dangerous precedent, because of the overlapping jurisdictions, not to confer with those parties.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** 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 Waterloo—Wellington, Water Exports; the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore, Canadian Coast Guard.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, as I did earlier for our colleague from Halifax West, I would like to thank my colleague from South Shore for his remarks on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party. I thank him for his positive contribution to this debate at second reading and for supporting the principle of the bill, so that a full and comprehensive debate can take place and that we can learn from the experts who come to testify before the committee.

I too look forward to starting work on this bill as soon as possible in committee with his colleague from Nova West, and I thank him for his remarks.

[English]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the hon. member on the government side.

Certainly that is the type of attitude we have to take toward this very important piece of legislation. My hon. colleague for West Nova has been following this legislation very closely and it is through this type of co-operation and understanding that we can promote this important type of legislation.

[Translation]

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the government on introducing this bill regarding marine conservation areas and to express my particular delight because this is one policy area that all members of the House agree requires very urgent attention.

[English]

In congratulating the government I would also like to say that the Secretary of State for Parks earlier today made a very important reference to the commitment Canada made at the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and also in signing the biodiversity convention in Rio in 1992. These are two very important points of reference in our participation and role in the global community.

The sooner this bill can be moved ahead the better because it will take time to implement. Today we are discussing legislation which is enabling, but that is all it does. It sets the foundation for the creation of the marine protected areas. That is the extent of the measure. It is the first step on the road toward a very distant goal.

Also I would like to make a note of caution at this point in connection with the ecological integrity of existing parks, such as

the case of the Pukaskwa National Park where some threats are being noticed near the proposed marine park in the form of forestry companies which are now asking the Government of Ontario for permission to log closer and closer to the park boundaries.

• (1635 )

In other words, the buffer areas around the national parks are in need of being firmly protected. There is, as we all know, a strong connection between our land-based parks and our marine parks. Therefore it is incumbent upon us to protect them both.

It is interesting to note that an agreement signed by Ottawa and the Government of British Columbia in July 1995 provides for the initiation of marine conservation area feasibility studies for two places: the Strait of Georgia and the Queen Charlotte Sound marine regions. One can see from this how long it takes, even when there is joint co-operation between two levels of government. Marine parks cannot be established overnight. This is an undertaking that is time consuming and complex. Marine parks cannot be established by the federal government acting alone, as we all know. It requires the co-operation of provincial governments and very much the support of local communities.

We are engaged in an undertaking which is probably the envy of the whole world. We are moving forward toward the establishment of a Canadian system in the field of marine conservation areas. The momentum is there, but we still have to add more pressure to see real movement.

The next step and perhaps the most difficult one is developing the management plans which will take into account the need for protecting biological diversity, plant and animal, and the need for ensuring that marine national parks are immune from the encroachment of various industrial pursuits and activities. In this way we can ensure that marine conservation areas become effective in achieving the goals of establishing themselves and, of course, at the same time preventing pollution.

Members will note that the preamble of Bill C-48 recognizes the role of the marine ecosystem in maintaining biological diversity. That is the beauty of such a bill. However, I noticed that the idea of pollution prevention does not appear in the preamble of the bill. Perhaps that is something that can be done at the committee level. I will have some other observations to make to this effect later on by way of amendments.

We can ask ourselves at this point whether the establishment of the protected areas proposed in this bill will create small ocean sanctuaries while the rest of the sea and ocean environment rapidly deteriorate, or whether we will have a critical mass, the beginning of marine conservation areas which will set models for the larger sea and ocean surrounding them. This is something I would like to deal with at the end, with future generations in mind.

### *Government Orders*

A few minutes ago the hon. member for Churchill River spoke about the uses of our oceans in a manner consistent with sustainable development. He is right in doing so. He also spoke about pollution prevention. These are themes that I would commend to the parliamentary secretary in the hope that these themes will guide him and his colleagues in committee when it comes to the examination of this bill clause by clause.

The preamble provides a guide for the operation of the bill.

• (1640 )

There is a definition of the precautionary principle, however, that is in need of examination because it makes reference to cost effectiveness as being a measure to prevent environmental degradation.

The suggestion I would make at second reading is that it would be desirable to remove the words cost effective because they can be potentially very damaging. It will not be possible to establish parks in conservation areas if we are guided only by cost effectiveness principles. There are many other values that come into play when proceeding with the purpose and the intent of Bill C-48.

Looking at the bill more closely, it seems to me that in the preamble the reference to cost effectiveness ought to be revised by perhaps just leaving the word "effective". It is less limiting in scope and it still has value. It has merit. But the term "cost" is certainly one that will hamper future generations of administrators and political decision makers.

In examining the bill further, in subclause 4 of clause 9, I find that the minister will have to make agreements with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans when establishing a management plan. This could have some negative effects because the goals of the minister in charge of Canadian heritage may differ from the goals of the minister in charge of fisheries and oceans. This limitation in the powers of the minister of heritage will not be very helpful and ought to be removed if we are to allow for a speedy process in the establishment of the conservation areas.

Moving on to prohibitions, on page 7 of the bill, it is a bit disturbing to read clauses 12, 13, 14 and 15. It seems to me that a bill establishing conservation areas ought not to envisage the disposition of dumping. Dumping should not be allowed in marine conservation areas. It is as basic as that. Dumping ought to take place in a safe manner on the land and subclause 14(1) ought to be deleted.

I notice also in clause 13 that, while it is desirable that no person shall explore or exploit hydrocarbons, minerals, aggregates and other organic matters, there is no reference to fishing. Therefore, the question arises: Is fishing allowed in marine conservation

*Government Orders*

areas? If so, under what restrictions, under what limitations and under which criteria? Obviously fishing in an unlimited fashion could not be allowed in a conservation area. Therefore, clause 13 needs to be clarified.

Clause 14 has some positive features to it, namely that the concurrence of the minister is required before issuing a permit under section 71 of CEPA, provided that the role of the minister will be as stringent and as disciplined as the role performed by the minister in charge of CEPA itself.

• (1645)

When we come to clause 15, permits and authorizations, it seems to me that the superintendent is given too wide powers. The powers given to the superintendent ought to be restricted. The issuing of permits should be examined very closely before the final decision is made at the higher level because this could have a serious and negative impact on the quality of the area that is to be conserved.

Under the regulations, clause 16(1)(a) is a very good one because it is the first and is very strong for the protection of ecosystems and the elements of ecosystems. Clause 16(1)(j) is for the control of the flight of aircraft and so on to prevent disturbances of wildlife et cetera. We all know the reasons and it is good to find it spelled out.

When it comes to clause 16(1)(l), authorizing the dumping of substances and so on, I would say with all due respect that the minister would be well advised in removing this subclause from the regulations. We cannot have a conservation area in which we dump substances. It is almost a contradiction in terms. We have to be very careful. We all know that there is waste and that human waste must be handled, be it industrial, commercial and otherwise, but there must be ways of doing it on the land in a very well controlled fashion so as to facilitate and enhance the quality of the conservation area.

In clause 16(4) there is a provision for air navigation that can only be made on the recommendation of the minister and the Minister of Transport. Here again it should be a decision by the minister alone because of the nature and the purpose of the bill. There has to be some degree of autonomy if we are to pursue this goal seriously and effectively. The Minister of Transport may have very important considerations but sometimes they will have to be modified by the will and intent of the minister himself or herself.

Clause 17 on page 10 indicates that the governor in council may exempt from any provision of the regulations a movement of a ship or aircraft. Why is that necessary? Surely a conservation area where we want to protect the marine quality ought to be also protected from the movement of ship or aircraft. These are not immense areas that cannot be bypassed or circumvented. Surely there are alternative navigational routes.

Here again I am appealing to the parliamentary secretary to add some words such as "under exceptional circumstances" to clause 17(a) or (b), to stress the fact that only under specific conditions the movement of ships and aircraft ought to be allowed. In other words, it would indicate that the legislators are giving a strong signal to the administrators that only under special conditions the movement of ships and aircraft is going to be tolerated.

I notice clause 29 deals with litigation of environmental damage. It reads something along the lines that any person who has management or control of the substance or who causes or contributes to the discharge or deposit, in other words, that could injure animals, fish or plants in the area, shall take reasonable steps to prevent or mitigate such degradation or injury.

• (1650)

It seems an element of urgency is missing in this clause. The word immediate ought to be inserted. I do not know how the courts would interpret the word reasonable in this context, whether it would mean mild measures or strong measures. Clause 29(1) deserves to be examined in committee. There may be a way to strengthen this clause by inserting the element of immediacy and urgency.

The exception on page 16 under clause 29(4) is also a bit troublesome. It reads that no measures may be directed to be taken if action is taken under several other acts. Suppose the action taken under several other acts is weaker than what the minister would like it to be in order to protect and conserve these areas. In that case the loser will be the minister and the conservation areas that are being established.

A qualifier should be included in the exception, that if the action taken under such acts as the Canada Shipping Act, the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, CEPA and so on are equally as strong, then this exception applies. If not, then a specific action ought to be identified so as to properly and effectively protect the affected area. Otherwise by leaving it to the Canada Shipping Act, the condition of the protected area would be in serious danger.

I hope what we are doing here today will be the creation not of sanctuaries under siege, namely of isolated beautiful areas, while the rest of the marine environment degrades and declines in quality. I hope Bill C-48 will create models for proper behaviour in the larger picture of the seas and the oceans.

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I enjoyed the member's speech. He went into a lot of detail, which sometimes needs to be brought to bear in these debates.

In terms of the legislation surrounding protected marine areas, there are three federal departments that can protect marine areas, Environment Canada, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and

this bill will enable Heritage Canada to do the same. Can the member give me an impression of why he thinks it is that way?

The member for Davenport is the chair of the environment committee. He made a lot of detailed comments about this bill which falls under the heritage department. My colleague from Dauphin—Swan River and I were saying that this is really an environment bill and not a parks bill. I am adding to that same question by making that statement.

The member talked about his concern about navigation and the question of navigational alternatives. That is a very interesting question for me and the area I represent. Let us think about traffic control and some of the big ships that now utilize the inside passage on the west coast from Vancouver up to Alaska. There is a lot of cruise ship traffic, freight traffic and marine traffic of every size and shape. To control all of that there are vessel traffic control centres which are similar to the air traffic control centres.

• (1655)

The problem is twofold. The reality is that we are operating in two dimensions only when we are operating on the water. In the air we have three dimensions so things can be a lot more limiting and in many respects a lot scarier.

Another factor has come into being lately. Federal funding for the coast guard, federal fisheries and other areas that affect all of the marine oriented activities has been chopped to the point where we were not navigating for our freight traffic, our cruise ships or our large ships for a period of 12 hours just about a month ago. This was very scary indeed.

If we cannot do that for everything from cruise ships to oil tankers to major log transports and so on, how in heck are we going to enforce a new arrangement where we are trying to deal with navigation in a specifically declared conservation area?

**Hon. Charles Caccia:** Madam Speaker, I congratulate the member for Vancouver Island North for being so effective in compressing so many policy statements into one question.

The first one, if I understand it correctly, can perhaps be easily answered by saying that there is from time to time a reorganization of government structures and it is conceivable that one day the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Department of the Environment will be merged into one. It may well be that one day the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will incorporate certain activities or this particular one and become the promoter of conservation areas. We do not know.

At the present time, the member is quite right in pointing to this tri-dimensional responsibility. In a way it seems to me quite positive that we should see a conservation area as part of our heritage. Let us see whether it works this way. Hopefully it will,

### *Government Orders*

but if it does not, we will have to find a better administrative arrangement. It is only through trial and error that this can be established.

On his second question, I am glad to learn that the hon. member of the Reform Party regrets the cuts in federal funding. I thought that his party was passionately behind the idea of cuts in government expenditures. I am not. Perhaps he and I should have lunch more frequently and go over the kinds of cuts we do not want to have. Certain damages are being effected. As to what is the public interest and what are the activities that we would like to see better protected and better promoted, in that sense, he made some very good points. I do not have an easy and quick answer to his concern.

• (1700)

I would imagine that a partial answer would come from his third question, namely that with the lack of funds we ought to rely more and more where possible on the education of the public and all sectors concerned so we get co-operation through the means of a better understanding of the goal that is being pursued with this specific type of legislation.

This specific type of legislation has some very strong provisions for offences and punishment. Under section 24 it is not minor and therefore if this section is really enforced some of the recommendations of the hon. member may be met and satisfied once this legislation becomes operative.

[*Translation*]

**Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have a brief comment and a short question.

I find interesting the notion that, when it came time to pass the bill creating the Saguenay-St. Lawrence marine park, few members seemed concerned about a three-party administration or about any sort of duplication. I hope members are not using scare tactics in order to impede the bill's progress.

I would also like to congratulate the member for Davenport on his usual fine work, his suggestions, and his very detailed recommendations. It will be not only my duty but also my pleasure to forward them to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage and to the government for consideration.

**Hon. Charles Caccia:** Madam Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary. I must point out that, with respect to the bill as a whole and to his earlier remarks, I am in complete agreement with him.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, before I talk about the bill I would like to talk a bit about the area I come from. Almost half the coastline of British Columbia would fall into my riding of Vancouver Island North. That is half

*Government Orders*

the coastline of Vancouver Island and a good portion of the adjacent mainland coastline.

Within the constraints of all that coastline there is a lot of activity going on at any given time. There are certainly a lot of aquaculture operations. There is a lot of fishing activity, commercial and recreational. There is a lot of under sea harvesting. There are a lot of transportation activities. I talked a bit about that during my questioning of the member for Davenport.

There is a history of oil and gas exploration. There is as much oil and gas identified without major effort on the B.C. coast which would exceed the Hibernia area on the east coast.

We have very active waterways. I mentioned cruise ships. When I am at home I very often see six or seven cruise ships go by on any given evening.

I think it is important to recognize that we have a somewhat unique circumstance in British Columbia when it comes to our ocean area. We have established that the Gulf of Georgia, the seabed and all that belongs to the province.

• (1705)

That tends to create some new and different wrinkles on things because generally in Canadian jurisdictions the oceans are federal.

I have great concerns about the politicization of the protection of marine areas. That is one of the reasons I brought up this question about why we have three different federal departments all involved in one way or another in protecting marine areas.

There are many ways to colour the response to that but if people really think about it, if they are familiar with the way this place operates, it probably has a lot more to do with politics than with protecting the marine environment.

The reason we have three different departments trying to protect marine areas is that this is a public relations exercise to various degrees for various ministers.

In the case of this bill, we think it is properly an environment bill. It is falling under heritage because we know who the minister of heritage is, what she is all about and what she wants to promote. She wants to promote the fact that she is out saving marine resources as well as land resources tied in with her parks mandate.

I would like to comment a little about my concerns regarding navigation on our waterways because I asked a question about it to the previous speaker. In the response it occurred to me that there is a non-understanding on the government side that when it comes to monitoring marine traffic we have signed treaties with our neighbour the United States.

We have signed collective agreements with our employees regarding how we are going to monitor marine traffic. This government, this administration chose to break those collective agreements and chose to break the terms of that treaty because it has mismanaged the funding for the coast guard and the department of fisheries for this year.

When it comes to making cuts, the government will make the cuts at the place where service delivery is hurt. It will not make it at the place where the comfortable bureaucrat is continued to be sheltered, protected and coddled. It certainly will not make it in the minister's office. The spin doctors are all still viably employed.

There was one other response I elicited to my question regarding why we cannot have all this legislation fall under one mandate. Why do there have to be three mandates? What is the difference between these protected areas? What will the rationale be?

All we got was "We don't know that. Maybe they will not all be under one mandate. At some point maybe they will all be under the same department". Those are all fuzzy, feel good statements.

We do know what the current situation is. We know what today's situation is. This is today's legislation. Surely to goodness we can design legislation that maximizes the current structure of government in terms of getting results. That is all I am requesting.

• (1710)

It is useful when discussing this bill to think about how this came about. I realize it goes back to the early 1990s, but in October 1996 the Prime Minister gave a speech to the World Conservation Congress. He announced the federal government's intent to introduce new legislation to establish and administer a network of marine conservation areas in the Great Lakes and in the Pacific, Arctic and Atlantic Oceans.

Where did this great initiative start? Did it start from local concerns, ideas expressed and generated by the grassroots, by the communities or by the provinces? No, it started from the need of the Prime Minister to polish his international stature at an international conference two years ago. Is that not typical?

Afterward we heard the national parks directorate saying it wanted to consult with interested groups and individuals as the first step toward developing the legislation. Should the first steps not arise from a problem or a perceived need that is expressed by those who have a problem? Must we always have legislation imposed on us from above?

Let us look at some of these consultations. When the legislation package came out I sent out a request for comments from 22 groups. All those 22 groups are groups that should have been consulted by the government. These groups found they could not comment in a meaningful way on the legislative package because they did not know where the marine conservation areas were going

*Government Orders*

to be created. It is that simple. How can any local group get its teeth into a piece of legislation that has a vacant schedule I and schedule II that are supposed to identify what the marine conservation areas are? It cannot do it.

We know there are 29 so-called representative areas in Canada with lines arbitrarily drawn on a map. There would probably be at least one marine conservation area established in each of these 29 areas. Where are they within the lines on the map? How big would they be? No one knows.

From previous so-called consultation processes we do know that the federal government has preconceived ideas about the process and about areas it would like to designate that have nothing to do with consultation and everything to do with special interest groups and squeaky wheels in the maintenance of bureaucracy. These are not in keeping with local priorities.

I want to explain something. The recreational sector, which will be heavily impacted by anything that comes out of this, has no effective lobby in many cases. For example, in my constituency fishing is a big thing. The private sector does not include sport fishermen. This recreational sector is composed primarily of individuals anglers. If the federal bureaucracy decides to close a marine area to fishing, this will put a whole bunch of local anglers out without no means of effectively protesting the government's action.

Certain marine areas are being targeted in northern Vancouver Island as sites for marine protection areas because certain squeaky wheel groups want to exclude activity from that area. However, these special interest groups do not represent the general public.

If we invent enabling legislation to create marine conservation areas and then we do not create the areas, we get a bureaucracy that becomes increasingly uncomfortable because it wants to fulfill its minister's agenda for the Prime Minister. So it creates as many of these areas as it has to.

• (1715)

In effect we create a self-perpetuating machine churning out regulations that have no business existing in the first place. We end up with marine conservation areas that have a very weak rationale which flies in the face of common sense and local sentiment.

There has to be a better way. We have to make sure local government is involved in a meaningful way. I am aware of how local government was involved in the consultations on protected areas. We are talking about a DFO mandate here, not a heritage mandate. They are paid lip service but their concerns are not what drives the process. DFO bureaucracy drives the process in that case.

There is nothing in the legislation that tells me the bureaucracy will be held to account in ensuring that the municipal level of government, the one that is in touch with local needs, will have any meaningful decision making power. Indeed that would be contrary to the philosophy of the government and so it is no surprise.

My own constituency concerns are primarily about fishing at this point. One thing the legislation does is create a reverse onus, the opposite of the current circumstance. This means that right now fishing is always open unless areas are specifically closed.

Bill C-48 will make a marine conservation area a closed area and the department or minister will have to take steps to open it for fishing. This is a comfortable place for bureaucrats, but it is a terrible place for fishermen.

The legislation is very good in appearances. It gives the minister the ability to say she has created marine conservation areas. This supports the international speech made by the Prime Minister in 1996. It probably will not cost the federal government that much because it is easier to create a water park than a land based park. The real cost of the exercise will be the people whose traditional activities have been proven to be sustainable activities over the decades or over the generations. These people will have a tendency to be dispossessed.

We can be almost certain that no cost benefit analysis and no sociological or socioeconomic analysis of the bill has been done by the government. I would guess the government has no idea what the program will cost. In any event it probably does not matter because the government's first order of business will be to offload any management responsibilities on to everyone but itself. After having taken credit for starting what it has brainwashed everyone into believing is the greatest thing, the federal government will point fingers at everyone but itself.

The U.S. has had similar legislation since 1972. It passed the marine protection, research and sanctuaries act at a time when there was a burgeoning global awareness of environmental issues and a real environmental bandwagon. We were all in the same category at that time.

Since 1972 the United States has created 12 national marine sanctuaries. There are five off the east coast, five off the west coast, one in Hawaii and one in American Samoa. The goal in creating these 12 areas has been to protect vital pockets of distinct and threatened ocean in American territorial waters.

The first such sanctuary made in 1975 consisted of less than one square mile off the North Carolina coast surrounding the wreck of the *Monitor* from the Civil War. The others include the world's third largest barrier reef, unique waters off California, and coral reefs.

*Government Orders*

• (1720)

The entire U.S. system of 18,000 square miles of water has an annual budget of \$11.7 million and volunteers are an essential component of making sure its system works. There is a lot of buy-in in the U.S. system.

I do not think our government has thought about the cost in terms of capital outlay, human effort and the cost of people displaced by the system. We have created 29 zones and no realistic budget.

When we look at the problems we have had with our fisheries resource and are continuing to have on both coasts, it is very clear that we are unable to police effectively overfishing, poaching and other associated problems. Right now on the B.C. coast police boats have been taken out of service. Police airplanes have been grounded. They are under tight budgetary constraints.

I was in Owikeno, a native village on the mid-coast of British Columbia. It used to get a once a month visit from the RCMP. It does not get any visits any more unless it is an absolute emergency. The police are concerned about drug interdiction. They have all kinds of concerns. They cannot enforce the Criminal Code on the water any more, and there are very limited resources in other departments. I am very concerned about all of that.

Bill C-48 will not prevent or assist any of this. If the funds are not provided the legislation cannot be effectively put in place. I could say a lot more, but possibly in the question and comment period I will be able to say some of it.

**Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Parks), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the member's comments on Bill C-48. I have a couple of questions based on some of them.

One of his suggestions was that this initiative or the whole idea of marine conservation areas simply began when the Prime Minister made a speech in 1996. Perhaps he may want to explain to the House how this could be an idea that only started in 1996 when the first marine conservation area, Fathom Five, was established in 1988, a full eight years before the time when he claims that this idea came forward.

The hon. member and others who spoke on this matter referred to some sort of diabolical plot by the Minister of Heritage to include this in her portfolio when it should rightfully belong somewhere else. Maybe he could explain why it is that there are already marine conservation areas which are administered by parks and have been administered by parks long before the current minister assumed her particular position. Perhaps he may want to address that point.

Most of all I would like to know how the member can blanketly oppose the legislation, even putting forward an amendment, after voting for a marine conservation area earlier this year at the Saguenay-St. Lawrence.

**Mr. John Duncan:** Madam Speaker, I am opposed to the way in which we have such disparate departments promoting legislation that does not seem to hang together or tie together and which tends to politicize the whole process. I am not blanketly opposing the protection of marine areas.

• (1725)

In terms of talking about dates and when things happen, I remind the parliamentary secretary that in 1957 British Columbia created marine parks. I have been in those marine parks in Montague Harbour on Galiano Island and at Rebecca Spit in my riding. Some of these marine parks actually contain no water, but they protect anchorages and scenic shoreline areas.

There were many activities in the 1960s, the 1970s and the 1980s. Now British Columbia manages—this is the west coast after all—73 provincial parks and recreation areas and 15 ecological reserves with marine components. Parks Canada manages 155 square kilometres of marine waters in Pacific Rim National Park. I spent seven years in that area. I am well aware of the plan to create 3,000 square kilometres of national marine conservation area in the Queen Charlotte Islands.

That is not germane to the exercise. It is not whether we have protected marine areas. It is how we go about it. I am saying the legislation is full of holes. There are lots of concerns. If we are to do it, let us make sure we are locally sensitive and that the people with the most potential to be displaced have the most to say, particularly in the beginning, about how they will either be achieved or even whether it is appropriate to do so.

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question for the member opposite. Would he tell the House which of the 29 areas he or his party do not want to be conservation areas?

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I never indicated that I did not want a marine conservation area in any of the 29 areas. Dividing Canadian waters into 29 slots told me that the federal government must be targeting a minimum of 29 marine conservation areas. When we look at the U.S. experience since the 1970s it has only created 12 areas.

I am questioning whatever rationale went into it, whether or not it was a realistic rationale. I will be happy to identify which of those 29 areas I would not want to see designated as marine conservation areas when the parliamentary secretary tells my caucus which industry he would like to see targeted if the split-run publishing bill is found wanting by WTO.

[Translation]

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in his speech, the member expressed his concern at the overlaps within the federal administration.

Three departments are in fact involved with the same bill. In real life, experience has shown that, when a number of departments are involved, they generally do not readily cohabit, the exercise is costly and the bureaucracy is extremely cumbersome.

I can understand the member's observations, because we can end up with a single area that is zoned in several ways.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member from the Bloc for her question. I was trying to point out that the government has very scarce resources that are already fully allocated. Indeed it is suffering some obvious shortfalls that it had not anticipated in the marine field on the west coast. So I thank the member for pointing this out. Indeed when we have three different departments we have diffused management and it is less effective. We have seen that very clearly in the management of the fishery. When there is one manager we can attempt to manage the fishery. As soon as there are two or more, everything falls apart.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[*English*]

### MILITARY MISSIONS BEYOND CANADIAN BOUNDARIES

The House resumed from June 10 consideration of the motion.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before we begin debate, the Chair has received notice from the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maison-neuve that he is unable to move his motion during private members' hour on Friday, October 30, 1998.

[*Translation*]

As it was not possible to change positions on the list of priorities, I ask the clerk to drop this motion to the bottom of the list.

[*English*]

Private Members' Business will thus be cancelled and the House will continue with the business before it prior to Private Members' Business.

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured indeed to rise to speak in support of my colleague's Motion No. 380. The motion brought forward by the official

### *Private Members' Business*

opposition's chief critic on foreign affairs, the hon. member for Red Deer, asks this House to seek majority support through an official vote in the House before Canadian military personnel are committed to an active military mission outside the country.

All members of the House should support this motion. This is a motion that would strengthen our democracy and make the executive branch of government more accountable to Canadians. This motion attempts to balance the requirements of ruling with the argument of accountability. It is a step forward in redefining responsible government as we enter the 21st century.

It seems only just and right that we should always debate and vote to support our troops before we agree to send them overseas. Our troops can then embark on their mission knowing that a majority of elected representatives from every part of Canada approve and support that mission as they go off to foreign destinations to protect freedom and democracy and defend defenceless people in so many parts of the world.

If passed, this motion will help inform Canadians. This motion will help make the foreign policy process more transparent and therefore more legitimate.

In the foreign policy paper "Canada in the World" the government claims it wants a new and broader process for foreign policy formulation, but when it comes to practising it the government fails.

By making decisions to commit our troops without debate in this House, the government is attempting to prevent itself from being held accountable for the lack of equipment and the poor grade of equipment our troops are asked to use despite year after year defence budget cuts.

Motion No. 380 asks for a debate to take place in the House every time the Liberals want to risk the lives of those who have pledged to die for our country so we can compare the capability of our armed forces to what the Liberals are asking them to do. This House is the very place where Canadians should be consulted. Canadians want the days of secret decision making to be gone.

Take note debate takes place only after a decision to dispatch our troops has already been made by the Prime Minister while on the telephone with another world leader. That is not democratic. It is autocratic and shameful.

Recently in the House we debated military action in Kosovo. Did the Liberal government have any long term plan for dealing with Kosovo? No. Did we simply have a phony emergency debate to affirm the knee-jerk decision made by the Prime Minister?

• (1735)

What plan does the government have to prevent a Kosovo type conflict in the future? What leadership role is this government willing to play to handle such a situation in the future in a better,

*Private Members' Business*

more efficient and visionary manner? The government has the habit of inappropriately addressing various issues, whether taxes, the economy, justice, national unity and so on. The take note debate regarding the Kosovo decision was all the Liberal government allowed members of parliament and Canadians.

In order to deal with such problems there should be two plans. According to plan A diplomatic initiatives should be aggressively pursued at the first signs of a problem. Kosovo was an example of a too little, too late initiative by this Liberal government and other world governments. The government did not pursue plan A aggressively.

When we know plan A has failed we can go to plan B which is military action. That is where Motion No. 380 kicks in. Before we prescribe this bitter medicine Canadians will need answers to many questions. Why are we choosing a military situation over a diplomatic situation? What are the actions the government has taken? What other possible solutions can we pursue? What are the possibilities of finding a long term solution? How are we dealing with the long term persistent hatred in the minds of ethnic people? How much involvement are we asking from the other affected and related countries to deal with an issue that is in their backyards?

Canadians want to know whether we are creating more victims by sending troops. They want to know how far we will go, how much it will cost, who is paying and what share we will pay. Did the government assess the degree of risk before it committed the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces? Do they have enough equipment and facilities? What strategy do we have to deal with the original security situation? We look forward to the answers as do Canadian forces personnel. These decisions are made before we get the answers to these questions from this government. Motion No. 380 would make the information available in a timely fashion before the decision is made.

There have repeatedly been serious situations in the world, in Rwanda, Somalia, Nigeria, Bosnia, Haiti, Iraq, and the list goes on. Such situations will happen again somewhere, someday. We are not prepared to address international conflict situations in their infancies. We should be. We should be able to monitor and perhaps predict when economic, social, cultural, political or other factors are creating conflict in different parts of the world and we should address the conflicts before we have to use costly military force anywhere in the world.

Canadians are proud of their tradition of caring and intervention for the sake of peace but the world cannot continue to merely react to these situations. We have sent many peacekeeping missions around the world. I ask the foreign minister to look into the possibility of peacemaking missions rather than peacekeeping missions.

I cannot understand how we can keep peace when it is not even made yet. How can we keep something that does not exist? Let me give an analogy. When a pressure cooker is heated, steam is

produced. To contain that steam we put pressure on the pressure cooker. Suppressing the steam under weight might cause the whole thing to explode and create another mess. The best thing would be to remove the heat under the pressure cooker. No steam would be produced and we would not have to put any pressure on it.

Why do we always use military pressure to contain the steam of conflict in the world? Have we ever taken action to remove the heat under the pressure cooker? No. Would it not be easier to address the root cause of the problem? Why can we not prevent problems before they happen? That is the key question. Unfortunately this government has not taken this sort of action.

Our peacekeeping forces were stationed in Cypress for 29 years. Still peace was not made when we withdrew. We should focus on peacemaking before peacekeeping.

• (1740)

Conflict resolution is a precursor to peacemaking. Ethnic tensions in many parts of the world can be resolved by equitable, democratic and better governance. Pilferage and smuggling of weapons can be stopped. Child armies can be banned. Foreign aid should be tied to transparency and accountability of recipient governments. Corruption, poverty, illiteracy and education needs can and should be addressed.

The weak Liberal government lacks a proactive leadership role. It is just reactive because it is used to making knee-jerk decisions. Often a humanitarian crisis is the consequence of what is fundamentally a political problem.

For example, in the Palestine and Israel conflict in the Middle East, to help the refugees we committed \$55 million in 1995. But we had already spent more than \$136 million and the refugees were still being produced the day I was there in 1998. We tried to resolve political problems with financial solutions through foreign aid. This was absolutely wrong.

We need to meet these problems head on. We should make educated and democratic decisions. One of the best things to do is debate it in the House before the decision is made. I urge all members of the House to support Motion No. 380.

**Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, speaking about blowing steam, the hon. member for Surrey Central did a great job of it. Unfortunately he has not read very much history of the evolution of peacekeeping in this country, otherwise he would not have undertaken to say the things he has said.

I remind him that Canada's role in support of the United Nations is the most proactive and most forward advance that countries around the world have made. Canada is at the forefront. Canada moved to the forefront again by obtaining a seat on the security council.

*Private Members' Business*

When the hon. member accuses this government of not being proactive in peacekeeping, I suggest he reread his history books.

To speak to the motion more directly, the hon. member for Red Deer has proposed that there be a vote every time there is some deployment of personnel outside this country. I would just like to bring up a little history for the edification of the hon. member for Surrey Central.

In the declaration of war in 1939 the government announced the approval of the address in reply to the speech from the throne which stated the government's decision to support Britain and France would constitute approval of the declaration of war. On September 9 the address was approved without a recorded vote and war was declared the following day. This seems to me one of the most serious undertakings of this country.

When the demand in this modern day and age comes for personnel to go into other countries the call is quite instantaneous. We do not want to do anything to undo that which has been accomplished by the tireless efforts of thousands of courageous Canadian peacekeepers.

In the era we are in, the era of ethnic cleansing, of internal genocide and untold human suffering, it is simply unacceptable to propose that Canada, the world leader in peacekeeping, sit back and debate endlessly while tragedy unfolds.

• (1745 )

To do so would be to relinquish the respect and admiration which Canada has merited as a peacekeeping nation for over 40 years.

This government, which is proud of Canada's peacekeeping tradition and respects the sacrifices of Canadian men and women who have worn the blue beret, does not support this motion.

Most Canadian military deployments in recent decades have been contingents for United Nations peacekeeping operations. But there are other occasions when Canadian forces personnel are called upon to serve on active duty outside Canada.

Our alliance commitments in NATO and NORAD are founded on the promise of immediate action against a threat to any alliance partner. Such promises do not allow for delays and Canada takes these promises extremely seriously.

There are also events such as the Persian Gulf crisis when Canada is asked to play a central role in dealing with threats to international peace and security.

There are times for debate and deliberation over principles. But there are also times when Canada must respond rapidly to meet its commitments and to show its resolve. This is not to say that this government opposes debate. On the contrary, we recognize that

debate is essential, especially when men and women of the Canadian forces are put in harm's way.

Debate on important military issues is crucial and the opinion of this House is highly valued. Since its election by the people of Canada this government has done much to encourage the debate of all Canadian contributions to international peacekeeping operations, both within this House and in the public at large.

Discussion has indeed taken place, not only with regard to specific operations, but with regard to the principles and direction of Canada's peacekeeping policy in general.

It is obvious that no area of policy has been more openly discussed than Canada's contribution to international security. This openness is not only prevalent in this House. Canadians of all walks of life have been given the opportunity to comment on Canada's participation in peacekeeping operations.

As part of a Department of Foreign Affairs initiative to directly involve the Canadian public in our country's foreign policy, ordinary Canadians were invited to give their opinions and comments on Canada's involvement in the UN mission in Haiti.

This was accomplished through an Internet site which allowed private citizens to become more informed on Canada's involvement in international peacekeeping and to offer their own thoughts. The response was extremely positive. The site received over 500 visits and two-thirds of those who responded supported our involvement in Haiti.

We firmly believe that endeavours such as these go a long way toward opening up the foreign policy process to every Canadian much further than the mechanism proposed by this motion.

Given the ability and willingness of the Canadian public to voice their concerns with any peacekeeping operation and the quality of the frequent debate which takes place in this very House, it is clear that this motion is not a step forward. The only possible result would be the undermining of Canada's commitment to international security.

In this era when events unfold rapidly, leaving little time for reaction, a motion such as this is simply not viable. The government recognizes the need for the international community and Canada as one of its leaders to react quickly in times of crisis.

As the Canadian study toward a rapid reaction capability for the United Nations pointed out, the nations of the world must respond quickly. Having urged the international community to react promptly through this study, Canada has a responsibility to lead the way. That is precisely what this government intends to do.

As countless surveys and opinion polls have shown, Canadians support our country's role as the world leader in peacekeeping.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1750)

To suggest that a vote in the House is necessary to ascertain whether or not the Canadian public supports our leadership role is, quite simply, inaccurate.

Canadians support and have confidence in the government's choice to keep Canada at the forefront of international peacekeeping and security efforts.

In a recent study documenting Canadian opinions on foreign and defence policy, 79% of those polled considered peacekeeping important for Canada.

A 1998 study showed that 68% of Canadians want our current commitment to international peace and security to be maintained or increased and a similar number regard peacekeeping as being a very positive source of Canada's international reputation.

Clearly the Canadian people support this country's efforts at peacekeeping and international security. To support this motion one would have to ignore several very important realities of the world around us. First and foremost, events today unfold rapidly and often with tragic consequences. It is important for Canadians, for Canada and for the world to be able to act quickly. Therefore, this motion cannot be supported.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in turn to speak to Motion No. M-380 presented by my Reform colleague, the member for Red Deer.

The aim of this motion is, and I quote:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should seek majority support through an official vote in the House of Commons, prior to committing a significant contingent of Canadian military personnel to an active military mission beyond the boundaries of Canada.

There have, on several occasions, been emergency debates to support, after the fact, a decision to send Canadian troops to take part in peacekeeping missions.

We have noted that the Government of Canada has consulted the various opposition parties about these missions on several occasions, but after the decision was already made. Today's motion calls for one step further.

As we know, the Bloc Quebecois has already spoken on the matter in its dissenting report at the time of the release of the government's foreign policy statement in 1994. The Bloc Quebecois felt that one of the primary roles of Canadian forces on the international scene is to support peacekeeping missions by taking part in them. This is undoubtedly a Canadian talent and a flower, as we put it, in its international reputation.

However, we wanted Canada's future interventions to be subject to more specific criteria, and that is the gist of today's motion. The

motion before us seeks to ensure greater parliamentary control over the participation of Canadian military personnel to peacekeeping missions.

It goes without saying that members from our party are delighted to have this opportunity to discuss proposed changes to the Canadian Forces' activities abroad, during peacekeeping missions. We thank the hon. member for Red Deer for providing us with this opportunity to show the timeliness of our dissenting report.

Motion M-380 is consistent with the concerns expressed by the Bloc Quebecois during the various debates held in the House on this issue. Let me briefly mention the position adopted by our party regarding the issue before us today.

First, we think that the Canadian Forces play a major role on the international scene, and that they must support and actively participate in peacekeeping operations. However, we believe that the criteria used to determine Canada's future participation must be tightened.

As we know, recent peacekeeping missions have experienced problems, and Canada must take note of that. The missions to Rwanda, the former Yugoslavia and Haiti, for instance, have reminded us that we need to base our interventions on democratic legitimacy and rigorous planning.

• (1755)

We also pointed out in our report that:

The costs and complexity of intervention will require a new attitude on the part of the international community. The events in Rwanda and Bosnia are eloquent evidence of this. Canada must learn from the experience of all these peacekeeping missions. In the future, mission objectives and orders will have to be carefully established, under the aegis of the United Nations.

The conflicts to which I just alluded have clearly demonstrated the importance of first defining a more explicit framework for our interventions. The Bloc Quebecois also recognized the need to give the Canadian Forces a special configuration to maintain the credibility of our intervention.

At this stage, I would like to comment on a remark the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs made earlier. He said that, while the motion calls for a vote to be taken in the House of Commons every time Canada is asked to send troops to restore, monitor or maintain peace, this would not be possible and that the urgency of the request would not allow us to summon the House and to make decisions in a timely fashion.

I would just like to tell the parliamentary secretary that the crises he gave as examples, which would require a timely response, never happen overnight. They usually develop over a long time. Canada has a duty not only to act in times of crisis, but also to prepare for crises that, as I just said, do not happen overnight.

At the same time, we believe Canada should review its existing military alliances. Let me quote, once again, from the 1994 dissenting report:

The Bloc Québécois wishes to spell out the direction that Canada should take in this area. First, we think—and we still do—that Canada should rethink its current military alliances with NATO and NORAD so that their strategic missions reflect the UN's needs.

This approach would inject new life into these organizations and would make them more effective in protecting safety and in resolving conflicts. It would also make it possible for Canada to meet its public security objectives, which are crucial to its own domestic security.

In addition, the Bloc Québécois considers that Canada should encourage the setting up of a permanent contingent available to the UN for its peacekeeping missions abroad.

We are talking about thousands of Canadians and Quebecers engaged in peacekeeping and peacemaking missions. Of course, these soldiers being generally sent on a mission for six months or so, there is a rotation. However, since many human lives are at stake, we think the motion by the member for Red Deer should say something about determining the size of the contingent as well as the costs and the objective of the mission. Even though Motion M-380 is silent on these issues, it has the merit of putting the debate in the proper context.

Finally, as we have said many times in previous debates, we think Canada should submit any decision to participate in peacekeeping missions to a vote in the House of Commons, as rapidly as possible, where time allows. I would like to point out that we are being realistic, here.

We are happy to see this proposal being echoed in the motion before us today. Since the Bloc Québécois supports the fundamental principles outlined in this motion, we will vote in favour of it.

• (1800)

In conclusion, I would like to remind the House of the great importance the Bloc Québécois accords to this debate on the democratization of government decisions with respect to foreign affairs.

The globalization of exchanges we are now seeing, whatever their nature, makes the need for control of these activities by the people's elected representatives, and therefore by this House, all the more pressing.

The increased importance of international organizations such as the UN and the European Union, our participation in NORAD and NATO, the globalization of social movements, population movements, human rights issues, problems related to drug trafficking, and environmental abuse, to name just a few factors, all have a direct impact on both global security and on the sovereignty of nations.

### *Private Members' Business*

With this motion, the government has an opportunity to take a first step and meet the challenge of transparency by involving Parliament in decisions about whether to send Canadian military personnel abroad.

[English]

**Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me on behalf of all constituents in the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke to speak to this motion and highlight this government's commitment to enhancing the role of parliament in the consideration of Canadian defence and foreign policy issues.

A similar motion was debated in October 1996. At that time the government noted that any additional steps in the deployment process would seriously undermine Canada's ability to respond rapidly and effectively to international crises. The government's view remains unchanged as the nature of international crises does not make this motion a viable option for Canada.

However, a comprehensive public discussion of any major Canadian forces overseas deployment is a healthy and important activity that must be encouraged. Thus the government has continued its active engagement in consultation with parliament on Canadian forces troop deployments wherever possible and necessary.

Recent history shows us that these are not empty words or vacuous rhetoric that on occasion is the mantra for some members opposite. I am excluding the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore but I could be including the member for Lakeland when I say this.

Earlier this month the House debated the evolving situation in Kosovo and the prospect of Canadian involvement. All parties agreed that this was a serious humanitarian crisis and supported action if no diplomatic solution could be reached. We all agreed that air strikes may be necessary to quell the violence there.

In April of this year the House was consulted on two highly visible international developments. A special joint meeting of the House of Commons defence and foreign affairs committees attended by both ministers came to the unanimous conclusion that Canadian participation in a peacekeeping force to the Central African Republic was necessary. It is worth noting that the peacekeeping force was deployed in record time. Later that month a House debate led to unanimous House approval of continued Canadian participation in the NATO led stabilization force in Bosnia. There are many more examples of the government's commitment to open debate.

In addition to consulting parliament on troop deployments, many major foreign policy issues have been discussed in parliament. The Dayton peace agreement, cruise missile testing, NATO enlargement and NORAD renewal have all received consideration by parliament. Few areas of public policy receive more open discussion than do Canada's contribution to international security.

*Private Members' Business*

Indeed, it has been the policy of this government from the beginning that major defence and foreign policy issues be brought to the House. We have kept our word.

In addition the government called on the House for a comprehensive review of Canadian defence and foreign policies prior to the government reaching decisions on these matters. Parliament's recommendations were highly influential in defining Canadian policy for the 1990s and beyond.

• (1805)

My hon. friend's motion might be interpreted by some to imply that this government's decision on troop deployments rarely if ever involve parliament, that these decisions go against the democratic grain in this country. This is simply not the case.

We should all recall that Mackenzie King, a champion of full parliamentary sovereignty over Canadian policy, called parliament back from recess for an emergency debate on Canadian participation in the second world war. This government also strongly believes in parliamentary involvement. Earlier this year our Prime Minister called upon the House for urgent debate regarding Canadian involvement in the Persian Gulf, regarding Kosovo, and the Central African Republic and SFOR. Mackenzie King's democratic tradition continues.

It is also suggested that this motion will lend parliamentary support, approval and legitimacy to the deployment of Canadian forces abroad, as if these qualities were somehow absent today. The fact of the matter is that parliament is consulted on troop deployments whenever possible and necessary, and that these discussions are taken seriously by the government. The views of this House are taken into consideration when decisions are taken by the government.

And what of the international environment? The new international security environment is unstable. Crucial developments occur at astonishing speeds. It has been suggested that predicting international crises is relatively easy, that nothing comes up overnight.

Collapsing states and ethnic violence are not overnight developments but decisions on multinational intervention are. These actions, be they through the UN or NATO, are not often afforded the luxury of time. In this era of ethnic cleansing, of genocide and of untold human suffering, a few days delay could cost hundreds of thousands of lives. This happened in Rwanda.

Our ability to deploy rapidly has even more significant implications for Canada. Our NATO and NORAD commitments are founded on the promise of immediate action against a threat to any alliance partner. Canada takes these promises extremely seriously. If ever the need to defend our allies arose and our troops remained waiting idly by because of undue delay, our international reputation would be severely damaged. Hence the need for speed.

The international community's pursuit of a fully functional rapid reaction force especially at the UN is well documented. Canada has and will continue to build an important role in the development of such a force.

Canada's 1995 study "Toward a Rapid Reaction Capability for the United Nations" was a highly influential examination of how the UN and individual countries could improve their ability to respond to international crises. This initiative spawned an agreement in principle to develop a rapidly deployable mission headquarters. This headquarters will increase the UN's ability to get operations under way in a far shorter time. Also related to this is the United Nations multinational standby high readiness brigade, or SHIRBRIG, a co-operative effort between Canada and many European states. We hope that this brigade will be available to the UN by January 1999.

To address humanitarian disasters, national defence maintains the innovative Canadian forces disaster assistance response team under the acronym DART, which is not to be misconstrued with another DART, the acronym for Draconian arrant reform truculence. The Canadian forces DART is composed of 180 personnel who can be deployed for humanitarian and disaster relief within 48 hours.

Canada's commitment to developing rapid reaction capabilities is unparalleled. But Canada also tries to lead by example. Our quick contribution to address the recent crisis in the Central African Republic and the deployment of troops and equipment to help Italian regions devastated by mudslides are cases in point.

Our well earned reputation has been won in part by our willingness and our ability to act quickly. We must do nothing that threatens this. In fact we must do the exact opposite. It would not be wise to add any step in the approval process that could hamper our ability to respond. Requiring a vote on the deployment of Canadian forces abroad could in some circumstances impose delay and the cost of such delay would be measured in human suffering.

• (1810)

The record of the last five years shows that where a mission is about to be launched or the government is considering the renewal of an existing commitment, parliament will normally be involved. This can take the form of debate in the House or the appearance of ministers before standing committees.

Matters related to the overseas deployment of Canadian forces personnel are usually brought before this House for debate. I see no sign that the government will stop taking advantage of the opportunities to do so.

It is vitally important that the government retain the ability to act quickly. To limit its ability to do so in the manner proposed in this motion would be incompatible with Canadian values and interests. Given the government's record in consulting parliament regarding

these matters, I also see little practical advantage to be gained by imposing such a requirement.

To support this motion, one would not only have to ignore a well-established and consistent record of consultation, one would have to ignore the reality of the world around us. Events today are unfolding rapidly and often with tragic consequences. Rapid response is necessary.

The now well-established practice of consulting parliament has served this House, this government and Canadians very well. The government will continue to consult parliament on major defence and foreign policy issues.

In the final analysis, the Liberal government's commitment is to be strong. The Liberal government's commitment is to safety. The Liberal government's commitment is to save lives.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have to say it is never really fair to follow the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. He mentioned speed. I know about his love for horses and he knows a lot about speed.

Speaking of speed the member talked about the lives that could be lost if we brought this motion to parliament. The fact is that lives are being lost now, even without this motion. Many lives have been lost in Kosovo, in Asia and other parts of the world because of bureaucratic bungling.

Yesterday in this House the Indian affairs and northern development minister stated "This government must be accountable and transparent". Truer words could not be spoken. The unfortunate part is that this government is not acting on what she said.

There are 301 elected members of parliament in the House of Commons. Probably each and every single riding has military personnel serving in the country, very proudly and very well. It only stands to reason that members elected from those ridings should have a vote or a say on where we deploy these brave men and women around the world.

I wish to digress and mention my family background. My father was in the Dutch resistance during the war, was captured by the Germans and put in a prison camp. He and other members of the camp were rescued by the Canadians. The Canadians valiantly liberated the south of Holland and moved north through the rest of the country.

In 1956 my parents decided to immigrate to Canada. I was eight months old. My father said the only place to move in the world would be to Canada because it had a brave military and absolutely wonderful people. He said it would be a great opportunity for his children to grow up there.

### *Private Members' Business*

Forty years later I stand in this House as a member of parliament. I came from the country of Holland and am now in Canada because my mother and father gave me and my eight brothers and sisters that opportunity. That is what this country has done. This country is based on fundamental democratic policies, policies that this motion reflects.

Our current military is under attack through underutilized resources. The media heavily attacks military concerns.

• (1815)

Everyone here has seen the tapes. Everyone here has read the media articles about our military men and women around the world. The unfortunate part is that those articles do not reflect the true essence of our military today.

In my riding of Sackville—Eastern Shore there is a town called Eastern Passage which has the military base of Shearwater. Shearwater has been there for 80 years, serving this country proud. I might note that 80 years has passed since World War I.

The men and women of Shearwater do an outstanding job. The problem is that they do that job, literally, on a shoestring. They are under attack by their own personal wages, they are under attack by the equipment they have and they are under attack by their deployment. Yet the motto of all military people, especially those in the navy, is "Ready, aye ready".

The previous speaker from the Liberal Party indicated that this motion would risk or delay their capability of being ready. I would like to remind him and all of his colleagues in the Liberal Party that our military stands to be ready at a moment's notice. They are proud people.

The member from the Bloc indicated quite rightly that we are now in a globalized world. There is global uncertainty in other parts of the world. Our forces are traditionally put under UN forces to merge with other western nations to assist nations that are in conflict. Many times members of this House, especially in opposition and even those in the Liberal government, do not really know where the troops are being deployed or whose directions they are following.

All this motion is asking is that all elected members of parliament should at least understand where the troops are going and what they are doing. Members should have a say in that movement. I do not believe for a second that in the event of a crisis the opposition would purposely delay action.

Regardless of the suffering that our military personnel are going through on a domestic level, they do an outstanding job. On November 11 all of us in the country will honour the sacrifices of our military personnel, who are buried in over 60 countries around

*Private Members' Business*

the world. We will remember all of the conflicts which they have encountered.

I will be very proud to lay a wreath in my riding on November 11 on behalf of the people of Canada. Wreaths will be laid by veterans at eight other cenotaphs in my riding on behalf of the people of Canada.

All the Reform Party is asking for in this motion, which I support, is the chance to have a say. We just want to have an opportunity to speak before we send men and women into areas of the world where they may run into conflict. An ill-fated decision which is made too quickly may cause the lives of our military men and women.

In the 1990s military action means more than just the deployment of troops. It is about families. It is about the women and children left behind or the men and children left behind.

We have a right as members of parliament to decide their respective partner's future. I do not believe that it should be just the government that decides. If the government is fully confident in this House of Commons and fully confident in other members of parliament, it would bring it to the House for debate. It could be a very quick debate if need be, but it should be one in which every member of parliament can debate and vote upon the situation. That is all we ask.

In speaking about veterans, the Liberal government talks about the work it has done, yet when it comes to the merchant marines it is very slow to react. We recently had three merchant marines on the steps of Parliament Hill, on a hunger strike, fighting for compensation for something that should have been dealt with right after the war. But this government waited and waited, and it still has not acted.

The fact is that merchant marines also died in the war. They were abandoned by the government after the war and that situation continues today. I pray to God that this government does not abandon them and fulfils its promise to speak with them and deal with their concerns.

• (1820)

If we are to continue to have a proud and honoured military tradition in this country, we need to have an open and transparent debate. That is true democracy. That is why I support the motion put forward by the member for Red Deer.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that an opposition member, with very good intentions, has proposed a motion to this House that is extremely counterproductive, redundant and does not serve the debate, democracy or the country as a whole. It does not serve the country that our armed forces personnel go to. It does not serve humanity. It does not serve any purpose.

On October 7 of this year the House had a debate. Members on all sides had a chance to speak out on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of Canadians. A motion was put before parliament that would allow the House of Commons to give guidance to the government in dealing with a crisis.

At that time the government clearly stated its intention to work in co-operation with the international community, in conjunction with the United Nations, our friends and allies, in order to put a stop to the tragedy in the Balkans.

It is high time that we put partisanship behind us and worked collectively, not only as a parliament, not only as a community and as a nation, but as a world. We live in one world. It is a global village. It is a small world.

If any of us had flown as far above the earth as Bondar did and looked down, we would not have been able to see a border. We would not have been able to see the colour of people or know their religion. We would not have been able to see a town or a city. We would only have seen the world as one unit.

What we have to do as a parliament, as a community and as a country is to promote the kind of feeling that we are all one. We live in one small environment, in one small global community.

We have to put a stop to the horrible things that are taking place around the world. We have to be proactive and vigilant. We have to seek venues, such as the United Nations community and other venues, to establish a mechanism so that we can begin to resolve international disputes and problems through dialogue and discussion rather than resorting to violence, attacks and torture.

The world cannot take it any more. Our resources are evaporating at an incredible rate. One of the most expensive resources on this planet is the human resource and we must protect it. We have done damage to our environment. We have burned forests all over the place. We have eliminated fish stocks from different parts of the ocean. We have created toxic waste all over the place.

Now we have wars all over the place because of borders and other things that may have happened 500, 1,000 or 5,000 years ago.

None of us owns any part of this world. This world belongs to all of us collectively. We are the trustees of this world, as my colleague would say. We have a responsibility collectively to work in harmony to improve the relationship that exists between people.

This government has been a very proactive government.

• (1825)

I would say that the Minister of Foreign Affairs has set an example by getting this country to take the lead on the land mines issue, on the engagement process, trying to engage the other side and trying to enter into dialogue with the other side.

The previous minister of foreign affairs as well as the Department of Foreign Affairs and every officer who works in it have been very proactive in trying to encourage the United Nations to establish a United Nations peace service mechanism, a peace force in order to resolve disputes around the world. We have been very proactive.

I say to my colleagues in opposition, including those in the New Democratic Party, that they should be on board with what this government is doing. They should be supporting what the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Department of Foreign Affairs are trying to do on behalf of all us as public servants to get this country to be proactive.

We are trusted. We are a middle power. We do not have any colonial interests anywhere. We are not interested in annexing territories. We are a peaceful nation. There is confidence in our nation. There is confidence in our people.

We have to use that confidence around the globe in order to promote peace, prosperity and the resolution of problems through the mechanism we have spoken about, dialogue. Let us work together in unity. Let us not use it for a political purpose.

I have been here for almost ten years. It hurts me to see a motion like this trivializing the difficult times of the people in that part of the world who need us. Those on both sides need us. They need us to go in there and create an environment of engagement in that part of the world. The motion says that, in the opinion of this House, the government should seek majority support, through an official vote in the House of Commons, prior to committing a significant contingent of Canadian military personnel to an active military mission beyond the boundaries of Canada.

We are already in that part of the world. We have been in different parts of the world for over 40 years now. We have people who have been engaged pretty well in the vast majority of peacekeeping forces that exist in the different parts of the world.

There is nothing new here. Parliament has consistently been engaged in debate. Parliament has consistently debated issues affecting Canada's presence around the world, the peacekeeping presence around the world, the United Nations presence around the world.

Having a motion like this now is extremely counterproductive and not serving the democratic process the way it should be.

In light of what is taking place at this moment, if I were my colleague I would withdraw this motion and do the honourable thing and endorse what this government and this nation have been doing for the past 50 years or so.

To that extent, what we have to do as a House is say we have not only four walls and the floor and the ceiling but we have a nation. We have to take care of the business of the nation.

### *Adjournment Debate*

When we know the government has already made decisions on issues like this, when we know the government has international obligations, when we know the government has a role to play on the international scene as a member of the United Nations, as a member of NATO and as a member of the international community, we should say collectively that the government is doing the right thing. We should endorse what it is doing.

At the same time, as individual members of parliament we must continue to call on our friends everywhere, in our constituencies and around the globe, to pull aside the valance and come together as one people to start dialogue. This is the only way we can come to a conclusion so that we have a better community, a better nation and a better globe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you very much because you have been a model here and in your constituency. Many members of the armed forces live there. You know firsthand the importance of supporting our armed forces.

• (1830 )

I take offence that members of the opposition sometimes try to undermine the credibility of one of the finest police forces, one of the finest armies and some of the finest personnel around the globe. We have to support them. We have to do everything we can to ensure that they can continue to do their duty, not only in this country but around the world.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. The order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### WATER EXPORTS

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on October 1 of this year I asked a question of the Minister of Foreign Affairs about the export of water from Canada.

Earlier this year Nova Group, a Sault Ste. Marie firm, won a permit from the Ontario government allowing it to export 600

*Adjournment Debate*

million litres of water a year from Lake Superior to certain Asian countries. Not long after, Nova Group saw its permit revoked amidst a national debate on the environmental and international aspects of allowing the export of our freshwater.

In July of this year, two months after the initial permit was given to Nova Group, the Ontario government passed new legislation that banned the bulk export of freshwater, which is a reason for Nova Group's licence having been taken away.

The problem lies in the fact that Nova Group is now approaching the Environmental Appeal Board fighting to reinstate its permit. The environmental minister has already stated that if the provinces agree Ottawa would get involved and do something about the situation. Furthermore, the foreign affairs minister has asked the United States to agree to refer the situation to the international joint committee responsible for boundary waters since the water in question is coming from Lake Superior which borders both countries.

The Ontario environmental minister, having realized the mistake made by giving Nova Group the permit, thinks that the federal government should get involved in this very important issue.

This past weekend the United States Great Lakes Commission, an American environmental group, joined in the efforts against Nova Group. It stated that if we begin letting one company export our freshwater it will turn a trickle into a flood. During the hearings for this case beginning on December 7 of this year, the Great Lakes commission will be officially demonstrating support for the opposition of selling this natural resource. According to the commission this single permit, if it is returned to the Nova Group, would inevitably have a significant impact on the future of North America's freshwater.

Our natural resources are very precious. We need to think of our children and of generations to come. We need to control this very precious resource which is a staple of life and is a very serious problem for all Canadians present and future. The issue of water exports needs to be examined and discussed at the federal government level.

Once again I ask the Minister of Foreign Affairs what is his position on this matter.

**Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government is opposed to bulk water exports.

Let me clarify that there are no bulk ocean tanker shipments of Canadian water taking place now. The company, Nova Group, hoped to export to Asian markets, but the permit issued by the Government of Ontario was revoked. Nova Group has appealed the decision to the Ontario Environmental Appeal Board. That board has set its hearings early in the new year.

Federal officials consulted all provinces on options to deal with bulk freshwater export proposals. Considerable progress has been made in these discussions which were completed late last September.

The government will layout its strategy for a comprehensive approach to water exports before the end of the year, after ministers have had an opportunity to consider the results of these consultations with the provinces.

The U.S. has agreed to a joint reference to the International Joint Commission to investigate the issue of exports from boundary waters.

## ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I first raised this issue during question period on October 5, 1998 and subsequently raised it with the solicitor general on October 19, some two weeks ago.

• (1835)

In the four short minutes I have to express my feelings on such a tragic issue as the totally inadequate funding of our Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the best route I could go is to read from a recent newspaper column I wrote on this very subject. What follows is my weekly column which ran in three dailies and seven weeklies in my huge riding of Prince George—Peace River just last week. This column was entitled "Policing Liberal Priorities":

It's been almost three weeks since it was revealed that a serious "financial crisis" within the RCMP has forced senior Mounties to issue drastic orders. All RCMP boats remain tied up at the docks, all aircraft have been grounded and there is a ban on overtime and all training.

A couple of weeks ago I discussed how this shortage of funds will jeopardize the safety of Canadians, particularly those in rural British Columbia. The Mounties must make up a \$14 million deficit—\$8.5 million of that here in B.C. This has been good news for organized crime—there is no risk of being caught by surveillance boats and aircraft—and bad news for small towns who normally must rely on overtime to provide 24-hour policing.

As safety and security are considered a priority—even a right—in our society, filling this gap in policing is our government's top priority. Right? Apparently not, but it should be. The Solicitor General and the Prime Minister's government have had plenty of time to search the federal coffers for \$14 million to fulfil an obligation to provide Canadians with adequate law enforcement. The trouble is, they are simply not interested.

So where do the Liberal interests and priorities lie? In the past several days, myself and fellow deputy Justice Critic, the member for Langley—Abbotsford, have been able to identify plenty of places in which to scrounge up enough cash to restore the essential services of the RCMP. While there are too many to list here, I've managed to narrow it down to the—

"Top Ten Reasons Why the Liberals Can't Pay for Policing in Canada":

*Adjournment Debate*

10. A \$145 million spending spree designed to tell Canadians that the end of the Millennium is approaching just in case we hadn't heard. That includes \$700,000 to build a replica of a tall ship in service during the War of 1812-14.

9. "Other plans" for spending the \$3.5 billion surplus the government had this year.

8. A \$10,000 grant for the International Conference on Visual Poetry.

7. \$473,000 to reintegrate Malayan soldiers back into their society.

6. \$2 million to promote the use of electrical energy in Brazil.

5. \$15.5 million for the heritage minister's free flag handout.

4. \$120,000 for the Prisoners Support Action Network.

3. \$49,216 for the Prison Art Foundation.

2. A \$14.6 million windfall to the Prime Minister's own Shawinigan riding to replace an armory that the Defence Department originally said they don't need for another seventeen years! What a coincidence—it just happens to be the exact amount needed.

And, the Number One reason why the Liberals can't pay for policing in Canada—

\$1.3 million for the development of a more disease resistant banana in Honduras!

Is it any wonder that Canadians are truly questioning the "screwed-up" priorities of this government? These are just some of the ridiculous places where our tax dollars are spent. Tax dollars are supposed to provide us with basic services such as police protection and the enforcement of laws designed to guarantee a safe and orderly society. In total, my colleague from Langley—Abbotsford offered up \$60 million in questionable funding priorities in a letter to the Solicitor General to help him "find" the \$14 million for the RCMP.

(That) week during Question Period, I informed the House frontline Mounties in Prince George—Peace River (had) told me there will indeed be an increased safety risk to British Columbians, and to the officers themselves, because of these drastic budget cutbacks—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada.

**Mr. Jacques Saada (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will leave the grand-standing and political posturing to my colleague across the floor and concentrate on facts.

The RCMP is a government funded agency. Like all government entities it is expected to live within its established budgets. Decisions concerning the manner in which money is spent by the RCMP are operational questions appropriately left to the professional management of the RCMP. As is the case in several provinces, the RCMP is a provincial police force in British Columbia under contract with the provincial government.

• (1840)

First, as of December 1, 1998, 4,284 of the 4,286 authorized police contract positions in B.C. were filled. That is an average of 99.9%. It is not a bad batting average. Second, there have been no layoffs of RCMP members. Third, overtime is allowed for critical

operational situations. Fourth, RCMP boats and aircraft are being maintained and are available for emergency use.

I would like to quote a letter from the RCMP commanding officer in British Columbia to the RCMP men and women in a division. It indicated that public safety remained its number one priority and would not be compromised.

Let me say as parliamentary secretary that I share the priority of public safety, not politicking the way the members across are doing.

## CANADIAN COAST GUARD

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is always refreshing to hear the Liberal Party talk about public safety. The member for Ottawa Centre actually admitted in the House of Commons that they were responsible for the depletion of the fish stocks. The member said "we destroyed the fish stocks". A Liberal member said that. I wanted to reiterate it for the record.

My question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will be on the coast guard. The parliamentary secretary was in the meeting of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans when we asked the acting commander at that time, Michael Turner, of the coast guard a few pointed questions about the serious cuts and erosion of morale at the coast guard. Referring to the coast guard Mr. Turner said:

We are undergoing a period right now where we're having to re-examine some of our present operations. We are under considerable pressure funding wise, the whole department is. It is true that yes we have transferred a fair amount of money over the last few years from the coast guard to the rest of DFO.

That figure is \$200 million of coast guard money which was sent to DFO. As we all know the DFO does not have a good track record when it comes to handling money. He continued:

There will be some additional changes in the maritimes but I can confirm the \$55 million figure mentioned in yesterday's paper is not correct. Not at all, nowhere near correct. We are simply looking at a few percent that have to be adjusted.

I will speed up the clock a bit. Neil Bellefontaine, regional director of DFO in Atlantic Canada, said that his department was forced to cut its national operating budget by 5% or \$45 million. We are almost there. We are almost reaching the cuts.

After the Swissair disaster off Peggy's Cove the brave men and women of the *Mary Hichens*, the first coast guard ship that arrived, received a letter weeks later from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans indicating how proud he was. I give the minister credit for indicating how proud he and the government were that these people went through their own private little torture chambers after seeing what they saw in the waters that night and throughout the following

*Adjournment Debate*

weeks. However, it is an absolute disgrace that in the same envelope they received from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans was another letter saying that the ship they were on would be tied up and they would be laid off.

We cannot say to these people that they did a great job under horrific circumstances and then turn around in another letter and say they are to be laid off. What a wonderful Christmas present that was. It was a major slap in the face.

The *Daily News*, a great paper in my riding in Nova Scotia, asked a question the other day of their readers saying "Given the importance of the service to the Atlantic region, should the federal government have left the coast guard alone and found the money from another source?" Seventy-one out of seventy-two callers said absolutely yes. The people in Atlantic Canada know the value of a good coast guard.

Who will guard the coast? Who will look after our three coastlines from coast to coast to coast and our inland waters of Lake Winnipeg and the Great Lakes, for example? The cuts to the coast guard have been absolutely devastating. We heard recently here about the cuts to the RCMP. We heard recently about the cuts to the military. Yet government members stand up and say that public safety will not be compromised. It will be compromised.

• (1845)

I would just love for the parliamentary secretary to come back with an answer to those remarks.

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer

the member. I was preoccupied with how wrong the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore was in starting his remarks when he talked about the cause of the decline of the fishery. All along he has been saying it has been the foreign fishery and he comes up with a new line tonight. The member is eventually going to have to get his line straight.

Let me speak directly to the concerns of the member regarding the work of the Canadian Coast Guard. He is apparently under the impression from our session in committee that the coast guard had transferred up to \$200 million to other parts of DFO and that this would impede it from fulfilling its marine safety responsibilities.

In this regard I am very pleased to advise the member that he is quite mistaken. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, who is also responsible for the coast guard, has made it very clear on several occasions that safety at sea is and will remain a top priority of the department. So is conservation. It is the coast guard which provides the vital at-sea capability necessary to meet both these objectives.

As the minister has confirmed on a number of occasions, the coast guard is an arm of government that by its very existence and its visible presence represents the obligations and authority of the nation in our waters, our ports, our territorial seas and our fishing zones. Those opposite need have no fear that the Canadian Coast Guard is about to wither away and disappear.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.46 p.m.)







## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>National Railways</b>	
Mr. Jaffer .....	9585
<b>Parliamentarians on Population and Development</b>	
Ms. Augustine .....	9585
<b>Women's History Month</b>	
Ms. Bennett .....	9585
<b>Space Shuttle Discovery</b>	
Mr. Lunn .....	9585
<b>Theatre Collingwood</b>	
Mr. Bonwick .....	9586
<b>Leader of Bloc Quebecois</b>	
Mr. Discepola .....	9586
<b>Space Shuttle Discovery</b>	
Mr. Obhrai .....	9586
<b>Election Campaign in Quebec</b>	
Mrs. Jennings .....	9586
<b>Quebec Election Campaign</b>	
Mr. Coderre .....	9586
<b>Social Programs</b>	
Mrs. Gagnon .....	9587
<b>Women's History Month</b>	
Mrs. Dockrill .....	9587
<b>Group of Parliamentary Friends of UNESCO</b>	
Mr. Charbonneau .....	9587
<b>St. John's Harbour</b>	
Mr. Doyle .....	9587
<b>Small Businesses</b>	
Mr. Lastewka .....	9588
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>	
Mr. Hilstrom .....	9588
<b>Camille Laurin</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	9588
<b>Railways</b>	
Mr. Dromisky .....	9588
<b>Fred Gillies</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	9588
<b>ORAL QUESTION PERIOD</b>	
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	9589
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9589
Mr. Strahl .....	9589
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9589
Mr. Strahl .....	9589
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9589
Mr. Harris .....	9589
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9590
Mr. Harris .....	9590
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9590
<b>Election Campaign in Quebec</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	9590
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9590

Mr. Duceppe .....	9590
Mr. Duceppe .....	9590
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9590
Mr. Gauthier .....	9590
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9590
Mr. Gauthier .....	9591
Mr. Gauthier .....	9591
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9591
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9591
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ms. McDonough .....	9591
Mr. Vanclief .....	9591
Ms. McDonough .....	9591
Mr. Vanclief .....	9591
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mrs. Wayne .....	9591
Mr. Bertrand .....	9591
Mrs. Wayne .....	9591
Mrs. Wayne .....	9592
Mr. Bertrand .....	9592
Mr. Hanger .....	9592
Mr. Bertrand .....	9592
Mr. Hanger .....	9592
Mr. Bertrand .....	9592
Mr. Bertrand .....	9592
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	9592
Mr. Massé .....	9592
Mr. Duceppe .....	9592
Mr. Massé .....	9593
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Hanger .....	9593
Mr. Bertrand .....	9593
Mr. Hanger .....	9593
Mr. Hanger .....	9593
Mr. Bertrand .....	9593
<b>Quebec Election Campaign</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	9593
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9593
Mr. Gauthier .....	9593
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	9593
<b>Health Canada</b>	
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	9594
Mr. Rock .....	9594
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	9594
Mr. Rock .....	9594
<b>Datura Stramonium</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	9594
Mr. Rock .....	9594
<b>Canada Post Corporation</b>	
Mr. St-Julien .....	9594
Mr. Gagliano .....	9594
<b>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</b>	
Mr. Cadman .....	9594
Mr. Scott (Fredericton) .....	9594
Mr. Forseth .....	9595
Mr. Scott (Fredericton) .....	9595
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Proctor .....	9595

Mr. Vanclief .....	9595
Mr. Solomon .....	9595
Mr. Speller .....	9595
<b>Health Canada</b>	
Mr. Borotsik .....	9595
Mr. Rock .....	9595
Mr. Borotsik .....	9596
Mr. Rock .....	9596
Mr. Rock .....	9596
<b>International Trade</b>	
Ms. Carroll .....	9596
Mr. Speller .....	9596
<b>APEC Inquiry</b>	
Mr. Abbott .....	9596
Mr. Scott (Fredericton) .....	9596
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	9596
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Grewal .....	9596
Mr. Boudria .....	9596
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Request for tabling of documents</b>	
Mr. Hanger .....	9597
Mr. Boudria .....	9597
Mr. Hanger .....	9597
The Deputy Speaker .....	9597

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Marine Conservation Areas Act</b>	
Bill C-48. Second reading .....	9597
Mr. Mark .....	9597
Amendment .....	9598
Mrs. Tremblay .....	9599
Mr. Laliberte .....	9604
Ms. Girard-Bujold .....	9605
Mr. Laliberte .....	9605
Mr. Earle .....	9606
Ms. Alarie .....	9607
Mr. Earle .....	9607

Mr. Keddy .....	9608
Mr. Earle .....	9608
Mr. Bélanger .....	9608
Mr. Earle .....	9608
Mr. Keddy .....	9608
Ms. Alarie .....	9610
Mr. Keddy .....	9610
Mr. Bélanger .....	9610
Mr. Keddy .....	9610
Mr. Caccia .....	9610
Mr. Duncan .....	9612
Mr. Caccia .....	9613
Mr. Bélanger .....	9613
Mr. Caccia .....	9613
Mr. Duncan .....	9613
Mr. Mitchell .....	9616
Mr. Duncan .....	9616
Mr. Bélanger .....	9616
Mr. Duncan .....	9616
Ms. Alarie .....	9616
Mr. Duncan .....	9617

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

##### Military Missions Beyond Canadian Boundaries

Motion .....	9617
Mr. Grewal .....	9617
Mr. Reed .....	9618
Mrs. Debien .....	9620
Mr. Clouthier .....	9621
Mr. Stoffer .....	9623
Mr. Harb .....	9624

#### ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

<b>Water Exports</b>	
Mr. Myers .....	9625
Mr. Reed .....	9626
<b>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</b>	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	9626
Mr. Saada .....	9627
<b>Canadian Coast Guard</b>	
Mr. Stoffer .....	9627
Mr. Easter .....	9628

**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 des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.**