



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 191 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, March 8, 1999

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

Monday, March 8, 1999

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

• (1105)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 11.07 a.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

(Bill C-247. On the Order: Private Members' Business)

February 11, 1999—Resuming consideration at report stage of Bill C-247, an act to amend the Criminal Code (genetic manipulation), as reported by the Standing Committee on Health with an amendment, and of Motion No. 2

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask unanimous consent of the House for the following order:

That the Order for consideration at the report stage of Bill C-247, an act to amend the Criminal Code (genetic manipulation), be discharged and that the said bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health for reconsideration of clause 1.

I believe you would find unanimous consent for this motion.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health have unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to and bill referred to a committee)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we suspend the sitting of the House until noon.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.07 a.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 12 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1200)

[*English*]

FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES ACT

BILL C-55—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill; and 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1250)

[*English*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 327*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Folco
Fontana	Gagliano
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hubbard	Ianno
Ifody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	Mifflin
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood —125	

NAYS

Members

Anders	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bigras
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Duceppe	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guimond
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Laliberte
Lebel	Lefebvre
Loubier	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield	Ménard
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nunziata	Obhrai
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Price	Proctor
Reynolds	Riis
Ritz	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Jacques
Strahl	White (Langley—Abbotsford)—72

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Anderson
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bonwick
Bradshaw	Brien
Byrne	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Dumas
Finlay	Girard-Bujold
Lalonde	Laurin
Lincoln	Longfield
O'Brien (Labrador)	Plamondon
Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from February 10 consideration of Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to say a few words on this group of motions.

Government Orders

The debate coming from certain quarters has puzzled me somewhat. The Reform Party has been very strong in its opposition to this bill. It has been saying that we have no need to protect culture but only to promote it. That is an interesting observation. I do not agree with it but it is a free country and people can hold the views they want.

Today we are debating the 21 amendments proposed by the Reform Party. In my judgment those amendments delete every clause of the bill until nothing much is left. The amendments to methodically delete every trace of the bill seem to reflect the Reform Party's approach to Canadian culture, not in terms of protecting but in terms of promoting. In a very methodical and clinical way these amendments delete, delete, delete until the bill is emasculated.

An hon. member: That is mean.

Mr. Nelson Riis: My friend says it is mean. Fair enough. I am just describing reality.

An hon. member: And inaccurate.

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, my friend says that this is an inaccurate comment. I do not think it is inaccurate at all.

It is clear from the content of this grouping that the essential components of Bill C-55 are being deleted. It is fair to say that if we support the general thrust of Bill C-55, we will oppose these amendments put forward by the Reform Party.

• (1255)

It is also fair to say that in the budget plans put forward by my Reform Party friends, they would also essentially decimate the Department of Canadian Heritage. I stand to be corrected but that is my interpretation.

An hon. member: That would be good.

Mr. Nelson Riis: I was sending up a trial balloon. I could not believe that anyone would want to delete the heritage department.

An hon. member: Absolutely.

Mr. Nelson Riis: The enthusiasm comes loud and clear and emphasizes the point. I thank my Reform Party friends for the firming up of that position. We are good buddies of course, but good buddies can have different views on things. It is important that these positions be clarified.

I am actually dumbfounded. When we think about the struggle this country has. It is dwarfed by our friends to the south, the United States of America, and the synergy of business promotes their cultural industries. It is an incredible force and from day one

it has been a continuous battle on our front as Canadians to stand up to that onslaught.

I look specifically at the film industry. The American film giants have a stranglehold on the theatres across the country. Their control is a reality. Think of our struggling film industry. I am proud to say it is now centred in British Columbia. For a number of years the Canadian film industry was centred in central Canada but in the last few months, the size and the dynamism of the film industry are reflected in British Columbia. We are proud of that. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that we are a lot closer to Hollywood than other parts of Canada, I do not know. Nevertheless, it is a continual struggle.

It has now been clarified beyond any doubt what these amendments do to Bill C-55, so I will conclude my remarks and look forward to addressing the next round of amendments.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, to clarify, the hon. member for Kamloops suggested that the Reform Party would like to decimate the Department of Canadian Heritage. It is absolutely true that we want to cut substantially the waste in the kind of programs administered by the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

We believe that Canadian heritage and our cultural identity can better be protected by Canadians than by bureaucrats and politicians in Ottawa. We believe that free flag giveaways and handouts to interest groups seeking more cash are exactly what is wrong with this government. We think the huge subsidies to bloated crown corporations with their enormous waste and bureaucracy and middle management produce very little in terms of concrete results.

Those things are very low in the priorities of Canadians with respect to public spending. We do not apologize for a moment in saying that tax relief and health care for hard pressed Canadian families come as higher priorities to Canadians than grants and handouts to interest groups through Canadian heritage. We are proud to be in line with the public's priorities in this respect.

I stand today to speak to this latest folly by the Minister of Canadian Heritage. She was a very effective member of the opposition but she really has become something of an embarrassment to the cabinet, the government and I submit, this parliament when it comes to the kind of extremism in policy she promotes.

Bill C-55 is an effort to draw Canada back decades into the era of protectionism, an era when countries looked inward instead of outward, an era that is reflective of the kind of campaign the Minister of Canadian Heritage led against the North American Free Trade Agreement in the 1988 election.

When the Liberal Party sat on the opposition benches, it told Canadians that the free trade agreement would be the end of Canada, that it would be the end of our economic sovereignty and hence the end of our cultural and political sovereignty. I remember

Government Orders

the cries of Chicken Little from the Minister of Canadian Heritage and her colleagues at that time suggesting that to allow free trade between these two great partners, Canada and the United States, would lead to economic disaster. As we all know that has been proven to be completely specious.

● (1300)

The one element driving Canadian economic growth over the past decade overwhelmingly has been our bilateral trade with the United States, a country with which we conduct some 80% of our trade, about \$1 billion in trade a day. Bill C-55 seeks to address one very small element of the huge \$350 billion plus annual exchange between these two countries, the \$400 million magazine advertising market.

I must tell members that since deciding to run and since being elected on June 2, 1997 I have spoken with literally thousands of people in my constituency as well as thousands of others outside my constituency, going door to door, meeting people at town hall meetings, listening to their concerns, speaking on open line radio shows, and I can say that of the thousands of conversations I have had with Canadians not a single one has ever suggested to me that they had the least bit of concern about the sovereignty of the Canadian magazine industry.

I cannot recall a single ordinary Canadian outside the strange and twisted political hothouse of Ottawa and the Liberal caucus who suggested that we need to move decades backwards in economic policy to enshrine protectionism, as in this bill, in order to create restrictions on freedom of speech by penalizing American publications which accept Canadian advertising. Not a single Canadian has said that to me.

I look at the priorities that we face as a country, priorities I hear about every single day from ordinary Canadians. Priorities such as the need to put health care first in our public spending. Priorities such as the need for tax relief for working families. Priorities such as the need to democratize this institution to make Canada a more vibrant and representative democracy. Those are the priorities Canadians are concerned with. When I look at the government's legislative agenda I do not see those priorities addressed anywhere. Instead I see Bill C-55 which deals with an obscure concern of a relatively small interest group of enterprises.

What I have heard from my constituents is outrage that this government is proceeding with this bill. Calgary, which I represent in part, has a large and growing plastics industry. Our American friends, through their trade representative Madam Barshefsky, have indicated that the plastics industry in Canada could be subject to countervailing measures were we to adopt and implement the measures proposed before us in this bill. What would that mean? It

could mean potentially devastating tariffs for the plastics industry and for people who reside in my constituency.

I have not had a single one of my constituents call me to ask for this kind of protectionism. But many have called to say "Please do not let this crazy effort by the minister of heritage destroy our jobs and impair our industry by provoking the Americans into a bilateral trade war".

This bill is plainly and simply irresponsible. The government claims it is necessary. It throws twisted and completely inaccurate statistics to the effect that 80% of magazines on the stand are foreign magazines, implying therefore that the Canadian magazine industry is a marginal part of what is consumed by readers, which is completely irrelevant because 75% of all magazines read in Canada are received by controlled or paid circulation and about 94% of that segment of the market is Canadian owned. That is not an issue.

But even if it were, I submit that it is a question of freedom. I suggest that we need in examining legislation to make reference to first principles. The first principle that I would propose for all government action would be to maximize freedom; namely, liberty. I know it is a dirty word. It sounds like an American word to some of my friends opposite. But I happen to think that liberty is a concept deeply rooted in our parliamentary heritage.

I think Canadians ought to have the freedom, the liberty, to choose which magazines they read, which publications and periodicals they patronize, without having the government decide for them which of those magazines is acceptable and in which format.

● (1305)

It is really the classic 1960s retro, back to the past, protectionistic, inward looking, parochial liberalism which is rearing its ugly head in this bill.

I support the amendments put forward by my colleague from Dauphin—Swan River which seek to delete the various clauses of this bill because I propose that this is an assault on the freedom of Canadians. Why do we not let Canadians decide for themselves what they want to read? If a Canadian wants to order the split-run version of *Sports Illustrated*, why do we not let them buy and read it? Where is the harm in that? What damage is done to the Canadian cultural fabric by allowing people to exercise their free choices in deciding what they will consume in terms of reading materials? I simply cannot grasp the rationale for this bill.

To try to impose government sanctions essentially on those who would consume such materials, what we are doing is not only violating their freedom of expression, we are clearly threatening a significant portion of our economy and our economic growth.

Government Orders

I have heard no compelling response from this government to the very serious threats of our American allies to respond through negative tariffs and countervailing measures if we proceed with this bill as the government now seems to be intent on doing.

I know that this bill is very similar in form and content to similar legislation which was passed in the last parliament but which was found by the World Trade Organization to be contrary to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. What I can say is that Canada as a trading country ought to be a champion of free trade. We ought to clearly abide by the rulings of the World Trade Organization. We ought not to be trying in bills such as this to skirt around the rulings of the WTO and other dispute resolution bodies. By doing so we are impugning our credibility as a trading nation in the community of nations. For that reason I think we are doing even greater international damage to our economic base as a trading and exporting nation.

For all of those reasons I, on behalf of my constituents, will vigorously oppose this bill. Notwithstanding the fact that the government is ramming it through this House with a closure motion today, I will oppose this bill and support the amendments of my colleague from Dauphin—Swan River.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the House earlier today it was not my intent to actually speak to this particular bill. However, I want to react to some of the comments made by the previous speaker.

I actually heard a very impassioned plea concerning his support of the free trade agreement which first came into effect in 1989 and which was expanded to the NAFTA in 1993. He actually pointed out something that is very factual. Canada is indeed an export driven economy. We rely very much on our trade not only with the Americans but throughout the world for our economic prosperity.

He also pointed out the benefits of free trade. Before free trade we had about \$80 billion to \$90 billion worth of trade annually with the Americans. Today, because of the success of free trade, we trade essentially \$240 billion worth of commodities with the Americans on an annual basis.

I agree with the hon. member that free trade was great for this country in terms of our wealth and growth. The amount of substantial growth which we have seen in this country over the last number of years has been largely due to our export driven, resource based economies, while our domestic economy continues to be stifled because our regime is so overly taxed.

In both the FTA and NAFTA we were able to negotiate exemptions for culture. That is something which I believe Canadians fundamentally support.

• (1310)

What is free trade about? It is about the free exchange of commodities. It is also about fair trade. I believe that Canadians want to establish their own environmental standards, their own standards with respect to labour and their own cultural standards.

The Progressive Conservative Party is supporting Bill C-55 because what it represents to us is free trade.

I wish the hon. member had the opportunity to benefit from another history lesson which I will touch upon. During the acid rain debate which culminated in 1987 we had to talk to the Americans about their industries and what they were doing with their sulphur dioxide emissions. They were killing our lakes and rivers. The Americans said that they were not so sure the science was conclusive. We showed them the science. We also showed them that they were hurting their northeastern states as well. We negotiated with Ronald Reagan and George Bush, in a very aggressive fashion, an air quality arrangement so that Canada could protect its rivers and lakes with respect to free trade. We knew it was the right thing to do. Protecting Canadian culture as well is the right thing to do.

The standpoint of the member who just spoke on free trade and who said that it was fundamental to the growth of this country, that if we did not have it we would not be as strong as we are right now, is a little ironic. I also want to point out to the hon. member that in 1988 his party chose to run candidates primarily out west which potentially split our vote and we lost some candidates. By splitting our vote the Reform Party almost sacrificed the free trade agreement. This is an individual who now wants us to unite and come together. It was his party's fundamental economic principles that actually attacked—

An hon. member: Ten years of Brian Mulroney.

Mr. John Herron: Yes, the member mentions Brian Mulroney. He actually just defended the free trade agreement brought in by former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

I also find it ironic that the member is now supporting free trade when his party jeopardized that particular arrangement. He is backing off on picking out a party that now wants us to unite as opposed to not uniting.

The other thing I find a little ironic is that this individual was speaking about protection for the plastics industry. We also know that this individual is not necessarily a strong supporter of the latex industry.

What I want to point out is that Canadians want to be able to establish their own cultural, environmental and labour standards.

Government Orders

We are an exporting nation. Having said that, every time we get into a situation from a trade dispute perspective we cannot necessarily back off for the sake of backing off. We have been assured by the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Minister for International Trade that Bill C-55 is NAFTA friendly and that it will stand up with respect to the mechanisms under NAFTA. That is why the Progressive Conservative Party is supporting it.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a very real pleasure for me to stand in the House today to address the very important Bill C-55. I do so on behalf of the residents of my area of Waterloo—Wellington.

This new measure will ensure that Canadian magazine publishers continue to have access to Canadian advertising revenues by regulating the advertising services supplied by foreign magazine publishers in Canada. It is important to note that this bill is in keeping with Canada's longstanding policy of promoting Canadian culture and that it respects our international trade obligations. We must have Canadian magazines that are vigorous and viable. Unless Canadians stand up for Canadian culture, no one else will.

For 40 years the federal government has supported our domestic magazine publishing industry. That cultural policy has been a clear success. Today there are more than 1,500 magazine titles published in Canada with revenues of over \$1 billion. Eighteen of the top twenty magazines available here are Canadian.

• (1315)

It is important to note at this time that the bill that is being proposed does not affect the content of magazines. Publishers will continue to produce editorial content that they consider attractive to Canadians. It does not affect the price of magazines, for example. Canadians will continue to enjoy access to foreign and domestic magazines that are competitively priced.

The advertising revenues generated through the supply of advertising services are critical for any magazine publisher. Such revenues generate more money than subscriptions or newsstand sales combined. Without this key revenue source, editorial content cannot be created or photos purchased. Canadian magazines simply cannot survive without sufficient advertising revenues.

The government wants to ensure that Canadians continue to have access to their own ideas, stories and information. That is why Bill C-55 is important. It will ensure that Canadian magazine publishers have access to the funds they need to stay healthy and provide an essential vehicle of cultural expression. That is important to note.

The act will prohibit foreign publishers from supplying advertising services directed primarily at the Canadian market to a Canadian advertiser. We do not expect, for example, foreign publishers to respect the will of parliament and not contravene the

legislation. However we need the tools to enforce it if necessary, if in fact those expectations are met.

These tools are flexible and give publishers a chance to comply with the law before more serious penalties are needed. If a foreign publisher is suspected of contravening the law, the minister has the authority to send a letter requiring that the action be halted or to demand the foreign publisher to prove that no offence has taken place. In other words, they can be let off with a warning.

However failure to comply with a letter to stop would mean that the minister could turn to the courts. The court can order the publisher then to stop publishing advertising services or other activities it deems are outside the law.

The bill provides for maximum fines to be levied against foreign publishers found by the courts to have contravened the law. Where an offence is committed by an individual there is a maximum fine as well. The level of fines must be high enough to be an effective deterrent.

This measure deals only with the supply of 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 subscription. The Canadian market will continue to be one of the most open in the world. The act will not apply to foreign publishers now operating in Canada that maintain their current levels of activity. Canadian magazine publishers and Canadian cultural groups support the bill, which is something we should all note.

Canada will defend its rights as a sovereign country to develop measures designed to support our domestic cultural expression. We have negotiated rights in international trade agreements and we will defend those rights.

Bill C-55 does not violate the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Bill C-55 does not violate the NAFTA or any other international trade obligations. It has never been challenged before the WTO or in any other dispute settlement today.

American magazines cross our borders every day and Canadian magazines compete successfully for readers, despite our close proximity and common language. This is because Canadian publishers produce original content for the Canadian market, content which is of interest to Canadians. The bill is about the advertising services market and the massive cost advantages foreign publishers would enjoy.

Finally, the legislation ensures that Canadians continue to have the freedom to express and enjoy a diversity of Canadian ideas, something we should all be proud of. The new law will guarantee that Canadians will continue to have access to magazines which tell their stories to each other in their own voices. It is in keeping with Canada's longstanding cultural policies and will ensure that

Government Orders

Canadian magazine publishers have access to the funds they need to do so.

I urge all members of the House to work for a speedy passage of Bill C-55. It is certainly something Canadians want, deserve and expect. We need to move expeditiously on it.

• (1320)

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the amendments to Bill C-55 brought forth by the member for Dauphin—Swan River. I support these amendments because I oppose the bill for three good reasons.

The first is that on this issue the government and the heritage minister are wrong. In fact they are breaking our trade agreements. The United States in this case has every right to bring action against Canada if the legislation should proceed and be put into law. Canada is wrong in this case. The heritage minister is wrong and the government is wrong. The United States would be completely justified in doing that. That brings with it some very serious problems.

The first problem is that it would do an awful lot of damage to businesses and to workers in this country. We do not know exactly where the Americans would choose to hit. I will talk a bit about that in just a couple of minutes.

The second reason I oppose the bill is that it is not supported by Canadians. The very basic question is who supports the bill or the legislation. When we ask that question we realize it is an awfully short list. It pretty much boils down to a list of large publishing companies. That is who supports the legislation. It is not supported by most Canadians. It is not even in the top 10 list of what Canadians feel are important issues to them right now.

We know that health care is at the top of the top 10 list as is tax fairness for families. Why are we not debating legislation that would deal in a proper and meaningful way with either of those issues? We would support those issues and legislation that would make things better in those areas, but we cannot support the legislation. It just is not supported by Canadians for several reasons, but I think the main reason is that they recognize the harm that would be done to businesses and the number of jobs that would be killed in this country should the bill proceed.

Both major economic houses in the United States government have come out and very clearly said "If you pass this bill, if it becomes law, we will take action against Canadian industry, Canadian businesses", and that will have an impact on Canadian workers.

We have a real problem with the legislation. Members of the Reform Party are not willing to allow a piece of legislation to pass

which is wrong, which is not supported by Canadians, and which is a real threat to the jobs of Canadian people.

Members of parliament in the House who support the bill and do not support the amendments will have a lot of answering to do to the people in their constituencies and across the country when some of them lose their jobs because of action taken by the Americans, action which is proper, action which the Americans are completely justified to take under our trade deal.

I have a big problem with the bill. I have a problem with the heritage minister bringing forth the legislation. I will continue to oppose the legislation, no matter what squealing there is across the floor, and there is plenty of it right now.

I could talk about the steel industry, one industry the Americans have indicated they might target. The heritage minister is from Hamilton, the steel city. I could take the attitude that if action were taken against steel workers and it hurt that minister, why should I feel bad about it? In fact I would feel bad about it because we are talking about real people and real jobs.

Even to get at the heritage minister, to make her wear the shame that she should wear for bringing forth the legislation, I am not willing to sacrifice the workers of this country. It would be a real shame and wrong if steel workers end up suffering for the actions of the heritage minister and the government in the bill. I cannot support it for that reason.

• (1325)

I want to talk about the people back home. I am a farmer and many of the people in my constituency are farmers. Most people in the House from all parties understand the very serious situation that farmers are in right now. Most of the harm and difficulties they are facing right now are not of their own making. Farmers, above people in any other industry, have done what they should have done to be able to deal with a downturn in their industry, but what they did not count on were unfair trade practices being aimed at them.

That is what is killing their businesses and driving their commodity prices down more than anything else. It is unfair trade practices in Europe. Because of these unfair trade practices in Europe the United States has put in unfair subsidies to counter them. We also see unfair import restrictions into Asian countries such as Korea and Japan. Those too are causing severe harm to our farmers.

In my area probably 25% of hog farmers will go broke. They either have gone out of business in the past three months and will in the next six months. Over that nine month period 25% of hog farmers will be out of business. Very little of the reason is of their own making. Much of the reason is due to unfair trade on the part of other countries.

Government Orders

It is the same situation for alfalfa producers. Subsidies in Spain, for example, are higher than the price that our alfalfa producers receive for their commodity. That cannot be right. That is wrong and it is unfair. These unfair trade practices have to end.

For grain farmers in western Canada prices have been hit dramatically due to unfair trade practices in other countries. That is the reason. It is not poor management. It is not the inability to market their commodities well. It is not that at all. It is unfair trade practices.

Just imagine that we add to the existing problems of our farmers action taken by the Americans due to this ridiculous piece of legislation the heritage minister is bringing forth. It seems like everyone in the Liberal government, in that caucus, is willing to support it.

I am bitterly disappointed that members of the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party will support this piece of legislation. They are willing by supporting the bill to see our farmers suffer even more than they already have through reduced commodity prices and through borders being shut off. They are willing to see that suffering for a piece of legislation which will help very few people. Most of the people it would help are large publishers that do not need the help, quite frankly.

I do not understand the minister's idea that Canadian publishers cannot do well in an open and free trading environment. I have more confidence in them than that. They have done well and they will continue to do well. They do not need this piece of legislation. If they did need it and if it were unfair, if it went against the trade deal, I still could not support it. They would have to find a way of working through it.

It makes it that much easier to oppose the bill and to support the amendments knowing that in fact they are not needed. They will not help, quite frankly. Those who support the bill are saying with their vote that they are willing to see steelworkers, people from other industries and farmers who have already been hit so hard by unfair trade take another hit. I cannot allow that to happen.

Every member here had better consider the answering they will have to do to their people back home should they support the bill and their people become the ones targeted by the American trade action.

• (1330)

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to enter the debate on Bill C-55.

I will respond to some of the comments from the other side of the House. We heard a comment about dictatorship. This bill is about safeguarding Canadian magazines and it is about safeguard-

ing our culture. I am amazed at how the official opposition, standing alone, is once again trying to cave in to the Americans.

In a *National Post* article the House leader for the Reform Party talked about rolling over. It seems to me that any rolling over is being done by the Reform Party. As soon as the Americans threaten something, the Reform Party wants to say "We surrender. Canadian culture is not important and the Canadian magazine industry is not important".

If Reform members are the Gingriches or the Livingstons of the north, and they look to Ross Perot as an inspiration, then I can understand why some of their reasoning comes forward in the way they expound it.

In terms of the great united alternative conference, the Reform Party declared no confidence in itself. No confidence. The opposition party declared no confidence in itself. And it is finding out that the Conservative Party does not want to join in its effort to unite the right, to unite the party that wants to roll over.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member opposite is straying a long way from the subject. Because you have not taken him to correction, I assume you are now giving permission to following speakers to speak on any subject they want on this bill.

The Deputy Speaker: I thought the hon. member was talking earlier in his remarks in relation to the position of the opposition on this bill. He was using the expression "rolling over" which he just used so I assume there is a connection here that is going to become manifest in a moment. Since he used the same expression, I had not thought of interrupting.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the party opposite being upset when we talk about what it means to protect and promote culture in Canada. There is no country in the world that faces the kind of challenges we face in Canada—

An hon. member: I guess not. They are not underneath a Liberal dictatorship.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I can only ask the opposition members to quiet down a bit. Once their time comes to speak, we will all listen to them with great interest.

There is no country in the world that has the unique challenges Canada has. This bill speaks to that. That is why most of the parties in the House, with the exception of one, are supporting it.

• (1335)

For many years Canada has maintained a policy designed to provide Canadians with distinctive vehicles for cultural expression. These measures have balanced the need to maintain a Canadian presence on our own screens, in books, music and magazines while welcoming foreign cultural products.

Government Orders

Today and possibly always we will be faced with a fundamental challenge in our cultural relations with the United States. Culture is the voice that defines us as a nation. It is our heritage. It is who we are. The U.S. sees culture as an entertainment commodity with a bottom line. It is constantly trying to increase its market share across the globe.

Unlike the Reform Party, the Liberal Party does not believe that our culture is for sale. I will repeat that. Unlike the Reform Party, we do not believe in selling out our culture and we do not believe in rolling over. Because of this essential difference, we never play on the same field. We and other smaller countries must insist on making our own policies that maintain our cultural existence.

That said and despite our differences, the U.S. and Canada are neighbours, friends and each other's best trading partner. Given the vast amount of trade in goods and services which move freely across our borders, only a small percentage are subject to occasional disputes. When trade irritants do arise, the two sides have traditionally sought to resolve their differences through bilateral dialogue or if necessary, by resorting to the dispute settlement provisions in trade agreements. It is not rolling over.

Canada will defend its rights as a sovereign country to develop measures designed to support our domestic cultural expression. We have negotiated rights in international trade agreements and we will defend these rights.

Bill C-55 ensures that Canadian magazine publishers have fair access to Canadian advertising services revenues. Without these revenues, they would be unable to provide readers with the broad range of Canadian publications currently available.

Bill C-55 does not violate the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Bill C-55 does not violate the NAFTA or our other international trade obligations. It has never been challenged before the WTO or any other dispute settlement body.

Bill C-55 does not impose additional restrictions on Canadian advertisers. They will continue to enjoy the same opportunities they have always had, including access to international markets via foreign magazines.

The bill does not place restrictions on the content of magazines or of individual advertisements, or limit Canadians' access to foreign magazines.

Bill C-55 does not limit competition in the Canadian magazine industry. In fact, Bill C-55 ensures the economic viability of the Canadian magazine industry and the preservation of over 7,000 jobs for Canadian writers, artists, photographers, editors and art directors.

U.S. magazines cross our border every day and Canadian magazines compete successfully for readers, despite our close proximity and common language. This is because Canadian pub-

lishers produce original content for the Canadian market, content which is of interest to Canadians. This bill is about the advertising services market and the massive cost advantages foreign publishers would enjoy.

The legislation ensures that Canadians continue to have the freedom to express and enjoy a diversity of Canadian ideas.

The main rationale why this House with the exception of the Reform Party is in support of this legislation is that the majority of parties in this House believe that Canadian culture is worth fighting for and that Canadian culture is worth preserving.

• (1340)

We have to be able to tell the story. We have to be able to tell the Canadian story from a Canadian perspective from coast to coast to coast. It will do us precious little good if we have to hear what this country is about from Hollywood and the United States. That is why we are fighting to preserve Canadian culture. As long as this party is in government, we will continue to do so.

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to sit in the House today and watch Liberal member after Liberal member stand and read a speech prepared for them by the office of the heritage minister. One thing that comes clear in listening to their speeches is that they do not understand what is at the very root of Bill C-55.

The fact is this is a very profound infringement on the freedoms of Canadian business. This government is taking one more huge step of intrusion into the freedom of choice that Canadian businesses have with respect to where to place their advertising dollars in this country.

After this bill is passed, Canadian businesses will not be permitted to place advertising for Canadian readers in the media area of their choice. That is what Bill C-55 is doing. It is saying that a Canadian free enterpriser, an entrepreneur, a business, whether selling goods or a service, cannot advertise in the Canadian split-run side of an American owned publishing company. They cannot target Canadian consumers or a potential market of their product in a split-run Canadian edition of an American publisher. That is what this bill is saying.

We in the official opposition came to the House in 1993. Time after time after time we have seen this government intrude further and further into the lives of Canadians, their family lives and business lives. What is it about this government that thinks it should be in control of everything in this country? Where are the individual freedoms of Canadians? Where are the individual freedoms of Canadian business?

The government is saying there will be freedoms of expression and choice in this country under this Liberal government, but there never will be freedom of choice under this Liberal government.

Government Orders

That is what it is all about. It is about dictatorship in the strongest form. I cannot believe it. What happened to democracy? What happened to freedom of choice in this country? It is a joke.

The member said the Liberal government shall be the protector of Canadian culture, the protector of Canadianism. Let me give three examples of how the Liberals protect Canadianism.

This is the government that threatened Canadians with fines and/or imprisonment if they dared to put on the census form that they were Canadian. This is the very government that would not allow a Canadian citizen when asked what heritage they were to put the word Canadian. People were threatened with criminal fines and sanctions. Is that the great protector of Canadianism? The Liberals are a little silent now.

This same government has so little faith in the patriotism of Canadians that it spent \$20 million of taxpayers' dollars to buy Canadian flags to give away free in an attempt to buy patriotism from the Canadian people. The Liberals have so little faith in the patriotism of Canadians that they thought they better give away some free Canadian flags at a cost of \$20 million of taxpayers' money.

What kind of confidence in Canadianism is that from this Liberal government that now stands up as the great protector of Canadianism in this country? It is a hypocritical position for them to take in the strongest form.

• (1345)

This one is really the biggest joke of all. This Liberal government, these great protectors of Canadian culture and heritage—

Mr. Wayne Easter: Absolutely, protectors of Canadian culture. That's right.

Mr. Dick Harris: This is the same Liberal government, the same protectors of Canadian culture and heritage, that thought it would be a good idea to sell the rights to the RCMP logo to Disneyland.

An hon. member: Goofy of the north. That's what you boys are.

Mr. Dick Harris: The proud heritage of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, their logo, their traditions which have been with this country for decades, which we are all proud of as Canadians, this Liberal government, these great protectors of Canadian culture and heritage, thought it would be a good idea to exploit that Canadian tradition, that Canadian heritage, for a few American dollars.

How hypocritical can they get? They stand today to call themselves the great protectors of Canadian culture. They are so quiet

over there now. I think they are embarrassed. They have been caught like a rat in their own trap.

This is about profound intrusion into the rights and freedoms of Canadians. That is this government's version of how to run this country: get its fingers into everything that goes on in this country through regulations, restrictions, sanctions, impositions or whatever it can do to control every single person to do its will or to do things its way. That is the mandate of this government. It has been since Liberal hero Pierre Trudeau came on the scene. Unfortunately he is still obviously having an influence on this government.

Members of the Liberal government are these great protectors of Canadian democracy. They should be called the great intruders.

With this bill Liberals are like people walking blindfolded into a den of snakes. The heritage minister has set herself up as the czar of Canadian publishing, the czar of the industry. She thinks that she can unilaterally put this restriction on and the Americans will just roll over and play dead. Does the minister not realize for one minute the implications of what she is trying to do? Mr. Speaker, you do not play baseball with a little tennis racket when you are playing against an American team. You have to go in with a position of strength.

The minister has just put Canada in a very tenuous position. Do we think the Americans are going to roll over and play dead because of the minister's little whim? There is not a hope. We are going to see retaliation.

Perhaps the Americans should start with the plastics industry which comes right out of the riding of the Minister for International Trade. That would be a good place for the Americans to start, and they have suggested it. Perhaps they should start with the steel industry which comes right out of the riding of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. That would be a good place to start. It is going to happen. Liberals are walking blindly into this predicament in which they are going to find themselves on the short end of the stick if they keep going down this path.

It is a sad day in Canada. It is going to be a sad day for Canadian manufacturers who are going to find, no doubt, sanctions against their products entering the U.S. Most of all, I think it is really a sad day for the freedoms of this country, the freedoms for which we fought two world wars to protect to ensure that this country would be a country where if we worked hard, if we were diligent, if we were prudent in our decisions, we could succeed. But we have a government come along and say "That was just a myth. As a matter of fact, the way we do things here under a Liberal government is the way we say it should be done".

• (1350)

When I heard about this bill the first thing that crossed my mind was how many in this Liberal government bought shares in the big Canadian publishing firms. Is that the real reason? Does the

minister of heritage have a bunch of shares in Maclean Hunter or Rogers Communications or Time Warner? Is that the reason? Maybe it is a personal monetary thing. Maybe there is going to be a big payoff. One usually finds that when people do very irrational and dictatorial things somewhere down the paper trail one finds a dollar amount attached to it.

One has to assume that there are two reasons for this: either there are a bunch of shares owned by this government, by these caucus members, in Canadian publishers, or the Canadian publishers are and are going to become very big contributors to the Liberal Party of Canada. It is a joke.

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

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Dick Harris: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was very remiss in my presentation. The information given to me regarding the census forms and the fines that could be imposed if one wrote Canadian was given to me by the member for Okanagan—Shuswap.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid that is not a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the observations of my colleagues opposite on this very important bill.

As they spoke, I realized that either they did not really understand what they were talking about or there was some ill will on the other side.

For example, when one of our colleagues opposite says that the United States, our neighbours to the south, would be entitled, if the bill passed, to—

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret interrupting my good friend's presentation, as I am looking forward to hearing it, but when he refers to the members across the way he mentions presumably a certain party across the way. I think he should clarify that in this crucial debate.

[Translation]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys is absolutely correct. My comments were directed to the Reform Party members, not to the other parties in opposition. My apologies.

With the exception of the Reform Party, everyone understands the importance of this bill and is prepared to support it.

S. O. 31

Getting back to the Reform members, who claim the Americans would be entitled to all sorts of reprisals against Canada, this is absolutely false. If they bothered to check, to read NAFTA or the agreements between us and the World Trade Organization, they would realize that the U.S. has no more right than any other country that is a party to these agreements to seek reprisals with impunity. They must adhere to certain prescribed standards.

If the Americans decide to go outside the rules they themselves have agreed to, that is a whole other story. Once again, this situation gives an insight into the mentality of the official opposition, for when the Americans bark, the Reform hides out, of fear for their bite.

We have heard a number of Reform members claim that there would be reprisals in the area of agriculture. Unfortunately, they tend to forget that, yes, it is true that agriculture is an essential sector of our economy, one that is vital to the well-being of our nation and its people. No one can deny that fact, but it is also true that culture is of equal importance. One provides food for the body and the other for the spirit. Unfortunately, they tend to neglect the second aspect all too often.

I realize—

The Speaker: I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary. He will have seven minutes to finish his speech, after Oral Question Period.

[English]

I understand there is an agreement in the House that there will be statements about the Canada Games. We will begin with the hon. member for Malpeque.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1355)

[English]

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that the closing ceremonies of the 1999 Canada Winter Games took place in Corner Brook, Newfoundland on Saturday, March 6, 1999.

Each games is a celebration shaped by the vision of the host community and animated by the thrill of competition and the pride of athletes seeking to achieve their personal best. The experience changes the lives of thousands of young athletes and the life of the host city and surrounding region.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the 3,200 athletes and over 600 coaches and managers from all across Canada who

S. O. 31

participated in 21 sports at the games in Corner Brook. I would also like to congratulate the organizing committee and the 7,000 volunteers who made the 1999 Canada Winter Games a very special event and a tremendous success.

I know that all hon. members and Canadians everywhere join me in congratulating the host society, the community of Corner Brook, which had wonderful hospitality, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador for one wonderful, fine time.

* * *

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this weekend saw the conclusion of the 1999 Canada Winter Games in Corner Brook, Newfoundland.

The two week event saw 3,800 athletes from across the country competing in 21 different sports. It is a true pleasure to see young athletes come together in the name of sportsmanship and competition, and to have the opportunity to meet fellow athletes from different provinces and territories. The goodwill that is created by people from all parts of this vast nation coming together is immeasurable.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the athletes, organizers, volunteers and the people of Corner Brook, Newfoundland for a job well done.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois congratulates the residents of Corner Brook, Newfoundland, on the warm and well-organized welcome they extended to the 350 athletes and those accompanying them who descended on their city for the Canada Games. One quarter of the city's 26,000 inhabitants served as volunteers. Bravo to all of them for their role in the games' success.

The Canada Games Council took the opportunity to pay tribute to the dedication of Claude Hardy, who has been working with young people for 30 years and who chairs Quebec's delegation to the Canada Games. An award was even named after him.

Ontario won the most medals, with 116, just eight more than Quebec. The Bloc Québécois congratulates athletes from Quebec and from all of Canada on their performance.

This being international women's day, it is interesting to note that women outnumbered men in Quebec's delegation. We congratulate all the athletes and those accompanying them on their commitment, and the residents of Corner Brook on their hospitality.

[English]

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of New Democrats in the House of Commons I would like to congratulate the people of Newfoundland, and especially the residents of Corner Brook with its 7,000 enthusiastic volunteers who dedicated their time, energy and talent to support the young athletes who came from coast to coast to coast representing Canada's very best, including young Patrick Snider who received a Bronze Medal for épée fencing.

Canadians are truly proud of these young athletes, their sportsmanship, their professionalism and their achievements. It was truly moving to see these young future Olympians in competition. We wish them all well.

* * *

CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus I am pleased to extend congratulations to the participants and organizers of the 1999 Canada Winter Games in Corner Brook, Newfoundland. We applaud and echo the declaration of the chairman of the Canada Games Council that these truly were the best games ever.

I am particularly proud of the record performances delivered by the young men and women of my home province. My province captured a total of 19 medals, far exceeding the previous record, and was awarded the Jack Pelech Award as the province displaying the most sportsmanship and spirit. All of our athletes and our teams performed well.

I would particularly thank Newfoundland's chef de mission at the games, a good friend of mine, Mr. Jimmy Tee, for his tremendous contribution and leadership.

The games in Corner Brook were such a huge success because of the hard work of the organizers and more than 7,000 volunteers.

We would also like to acknowledge the participation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly the Premier and the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture for their contributions and support. As well we want to commend the Government of Canada for being a major supporter of the Canada Winter Games.

• (1400)

To all the athletes, coaches, organizers, volunteers and the people of Corner Brook, we extend a very sincere thank you and congratulations on a job well done. They have made us all very proud.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an historic evening in Quebec. It marked the first “Cinéma d’ici” gala.

It was a unique and emotion-filled event at which tribute was paid to numerous writers, actors and actresses for the talent and unstinting commitment to quality that characterizes their work.

Film is very much a part of our culture. Without it, society has no soul and would be without a vital means of proclaiming its existence to other nations.

Quebec’s film industry is active and draws on considerable talent. It is up to us, the public, to seek it out, to appreciate it and to challenge it so that it can more easily make the transition from within Quebec’s borders to the international stage.

Once again, bravo to all the participants and best wishes for what promises to be an increasingly successful future for this cultural industry.

* * *

[English]

AFRICA

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, increasing instability is affecting wide swathes of Africa, threatening thousands of innocent civilians.

In Angola a precarious peace has been shattered and the conflict is escalating daily. Land mines are being laid, UN planes shot down, and thousands face starvation as a result of cancelled peacekeeping operations. Despite UN sanctions, UNITA rebels are arming with the proceeds of millions of dollars of illegal diamonds. The federal government must work with our partners to stop the fuelling of this conflict.

In Zimbabwe, President Mugabe has been silencing all opposition. Journalists have been jailed and tortured. Zimbabwe support for the war in the Democratic Republic of Congo seeks to sink the country. Mr. Mugabe’s is also poised to threaten to privatize 530 farms, which will severely compromise the ability of that country to earn revenues.

I implore the Minister of Foreign Affairs to work within the UN to stop Mr. Mugabe from engaging in disastrous economic policies.

* * *

[Translation]

PUVIRNITUQ CO-OP HOTEL

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the official opening, on March 6, 1999, of the hotel of

the Puvirnituk co-op marked the beginning of a new era in tourism development for the community of Puvirnituk and Nunavik’s Hudson Bay coastal region.

The convention centre, located in a warm environment, provides all the necessary services for business meetings, receptions or tourist activities.

Puvirnituk is located 1,144.5 kilometres north of Montreal, along on the east coast of Canada’s Hudson Bay. Air Inuit has regular weekday flights between Montreal and the community.

The co-chairs, Peter Ittukadlak, from Puvirnituk’s co-op association, and Wellie Ittok, from the Fédération des coopératives du Nouveau-Québec, wish to thank Aboriginal Business Canada, Industry Canada and Tourisme Québec for their involvement in this new “Inuit Adventures” tourist project.

Together, we share the common goal of making Puvirnituk an increasingly popular international destination for tourism, culture and adventures.

* * *

[English]

SUDAN

Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the team of women and men led by Baroness Caroline Cox, president of Christian Solidarity Worldwide of the United Kingdom. Reverend Cal Bombay from Crossroads Christian Communications has travelled with these delegations in his tireless efforts to free the slaves of Sudan.

On February 15, 1999, on a six day mission they successfully assisted in securing the freedom of another 325 slaves and facilitated arrangements for the return and redemption of 309 others, making this a total of 634. This group, the majority of them children, ranged in age from two to forty-two, some having been taken as slaves since 1994. A previous trip in 1998 enabled them to purchase the freedom of approximately 500 more slaves.

Christian Solidarity Worldwide calls on the international community to step up pressure on the NIF regime to desist from military offensives against innocent civilians and from its policies of abduction of women and children into slavery, looting, and the destruction of means of subsistence.

* * *

COMMONWEALTH DAY

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Commonwealth Day, a day set aside by over one-quarter of the world’s population to celebrate the values of co-operation, human rights, democracy and development. The theme for this

S. O. 31

year's Commonwealth Day is music, the universal language to help us foster international learning and understanding.

The Commonwealth is a dynamic association of thousands of Commonwealth citizens active in international voluntary, professional, developmental and service organizations which constitute an important force in building international co-operation and understanding.

• (1405)

This Commonwealth Day is special as it marks the golden jubilee of the creation of the Commonwealth. As we look back over the past 50 years Canadians can take pride in our collective accomplishments. During the past year Canada continued to play an active role in Commonwealth fora, discussing and responding to urgent issues ranging from Nigeria and Sierra Leon to a global financial crisis.

The Commonwealth has proven itself an effective defender and promoter of democracy, human rights and sustainable development. Let us all work to protect this legacy throughout the world.

* * *

COMMONWEALTH DAY

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Commonwealth Day. In 1949, the second Monday in March was chosen to be the day when member countries around the world observe their association as Commonwealth members.

This year's theme for Commonwealth Day is music. Music is a unifying force that binds us together as citizens of the global community. The rich variety of music is as diverse as the Commonwealth itself. The Commonwealth includes over a quarter of the world's population, spanning differences in race, creed and language in 54 countries.

Yesterday I was privileged to attend the Royal Commonwealth Society celebration in Toronto and was impressed by the musical performances of our young people and their ability to communicate through music.

Our future is assured as young people around the world participate in musical activities and share in these international fora. Happy Commonwealth Day to all.

* * *

THE LATE JOE DIMAGGIO

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from time to time an individual comes along who people admire all around the world, a person who embodies class, hard work, dignity and dedication, a person who is a role model for millions.

Such a person was Joe DiMaggio who died this morning at age 84. Joltin Joe led his beloved Yankees to nine world series titles in 13 years.

Canadians can see a similarity to some of our own heroes like Jean Béliveau and Gordie Howe. The Yankee Clipper, like Howe and Belliveau, starred in another era but his name and reputation are legendary.

Long before the Blue Jays or the Expos, the Yankees and Joe DiMaggio were loved by millions of Americans and Canadians. America has lost a true hero and we finally know the answer to that musical question "Where have you gone, Joe DiMaggio". He has gone to rest. May he rest in peace.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, since 1996 the government has been posturing on changes to the toothless 15 year old Young Offenders Act, the act that allows youth who commit violent crimes including murder and aggravated assault to get away with it.

Last May the justice minister released a discussion paper, a strategy for renewal of youth justice, and at the same time promised Canadians a new youth criminal justice act by the fall of 1998.

Fall came and went and now we are two months short of the first anniversary of the minister's discussion paper. Lo and behold we hear that a new youth criminal justice act will be tabled on Thursday.

In typical Liberal orchestration the new act will not be a universal code of conduct. Rather, it will allow opting out by those provinces that feel these darling young offenders are simply misunderstood. Those provinces and indeed most Canadians that wanted to lower the minimum age of young offenders from 10 to 12 will also be disappointed.

It is regrettable that after a decade of debate we will not get a universal code. On Thursday the window of opportunity closes for another decade. The government is afraid to stigmatize young offenders at the expense and safety of our communities.

* * *

[Translation]

WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS

Ms. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1921, Agnes Campbell MacPhail became the first woman elected to the House of Commons. She was the only woman in the House; the 234 other members were men.

Sixty-seven years later, in 1988, when I was elected for the first time, there were 39 women out of 295 members of parliament, or a measly 13% of the overall membership.

Today, there are 60 women out of 301 parliamentarians, which means 20% of this House's membership. This is definitely an improvement, but we still have a long way to go.

According to an inter-parliamentary union study, Canada ranks 20th in the world when it comes to women's representation in parliaments. Compared to Scandinavian countries, this is a disaster.

I wonder when the House of Commons will be representative of the overall population, that is when men will make up 49% of its membership and women 51%.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, March 8, is International Women's Day, and the first day of International Women's Week.

• (1410)

Moreover, this year's theme "Going Strong—Celebrating Older Women" dovetails very nicely with the International Year of Older Persons.

Often older women find themselves alone in the world as they approach the end of their lives, and require an increasing proportion of health care.

Our government has announced the investment of over \$13 billion in health services, prevention and research. That is thirteen billion dollars.

The Liberal government clearly has the health of women, and of all Canadians, at heart, and is prepared to prove this with concrete actions.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate International Women's Day, women in the public service are still fighting for the federal government to keep its promise on pay equity.

Women after 20 years of service with an average pension of \$9,600 are fighting the Liberal government's plan to raid their pension fund. Women on low incomes live in substandard housing as the federal government abandons any responsibility for social housing. Instead of receiving home care many women who need it are subsidizing the government by providing care for other family members.

On this International Women's Day Liberal members talk about "Growing Older: Celebrating Older Women", but when the Liber-

S. O. 31

al government puts its slogan into action it means going wrong: robbing older women.

Women are tired of this double standard. Instead of empty platitudes it is time for action to ensure that yet another generation of older women is not condemned to live in poverty.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week's gaffe by the junior finance minister who said that stay at home parents really do not work was just an honest reflection of the government's tax policy which treats at home parents like second class citizens and which, in the words of the C. D. Howe Institute, accords to children the same value as disposable consumer items.

His comments were all too reminiscent of statements made by other Liberal MPs such as the MP for Vancouver Kingsway who said that stay at home parents were "taking the easy way out", or the member for St. Paul's who said that full time moms were "just elite white women", or the last Liberal candidate for Calgary West who characterized stay at home parents as "barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen".

These hurtful stereotypes would not be so cruel if they were not reflective of a tax code which penalizes parents that make real economic sacrifices to do what they believe is best for their kids.

Tomorrow we will get a chance to end this discrimination against single income families whose tax bills are 60% to 100% higher than their dual income counterparts. Tomorrow all those Liberal members who profess a commitment to the family will have an opportunity to put themselves on the record.

Will they bend to the whip or will they do what is right? Canadians are watching.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day is an unique opportunity for looking at our progress as far as the status of women is concerned.

In the past few decades, women have definitely made considerable advances, but the battle is far from over, as an examination of their socio-economic situation will show.

In last Saturday's *Le Devoir*, an article by Claire Harvey offered a clear picture of just how precarious women's employment is. According to her, close to 70% of women are part time workers.

She confirms the Bloc Québécois' contention that women rarely qualify for the maternity leave available in the employment

Oral Questions

insurance program. She also indicates that current labour market conditions have increased poverty among women.

Yet in its latest budget, the Liberal government thumbed its nose at the difficult situation of women, by refusing to make any improvements to an employment insurance program which excludes 7 out of 10 of them.

This speaks volumes about the government's true intentions, and shows just how far down the grocery list of priorities women rank.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, today women throughout the world are being recognized for the enormous contributions they have made and continue to make toward improving humanity.

International Women's Day gives all citizens an opportunity to reflect upon the great strides women have made over the years to help improve their economic and social condition.

[Translation]

It is thanks to their courage and tenacity that they gained personal rights that men have always taken for granted.

[English]

Not so long women were not entitled to own property. The right to vote was only granted to women in 1918 after the famous five fought successfully to have women declared as persons under the law.

Women are still struggling for equality. The President of the Treasury Board would deny their rights by appealing pay equity. Under Canadian tax laws the Liberal government discriminates against women who stay home caring for their children versus those who work in the workplace.

I hope we can commit ourselves today to working together to help improve the lives of all women within Canada and abroad.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, March 8, marks International Women's Day. The Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Status of Women expressed all our sentiments when she said "today is a day to celebrate the gains that women have made and to plan for the day when we can take our place for true equality".

• (1415)

[Translation]

This morning, in my riding of Ahuntsic, I organized for the fourth time a breakfast to highlight the work of non-governmental organizations. I once again had an opportunity to see the exceptional work and the unconditional dedication of several organizations in my riding, such as Transit 24, Concertation-femmes, the Montreal Italian Women's Centre, Maji-Soi, the Maison buissonnière, Remue-ménage, Mono-vie Ahuntsic, Entraide Ahuntsic Nord et Sud and the Centre d'action bénévole Bordeaux-Cartierville, to name but a few. These groups are dedicated to improving the life and plight of women in my riding of Ahuntsic.

[English]

Today women from Ahuntsic and all over the world, despite linguistic, cultural and political differences, will join together in celebration of the progress that women have made and recognize the further goals we need to achieve together.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TAXATION

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have been debating family tax fairness for days now but the Liberal excuse for rejecting our motion tomorrow is not exactly clear. Evidently they have to vote against it just because the opposition brought it forward.

Let me read that motion again:

That... the federal tax system should be reformed to end discrimination against single income families with children.

How on earth does the Prime Minister justify forcing his MPs to vote against that?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to pit families where parents work either in the home or work out of the home against each other.

What is important is that the government recognizes the tremendous burden and responsibility that parents have raising children. It recognized its responsibility to work with them, which is why we referred the matter to the House of Commons finance committee.

I would ask the hon. member to work constructively with the finance committee to that end.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what pits families against each other. It is that a dual income family and a single income family pay such discrepant tax rates, and it is the government that does it.

Oral Questions

The government has discriminated against parents who choose to have one of their spouses at home when they have children. The government has opted in budget after budget to let this discrimination continue. It is wrong.

I would like to know for those backbenchers who have the courage to vote against this discrimination tomorrow night, how he will force his MPs to continue to abandon their principles?

The Speaker: I would judge that the question is at best borderline. I see the hon. minister is on her feet. I will permit her to answer the question if she wants to.

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are back again to a lack of understanding of the issue. The hon. member across continues to talk about the income tax system as if it is the only thing that is applicable to the issue.

If we look at the graph of a dual income earning family, in a dual income earning family someone has to take care of the children until there is a deduction for day care. That puts the dual income earning family \$4,400 behind the single income earning family.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, talk about a lack of understanding. I think we have seen it demonstrated right there.

The minister can talk about graphs. She can talk about \$4,400. She can talk about child tax benefit all she likes, but the government knows that these people are paying 60% to 100% more in the tax system. There is nothing fair about that. The lack of understanding is on the government side.

I would like to ask the minister, as soon as she sits down to hear the question, why the government will not make this fair in the tax system for families that choose to stay at home with their kids.

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a case of "don't confuse me with the facts; I mean I don't want to hear what the facts tell me".

This information does not come out of some ideology or some harebrained philosophy. It comes out of looking very clearly at the cost of a dual income family going to work and the cost of a single income family going to work, where they are both earning the same money. The facts speak for themselves.

I would like the hon. member to do some math 101 on this.

• (1420)

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at the risk of further confusing the secretary of state, and I hope not to do that, our motion simply calls for an end to discrimination against single income two parent families. That is it. There is

nothing confusing about that. What is the problem? I ask the government what is the problem with that?

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem is simple but not simplistic. The problem is simply that income tax is not the only system families depend on for their income. There are transfers to families in which the Government of Canada does not discriminate against single income families. The child benefit is a major one that assists low income single income families headed by single mothers.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the government tries to find complexities where it does not want to find solutions. The fact is that single income two parent families are being penalized by this tax system. When is the finance minister going to end it?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we have a progressive tax system and we tax on the basis of individual income. If the hon. member is against that, then she should stand in the House and say that people who earn \$25,000 a year should pay more in income tax than those who earn \$50,000. If that is not her position, then she will go to the House of Commons finance committee and she will work constructively with members of the government who want to make sure that families who are raising children have a partner in the Canadian government.

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is International Women's Day, a day set aside to reflect on the status of women in Canada and to examine our behaviour and actions.

But, when it comes to women's issues, the most significant thing this government has done has been to abolish the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Is the minister responsible for the status of women proud of having abolished this agency and does she think doing so has advanced the cause of women?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that today, on International Women's Day, we should think about women, but it is not the only day. While we only get such questions from the opposition today, this government spends the other 364 days looking after policies that would increase gender equality.

Oral Questions

In response to the hon. member's question, Status of Women Canada this year has spent over half a million dollars funding 22 organizations within Quebec to assist them in encouraging equality for women in that province.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the minister paid more attention to what went on in the House, she might know that we have asked many questions about women's issues.

An hon. member: They never have any answers.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: They never have any answers.

The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women was created to advise the government on various women's issues and to propose policy directions.

Does the minister realize that, by abolishing this council, the government has become both judge and judged as it were? Can the minister tell us who is now advising the government on women's issues and who is representing women impartially when these issues come up for discussion?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the advisory council on the status of women was disbanded, an independent arm's length body was set up to fund research on women's issues. Much of this research is critical analyses of the government's policies. We have funded five such research initiatives in Quebec over the last year.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on this International Women's Day, there is a great temptation to review what the government has done to support changes in the status in women in society.

The main decision the Secretary of State for the Status of Women has made was to reduce funding to women's groups.

Is the Secretary of State for the Status of Women proud of what she has done when she sees the activities of thousands of women's groups threatened because she has literally starved them?

• (1425)

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not cut the supply of funding. The same amount of money is going into funding. We have changed the manner in which we fund organizations to the benefit of the province of Quebec and the women's organizations there which are getting more money than they used to get. More

groups are getting it. Some groups have availed themselves of three year funding which they never used to be able to do before.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like the minister to go and see for herself what is actually happening. She might understand the real situation. What she has just said is utterly false.

I would remind the Secretary of State for the Status of Women what she has already said. She promised women's groups that there would be more funding available to help them.

When does she plan to honour her commitment, since, in the latest budget, there was not one cent more for these women's groups?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that is very difficult for the members across to understand is that issues that deal with women's equality do not only sit within Status of Women Canada. Gender based analysis has made it possible for departments across this government to suddenly make women their number one priority. In achieving it, Human Resources Development Canada has gone about trying to enhance the ability of women to get training. The child tax benefit has assisted many of the poor, single income women with children so that they can afford to look after their children.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance has demonstrated some open-mindedness in recent days about finding ways to end the discrimination against stay at home parents. He does not have to agree with everything the Reform Party is saying or for that matter what others may be saying.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance, within the context of preserving the progressivity of the Canadian tax system, would he commit that by next year's budget he will find a way to end this discrimination?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that whether it be the care giver credit, the child tax credit, the national child tax benefit, we have worked on this problem consistently budget after budget. As the minister said, this is not something we all of a sudden discovered, as has the Reform Party.

I do not want to prejudge what the House of Commons finance committee is going to do, but I certainly am going to say that I am

Oral Questions

sure that the hon. member, unlike perhaps the Reform Party, will work constructively with the House of Commons finance committee to see if we can come up with what is the proper answer.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the problem with the system as it now stands is that there is no universal benefit that values parenting no matter how it takes place. We have to honour all those choices. We have talked about honouring the stay at home choice by ending the discrimination. We also need to talk about honouring the choice of those who choose to, or perhaps those who do not have the choice and have to work outside the home. It seems to me the way to do that is to make the new social union framework work. Test it by having the federal government show leadership and use the new social union to bring in a new national child care program. What about that?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the child tax credit in fact does go to families, whether or not both parents are working in the home, or whether or not parents are working outside of the home. The basic point that is raised by the hon. member, which is the responsibility of government to work in partnership in terms of the raising of children and recognizing that burden and that responsibility, is a point which is well taken.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice will table long awaited changes to the Young Offenders Act this week. From the usual leaks from her department we know much of the content of the bill is before the public and that it will allow some provinces to opt out.

These much overdue changes are but minor progress toward correcting the dangerous trend of youth violence in Canada. All of these changes will have little effect if the law enforcement community does not have the necessary resources to enforce the law.

Will the minister commit to assuming the intended 50% funding responsibility of the federal government for the existing and the new legislation?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, extensive consultations have been done. All the attorneys general across the country have been consulted. The government will be bringing forward legislation on young offenders very soon.

* * *

PRISONS

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Of course, that does not come near to answering the question, Mr. Speaker, so I will try another 50% question.

Last week on the subject of 50:50 prison release quotas, the solicitor general stated there are no quotas, there never were any quotas and there never will be any quotas. If this is to be believed, how does the solicitor general explain CSC commissioner Ole Ingstrup's statement that by the year 2000 he would like to see a 50:50 ratio between convicted felons in prison and those on parole? Could he please explain exactly what a 50:50 ratio is if it is not a quota?

• (1430)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ingstrup wrote an open letter indicating that there were absolutely no quotas. I can assure my hon. colleague that there are no quotas, there never were any quotas and there never will be any quotas. Public safety is always the number one issue and it will continue to be.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, British Columbians are overwhelmingly opposed to the Nisga'a treaty, so much so that this government will not even let them have a vote on the deal.

This government wants to ram the Nisga'a treaty down the throats of British Columbians by rushing it through this House before the B.C. legislature has even had a chance to deal with it.

Why is the government insulting British Columbians by denying them a vote on the Nisga'a deal? Why is it ramming it through this House and down the throats of British Columbians?

Mr. David Iftody (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong. We have a tripartite process with the Nisga'a people, the Government of British Columbia and the Canadian government. We have obligations under that tripartite process to put forward a legal document. It is still in the drafting process. We do not yet have a legal document.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the member talks about a tripartite agreement. What he fails to mention is that the people of British Columbia are not part of that process. This government is bent on insulting the people of British Columbia.

If the government is so sure that the support for the Nisga'a agreement is there, why is it refusing to have a democratic referendum on this deal? What is wrong with giving this controversial deal the democratic seal of approval?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for the British Columbia government. However, I do want to inform the House and the public who are watching on television that this bill which the member says is being rammed through the House has not even had first reading yet. We are

Oral Questions

proceeding with due deliberation. The hon. member should not try to say something which creates the wrong impression.

[English]

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, women are being heavily penalized by the new employment insurance program, because they need to work twice as long to be eligible for maternity benefits.

Is the Minister of Human Resources Development going to finally come down from his ivory tower and comply with the repeated calls by the Bloc Québécois to remedy the unacceptable situation in which the new employment insurance program places women?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of this House to the fact that the new employment insurance program has made it possible for women who work part time, whose work weeks are under 15 hours, and who were never before covered, to now be eligible.

I also want to remind the hon. member for Québec of the family income supplement, which we have integrated with our employment insurance reform, and to the 220,000 people who receive that supplement. Two-thirds of those who benefit from this assistance, which is part of the employment insurance reform, are women.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it might have been worth the minister's while to read the article by Claire Harvey in this past weekend's *Le Devoir*, which quoted the Minister of Human Resources Development.

With all the projected exclusions in the employment insurance program, does the minister finally intend to make the decision to bring in changes to the program which will change this unacceptable system, which excludes seven out of ten women from benefits?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that women, and men, who lose their jobs or leave them for a good reason are perfectly covered by the employment insurance program. Allow me to repeat the figure once again: 78%.

I also want to point out that our reform has provided retroactivity to women, so that they may benefit from active employment measures, which was not the case in the legislation the Bloc Québécois wants to go back to.

Retroactivity for women who have been in the home for a number of years is now up to five years, so that they may receive assistance in returning to the work force.

PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today the government called closure for the 49th time, this time on C-55.

At least two Chinese language magazines under foreign ownership are published in Canada: *World Journal* and *Ming Pao* magazine. The heritage minister's Bill C-55 will shut down these magazines which are published in Canada.

• (1435)

The heritage minister says that the magazine bill will protect culture. If that is the case, why are Chinese Canadians paying the price?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I thank the hon. critic from the Reform Party who last week came out in support of the government's policy on official languages. That was very much respected.

I also want to say that if the member has an opportunity to review the legislation he will note that any magazine that is currently publishing is not touched by the legislation.

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-55 will have an immediate effect on foreign owned split runs other than American.

Many Chinese people came to this country seeking freedom, like freedom of speech. Over 100,000 Canadian Chinese will read the *World Journal* and *Ming Pao* magazines. Why is the minister willing to sacrifice their readers?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to underscore once again and I am speaking in a temperate fashion because I want to measure my words carefully. The member is making certain claims, all of which are completely false. The fact is the legislation made a provision for grandfathering precisely because magazines that are currently publishing here should not have any change to their operation.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the deportation of Nancy Castillo Duran, scheduled for March 11, has mobilized an impressive number of organizations, individuals and elected representatives, all of them calling on the minister to review her decision.

Will the minister admit that there is no valid reason to deport Mrs. Castillo Duran, since both her children were born here, she is legally married, she is a member of Quebec society, she has a job

offer and, to put it briefly, she has made her life here for the past 18 years?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Hochelaga—Maison-neuve knows full well that the Privacy Act prevents me from commenting publicly on this file.

That having been said, it is very clear that such situations raise questions about the existing system and illustrate the need for a review of the system to make it much more effective. This is something the government is planning for this year. In the meantime, the situation of concern to the member for Hochelaga—Maison-neuve will be reviewed.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maison-neuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear: the system allows the minister to take compassionate action.

Will the minister stand by while a 12 and 13-year old are separated from their mother? We are calling on her today to please take action, because these children need their mother.

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the file is now being reviewed.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today is International Women's Day. And yet, Leyla Zana, a mother of two and member of parliament in Turkey, will not be celebrating, because she is imprisoned in Turkey for upholding the rights of the Kurds.

Will the Minister of Foreign Affairs defend human rights on the security council so Turkey will free this woman?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already raised this particular case directly with my counterpart, the minister of foreign affairs of Turkey. The response was that the case is before the European council and the European Court of Human Rights and is being dealt with according to the rules.

I can assure the hon. member that we will continue to press the Turkish authorities not only to provide for proper justice but to try to find some reconciliation to give the current minority in that country its proper rights.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the European Union has made it very clear in speaking out against human rights atrocities by the Turks against the Kurds. We cannot wait any longer.

Oral Questions

Leyla Zana's crime was to speak her language and have freedom of speech.

Again the question is will the foreign affairs minister take this case to the UN Security Council and demand that all human rights atrocities by the Turks against the Kurds be stopped?

• (1440)

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member properly knows, human rights cases do not go to the security council. Human rights cases go to the UN commission on human rights in Geneva.

We just finished a major consultation this past week where the matter was raised. As I have said, I have raised the matter directly myself to the point where the case is now being heard before the European council on human rights.

I once again emphasize that we believe it is very important in all of our dealings with Turkey that it recognize the need to establish proper human rights for the Kurdish minority.

* * *

[Translation]

WOMEN POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at the dawn of the year 2000, Amnesty International continues to report too many horror stories of women being imprisoned for political reasons.

Brutality, rape, arbitrary and abusive arrest, this is what awaits women peacefully working to have their rights respected.

My question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Could Canada not use its presence on the security council to exert political and diplomatic pressure in order to free such political prisoners around the world and finally condemn those countries violating their basic rights?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member likely knows, last February when we were present at the council we specifically raised the initiative at the security council to deal with the broad issue of the persecution of civilians during times of conflict. In that case we specifically raised the problems related to humanitarian workers, to children, to innocent victims, including woman, and said that the United Nations Security Council must address these problems through a series of concrete recommendations.

We are now waiting for the secretary general to provide a response to that initiative and we will be very glad to share it with the hon. member because we think it is an important step forward

Oral Questions

in the promotion of the protection of women's and children's rights in times of conflict.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, older workers often have difficulty finding employment.

In New Brunswick we have the so-called New Brunswick job corps, where nearly a thousand men and women participate in a program for those over 50. It is funded by our federal and provincial governments.

I would ask the Minister of Human Resources Development to explain the anxiety that we have in New Brunswick over the fact that the program may soon end.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the New Brunswick job corps program will continue until December 1999. This will allow the last 930 participants to finish the project.

We are pleased with the program's track record. Lessons learned from the New Brunswick job corps will be valuable in addressing the needs of older workers in the country.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Labour, for her efforts and her interest in the continuation of this funding.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, according to cabinet documents obtained by CTV, Atomic Energy of Canada wants to fast track the burial of tonnes of nuclear waste in the Canadian Shield.

The report says that the work should begin as soon as possible and with as little consultation as is necessary.

Why do the Liberals want to fast track the burial of 30,000 tonnes of nuclear waste and why do they want to restrict public consultation?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, in making reference to the report by CTV News, is simply and plainly wrong.

The government's policy with respect to this matter was announced on December 3 in our response to the Seaborn report. The Seaborn report was the culmination of 10 years of investigation on this question.

We have laid out our way forward which involves both immediate and long term consultations. The document is there on the Internet and it has been there since December 3.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the documents on the Internet, we are talking about confidential cabinet documents.

Things change over time. The cabinet itself has ordered that public consultation be restricted. If there is nothing to hide, why does the minister want to fast track this project? Why does he not want public consultation?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the allegations in the gentleman's preamble are absolutely and plainly false.

The document that is the government's policy is the December 3 response to the Seaborn report. It lays out an extensive pattern of consultation by me, by my department, by the government and by the waste disposal agency. It is all there in a very public, open and transparent way. That is the government's policy. The gentleman and CTV News are wrong.

* * *

● (1445)

THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is International Women's Day and women are the lowest paid workers in the public service and the Liberal government is trying to keep it that way.

It has denied them pay equity. It froze their wages for six years. This wage freeze created a surplus in the pension fund and now the Liberal government is raiding the surplus. These are not gold plated pensions. The average woman with 20 years of service only gets \$9,600 a year from her pension. The government should be a model employer.

Does the Treasury Board president think he is setting a good example for the private sector by stomping on pay equity and raiding the public pension plan surplus?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government was the first government to introduce a law which gave pay equity to women in 1979 and we have kept to it. We have already paid out over a billion dollars to make sure that pay equity was implemented in the federal system.

We have in our law extended pay equity to federally legislated enterprises. The federal government, and in particular the Liberal government, has always been favourable to women and it is trying to continue to create justice in the system.

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Board president and the Liberal government are unrepentant. They have lost all credibility with public service workers, particularly women.

Oral Questions

First the government agreed to a joint pension management and investment board. Now it has flip-flopped and is shutting the workers out of any say in managing their own pension.

The flip-flop smacks of 1950s patriarchy. Most of the workers who rely on this pension fund are women. The Liberal government's attitude seems to be that women cannot or should not manage their own money. This attitude has no place in the 1990s.

Can the President of the Treasury Board explain why he thinks public servants need big brother to manage their pensions?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately my colleague in her preamble stated things that are not in parallel with reality.

In fact it is the government itself that proposed to have joint management of the pension fund and it was ready to introduce a law to do this. However, the unions were not prepared to take the risk, to share the risk with the employer in a future pension fund and I have left on the table the possibility of having joint management of the pension fund with the unions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CHILD TAX BENEFIT

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Last fall we learned in the Department of Finance's economic and financial update that, in four years' time, inflation will have eaten \$665 million away from the child tax benefit.

With the budget now presented, is it not fair to say that, through inflation, low income families will in fact have lost \$365 million net in four years' time?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the past two years, we have increased the benefit by \$1.8 billion. This year, we have added another \$300 million.

That certainly compensates for inflation, and much more.

Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC): Mr. Speaker, despite what the minister has said, the real value of the national child benefit, vital assistance to many low income families in Canada, which include many single mothers, continues to shrink as the result of inflation.

This is particularly true since, in two years' time, inflation will have totally wiped out the increase in the latest budget.

How does the minister intend to offset the losses thus incurred by Canadian families?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the member's figures are questionable.

In the past two years, we have added over \$2.1 billion. That compensates more than amply for inflation.

* * *

CANADA-PALESTINE RELATIONS

Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of International Trade.

The minister is just back from a mission to the Middle East, during which he spent some time in the territories under administration by the Palestinian Authority.

Could the minister share his impressions with us and tell us what Canada intends to do to enhance its relationship with the Palestinians?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the hon. member for his interest. A new page has been turned in the history of Canada-Palestine relations.

● (1450)

The Palestinians are planning their future and Canada intends to help them do so. In particular, we have signed a framework agreement to facilitate trade exchanges, knowing that peace and prosperity are linked.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL DISASTERS

Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Portage—Lisgar, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, prior to the 1997 federal election and during the Manitoba flood Liberals were handing out \$5,000 cheques to flood victims. Now, 18 months after the election and after the flood, this government is demanding the return of these funds. Why? Are these victims supposed to wait for another federal election with empty Liberal promises?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague misunderstands the situation completely. These were accountable advances. Up to \$5,000 in money from the Government of Canada was put into the hands of each person who needed assistance. When they were given the money there was a signed statement saying that it was an accountable advance and that it would be repaid.

Almost 2,000 people were helped in Manitoba. To date 1,700 have come to an agreement with the Government of Canada. Two hundred are in the process of coming to an agreement and we are working with another hundred, hoping to come to an agreement quickly.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

CANADIAN FORCES

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian forces have failed in their attempt to fully integrate women into their ranks, according to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. At the moment, women represent only 10.8% of the army, only 3.1% in the combat units and there is not one woman general.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence. What is he waiting for before taking action? Is he waiting for the commission to cite the officers of the Canadian forces for contempt of court in the light of his failure to rectify the situation?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that change has been slow, but it is accelerating. This government is solidly committed to the current course that will involve the full integration of women into the Canadian forces.

I might add that the 10.8% is the second highest of the NATO countries, but I believe we can do more in terms of being able to give women every opportunity to join whatever part of the Canadian forces they wish, and considerable progress is being made in that regard.

* * *

CANADIAN FARMERS

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday farmers were demanding the resignations of both the agriculture and the wheat board ministers because neither attended a farm rally in Regina. This no-show is in sharp contrast to last Monday's announcement when the minister of agriculture said that it was a great day for Canadian farmers. Saskatchewan and Manitoba farmers attending the rally disagree, saying that AIDA stands for "another insulting deceptive announcement".

Could the Deputy Prime Minister tell the House why the government could not be bothered to send one representative from its 155 member caucus to explain this program to prairie farmers?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this particular weekend the minister of agriculture was leaving for a trade mission to Japan. In my own case, I was in Washington on Saturday talking with Canadian embassy officials about access to U.S. grain markets for Canadian grain supplies and heading off additional trade disputes.

The organizers of the committee made it absolutely clear that the only persons who would be acceptable in terms of representing the government would be the minister of agriculture or myself.

Unfortunately, in the circumstances, both of us were fighting for farmers elsewhere.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, on February 26 Human Resources Development Canada announced \$750,000 for Joval International clothing recycler of Toronto to relocate in Liverpool, Nova Scotia. Considering ACOA's recent losses of \$2 million in two Bathurst textile companies, can the minister responsible for human resources development explain why his department would fund a company that will compete directly with the long established Nova Scotia clothing outfit, Frenchy's, which presently employs over 125 people across Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made remarks about the textile industry in New Brunswick. He has to understand that while there are some hit and misses with the system, basically we have been very successful.

● (1455)

I have to tell the hon. member that in the province of New Brunswick in the last decade the textile industry has increased five times, going from \$60 million to \$300 million. That is a success.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police recently announced that it would suspend training at its Regina training academy until further notice. My question is for the solicitor general.

The RCMP is our national police force. Canadians want to know how we will provide training for our future police recruits.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all areas of government, including the RCMP, had to deal with the financial mess which this government inherited when it took power.

Because our Prime Minister was able to put us back on a proper financial track, remove our deficit and work on the debt, I am pleased to indicate that training will resume at the depot in Regina on April 6.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, earlier in question period the Minister of Finance referred to it as a

Oral Questions

problem. Before the problem can be fixed the minister must acknowledge that discrimination exists.

Would the finance minister not admit that Canadian tax law discriminates against single income, two parent families? Would he not agree that the discrimination exists, yes or no?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I do recognize is that we have a progressive tax system and, as well, we tax on an individual basis.

The government also recognizes that it has, in each of its budgets, the responsibility for government to partner with parents in the raising of their children, and we intend to do that.

That is why we brought in caregiver credits. That is why we brought in the child tax credits. That is why we brought in the prenatal nutrition program. That is why this matter is being referred to the House of Commons finance committee.

* * *

CANADA MARINE ACT

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as predicted by the Reform Party, Liberal insider Merv Russell has been appointed director of the new Halifax port authority.

Old Merv is not going to be lonely because the transport minister also appointed Liberal playmates Al Abraham Jr., Elaine Gordon and Gregor Fraser.

The new Canada Marine Act is supposed to devolve control of seaports to local stakeholders. Why are Liberal connections so important for federally appointed directors to the Halifax port authority?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, positions under the Canada Marine Act or the seven positions of the port authorities are nominated in consultation with users. The names that he just raised came through that process.

Mr. Russell served as the previous chair. He served with distinction and was nominated by one of the user groups. It is obvious that he would be a choice for the new chairman. He was not appointed by us as chairman, he was elected by the new board.

* * *

[Translation]

REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, ten years after the establishment of the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies, Canada is the only country still without a

clear policy regulating the use of medically assisted human reproductive technologies.

How does the Minister of Health explain that, after all this time, the only standard in the matter is a voluntary moratorium, whose effectiveness is not measurable?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member indicated, we established this voluntary moratorium a few years ago.

In the last parliament, we introduced Bill C-47. At the end of that parliament, we had begun consultations to determine the best way to proceed. We will act when we are ready.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the multimillion dollar Seaborn panel on nuclear fuel waste recommends that a management agency be established that is at arm's length from industry. However, this Liberal government ignored the panel and set up a fast track process, including an industry-based waste management organization. This is completely contrary to the panel's recommendation.

● (1500)

When will the government commit to establishing an independent waste management body that protects our public and environmental safety?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in our response to the Seaborn report we agreed with the vast majority of Seaborn's recommendations. He did recommend a waste management authority that would be in the nature of a federal crown corporation.

It was our view in the response that we published last December that the ownership responsibility for that waste belongs with those who produced it. Accordingly we believe it is more appropriate if the responsibility for the agency rests with the producers and the owners of the waste, subject explicitly to the oversight and regulatory authority of the Government of Canada.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Nova Scotia economy has been devastated by the serious downturn in the fishery, the financial crisis within the agricultural sector, and most recently by the closing of Cape Breton's Devco mines. The Liberal government's response has been to reduce funding for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency by \$40 million.

Routine Proceedings

Could the minister responsible for ACOA explain why the government is turning its back on Atlantic Canadians?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would invite the hon. member to have a closer look at these figures.

Basically the ACOA program is made up of a core program and a non-core program. The money that he is talking about is essentially the sunseting of some TAGS programs and other programs such as the infrastructure program. We have also saved over \$3 million in running the organization. I think that is pretty good.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in both official languages a number of order in council appointments which were recently made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

SEXUAL OFFENDERS

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions to present. The most important one indicates that between April 14, 1997 and February 1998, ten months, four sexual assaults took place in the Abbotsford area. All four were committed by residents of the Sumas Correctional Centre. At least the last sexual assault was committed by a dangerous repeat offender with 63 prior convictions.

The petitioners are alarmed to see that 28 offenders walked away in the last eight months, an average of 3.5 per month from February 9, 1998 to September.

• (1505)

They ask that parliament enact legislation to ensure that Sumas Community Correctional Centre officials will have the right to refuse violent, repeat and dangerous offenders who could pose a danger to society, and that habitual violent offenders and sexual perpetrators should not be allowed to reside at Sumas Centre any longer.

The next petition I have contains 1,500 signatures. It asks that everyone who commits an offence under section 253 or 254 is guilty of an indictable offence or an offence of punishment on summary conviction and is liable for a first offence to imprisonment for not less than seven days, for a second offence to imprisonment for not more than fourteen days, and for each subsequent offence to imprisonment for not less than ninety days.

The final petition I have is in addition to another 7,500 signatures, making a total of 15,000 signatures from sincere and concerned citizens from the Fraser Valley and beyond.

They ask that reasonable action be taken promptly by government and that parliament enact legislation to ensure that the Sumas Community Correctional Centre's officials have the right to refuse violent repeat and dangerous offenders who could pose a danger to society and that habitual violent offenders and sexual perpetrators should not be allowed to reside at Sumas Centre any longer.

It is about time the government took action on this matter.

[Translation]

BILL C-68

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present two petitions to the House.

The first one, which was circulated in the riding of Beauce, is from Claude Gilbert and concerns Bill C-68.

PAY EQUITY

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition, also circulated in the riding of Beauce, is from André Grégoire and concerns pay equity.

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present today the first of a series of petitions collected by Kawartha Ploughshares, a peace group in my riding.

They point out that whereas sanctions, far from helping to destroy the oppressive government of Saddam Hussein, have actually strengthened it and destroyed any useful opposition since instead of struggling for their rights the civilian population has had to struggle for survival.

They therefore call on parliament to strongly appeal to the United Nations, the United States and Britain for a rejection of any further military action against Iraq and call for a serious attempt at peace negotiations with Iraq and its neighbours.

[Translation]

PAY EQUITY

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of Longueuil, who believe sincerely in the equality of men and women and in justice being done, I have the honour on this International Women's Day to table, and more importantly to support, a petition calling on the federal government to withdraw its appeal against the public service pay equity decision and to give effect to the court ruling that it pay its employees what it owes them.

This petition is the first in a series that my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois will be tabling this week. I am also tabling the same petition for my colleague, the member for Louis-Hébert.

[English]

MARRIAGE

Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the several hundred signators to a petition from Prince George—Bulkley Valley pray that parliament enact Bill C-225, an act to amend the Marriage Act and the Interpretation Act, so as to define in statute that a marriage can only be entered into between a single male and a single female. I agree with this petition.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I have two petitions to present. The first petition is signed by a number of Canadians including from my own riding of Mississauga South on the subject of human rights.

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that human rights abuses continue to be rampant around the world, particularly in countries such as Indonesia. They also acknowledge that Canada continues to be recognized internationally as champions of human rights.

Therefore they call on parliament to continue to speak out against human rights abuses around the world and to seek to bring to justice those responsible for such abuses.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is on the matter of public safety officers.

The petitioners would like to draw the attention of the House that police officers and firefighters are required to place their lives at

Routine Proceedings

risk on a daily basis as they execute their duties and that when one of them loses their life in the line of duty we all mourn that loss.

• (1510)

The petitioners therefore call upon parliament to establish a public safety officers compensation fund for the benefit of families of public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

FRESHWATER

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 on behalf of a number of constituents who point out a whole number of concerns they have regarding the export of freshwater.

They make a number of suggestions on what the Government of Canada and parliament ought to consider.

PROPERTY OFFENCES

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by 189 Canadians, mostly residing in the districts of Edgeley, Edenwold and Fort Qu'Appelle, just east of Regina.

Their formerly very peaceful and crime free rural area is being plagued by break-ins, sometimes while householders are at home. They say that whereas break and enter often involves serious loss or damage and whereas serious sentences for property offences are ordinarily minimal, especially when the offenders are minors, they call upon parliament to recommend more stringent sentencing for property crimes and to make laws requiring those convicted of vandalism and/or break and enter and theft to make financial restitution for damages.

[Translation]

PAY EQUITY

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, I have the honour to table a petition asking that the government withdraw its appeal of the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal decision on equal pay within the public service and that it implement that decision without further delay.

This petition goes along with those presented by my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 164 and 181.

Routine Proceedings

[Text]

Question No. 164—**Mr. Jean Dubé:**

Can the Department of Human Resources Development provide clarification on a recent incident in one of its offices, in St. Clair, British Columbia, where a francophone employee was apparently prevented from replying in French to a francophone client?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): The Government of Canada strongly supports the rights of francophones outside Quebec to get service in their own language, where there is a population that needs it.

When Human Resources Development Canada, HRDC, began to consolidate its offices in 1997, it consulted with the Vancouver community to see where and how they would like the department to set up a bilingual office.

A review of the most appropriate location for the provision of bilingual services was also needed. A town hall meeting was held in French to provide an opportunity for the francophone community to provide input on service consolidation plans and especially which office should be responsible for providing bilingual services. Invitations were extended to all francophone associations in the greater Vancouver area and efforts were made to ensure participants were representatives of all HRDC's client groups. The Sinclair office's bilingual staff were also invited. Due to the length of time that has elapsed since the meeting was held, it is not known whether staff from the Sinclair office were in attendance. However, all participants attending the town hall meeting expressed the preference that bilingual services should be provided in a full service Human Resources Centre of Canada, HRCC, and their choice was HRCC Vancouver. Also, a study of the demographics of the francophone population clearly showed that the majority of francophones were living in the HRCC Vancouver area.

Based on the process outlined above, bilingual service was transferred to HRCC Vancouver in October 1997. Advertisements were placed in the local French paper and on radio station CBUF-FM to communicate where bilingual service was available. A letter was also sent to all francophone clients to inform them of this move.

There are currently 20 points of service designated as bilingual service sites in British Columbia. Nine of these are in Vancouver. Of the nine, there is only one HRCC which is fully bilingual. Along with the one bilingual HRCC in Vancouver, the infocentres, Labour Canada, income security and regional offices are designated bilingual.

In the case of the Sinclair office, even though the office is designated unilingual English, employees are encouraged by management to respond in the language of the client when the need arises. This ensures that quality services are offered to all clients. It is HRDC's policy to designate bilingual positions in unilingual offices if the work entails services that are to be provided in both

languages. This policy is in accordance with official languages regulations. In the incident mentioned by Radio Canada, this policy was regrettably not followed.

Question No. 181—**Miss Deborah Grey:**

Regarding the National Philatelic Centre of Canada Post: (a) is Canada Post planning to issue a stamp in honour of Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip's 50th wedding anniversary; and (b) is Canada Post planning to issue a stamp in honour of Prince Charles' 50th birthday?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): (a) The 50th wedding anniversary of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness Prince Philip occurred in 1997. As Canada Post commemorates anniversaries in the year in which they occur, the corporation does not intend to issue a stamp on that subject in 1999. However, the corporation issued a new stamp in January 1999, bearing the image of Her Majesty, to correspond with the new basic lettermail rate of 46¢.

(b) The Sovereign is the only living person who can be the sole subject of a postage stamp.

[English]

Mr. Peter Adams: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Speaker: With your permission, I shall return to petitions with the hon. member for Frontenac—Mégantic.

* * *

PETITIONS

PAY EQUITY

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of constituents of Frontenac—Mégantic, who believe sincerely in male-female equality and in justice, I have the honour to table a petition demanding that the federal government withdraw its appeal against the public service pay equity decision and give effect to the court ruling that it pay its employees what it owes them.

This petition goes with the ones presented by my colleagues from Longueuil and Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1515)

[*English*]

FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The astute and erudite hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier had seven minutes remaining.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, prior to Oral Question Period, I was speaking to the bill under consideration, Bill C-55, an act to protect the Canadian periodical industry.

I mentioned that, contrary to what certain members of the Reform Party were saying, our neighbours to the south, the Americans, do not have the right, with impunity as our colleagues were indicating, to impose sanctions or to retaliate, because they too are party to international trade agreements, such as NAFTA and the WTO.

There are rules and procedures, and if the Americans wanted to retaliate, they too would have to comply, despite what the Reform Party members are saying.

I also mentioned that we on the government side are not prepared to hand certain sectors of our industry priority over others. The government does not share the opinion of some members of the official opposition who do not consider Canadian culture worth fighting for. Both agriculture, which is vital to our economy, as I mentioned, and Canada's culture, which is vital to the well-being of our psyche, must be protected.

As I was saying, one feeds the body, the other, the mind. Unfortunately, our Reform colleagues are not quite as concerned as they might be about the food for the mind that Canada's culture represents.

I would also like to take them up on another mistaken notion. Two weeks ago, with colleagues from the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, I visited Thunder Bay and the western cities of Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Edmonton, Vancouver and White Horse. My colleague, who is the official opposition critic, toured the eastern part of the country with the other half of the standing committee.

In the western leg of the trip, the Canadian public was very outspoken and supportive in its comments about the need for this bill, once again contrary to what Reform Party members have said.

Government Orders

Canadians generally are very aware of the importance of having strong Canadian cultural industries that are able to compete with other countries.

This brings me to another point that our colleagues are unable or perhaps unwilling to understand. We are not talking about undue protection. We are talking about drawing up ground rules that are fair to everyone.

[*English*]

We are not here suggesting that our magazine industry cannot compete, as members of the Reform Party might be suggesting. It is not that at all. It can and has done so over the last 30 years. Our industry has developed quite well because we have had a level playing field in place and we insist on maintaining such a level playing field.

It is not level when one competitor has an incredible advantage of having overhead costs that 70% less than the overhead costs of the Canadian publishers. That is the essence of a split-run edition. They cover the costs of preparing the edition. They come into a country. They take out the pages that carry ads and which are replaced by other ads. They can undercut the market greatly without necessarily adding anything of any significance or value to the Canadian cultural aspect of what these people are trying to do. In most instances that is what has happened. It is not a fair or level playing field.

Under a fair and equitable competitive system our magazine industry will compete with any other in the world. It is not fair if its competitors have a 70% overhead cost advantage.

• (1520)

The other thing the Reform Party seems to forget is that it is indeed a unique relationship in terms of Canada and the U.S. and the magazine industry.

Eighty to ninety per cent of the magazines exported by our American neighbours are exported in one country only, Canada, because of the proximity and in a number of provinces similarity of language. Therefore there is a great deal of affinity in the market. That does not seem to satisfy them. They want more.

They control over 50% of our market. They have 80% of our shelf space. It is not enough. They want more. When the Americans say "if you do this we will do that so back off", Reformers say "we do not want to protect, we will back off and the 6,000 people who happen to work in this industry, too bad for them, so sorry, so sad, we are not prepared to do that".

We will stand by the magazine industry in this country as we have in the past. Members think this bill is exclusively from the Minister of Canadian Heritage. It is not. Do not make that mistake. It is a bill supported by the government and members on this side of the House and we will see soon enough on that.

An hon. member: And three other parties.

Government Orders

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Thank you to my colleague, and three other parties on the other side of the House.

I conclude with a question. I wish anyone who has thought about this debate, this bill, this issue would ask themselves this question and answer it fair and honestly. It is a very simply question.

Which foreign publication, which American magazine, is not allowed into this country? I dare any member of the House to find a foreign or an American publication to be more precise that is not allowed in this country. They will not. It is a totally open market. We are not restricting any American publication or magazine from coming into the country. Canadians can buy any American magazine they wish to buy on almost any news stand and yet that seems not to be good enough for the members opposite. Why?

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate I wonder if we could now revert, with the consent of the House, to applications for emergency debate so that I can deal with a matter raised by the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

BILL C-55

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, from what we just heard from the hon. member from across the way, he and his government basically missed the point.

My application for an emergency debate deals with the issue of risk this government is putting Canadians at with Bill C-55. In fact, the faster it fast tracks this piece of legislation, the greater the risk.

I believe a billion dollars worth of retaliation will impact hugely right across this country, probably up to 45,000 jobs. This is from a paper on international trade. I can submit this later on.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has reviewed the letter submitted by the hon. member in support of his argument that there should be an emergency debate on this subject and has concluded that it does not meet the exigencies of the standing order at this time. Accordingly it is not permitted.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening all day to a lot of passionate debate on both sides of the House about Bill C-55, although frankly a lot of the comments have very little to do with Bill C-55.

The debate seems to have taken some directions far beyond what was ever contemplated by Bill C-55.

• (1525)

We have been hearing the Reform Party trying to strike fear into the hearts of Canadians that if we have the temerity or the gall to do anything to protect sovereignty we will be smashed by our American neighbours, that tanks are going to roll across the border and devastate our steel industry and our plastic industry as if we are supposed to cower at this great force, that we do not have the wherewithal to look after industries that we care about; not only industries we care about but our Canadian cultural sovereignty.

I asked for an opportunity to speak to this today because I have always seen myself as a fiercely proud Canadian nationalist, almost too far that way sometimes I have been told. I am very proud and I really regret the fact that this country has moved away from some of the positions we used to take in terms of looking after Canadian industries.

I have been reading a book recently, *1967*, by Pierre Berton. He talks about Canada as it was in 1967 and the government of the day. It talks about leaders of that time, politicians like Walter and Duncan Gordon and Paul Martin Sr., people willing to take real steps to something about the foreign takeover of our industries.

At that time it was not seen as frivolous or silly to talk about limiting the amount of foreign ownership of certain industries that were key to Canadians. I was very pleased to see those moves in those days. I was too young at that time to really appreciate them. Certainly in recent years, as we see that school of thought slipping away, I am looking back with some regret that we have somehow lost that.

When I hear a debate like we heard today that we cannot make a move as minor and insignificant as trying to look after this one small aspect of our cultural and artistic industry, if we cannot make a move like Bill C-55 without worrying about being squashed like

Government Orders

a grape by this steamroller to the south of us, we really have lost our ability to chart our own destiny as a country.

Bill C-55 is not a broad sweeping interference with the free market. For those hon. members who really advocate the free market and the free hand of the market, et cetera, this is not an interference of that ability for industries to conduct themselves. This is not state intervention in any way that will offend anyone. It is a very minor detail that recognizes that arts and culture are as much of an industry and as much of an engine for economic growth as any of the other smokestack industries or the high tech industries we are fond of promoting and encouraging.

The member for Kamloops spoke very well about industries like the film industry and how we would be crazy not to do all we can to cultivate and nurture that burgeoning new industry in B.C.

The film industry in Manitoba now is a \$100 million a year industry. The member for Winnipeg North—St. Paul can testify to this. Two years ago it was \$13 million a year. Last year it was \$50 million and this year it is \$100 million, with a new sound stage being built and new crews being trained to push that limit even further.

This is the kind of thing, if we really want to talk about growing the economic base in areas where we have real opportunity and real potential, the arts, culture and heritage, that we cannot ignore. We heard about jobs being bantered about here and possible job loss if we take the step of Bill C-55. What about jobs lost or lost opportunity if we do not act in this regard?

Community colleges in British Columbia have started 22 new apprenticeship programs in the film industry. That is brand new. That is a whole new growth area, not only new jobs but new training.

We always used to wonder what a gaffer does. At the end of movies when the credits roll we see best boy, gaffer, key grip and jobs like that. Those are all apprenticeable trades, legitimate career positions, as are the electricians, the carpenters, the set designers and the lighting guys. It is a huge growth area. B.C. is looking forward in that regard and is welcoming the jobs which go along with that.

• (1530)

What we have been hearing people talk about more than Bill C-55 is free trade. Our party is not crazy about free trade. We were cautious about going into liberalized trade agreements that may—

An hon. member: You were fearmongering.

Mr. Pat Martin: A member just said that we were fearmongering about free trade. In fact, our predictions came true. It is not fearmongering any more. It is like slanderous and slander when it is the truth.

In actual fact, our worst fears were realized. We watched half a million good jobs flow south of the border. We heard that great flushing sound Ross Perot used to talk about. Whoosh, the jobs went right past us. We were not wrong about that. We were absolutely right.

Fortunately we intervened recently on the MAI. Everybody in this room except for our party, this whole House of Commons was willing to walk blindly into the new multilateral agreement on investment. Thank goodness somebody did sound the alarm on that.

Now that the dust has settled on that liberalized trade agreement called the MAI, we know what the real motivation was. The people who were pushing the MAI said there is a surplus of democracy in the world today that is interfering with the free movement of capital. The global capitalists were worried about a surplus of democracy, meaning that people like us, those of us in this House are a nuisance and interfere with corporations doing exactly what they want to do when they want to do it.

That is exactly what we have heard today from the Reform Party. Reform members have been saying that this House does not have the right to make rules to look after our own well-being because the corporate sector in the United States will punish us. I am not prepared to accept that. As a fiercely proud Canadian nationalist, I will never accept that.

It is our duty to do all we can to take charge of our own destiny and to do what we think is right in this country, by majority vote. Not everybody will always agree all the time with the right course to take. In this example, Bill C-55, that is pretty clear. Four parties out of five, and 250 votes out of 301 say the right thing to do is to protect our cultural sovereignty, to protect our arts and culture community, our heritage industries.

The Reform Party is more interested in the Heritage Front than it is in the heritage industry. The only time I ever hear of heritage associated with the Reform Party is by some of its members who are leaders in the Heritage Front. It has nothing to do with arts and culture, does it?

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would suggest that clearly untrue and slanderous allegations are unparliamentary. I ask you to have the member withdraw those remarks.

The Deputy Speaker: It sounds as though it is a matter for debate. I think the member has not said any slanderous thing that I have heard.

Mr. Pat Martin: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about free trade agreements and fearmongering about the Americans beating us up if we pass Bill C-55. We have not heard very much about the merits of Bill C-55 although the parliamentary secretary has just done a pretty good job to try to outline those in a fairly balanced

Government Orders

way. That is the only balance I have heard today in listening to the debate.

Our own critic in this area, the member for Dartmouth, clearly pointed out that the NDP supports Bill C-55. She was quite clear that she would not accept the Reform Party amendments. Her recommendations to us were to reject the Reform Party amendments because they simply dismantle Bill C-55 piece by piece.

If we are proud of our Canadian culture and our Canadian heritage, if we are fiercely proud Canadian nationalists as everybody in this room had better be, then we should be passing Bill C-55 and we should be voting down any amendments to the contrary such as those put forward by the Reform Party.

• (1535)

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in the House today in support of Bill C-55. I would encourage all of my colleagues in the House of Commons to support this bill unanimously.

Bill C-55 sustains an important cultural objective that has been in place for three decades: to ensure the availability of information, stories and images in the magazine sector that reflect and inform Canadian society. Bill C-55 delivers on this objective by preventing unfair competition in our advertising services market which, if left unchecked, would put the Canadian publishers that provide Canadian stories to Canadian readers out of business.

If U.S. publishers could enter our advertising market, which they have not had access to for over three decades, they would dump advertising services. This is because they would have virtually no costs in that market, would achieve profit margins of up to 80% and would therefore heavily discount advertising rates in order to capture market share.

Canadian manufacturers of goods, including those in sectors that have been identified as potential targets of U.S. retaliation, have remedies available to them to prevent dumping. Canadian steel producers for example regularly exercise their rights under trade agreements by bringing anti-dumping cases. Magazine publishers do not have that option because so far there are no dumping rules for services. But Canada does have rights under our trade agreements to take measures in support of cultural industries and to regulate access to our advertising market in the magazine sector, the only available means to prevent unfair competition.

In February at a luncheon of the Broadcast Executive Society, Michael McCabe, president and chief executive officer of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, called for support of the foreign publishers advertising services act. Mr. McCabe's com-

ments about the current U.S. assault of this bill merits repeating. Mr. McCabe stated as follows:

The current American assault on the Minister of Canadian Heritage's efforts to sustain a Canadian magazine industry is just the leading edge of a broader assault to come. That's why it's so important.

We have to be able to maintain in this country a set of cultural policies that ensure that we can tell our own stories to our own people, and to others. The American proposition that it's just business and there should be a level playing field is a myth—and a dangerous myth—given their size and market power. We, and other small countries, have to insist on the freedom to make the policies we need, to support our own cultural existence.

Magazines are just the beginning. We can't fail at this. If we do, it will damage not only our businesses, but our country.

The U.S. claims that Bill C-55 is protectionist and precludes its cultural products from entering Canadian markets. That is not the case at all. In fact, foreign competition dominates the Canadian cultural market. According to the report of the Cultural Industries Sectoral Advisory Group on International Trade which was released on February 17, 1999, foreign firms and products account for the following: 45% of book sales in Canada; 81% of English language consumer magazines on Canadian newsstands and over 63% of magazine circulation revenue; 79%, or over \$910 million, of the retail sales of tapes, CDs, concerts, merchandise and sheet music; 85%, or \$165 million, of the revenues from film distribution in Canada; and between 94% and 97% of screen time in Canadian theatres.

While Canada believes its citizens should have access to foreign cultural goods, the government also recognizes that we need space for our own voice. Our culture is an integral part of who we are. Sharing stories and ideas and creating a better understanding among people in Canada is an effective way to build a healthy multicultural society. The government as steward of our national identity has a duty to promote cultural activities that help build a sense of community.

Cultural products are not simply commodities that can be packaged and sold. Cultural goods and services are different from the goods and services of other industries and should be treated differently.

However, Canada is not alone in its efforts to promote culture and cultural industries. Like Canada, many countries provide direct support for their cultural industries.

• (1540)

For example, the European Union's media II program provides grants and loans to promote the development of film production projects aimed at the European market.

The United Kingdom provides subsidies for a wide range of artistic activities through the arts councils which are funded by lotteries, while the British Film Institute provides direct grants for film production and exhibitions.

Government Orders

France's Centre National de la Cinématographie uses special cinema taxes to support film production. Any producer of fiction, animation, cultural shows or documentaries whose programs have been broadcast by French television automatically receives a grant from the country's film and television industry support fund.

The Swedish Film Institute uses a tax on cinema tickets and video rentals as well as state funds to make film production grants.

Interestingly enough, the United States directly supports everything from literature to drama through the National Endowment for the Arts.

We are at a critical juncture in the history of magazine publishing in Canada as we face the choice between caving in to American pressure tactics or maintaining our right to continue the longstanding policy of ensuring that Canadians can choose to read their own magazines as well as other magazines from around the world.

Magazine publishing has never been an easy business in Canada even without the unfair competition of split-run editions of American magazines. The scale of our market, the competition for readers from American magazines, and the negative impact on our advertising revenues of the spillover advertising that Canadians see in American magazines have all meant that Canadian publishers will survive only if they produce quality magazines that Canadians want to read and at the same time operate at peak efficiency.

Canadian magazine publishers have called on this government to provide an environment of fair competition, a level playing field so they can continue to have the incentive to invest. Fair competition cannot exist when our split-run competitors have costs less than half of ours and no Canadian content.

Bill C-55 is the only measure that has been identified that is effective in preventing unfair split-run competition and also is consistent with our trade agreements. Bill C-55 does not violate the NAFTA or any other international trade obligation. It has never been challenged before the WTO or any other dispute settlement body. Bill C-55 is entirely consistent with our trade obligations.

Bill C-55 regulates foreign access to the Canadian magazine advertising services market. It is a services measure. It does not apply to or affect imports of magazines. As a services measure, it falls under the GATS. Canada did not offer and the U.S. did not obtain or pay for access to our advertising services market in the negotiation of the GATS. Canada therefore has no obligations and the U.S. has no rights vis-à-vis access to the market.

U.S. threats of retaliation under NAFTA show that it does not have a legal case to make. If it did, it would use the WTO rules, where it started the dispute in the first place, to challenge Bill C-55. Moreover, under NAFTA the United States cannot forum shop. The provision for retaliation under the cultural exemption applies

only if the measure would violate an obligation in the FTA, if not for the exemption. No such obligation exists. The level of retaliation the U.S. has threatened is equally illegitimate. The fact that Canada's previous magazine measures were ruled inconsistent with the GATT does not mean the new measure would also be ruled inconsistent. Bill C-55 is completely different from the previous measures.

I would like to conclude with a quote from a recent bulletin of the Canadian Conference of the Arts which reviewed the importance of Bill C-55. "We give the last word to President Bill Clinton: We must enforce our trade laws when imports unlawfully flood our nation".

Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with everything I have heard today, I must say that I endorse free trade, not liberalized trade.

• (1545)

I have come to know in my short time here in the House of Commons, and in my time before that, that it is actually liberalized trade, not free trade. Free and liberalized are not the same thing at all. Liberalized means regulated. Liberalized means subsidized. Liberalized means tampered with and that is exactly what we have.

For the folks back home I want to describe what is going on today. We are debating Bill C-55. It is the heritage minister's attempt to try to control freedom of speech, freedom of advertising with relation to freedom of speech, and to invite U.S. retaliation against Canadian industries.

There are 21 clauses in this bill. My Reform colleague has proposed 21 amendments which would delete each one of the clauses with regard to the amendments and the changes and whatnot involved with Bill C-55.

On top of that, there is an amendment that has recently been added by the minister that would give the minister the power to decide when the bill will take effect. We all know that is redundant because the cabinet already decides when a bill will be proclaimed in law. What the heritage minister indeed is doing in this particular example is buying herself time because the government knows this will result in retaliation and it will be bad for other industries in Canada. As a result, the government is putting an eject button into its own legislation because it wants to quickly ram it through the House and then potentially be able to just eject this thing and have the minister stall on it so it is not proclaimed. The government already recognizes that it is bad legislation. I do not know why it is defending it today. I guess it is a face saving measure.

Not only do I believe in free trade as opposed to liberalized trade, but I also believe in free speech as opposed to Liberal speech

Government Orders

and talking points, especially those prepared by the minister and what the backbenchers on the Liberal side are reading today. I think that Canadian taxpayers and citizens deserve to know more, and we should have no more Bill C-55.

Let us talk about some of the problems that Bill C-55 can bring to Canada. U.S. retaliation is one of the things that Bill C-55 can bring. I would like to quote a few statistics and articles that have been done on this particular issue.

There is \$1 billion of trade that is done every day between Canada and the United States. It is the longest undefended border in the world. We have had a pretty good relationship, aside from the war of 1812, but then they were not really our troops, they were British troops at the time. Canada was formed in 1867, so it was a bit before our time. However, we have a pretty good relationship with the United States in terms of trade.

Bill C-55 would restrict trade. We have already signed an agreement stating that we would not restrict trade. It was called the North American Free Trade Agreement. To boot, there is also the World Trade Organization and some of the agreements we have made under that auspices.

There have been precedents that have already been set within those agreements which Bill C-55 would violate. Just to prove that point, both parties on the two most powerful U.S. congressional committees are backing the U.S. trade representative's threat of retaliation.

Across the border to the south we have the two most powerful committees to deal with, as well as both parties and a representative of the White House all telling us that if Bill C-55 goes through there will be retaliation.

This is what we are talking about in terms of the numbers. It is designed to address about \$400 million per year in the magazine advertising market. In the big picture we have \$400 million over an entire year concerning magazine advertising. There is \$1 billion worth of trade per day between our two countries. Why, hon. members ask, for \$400 million and some smaller fraction of that to be affected by Bill C-55 would we look to jeopardize \$365 billion worth of trade?

• (1550)

Roughly that means that for one-one-thousandth of the amount of trade we do with the United States we would jeopardize our trading relationship over something that the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Agreement have already laid out for us in precedent. It will not stand in terms of a point of law. It does not make a lot of sense, does it?

What has the U.S. trade representative let us know they would be potentially looking at in terms of retaliation? They are talking

about steel. Would that not be an interesting scenario? How fitting it would be for the member from Hamilton who is advocating the changes to Bill C-55 to have steel hit on by the U.S. in terms of trade retaliation. The workers in her own riding, people who are steelworkers in Hamilton, would be affected by that trade retaliation.

I do not want that and neither does our heritage minister. Therefore I ask her today to either substantially change this bill or to get rid of it altogether.

If U.S. representatives decide to retaliate it would only be fitting that they do so in an industry that is directly related as closely as possible to the heritage minister's own riding. I hope that does not happen. That is why I hope she repeals this bill.

Other commodities which are under threat are textiles, plastics, lumber and wheat. Those are all big commodities and Canada is an export nation.

Why would we want to risk our reputation internationally as an advocate of rules based trade in order to satisfy the whims of our heritage minister? I do not know why we would want to do that.

I hope those people in the Liberal caucus will stand up so this does not happen. I hope that when they ram this bill through they will make sure that the eject button they are putting into clause 22 is used and this thing gets shelved so that steelworkers in Hamilton do not lose their jobs because of the whims of their own representative in the House of Commons. That is what I hope happens. I wish they would repeal it altogether. As a stopgap measure, because they are not willing to admit their own abuses of trade practices and rules based trade, I hope they have the decency at least to do that.

Fifty per cent of the magazines purchased in Canada are foreign. That is another statistic I will throw into the debate. It is important to temper this whole thing with an understanding of what is going to be affected.

This is all about an unreasonable limit on fundamental freedoms, on freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It is also a violation of property rights and freedom of contract.

I am going to touch on some other things that this government has been going along with in terms of violation of freedom of speech, violation of property rights and violation of freedom of contract.

The press has not been in love with the Liberal government of late because of the whole idea of freedom of speech. It goes back further than this, but let me list a few examples.

We had APEC. When the Prime Minister and his crew were going after Terry Milewski and the CBC, the press were not impressed. That is only fair because the Prime Minister was trying to stifle freedom of expression and freedom of speech.

Government Orders

We also have the CRTC which suppresses the Canadian identity from coast to coast to coast in terms of its finagling and shutting down competition in the cable industry. I could go on to name a few others.

One of the most egregious violations this government has thought of yet with regard to the violation of freedom of speech has been the election gag laws. If there were third parties who wanted to advocate a position or publish polls during an election, this government would impose fines or jail them. That is another way this Liberal government does not like freedom of speech.

The government also uses taxpayers' money on propaganda. It loves spending money in places where it should not be spent to advocate how good the government is. This goes to show how out of touch and elitist this government is when it comes to freedom of speech. It allows it only when it serves its own ends. Shame on it. It should repeal Bill C-55.

• (1555)

Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear some of the justification that members opposite seem to be trying to put forward to justify why they are actually voting against an industry that, by the member's own admission, generates \$400 million in revenue. They trivialize that. They do not seem to think that is important.

As well, the industry employs over 7,000 people.

We have also heard the argument that somehow Bill C-55 is against freedom of speech.

I will deal with the first issue, the accusations and comments about closure, that somehow this government in a heavy-handed way is shutting down debate.

The previous speaker stated that there are 21 clauses in this bill and then went on to say that his critic had put forward 21 amendments which would basically cancel out each one of the clauses.

Does that sound like an attempt to be constructive? Does that sound like they are putting forward alternative suggestions? There are 21 clauses and 21 amendments which are contrary to the entire intent of the bill. It is clearly nothing more than an attempt by the Reform Party to filibuster, to try to stall instead of allowing for debate to take place.

I will give the House an example. This is a quote directly from the government House leader in talking about Reform: "Do they think this is serious debate or is it stalling?" He went on to say: "I think most Canadians would agree that 50 speeches and to still be on clause 1 constitutes stalling".

Quite clearly they are not interested in getting into why the Canadian parliament is at the point where it is actually passing a

law that would restrict the open flow of advertising. Why would we want to do that?

They throw up the threat that the United States is going to retaliate, as if we should just tuck our nationalistic tails between our legs and go home. In fact, they make the comment in a press clipping, saying that Liberals want Reform to roll over in its opposition to this bill. What in essence we are hearing from the opposition is that they want the Canadian government, and by extension the Canadian nation, to roll over to the Americans.

The member said one thing that is accurate. We have the longest undefended border in the world. It is a free border, with free crossings. We have a relationship in trade, to the tune of a billion dollars a day. We have a relationship in terms of tourism. How many Canadians own property in the United States? We have an excellent relationship with them. But are we just to turn around and say that we do not care that what they are doing is in our opinion illegal activity that is damaging an industry? Would we tolerate it for any other industry?

I would suggest that if the fear that is being promulgated by the Reform Party were to come true and the United States were to put a tariff or some kind of a sanction on steel products, clearly that would be against the North American Free Trade Agreement.

There are mechanisms, solutions and ways of dealing with the situation. They cannot simply violate that agreement. This bill does not violate the NAFTA. I do not know how many times we have to say it.

It is somewhat disturbing to me to hear the false impressions that are put forward in question period and in debate. They are impressions that when researched are simply not backed up by the facts.

• (1600)

I can give an example. If a foreign publication is operating in this country for over one year it will not be impacted by the bill. Canadian advertisers are not impacted by the bill. A case in point would be *Reader's Digest*, which is currently about 75% Canadian owned. There is no negative impact on *Reader's Digest*. *Time Magazine* is grandfathered by the bill.

Mr. Peter Adams: Grandparented.

Mr. Steve Mahoney: Grandparented, I stand corrected by the member for Peterborough. I thank him very much. The point of the matter is the minister, the committee and the staff have taken care to make sure that the actions taken do not reflect negatively on the industry. For every action the government takes clearly there is reaction.

Let us assume that the split-run magazines come in. It is very confusing for my constituents who have called. There have not been a lot, but basically they have called to say that we cannot let the Americans put us out of business. I have had none of the types of calls the Reform Party has referred to in this area.

Government Orders

I want to refer to a hypothetical scenario. If we do not act and there is no Bill C-55 and all of a sudden I see the critic standing in his place during question period demanding to know what the heritage minister will do to protect the \$400 million in trade and to protect the 7,000 jobs, I can just hear the outrage.

If we were to do nothing in this area, I suspect Reformers would simply, as they often do, switch principles and go at it from the other side. What do we hear but cries of outrage when we hear about the potential for or the fear of selling water to the United States. We hear all kinds of people getting upset and saying tell them it is not so, that we have to protect Canadian resources, that we cannot cave in to the Americans, and let them solve their own problems. On the other hand they say the Americans will beat us up, punch us in the nose with some trade sanctions and we will have to bow down to them.

I tried to come up with an analogy that made some sense in relation to protecting our cultural industries. I think people will understand that we see the tremendous success in the entertainment and the media industries of Canadians around the world.

In the recent music awards something like seven of the top ten nominations were Canadians, people like Shania Twain and Céline Dion. How did that happen? How is it that all of a sudden we have names like those ones, as well as Michael J. Fox and the late John Candy. One of the great successful music groups in Europe right now happens to be a group called the Bare Naked Ladies. I was talking to my brother-in-law the other day. He said they were playing to packed houses. Other Canadian talent is the Tragically Hip and James Cameron, the director of *Titanic*. The list goes on and on.

Gone are the days when the only two internationally known Canadian stars were Paul Anka and Robert Goulet, singing a medley of his hits. Why is it that we see Canadians succeeding? I think it is because they are tremendously talented people, but I also think it is because the nation through successive governments over the years has recognized the need to protect and ensure Canadian content in print, on the airwaves and in all aspects of entertainment and media.

A country of 30 million people is producing some of the top talent in the entire world and is exporting our cultural capabilities around the world. It truly is an amazing success story. This is frankly no different. We are ensuring the protection of this industry with the bill.

Reform is simply opposing it to be obstreperous. I guarantee if we did not do this it would take the other approach entirely.

• (1605)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought we had moved on to the second group of motions. I could certainly

continue and address the first group but I have already spoken. Is it still within the rules that I can speak?

The Deputy Speaker: No, I am afraid the hon. member can only speak once to a grouping. I know he is looking forward to moving to Group No. 2.

Mr. Bryon Wilfert (Oak Ridges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-55 today.

Who makes policy in Canada? Is it parliament or the U.S. congress? Shall we as a parliament govern our actions and our policies based on threats or perceived threats from political leaders south of the border?

The official opposition would have us move or not move based on the whims of Americans. Canadians have elected us to do the job. They have asked us to protect Canada's vital interests. Bill C-55 is about the survival of our magazine industry. The issue is about cultural differences.

Americans view culture as a commodity. Certainly our culture needs support from the entrepreneurial excesses of American capitalists. Canadian culture is something that needs to be promoted and enhanced.

Eighty per cent of our population lives within 150 kilometres of the U.S. border. We are subject to a barrage of American entertainment through films, magazines and television. American entertainment has become what the English language has become around the world. It has become universal. It has become the mode by which people listen and take American values.

Our culture is what defines us as a nation, but it is difficult being so close to a population which is 25 times our size. The Americans see culture simply as an entertainment commodity with a bottom line. Clearly they are trying to expand that bottom line in terms of their share of the international market.

Canada must and needs to create policies which maintain our cultural existence and in this regard the bill will assist in maintaining that objective.

We have over 1,000 publishers producing over 1,400 Canadian titles in Canada and 561 consumer magazines with a total circulation of over 47 million. We have 826 Canadian business publications with a total circulation of over 11 million. Twenty-four million Canadians over the age of 12 read one or more major Canadian consumer magazines annually. The industry employs 5,200 full time and 1,700 part time people. Twenty thousand additional jobs are dependent on magazine publishers. We are looking at a total annual revenue of over \$1 billion.

Canada has maintained policy measures designed to provide Canadians with distinctive vehicles for cultural expression. Although we welcome foreign publications, we have maintained a policy to promote our own cultural industries. With the adoption of

Government Orders

Bill C-55, U.S. magazines will continue to be welcomed into this country. They account for 80% of newsstand sales presently.

Bill C-55 is about regulating foreign access to the Canadian advertising services market. This issue is very different from wheat or coal or steel. It is about being Canadian. It is about providing a sustainable and visibly Canadian periodical industry by ensuring the advertising revenues needed to create content is available. One page of advertising equals one page of content.

Some would argue that the bill would cause a trade war. Canada is obliged by trade treaties to allow free trade in goods, but we have never agreed and will never agree to give foreigners free access to the Canadian advertising services market. As Canadians we must and will defend our rights as an independent and sovereign state to develop policies which support our domestic cultural expression. We will and are defending those rights.

• (1610)

Bill C-55 maintains a Canadian policy that has been in place for three decades. It aims to ensure the environment in which our Canadian identity can be maintained. What is at stake is the future of over 450 or so smaller and more specialized Canadian periodicals that fill an essential niche in the country's culture. So-called editions would kill the prospect for young publishers, for young editors who might want to set up their own magazine.

Fundamental to this policy has been the belief that Canadians must continue to have the opportunity to read about their own stories, their values and their interests. In order for this to continue Canadian publishers must be able to operate in a fair and competitive environment. The bill will ensure that Canadian magazine publishers have fair access to Canadian advertising services revenues. Without those revenues they would be unable to provide readers with the broad range of Canadian publications currently available.

This is not a NAFTA issue. The bill does not violate NAFTA or other international trade obligations. It has never been challenged before the World Trade Organization or any other dispute settlement body, for that matter. Comments about trade war are not well founded. Canada and the United States have the most successful trading relationship with more than 95% of our goods and services moving freely across the border. If the Americans do not like the provisions of the bill, they can always turn to international dispute settlement provisions.

Early this year the Prime Minister stated:

It is very important to maintain a Canadian identity. We have a good case and we will win it.

I certainly concur with that view. We should not be surprised with the American sabre rattling. Again the Americans are reacting, trying to have us back down. Back down we will not do.

Americans claim that U.S. companies will loose by being excluded from the Canadian market. There have been claims that they would loose up to \$300 million, a figure based on the improbable scenario of every U.S. magazine launching a Canadian split-run edition. This type of sabre rattling is what we are hearing.

It seems clear that despite the success of Canadian publishers in meeting the demands of Canadians for stories about themselves, the loss of advertising revenues to unfair competition in the advertising services market would have a very negative impact on the industry. Canadian content would be lost but not replaced by split-run advertising editions of U.S. magazines.

Canadians would loose the choice of reading their own stories. Canadians could not expect American publishers to incur the cost of adding Canadian stories to their split-run advertising editions. Nor should they. We need to promote our own stories written by and for Canadians.

The bill does not limit competition in the Canadian magazine industry. In fact, Bill C-55 ensures the economic viability of the Canadian magazine industry and the preservation of thousands of jobs of Canadian writers, artists, editors, photographers and art directors. Canadians need to be able to express themselves through their own medium. The legislation ensures that Canadians continue to have that freedom.

I urge all members of the House to support the legislation to send a message that our Canadian cultural institutions are worth preserving. We will not be swayed from doing the right thing to ensure that the values, interests and stories that make our country so unique are heard now and in the future. We must stand up for our own interests.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot in the debate about Bill C-55 serving to protect Canada's culture. I suggest the more correct term is to protect Canadian values.

When we think of culture we think in terms of the entertainment industry and we think in terms of the arts. What we are really dealing with is something far more prosaic. It is magazines that may deal with issues that are very much every day in Canadian life. It is the very fact that they are every day in Canadian life that makes it so important to preserve them as Canadian voices rather than American voices.

• (1615)

I will give a simple illustration. When we think of sports magazines and we consider the Canadian coverage of sports, be it sports occurring in Canada or sports occurring in the United States, we are liable to get a very different view from a Canadian on something like the use of drugs in sports than we might get in the United States. I am thinking of using certain performance enhanc-

Government Orders

ing drugs in baseball which has been the subject of a great many articles in both Canada and the United States. American society has a much more broad minded approach to this kind of cheating than does Canadian society. Americans would not consider it cheating at all but in Canadian society we might.

When we talk about the magazine publishing industry we are not necessarily talking about music magazines or arts magazines. We are talking about magazines dealing with home decorating, social issues, anything imaginable. Canadian values are reflected in this type of venue.

I will give another example. It is very important in Canadian society that we believe as Canadians that fundamental human rights pertain to the individual. In our charter of rights we do not even mention the issue of property. In the United States property rights are very much an issue. Americans are very conscious of the need to protect property. This has created a huge division in attitude between Americans and Canadians.

In magazine articles, even indirectly, this difference in values will be expressed. When a Canadian writer deals with issues at home, issues of safety, the safety of Canadian cities, that person will look in terms of the protection of human rights, of individual rights, not in terms of property rights.

I remember a vivid example of a *National Geographic* article that dealt with a tornado that struck the community of Homestead, Florida. It devastated that community. The article had illustrations of the various damage of the tornado. One illustration showed an individual property owner standing amid the wreckage of his property with his furniture and everything all smashed, including his home. He had a small silver plated gun to the head of a looter. The caption simply said something like Florida homeowner protects his property from looters.

That illustration is an example of the gulf in value that exists between American attitudes toward property, the protection of property and the use of force to protect property and Canadian values which would say that under no circumstances would anyone ever have the right to hold a gun to the head of a person merely trying to steal something or looking at the rubble after a tornado. That would never happen in Canadian society. What is really at issue here is not just the protection of Canadian culture but the protection of Canadian values.

I note the Bloc Quebecois is very much in support of the principles of Bill C-55, and well it should be. It is well established that Americans feel very strongly that there should be only one official language. They cannot understand a society that actually has a whole bureaucracy, all our engines set up to accommodate two official languages operating in a society. That has made us into an exceptionally tolerant people.

That is not what we get when we read American publications. When we read the language and the stories of a society, underneath are that society's values. It is the same in television. Unfortunately we cannot do much about the airwaves but we can do something about the publishing industry. Bill C-55 tries to do this precise thing.

• (1620)

How is it doing it? As someone who comes from the publishing industry, I am impressed that the drafters of this law have recognized some realities of the publishing industry. One is that companies have fixed advertising budgets. The more advertising venues one has for a company that wishes to advertise, the more that money will be spread around and less will go to any individual organization. I will give the example that is occurring right now.

The *National Post* is trying to enter the newspaper marketplace and it is up against the *Toronto Star* and the *Globe and Mail*. What we really see here is a conflict over trying to obtain what is essentially a limited amount of advertising revenue.

A story in the *Sunday Star* this past weekend claims that the *National Post* is making no progress. All we have to do is look at the *National Post's* pages and we will see very few advertisements.

It is the same kind of thing we are talking about now. If the government does not act in this area there is no doubt that Canadian advertisers will be attracted to split-run publications coming out of the United States because there is no doubt they have more bucks behind them, they have more resources in producing the glossy finished product to get those topic interviews that are so expensive. There is no doubt that money would be streamed to some of these American split-run publications at the expense of Canadian publications which may be doing essentially the same story but that story will always have an undercurrent of Canadian values as opposed to American values.

At that level this legislation acknowledges that there is a problem here that must be addressed because if it is not addressed, there will be less of a voice for Canadian articles, indeed on the same subject, reflecting Canadian values.

One might say that if the government feels that way why does it not just give all these Canadian magazines a direct grant. Why does the government not give a direct grant to Canadian writers in these magazines? This would encourage Canadian content.

I suggest the problem with that is when government interferes with culture or a freedom of expression or function in Canadian society or any society, it becomes the government's values or the bureaucratic values that begin to operate what is actually happening with that publication or cultural expression, be it music or print or whatever.

Government Orders

The only measure of whether something is worth saying is whether people will pay their own money for it or go to the trouble to hear what is being said. That is why it is so important to have this cultural responsibility in the hands of free enterprise. We do that by doing exactly what this legislation does, encouraging Canadian advertisers to invest those dollars in Canadian publications so that we can have Canadian stories about Canadians and about Canadian values.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to try to stop this Liberal filibuster. The Liberals invoked closure on this bill. We are ready to go on to the next group and see if we can get some debate going on the next group of amendments.

The Liberals are filibustering us, which is appropriate from a government that does not like to debate the issues but rather likes to just ram things through with its pulling of the strings of its backbenchers who vote the way they are told. There is no democracy. There is no debate. There is no consultation with Canadians across the country to see whether they support this.

One of the very interesting movies I saw not many years ago is called *The Mouse That Roared*. It is an old movie. I have discovered that if one sees any movies that are newer than about the last 20 years they will probably tend to corrupt one's morals.

• (1625)

It was about a small country that had interminable financial difficulties. In order to solve this problem, the prime minister or the president of this small country decided to declare war on the United States on the thinking that after it had lost the war, which undoubtedly it would, then the United States would, in its true fashion, pour millions and millions of dollars into the country to rebuild it which would restore its economy.

I was just wondering if that is what Canada is now trying to do. Is it declaring war on the United States fully expecting to lose so that our economy will be restored? I really do not think so.

This whole bill is based on a couple of totally wrong premises. One premise is that Canadian magazines cannot survive unless they are protected. I reject that. We have the same thinking from the heritage department when it comes to Canadian artists. It thinks that poor Canadian artists are so mediocre that they cannot make it unless the government prevents radio stations from playing other artists. They must play Canadian artists. I reject that.

If we look at some of the award shows these days we will see a fair representation from Canadian artists. They seem to be making it fine. There is no law in the United States which says they must play a certain amount by Canadian artists. However, those Canadian artists on their own and because of their merits are able to do this.

I contend it is the same for magazines. Canadian magazines appeal to Canadian readers in their particular niche of interests and they can make it very well, thank you, without government interference.

There is another premise which I roundly reject in this bill, that culture will somehow be either destroyed or made less vibrant if the government does not protect it. That is fuzzy thinking. Liberal thinking, thinking that says unless the government regulates, promotes, taxes and sends a whole bunch of investigators and supervisors into it, it will not happen. This is a totally wrong premise.

I grew up in a culture which is not one of the ones on the protected list, which is another problem. If we turn over the promotion of culture to government then we get a list of culture, A culture, B culture. We get all these different lists and anybody who is not on the list unfortunately has to make it on their own, which they will. Meanwhile their tax dollars are siphoned off in order to support other people's cultures.

I am quite convinced, from my own experience, that culture is something which we need to let the people control. It should not be handed over to a government bureaucracy. All this crying from the Liberal side about needing to do this in order to preserve our culture is just a bunch of hogwash. It just does not fly. It is a false premise, fuzzy thinking and wrong thinking.

I am quite convinced this bill is very ill advised. We are not fearmongering but strictly being realistic when we say that it puts at risk a lot of Canadian trade with the Americans because they have already given notice that they will do this.

I know members over there are saying let us not just fold every time somebody makes a threat. Of course not. We have our own sovereignty but let us choose the issues we will fight for. Let us make sure they are worth fighting for. Let us not pick a fight on something that is unnecessary, ineffective and that will only take us into a huge amount of trade disputes with the Americans.

I am ready to dispute with them anytime but does this government do this? Does it do it when it comes to our farmers and trade? No. The government puts up its own barriers. It says it will not let Canadian farmers send their wheat to the United States. It puts up its own barriers and prevents farmers from doing that.

Here it is saying it will put up a barrier to protect Canadian industry. That is just garbage because at every other turn it does just the opposite.

• (1630)

My contention and my statement in my short intervention unplanned as it is, is simply to appeal to the government backbenchers to think, just good old plain put the brain in gear. They should think for themselves. I know I cannot address them directly.

Government Orders

They should not simply vote for this because the Minister of Canadian Heritage has her political life on the line and there is a big move to try to save her face. I have no interest in having her lose face, but she could gain face by backing off on this legislation. I would like to see her come into the House today and say "I am withdrawing this bill until we do more study on it and find out whether or not it is really needed, and whether or not it is effective, and whether or not it is based on right premises and right thinking".

It is unconscionable that the Liberals are ramming this bill through. They have put in closure and are filibustering on the amendments in Group No. 1 so we cannot discuss the amendment in Group No. 2 which is the minister's motion. I cannot understand this. It is absolutely frustrating.

This is one of the things that brings this parliament into disrepute across the country. The people of Canada are not being heard. They are not being consulted. They are not being informed correctly. They always receive all sorts of different messages which are meant to give them the message the government wants them to believe.

This example is way off topic but it shows what I am talking about. When it comes to health care funding the government wants us to have \$2 billion, \$2 billion, \$2.5 billion. When it is all added up it is \$11.5 billion. The fact is that the health care funding is going up this year by \$2 billion and next year it will be zero because it is \$2 billion more than it was last year, next year as well. Yet the Liberals want Canadians to think it is going up another \$2 billion. It is not. That is the type of message the Liberals give. It is not a fair way of communicating with Canadian voters, Canadian taxpayers.

That is exactly what is happening with this bill. The government is giving out its message. I am going to say it, Mr. Speaker, and you can call me on it if you want to, but it is totally false information. The government is deceiving the people of Canada with this misinformation. It is time that the Liberals withdrew the bill and said to Canadians that they are going to look at it again because they want to do it correctly.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate and especially to follow the member for Elk Island. I can honestly say that the member represents for me probably 90% of the reason I could never ever be associated with the Reform Party. I am a passionate interventionist.

The member talked about how we are ramming this bill through. The bill is not being rammed through.

Today the Government of Canada and the people of Canada are receiving the MAD treatment from the Reform Party. Many years

ago, when I had the great privilege and pleasure of working for the then Prime Minister Trudeau, we would refer to the MAD treatment, maximum administrative delay. That is what the people of Canada are experiencing today. Whenever an opposition party essentially wants to delete every clause of a bill and thereby delete the bill, that is the MAD treatment.

Passionate interventionism is what I believe in. There is not a riding or a sector of this country's economy that would be alive and well today if we had not had some form of government intervention.

The member talked about tragedies. One of the real tragedies of the House of Commons has been the impact that that opposition party has had on so many other issues where we have watered down the Government of Canada activism, the Government of Canada presence in this country. That is part of the reason we have separatism, but fortunately that party is on the way out now. We can see that party has been so distracted lately because the economy is coming back. It is starting to lose its separatist foundation in that province.

● (1635)

I want to quote one of our national treasures. There was an article in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday, March 6. I want to quote one of our great Canadian hockey treasures, Frank Mahovlich. The article is by Graham Fraser. It states:

But Mahovlich has a bleak view of the game he once mastered and charmed.

"The head office is now in New York," he said in his radio interview. "We have lost this game. The game is not what it used to be. I mean, we've always changed the rules to suit everybody else. When we played the Russians, back in 1972, we weren't playing our rules, we were playing the Russian rules, the Olympic rules. So the game is not Canadian any more. We've lost it. Whether we can get it back or not, I don't know. We'll have to wait and see".

The members of the Reform Party have tried in so many areas to diminish the Canadian content, to diminish the Canadian presence, to diminish the Canadian activism. If there was ever an area where Canada's House of Commons should be standing on guard, it is in the area of culture.

I consider that Bill C-55 is really not an overly aggressive attempt to keep this country's magazine industry alive. I cannot understand for the life of me why the Reform Party is trying to put a spike in the spirit and the heart of this bill.

The member said to us that we think Canadian magazines cannot survive on their own. The bottom line is, I believe that. I believe they cannot survive on their own.

Have the Reform Party members ever competed against the American muscle with all its money and influence? When was the last time? Let us ask any Canadians who are listening to this

debate. Do not listen to me. Walk down to the local grocery store, walk down to the local variety store or go into the local bookstore and look at those magazine racks. Better than 50% of the magazines—

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Eighty per cent.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage has just corrected me and I appreciate that. Almost 80% of the magazines on the racks in this country are American magazines. Is the Reform Party that satisfied with the Americans having 80%? Does it want us to roll over and give them 90% or 95%? When will it stop? The Reform Party is going to want us to erase the 49th parallel next.

I dread the day when we have to have a debate about water with the Reform Party sitting in the House. My goodness, that will be the day when we really will be put to the test because that is something the Americans want a heck of a lot more than more shelf space on a magazine rack. We should all be united and I can see the Reform Party running away from the water debate saying to just roll over and give it to the Americans.

• (1640)

We should respect and work with our neighbours, but at the same time we have a duty and a responsibility to make sure that our magazine industry is vibrant and viable. If it means the Minister of Canadian Heritage has to stand up and say enough, that this is what we are going to do, then we should be a fist in this House of Commons, especially when the Americans have access to our community by selling magazines like no other country in the world.

The Americans ship them across the 49th parallel. There are hardly any shipping costs when they move magazines into this country. Let us think about that.

Members have to understand that many of the craftsmen and craftswomen who design, write and organize our magazine industry are the same artists who help other sectors of the cultural industry, the motion picture industry and the television industry. Unless those artists are given an opportunity to maximize and test their potential and have others give them feedback and critique the quality of their work, this is going to have an adverse impact on other business components of our cultural industry. It is a huge, huge industry. We are talking job numbers here that are very serious to our gross domestic product.

To the members of the Reform Party, let us not diminish the Canadian cultural activity. The Reform Party members said when they came to this House of Commons that when they saw something good for the nation, they would work with us and make change.

If there was ever a case for government intervention, this is it. This bill should be supported because the American magazine

Government Orders

industry currently has almost 80% of the magazines on the racks in this country. I say to the member for Elk Island that is quite enough for our neighbours and it is time that all of us in the House stood up for our own.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. 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 West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Justice; the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, Airbus; the hon. member for Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, Devco.

[*English*]

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill today. Of course, this will be our last opportunity.

It was rather interesting to listen to the member for Broadview—Greenwood. He thought that if there ever was a time when the government needed to intervene in this nation's cultural industry, this was the bill to do it, unless of course it happened to be professional hockey teams, in which case that would be a good idea too, unless it happened to be an artist back home, or who knows what. There never seems to be an end to the list of people.

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member just said that this would be the last chance the House would have to address this issue. I would like to point out to the member that we are at report stage and there is still third reading.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not think that is a point of order. I think really it is a point of debate.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Liberals seem to be so sensitive about the issue of time allocation.

Let us go back to 1956. Mr. Speaker, you were but a young lad I am sure. The Liberal government of the day decided that a crucial parliamentary debate, a debate such as we had today, on the trans-Canada pipeline had tarried too long. It implemented a powerful but rarely used standing order of the day and invoked closure, shut down debate to force a controversial bill through the House of Commons. The hue and cry from the opposition parties, the media and ordinary Canadians was staggering. In the election that followed the travesty of democracy became a scourge of the Liberal Party and the government of the day slipped into the government of the past.

• (1645)

How times have changed. This week another Liberal government has invoked a form of closure. This is number 49, the 49th time the government has invoked closure. I think it will hit the golden anniversary of 50 some time this week. That will be 50 times that it

Government Orders

has invoked time allocation and closure since it has come to power. That is the fastest 50 uses of closure in Canadian history.

Pipeline debates are passé nowadays, but debate on this bill, a very important bill to Canadians as the Liberal member prior to me mentioned, will be shut down. Debate will be silenced and the government will push it through and push it through again at the next stage because it has decided it is the easiest way to manage time in the House.

It is a vitally important bill. It involves not only a social principle. It could involve hundreds of millions, perhaps billions of dollars, worth of trade which could be at risk because of the bill. It is hugely important to Canadians and they want to see it properly debated in the House.

As I mentioned it is all over but the crying. The government has decided that there is very little political price to pay, so for the 49th time it will invoke closure or restriction on debate. We will be forced to vote on it tonight and it will pass into the annals of history as another time when democracy took short shrift.

The closure problem did not happen overnight. I do not want to point fingers at just one political party. The party that was in government before the Liberals also had this problem, although it took it eight years to reach 50 time allocation motions. This government has done it in five.

The political masters across the way have acted so consistently undemocratic over the past several years that in fact I would argue we have become callous to democracy's decline. The use of iron fisted party discipline means that MPs often vote to represent the party before constituents. The lack of electoral reform ensures that a majority government, in this case with only 38% of the national vote, has absolute dictatorial powers in the House of Commons, in the appointment process and in a hundred or a thousand different ways.

Unfortunately successive majority governments over the last number of years also meant that power sharing was no longer necessary, or they felt it was not. As a result Canadians increasingly tune out the democratic process between elections. The Liberals interpret this inattentiveness as a licence to ignore everything, from unanimous all party committee reports that are tabled in this place, to the Auditor General of Canada who says he will not sign off on the books of the government because they routinely transgress standard accounting practices.

Yet government members say "Who cares? We have 100% of the power. We do not have to share it. We do not have to do what is considered routine or ordinary or normal or accepted in any other practice. We will just do as we please". This is the 49th time they have taken that tact.

I recently attended a briefing on the current democratic reforms occurring in the United Kingdom. Although I do not claim that is

the perfect democracy either, I listened to an interesting discussion at the high commission. Members of the mother parliament, as we like to call it, are forging ahead with what they would consider to be radical changes. They are talking about devolution of powers to local governments in Ireland, Wales and Scotland. As they do that strange things happen. Not only are they restoring peace and tranquillity to those regions, but they are also instilling a sense of pride in those regions.

Power sharing under this new proposal through either a coalition government or proportional representation will be routine.

• (1650)

For example, the chairs of the committees will be allocated not on the percentage of who holds absolute power but on the percentage of the seats that are held in the House. Imagine chairs being allocated in a fair manner.

The use of referendum to determine broad public policy and even constitutional matters will be commonplace. Those on the Liberal side say that is a radical proposal, actually giving power to constituents, but in Britain they say that would be okay. In fact they have already done it in Wales, Scotland and Ireland, and with miraculous results.

Guess what. When people have a say in the legislation and in the constitution they buy into it. They say "I have been part of the process. I will live with the results".

Britain is one of the last holdouts for this unelected upper chamber in the world. The only other one in the free world is the Canadian Senate. It is the only other one that is unelected. Over there they are even toying with the idea of electing members. What a radical thought. What has got into those Brits? Have they gone completely over the edge? Imagine all this democracy at one time. How will they stand it? At the very least, the hereditary peers will be gone. It is unstoppable. The move toward democratization in that upper house is now inevitable and just a matter of time.

We are approaching the golden anniversary on time allocation, this black mark on the Liberal record. In the last parliament many high profile Liberals in government, esteemed people with perhaps as much procedural expertise as yourself, Mr. Speaker, were quoted as talking about the dictatorial Tory attitude on closure, about the fact that it was an affront to democracy. Now they seem to think it is routine business.

Within a few days we will see No. 50. Within a few more days we will see No. 51. I look forward to the day when they table the closure motion with the bill in the House of Commons just because it will be much simpler.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I agree with my colleague with respect to your knowledge of procedure and so on, but it seems to me that we are discussing Bill C-55 which has something to do with magazines. Are we discussing

Government Orders

procedure or the Senate? I would be grateful if you would rule whether these arguments are relevant.

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, further to that point, we on the other side of the House have a right to address this bill or any other bill in the way we see fit. The fact is in conjunction with this bill the government invoked time allocation and it is very relevant to the bill.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member who was speaking certainly took a flight of fancy when he described a lot of the changes that were happening in the U.K., which is very interesting, but I must say I was having a little trouble detecting its relevance to the bill before the House.

On the other hand, discussion about time allocation is entirely appropriate given we are operating under time allocation on the bill. I noted before the parliamentary secretary intervened that the official opposition whip had come back to earth and was back on the bill or something relevant to the bill and so I was reluctant to intervene in any way. I know that he will want to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the flights of fancy are obviously not restricted to either side of the House, and the Chair has his say as well. Since we are talking about Britain—I was talking about it as were you—when the awards are handed out, whether Juno awards, Academy awards or other internationally recognized awards, it is always nice to see the long list of Canadians who have made it to the top on their ability, not on the fact that they have been protected. That is how to do it. One becomes good at art or good at magazines or at whatever one happens to be doing and the world will beat a pathway to one's door.

I would hope that on this 49th occasion of the use of time allocation, which is unfortunately restricting the debate on the magazine bill, we would take stock and take note of what is happening here. As we consider changes for the future, I would hope our legacy to the world would be one that demonstrates dissenting voices and opinions are not only listened to but are listened to at length in the House of Commons and in Canada. We do not mind dissenting opinions. We think it is okay in a democracy to develop parliamentary procedures that empower people, not empower governments.

• (1655)

We realize that efficiency and control of the debate should not come at the expense of our freedom of expression and our time in the House. As we debate the bill, I hope we realize we are discussing both the future of our cultural industries, which are important, and the future of the democratic process and the changes the government seems reluctant to entertain.

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way said we may speak according to the way we see fit. I want to address the bill according to the way I see fit this afternoon because many of my constituents who are watching and listening to the debate have asked us questions and I would like to answer a few of them on Bill C-55, the magazine bill or the advertising by foreign periodical publishers bill, and freedom of expression.

I received a couple of calls today asking how Bill C-55 would ensure that Canadian magazine publishers have clear access to Canadian advertising services and the revenues accruing from them. The answer to my constituents was that without those revenues we would not have a viable Canadian magazine industry. Without those revenues we would be unable to provide Canadian readers with the broad range of Canadian publications we currently have.

Many of us as members of parliament were present at a display in one of the rooms on the parliamentary precincts a while ago where several hundred Canadian magazines were on the shelves. Men and women who were cultural artists, photographers, graphic artists, writers, publishers, et cetera, were also there. They were very proud of the work they were doing. They see this as a viable way of making a living for themselves and see any move in the direction of where there is no support for Bill C-55 as being a threat to them, to their future and to Canadian cultural activities.

After reading several articles in the press this weekend, we know that the Reform Party will not be supporting the bill. It is not unreasonable to hear what we heard today in debate. It is part of the plan of action wherein there is little support.

I want to speak specifically to my constituents who have some concerns and have addressed them to me. In discussions with several of them there was a sense that Bill C-55 would stop U.S. magazines from entering Canada. I think other members addressed this earlier, but I want to make sure they understand that U.S. magazines will continue to be welcomed in Canada and that U.S. magazines account for 80% of newsstand sales in Canada.

Bill C-55 is about regulating access to advertising services. Foreign publishers seek access to revenues from selling Canadian advertising services without producing original editorial content for the Canadian market. That revenue is then not available to Canadian publishers that actually produce original content for the Canadian market.

The important point is the fact that foreign publishers cannot come in and use our Canadian advertising services and walk away with our Canadian dollars, denying Canadians the opportunity to benefit from the Canadian market.

Government Orders

• (1700)

We hear a good deal about the trade war that will result between Canada and the United States. My constituents are concerned about this when they hear from the Reform members what could possibly happen to us as a result, what industries could be put at risk, the fact that at this point in time what we will be really doing is letting the American anger and the American feelings over this issue somehow come down on us like a ton of bricks.

I want to say to my constituents that this is not a trade war. Canada and the U.S. have the world's most successful trading relationship with about 95% of all goods going back and forth across the border. We have ways we could settle disputes and that dispute settlements are there to be used. This is precisely why Bill C-55 has provisions that if the U.S. dislikes the provision it can then turn to international dispute settlement.

One other item that is also important is something I jotted down from a conversation with a constituent who spoke about the fact that the bill does not place restrictions on the content of magazines or on individual advertisements or limits Canadians' access to foreign magazines. This is someone who is supportive of Bill C-55 and who wanted to make sure that I made that point today. This bill does not place restrictions on the contents of magazines.

Another constituent addressed the issue of freedom of expression to enjoy a diversity of Canadian ideas. I think this is what Bill C-55 is ensuring, that Canadians continue to have the freedom to express, the freedom to enjoy a diversity of ideas as seen in Canadian magazines.

I encourage my colleagues in the Reform Party to take a second look at their position at this point to recognize the importance of Canadian advertisers to invest in Canadian publications and to again take another look at the fact that this is not draconian and unprecedented legislation. We have at least 100 pieces of legislation that contain similar legal provisions as we see in Bill C-55.

This is not the last time to debate this bill. Other opportunities will be presented. This is not the last opportunity, as one member across the way states. Other opportunities will be provided.

We need to stand up for our cultural artists. As we head into the new millennium it is important that Canadian cultural activities be affirmed and that we go into the millennium strengthened.

Bill C-55 supports longstanding Canadian cultural policies. It is consistent with our international trade obligations and it is the Canadian thing to do.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I wish I could say it is a pleasure for me to rise this afternoon to address the Group No. 1 amendments to Bill C-55. Unfortunately I am unable to do that due to the fact that the

government, as has been referred to already during this afternoon's debate, elected to impose time allocation yet again for the 49th time.

Due to this time allocation at report stage, there is no assurance that this arrogant Liberal government will not impose time allocation as well at third reading despite what the hon. member preceding me had to say about this not being the last opportunity for hon. members on both sides of the House to address this legislation.

• (1705)

Due to time allocation and the reality that the clock is now at 5.05 p.m., my understanding is debate will be collapsed by this government through the use of time allocation at approximately 6.15 p.m. and we have not even got to discuss the Group No. 2 amendments. I wonder if I could have the unanimous consent of the House to move immediately to Group No. 2 amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Jay Hill: Madam Speaker, I think what we have just seen is indicative of the extremely arrogant dictatorial style of this government in the fact that it refused a very reasonable request that we move on to Group No. 2 amendments.

Ironically, Group No. 2 consists of only one motion put forward by the hon. minister of heritage, the very minister who is putting forward this bill. We will quite likely never get to Group No. 2. The reality is that through the use of time allocation by this government we on this side of the House will never have the opportunity to actually debate the minister's amendment to her own bill. I think that would certainly indicate to the viewing public exactly where this government stands on the use of time allocation and how it pertains to democracy in our country.

As we have said already during the debate, this is the 49th time this government has elected to use time allocation. There were 45 times that avenue was used to shut down debate and 4 times for closure; 36 times in the 35th parliament and 13 already in less than two years in this, the 36th parliament. Shame on this government. The reality that it has elected to continuously and systemically shut down debate and limit democracy is quite appalling.

My hon. colleague from Fraser Valley was showing how some of the Liberal members, when they were on this side of the House during the reign of terror by the Tory government between 1984 and 1993, were always quick to jump to their feet whenever that government utilized time allocation or closure to ram legislation through this place. Yet these same members, many of whom are

Government Orders

still here but who sit on the government side, are strangely mute when it comes to the use of time allocation.

There are examples of the flagrant abuse of power by this government other than the use of time allocation. Whipped votes come to mind when people think about how this government is abusing its power. We remember a year or two ago when we had the now famous flag debate where the Reform Party put forward a motion that a member should be able to have a small flag on his or her desk to denote their patriotism. It was voted down. There was a whipped vote and that motion was voted down.

We saw it with the hepatitis C issue where again the Reform Party was trying to get compensation for all hepatitis C victims. Again the government whip got all the backbenchers to fall into line and vote it down. Just last month the Reform Party put forward a supply motion concerning the child porn situation in British Columbia and how we wanted to use the notwithstanding clause to prevent those who would view child porn from possessing that type of despicable material. Again, a whipped vote and all of the Liberals fell into line and voted against that very important motion.

• (1710)

Tomorrow we will see the same type of thing take place when we have the Reform motion concerning the unfair tax policy and how it discriminates against single income families that elect to have one parent stay at home, work in the home and raise and guide their children.

What I am trying to point out is that unfortunately for Canada and the Canadian general public there are many examples of where this arrogant Liberal government is abusing the power it has been granted by the electorate. It is operating in a very dictatorial manner.

In that light I would like to quote from a publication called "Governing with Integrity":

The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. There is evidence today of considerable dissatisfaction with government and a steady erosion of confidence in the people and institutions of the public sector.

This erosion of confidence seems to have many causes. Some have to do with the behaviour of certain elected politicians, others with an arrogant style of political leadership.

A Liberal government will take a series of initiatives to restore confidence in the institutions of government.

One of the steps cited on page 92 is that more free votes will be allowed in the House of Commons. What I am quoting from is what has become known as the infamous Liberal red book on the policies they ran under in the 1993 election. Unfortunately for Canada they were elected to their first majority government in October 1993.

In the short time I have remaining one thing I would like to briefly refer to is of real concern to me. One of the most disturbing

trends we have seen lately is the drop in the electoral turnout at the ballot boxes.

Mr. Peter Adams: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member mentioned that he is short of time. I have been watching the clock and it seems to me that for seven or eight minutes he has been dealing with matters such as whipped votes. He is now bringing up the turnout of voters at the ballot boxes. Is he debating Bill C-55 at all?

Mr. Randy White: Madam Speaker, while we once again have a point of order from the Liberals who do not like to hear this, the fact is Bill C-55 has been subject to time allocation by this government. We feel every right to undertake the privilege in the House to talk to the abuse of Bill C-55 which is indeed time allocation in as much as the content of the bill.

Mr. Paul Steckle: Madam Speaker, I think it would be fair for the hon. member to retract his statement made a few moments ago that all members voted with our party on the matter of porn. We did not. There were four members who did not.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): These observations are really not points of order.

Mr. Jay Hill: Madam Speaker, in reply to the last point of order, I retract my statement about the child porn vote. I recognize the oversight that there were four Liberal members who had some courage and actually stood up and voted with the opposition on that motion. My apologies to those four members. Unfortunately we do not see enough of them break ranks and follow the lead of those four so that we can get those types of motions passed in this place.

In the minute or so I have remaining I point out to the hon. deputy whip of the government that when I started my intervention this afternoon, I did ask for unanimous consent to move forward and debate his minister's amendment. It was he himself who refused to allow me to voice my concerns about this amendment. It should not come as a surprise that therefore I elect to voice my concerns about the dictatorial manner in which this government operates.

• (1715)

There is ample evidence to suggest that voter turnout at the ballot box has declined in the last two elections from about 75%, which is the long term average, to about two-thirds. That is a dramatic drop in the number of Canadians who actually turn up to cast a ballot.

I would suggest that one of the very real reasons cynicism is running so deep in Canada today is because of autocratically run governments. The average voter sees no point in turning out to cast a ballot.

Government Orders

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to enter the debate this afternoon on Bill C-55.

The previous speaker about a year ago attempted to make a whole charade out of our national flag. It was something that really upset me at the time. As some may know, I have been very supportive of our flag. I tried to create a flag day. It is interesting that when that issue was before committee Reform did not support any of the initiatives. If we went back a year ago the flag that would be of choice for Reform members to have on their desks would be the stars and stripes.

Bill C-55 is about ensuring that we have Canadian culture in Canada. There are 30 million Canadians and there are 300 million Americans. Many of our people live within 100 miles of the U.S. border and are bombarded by American communication.

That does not mean it is a bad thing, but it makes it very difficult to build on what Canadians have built, an extremely dynamic, independent and sovereign country on the northern half of the North American continent.

Trade negotiation is just that. I was recently in the United States and there was no press coverage whatsoever about Canada's debate over maintaining its cultural industries through the use of Bill C-55. We are talking about a \$400 million expenditure on advertising, which means nothing, quite frankly, to the Americans. The debate in the United States was about steel and steel importation.

Those members jump up, one after the other, saying "Look at all the awful things the Americans are going to do to us if we pass this \$400 million piece of legislation. They are going to embargo our steel. They are going to embargo our softwood lumber. They are going to embargo our wheat". Quite frankly, the Americans want to do that anyway. It has nothing to do with Bill C-55.

When I was in the United States the debate was all about the steel industry, Bethlehem Steel. For members who are doing the bidding of the Americans, I would tell them that it is a lot cheaper to pay lobbyists to go to Washington to lobby the government, Mr. Clinton and the special trade representative, Ms. Barshefsky, than to build an efficient steel industry in the United States. The U.S. has old, inefficient operations.

If these members who love the Americans so much were concerned about their economy, they would be arguing that the Americans should be more competitive, allow Canadian steel more access to the American market and allow Canadian softwood lumber more access to the Canadian market because it would make them more efficient.

We do not want them to hide behind uneconomic trade barriers. Uneconomic trade barriers beat up on everybody. They use power to control their economy and to beat up their competitors.

• (1720)

This whole debate is about how they are going to beat up on us. It has nothing to do with cultural policy. It would not take the Americans five seconds if they thought that Disneyland or the Disney corporation was under the threat of competition within the United States to ensure that those industries in the United States were taken care of.

They have 97% of our film industry. The debate is about getting the other 3%. This is a ridiculous, idiotic debate and I am surprised at members opposite who seem to want to support that kind of initiative.

They talk about democracy. The reality is that Ms. Barshefsky does not represent the American people. She represents particular special interest groups, called American industry, which want protection. It is not just the Canadian steel producers. In fact they are the last people on their list. They want to attack Korean steel, Japanese steel and steel coming from southeast Asia.

Members should look at Bethlehem Steel or the steel operations in Pennsylvania. The reality is that the Americans have not paid the price to keep them efficient. They have not been efficient producers and they are being out competed. The Americans are supposed to be the great competitors. They believe in free competition. They believe in free markets, except when there are others coming into their market. Then they believe in securing their market and keeping the other guy out.

These people today are supporting the American agenda to basically build walls around the United States. They do not want us to compete in their market, but they sure want to compete in ours.

Does everybody remember the softwood lumber issue? The Americans successfully created quotas against the importation of Canadian softwood lumber. The Americans said that we could take them to the WTO and we would probably win. It is the same thing with this issue. If it were to go to the WTO, we would probably win.

But guess what? They could place embargoes on our exports to the United States. That could go on for three years in a court determined process and even if the Americans had to pay penalties by keeping artificially high prices on softwood lumber within the United States it would be a money maker.

What happened with softwood lumber? Canada ended up with quotas.

Those people over there are supporting that kind of agenda. Let the bully win. Do not do anything to the bully. Do his bidding for him. That is the Reform Party's agenda. Those people claimed to

Government Orders

wrap themselves in the flag a year ago and today they refuse to protect Canadian culture.

I do not like to use the word protection. I do not believe in protectionism myself. What I do believe is that Canada has an emerging cultural industry. Canadians want to tell their stories to each other. They want to have media, a communications network and magazines that tell Canadian stories.

Over the years Canadians have been happy and willing to step forward and pay that price because that is what we are. That is part of our Canadian heritage.

Day in and day out it is incredible what we hear from members of the Reform Party. The other day we were talking about tax policy and they said "I guess you have to pay Uncle Sam some day". That is their thought process. It is in their brain power. They do not even know what country they are living in. They have accepted the American agenda to such a great extent that they are standing up for it. They are not standing up for their constituents, they are standing up for a secular interest group, the American industry. They are the tool of American industry.

• (1725)

I do not know who exactly owns those oil fields in Alberta. I do not know what signs are over the gas stations out there. But they have been doing this for so long that they are committed to coming to the House to support the United States of America against their own people.

It makes me feel very good to support this legislation. The sooner we can put this into effect, the better it will be for my constituents and all Canadians.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I want to speak directly to Bill C-55. A lot of what I have to say directly involves time allocation.

To me there are too many issues. With this magazine bill the heritage minister is setting Canada up for U.S. trade retaliation. We all know that and the government knows that. With the risk of trade retaliation there is the risk of losing jobs, in particular jobs in the minister's own riding.

One thing that perplexes me is why a government would continue with this knowing full well that there are trade sanctions on the way.

The other thing is that when she bans Canadian advertisers from selling their goods and services in foreign magazines the minister is telling Canadian advertisers that when it comes to freedom of speech they are second class citizens.

That still does not seem to affect this government when it comes to doing what it damn well pleases in the House of Commons,

regardless of how it affects people in other jurisdictions. It is really sad.

I want to comment on an issue which my colleague from Prince George—Peace River brought up recently. He stood in the House a few minutes ago looking for unanimous consent from members opposite to move to the Group 2 amendments. Perhaps the folks out there do not understand what that is, but really what he wanted to do was get off the debate on the amendments that were proposed by the Reform Party and on to the debate of an amendment proposed by the minister.

Members opposite declined. Basically what that says is that the minister has an amendment to the bill which will not even be debated. For the life of me, I do not understand why the government would take that approach. What is it about debate in the House of Commons that we are not allowed to have?

For the people who do not understand what time allocation is, it is a way of preventing further debate on an issue because the government wants to put through a bill.

As people will have heard, there have been a lot of bills which have had time allocation placed on them. We must consider those bills and how much time we actually had to speak on them. I want to talk about a couple of them.

Bill C-36 came before the House at report stage. The official opposition had 50 minutes of debate before the government brought in time allocation. What kind of debate is that? In the House of Commons the government says "You have had your 50 minutes. Let us go ahead and do something else. We are going to push this through at this stage".

I can tell hon. members what is going to happen. The government is at the end of the line on this issue. We have now had 49 bills on which time has been limited and we are about to get number 50. As House leader I am sick and tired of sitting in House leaders' meetings listening to the fact that closure after closure, time allocation after time allocation, is going to occur and we will just damn well have to accept it.

That is not the way it is going to be. It may be time, and I think it is time, for the official opposition to say "Rather than your 50 minutes or your two hours of debate from us, maybe we will just close you down and see how you like that. Maybe we will just stall all of your bills. Maybe it is time for committees that want to travel to get in here and debate the bill because we will not allow that travel".

I think it is time to talk turkey. Enough is enough. When we want to talk at length about important bills such as Bill C-55, we do not expect to come into the House and have the government say "We do not want you to debate this any more. You have already had on this bill three hours and 35 minutes and that is enough". That is unacceptable. We will tell this government that it is not enough.

Government Orders

• (1730)

It is time to get ready for some serious turkey talk in the House. There are other bills. Bill C-2 was on the Canada pension plan and we wanted to debate this at length. It turns out that at the time of second reading on Bill C-2 the official opposition had 1 hour and 41 minutes debate on the Canada pension plan before this government decided we had had enough to say about it.

I was looking in the library recently at the debates which took place in the House of Commons in the 1960s under Diefenbaker. They debated it at length. There was no such thing as bringing in closure or time allocation. This was an important issue for all of Canada, so let us debate it and determine where things are going. What happens? We talk about it for 1 hour and 41 minutes and the government says that is enough. That is a disgrace. I wonder if they can understand on the other side how we feel about that. That was second reading.

Then we go to Bill C-2 on report stage and third reading. The government must have given a lot more time on that. It turns out the official opposition had 1 hour and 20 minutes before the government called time allocation.

I think the hon. member will stand up and talk about relevance in a minute on a point of order. About \$1 billion in trade is done by Canada and the United States every day. That is relevant to Bill C-55.

What is more relevant to Bill C-55 is this outrageous situation where we have the official opposition reduced to about an hour and a half of debate on bills that we think are important. We just do not understand how this government can bring in useless bills, and I mean lots of useless bills, yet when we get to something important it calls time allocation on it.

The only way the government is getting away with this is because it has a majority government and because people outside the House of Commons do not realize what time allocation and closure really are. It is really a sad day when a government pulls this.

This government has called time allocation and closure on bills so often that we will hit 50 times since the Liberals have formed the government in 1993. That is two years ahead of the Tories. Imagine. They have a worse record than Brian Mulroney on this by two years. I guess absolute power corrupts absolutely.

When we get a majority government like this it feels that it can do whatever it wants, whenever it wants. It is a sad commentary on what we call a democracy. We who came here from the west thought we would go down to Ottawa and speak on behalf of our constituents and talk about the issues that are near and dear to them. We did not realize that when we came here we would be short shifted on these issues.

For those who are listening to these comments, 1 hour and 20 minutes debate is only about three or four people who get to talk about these things. On Bill C-65 which has to do with equalization and about \$10 billion, which is coming up and we understand that time allocation again is coming in on that, we have just had 3 hours and 35 minutes debate. That is \$10 billion, 3 hours and 35 minutes debate, and that is probably about seven or eight people. We all want to talk about that here, not just some of us.

• (1735)

I hereby give this government notice that I am about up to here with this time allocation business. It can look forward to one heck of a fight in the House of Commons if I see it any more. I understand it is coming in once more this week and if it does, this government may be prepared for a long haul between now and June.

Ms. Elinor Caplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity today to talk about Bill C-55, the foreign publishers advertising services act. It will regulate advertising services supplied by foreign magazine publishers to Canadian advertisers where such services are directed at the Canadian market.

The new law will ensure that Canadian magazine publishers continue to have access to Canadian advertising revenues which are necessary for the survival of our periodical publishing industry.

Advertising revenues from the supply of advertising services are the main source of revenue for magazine publishers. They finance the production of editorial content, the purchase of photographs and much more. Without such revenues there would be no original Canadian content. Therefore access to revenues from the supply of advertising services is critical to the continued production of Canadian stories and of information of interest to Canadians.

Since Confederation Canada has preserved, promoted and enhanced cultural identity through mass media. Canada's longstanding cultural policies have supported the creation and communication of Canadian ideas, stories and information through the establishment of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, our National Film Board and a host of other organizations that give voice to Canadian stories and Canadian culture.

As well, Canada's cultural policies have played a key role in cultivating a vibrant, domestic magazine publishing industry. In 1996 Canadian publishers produced 1,500 magazines and sold 539 million copies and generated revenues of more than \$1 billion. Of the magazines in circulation in Canada, the percentage of Canadian magazine titles has grown from 20% in 1956 to 65% in 1997.

In a land as vast as ours and given our rich cultural diversity, Canadian magazines are a powerful vehicle for expression in the sharing of stories, information and perspectives. Canadian maga-

Government Orders

zines help define who we are and enable us to read about ourselves in our own voices as well as share Canada with those who live outside our borders.

In a world that technology continues to shrink it is critical that the federal government continue to support our domestic magazine publishing industry so that the creation and sharing of Canadian stories and Canadian perspectives will thrive.

With more than 250 million English speaking Americans to our south there is no shortage of American stories coming into Canada. From U.S. magazines we would not hear about Canada Day or St. Jean Baptiste Day or celebrating Thanksgiving in October. Nor would we hear about the details of Canadian bank mergers or the challenges of gardening in our northern climate. What we would hear is the perspectives and interests of other nations and other people.

This measure is not about excluding foreign magazines from our domestic market to enjoy hearing what others have to say, and we will continue to do that. In fact, Canada imports more American magazines than the rest of the world combined. Canadians also want to be able to read about themselves, their communities and their country. This is clearly demonstrated in the fact that 18 of the top 20 magazines in circulation within our borders are Canadian.

We must make sure that Canadian publishers have access to advertising revenues. Because of the relatively small size of our market, one-tenth the size of the U.S., a strong domestic advertising revenue base is required to support the creation of distinctly Canadian magazines. This way we can ensure that Canadian magazines help project our stories to our own citizens as well as to others around the world.

• (1740)

This new bill is really about choice, choice for Canadians to benefit from Canadian voices, perspectives and shared experiences.

As I mentioned, and this is very important for anyone watching this debate, we are not excluding others from our domestic market. Rather, Bill C-55 will result in a secure advertising base for Canadian magazine publishers. This in turn will ensure that this vibrant cultural industry continues to provide distinctive expressions, distinctive vehicles for expressions which are distinctly Canadian.

Therefore I urge all members to seek speedy passage of this bill. I also urge opposition members and all those speaking on this debate to give Canadians watching this debate and the Americans and others watching this debate the facts. The fact is it is important for Canadians to have the opportunity to read and hear about Canadian expressions and Canadian stories.

I have had a number of calls from residents in the constituency of Thornhill. Many of them have expressed to me their concerns. When my children were small I searched for Canadian publications and magazines. At that time there were not nearly as many as there are today. They are here today because there is a demand for them within Canada. The fact that we have a relatively small market means we need to do what we can to ensure that they will be here not only for today but for future generations. It is therefore my pleasure to participate in this very important debate.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the Liberals would have us think they are great champions of expediency and getting a wonderful bill through the House. This is why they have arranged matters with this bill in order to limit debate.

It is very instructive for people who have been watching today to notice what happened. The Liberals, terribly concerned about a threatened Reform filibuster, cut off debate. The Liberals then are filibustering. The dread filibuster has arrived. Who is driving the get away car? It is the Liberals. Here we have the Liberals throwing up speakers. I had not intended to speak to this part of the debate but I knew that they would use up all the airtime unless the opposition scrambled to speak.

In addition, far from there being a filibuster, we are not even allowed to speak to the minister's own amendment to this bill. In other words, the minister brings in what she tells us is a wonderful amendment to this bill but we do not get to talk about it, debate it, examine it or get any time to talk about the pros and cons of it. Why? The Liberals are refusing to even allow us to talk about the minister's amendment to the bill. That is the Liberal definition of democracy.

I hope Canadians watching this debate are getting as outraged and as fed up as I and many of us on this side of the House are about what is happening.

In addition to false accusations against Reform about a threatened filibuster, which came after we spoke to this bill for less than an hour, there is a stampede to stop a filibuster. I guess one hour is a filibuster according to the Liberals because they do not like to see any opposition to their measures. We then have other ridiculous assertions by the Liberals who are being thrown up to speak on this, none of which hold the slightest bit of water.

We had one member, for example, saying that Reform had diminished hockey. Is it not interesting that a government that is giving us a 65 cent dollar and 33% more taxes is accusing other people of hurting businesses that have to compete against the U.S.?

• (1745)

There have been some very interesting misrepresentations by the Liberals about Bill C-55. One is that there is a crying need to

Government Orders

protect Canadian magazines because 80% of the magazines purchased at the newsstand are American. The Liberals neglect to tell us that less than 5% of the magazines read by Canadians are purchased at the newsstand and 80% of those are U.S. We are talking 80% of less than 5%. Somehow it drives the Liberals into a frenzy of culture protection because many of the less than 5% of magazines purchased are U.S. magazines.

God forbid that Canadians should be allowed the freedom to purchase the magazines that they would like to purchase from newsstands. But of course Canadians really need to be protected against their own freedom of choice. Canadians have to be limited in the reading material they get. They can only read magazines produced in Canada because if Canadians dare to purchase from the newsstands a majority of magazines that are produced somewhere else, then the Liberals have to shut it down with some legislated measures.

Let us look at what has happened with this split-run business. In 1997 the Liberal government lost a challenge laid with the World Trade Organization against its unfair and inappropriate measures to try to coerce Canadians into reading only certain types of material. The World Trade Organization said that this contravened the kind of trade measures that had been agreed on in the international trade scene.

What did the Liberals do next? They brought in Bill C-55 in order to do an end run around the World Trade Organization. Of course the World Trade Organization understandably is a little unimpressed by this move by the Liberals but the Liberals have done it anyway. We heard today that the Liberals have brought in a measure that says that we cannot stop magazines that have been operating in Canada on split runs so this only applies to new magazines that come onstream.

If all of a sudden we have to protect Canadians against new incursions into their magazine market by the U.S., but we have to allow the magazines that were operating in 1997 when we lost this appeal to the World Trade Organization, then what are we really protecting Canadian culture from? None of the elements that were present in 1997 will be affected by this bill, only new ones. Suddenly there is a switch. The things we were going to have to be protected against in 1997 are now allowable, they are okay now. Our Canadian culture is not threatened by them any more, even though we tried to restrict them. Now we have to restrict something that may be new or different. We are not sure what it is yet but by God, we are not going to allow it. No siree, we are going to stand up for Canadian culture.

One of the members opposite even had the nerve to suggest that artists like Céline Dion and Shania Twain owed their success to the protective hand of government. What errant nonsense. If I were one of the artists mentioned in the member's speech, I would be absolutely furious at the suggestion that in some way, shape or form the comforting and kind hand of government had made me a success.

I would like to suggest a rather new and startling proposal to this government, which is that Canadian artists, Canadian culture and Canadian magazines can compete on their own. They may just be good enough, strong enough, timely enough, well written enough, well researched enough and appeal to the information needs of Canadians enough that they do not need this Liberal government and its silly bills to protect them.

• (1750)

It is time that we were realistic about some of these things. To hear the debate from the other side and to hear the intransigence on the other side about debating their own amendments is a poor reflection on the democracy of this place. As our House leader just mentioned, the Liberals' abuse of the system, the Liberals' assertions that do not hold water simply cannot be tolerated any longer.

Today in question period we heard the minister make it clear to everyone that she does not know the provisions in her bill and how the bill will affect Chinese publications and their split runs. There is clearly something wrong when the minister misinforms the House about the effect of her own bill.

Surely there is a great need to take some time to debate this properly and thoroughly but no, we have to close down debate. My debate is going to be closed down pretty soon, and I am sure everyone feels as badly about that as I do.

The Liberals have to arrange things so we cannot discuss the minister's amendments. It is time we put a stop to this. I appeal to members of the House to give this matter some sober thought. Make sure that bills are properly debated and presented and that every aspect is examined by the House as it is our duty and our responsibility to do.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have to point out to the House on the limiting of the debate that nearly two dozen Reform members of parliament have already spoken on this bill. Having heard many of them just at this one stage of the bill, I know that the same things have been said nearly two dozen times over. Nothing new is being added to the debate.

I should point out to Canadians who are listening that there was also second reading at which many Reform members spoke. There will also be third reading at which many more Reform members will speak. It is hardly the fault of the government if in all those opportunities, nearly 50 in total, the Reform Party has not been able to get across its message to Canadians.

The other thing I need to correct in the member's speech is the fact that we are trying to limit the choice of Canadians. There is no

foreign magazine that will not be allowed in Canada. If having 80% of the magazines on our newsstands that are American magazines is not enough choice for Canadians, I would be extremely surprised.

I want to talk about what it means to me to be Canadian. My father chose to come to this country nearly 70 years ago. He chose Canada. He was very clear about why he did not choose to become an American. He believed in the different values this country has, values that we as Canadians share from coast to coast to coast. Before I could learn to speak, I knew how lucky I was to be a Canadian. That is why I am in this parliament, to follow in the great traditions of the people who sat in this chamber before us and of those who will come after us, to preserve what this country stands for, not only for Canadians but for the world.

I am a believer in competition too. But there is no fair competition when an American magazine can produce absolutely no new literary product in Canada, yet can come here and steal revenue from Canadian magazines, making it impossible for them to survive in the marketplace and to continue communicating with and to Canadians what this country is about.

• (1755)

The American magazines can mass produce for the American market, send the same magazine into Canada and therefore discount or subsidize their advertising rates in Canada. It is called predatory pricing. This government is here not to allow Canadian magazines to be put out of business by that kind of unfair competition.

What is very clear to me is that we also cannot be bullied. When it comes to doing what is best for this country, we cannot be bullied by threats against other products in this country. We have to stand up against that. We have to stand up for the right of the Government of Canada to govern in the interests of this country and its people.

Of course what we have with Reform is a party that really wishes this country were American. It is quite simple. The Reform Party wants things like recall and referendums. It wants elected representatives of this country to be the captives of well heeled, well financed, very powerful lobby groups. That is who benefits from the kind of policies the Reform Party advocates.

I suggest that the Reform Party listen to Canadians. Listen to the debate that took place, first with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, then with NAFTA, then with MAI, and then with our involvement in the World Trade Organization. What Canadians said among other things was that they want to be able to protect Canadian culture.

As the world globalizes, we have one superpower in this world, a superpower that is reaching into every culture, every economy of the globe. Countries have to be able to stand up and protect their individual identity. We are prepared to stand up to 80% competi-

Government Orders

tion from foreign magazines and publications with fair competition.

The Reform Party says to let the marketplace decide. Look at the history of the country. The marketplace would never have built a railway across vast empty spaces to create a united country from Atlantic to Pacific.

The marketplace would never have created a communications network so that people in the far northern reaches of this country could be part of what Canadians were saying to each other, what was important to us and what we were talking about among ourselves.

The marketplace would never have created a national airlines so that we could travel and do business and visit relatives anywhere in the country.

The marketplace would never have said that it wanted a certain amount of Canadian content on our radio and television stations because it would have been afraid that featuring Canadian artists and performers would limit its profits. When those Canadian content regulations came in I have to say I was one who did not particularly favour them. I spoke much as the member might have at the time and I said that Canadian artists are good enough, they do not need a Canadian kindergarten to protect them from competition.

I knew within six months that I was wrong because I was hearing Canadian singers on my radio. I had never heard them before. Without those content regulations, we would not have had *Anne of Green Gables*, we would not have had Anne Murray, we would not have had Gordon Lightfoot, and we would not have had Shania Twain, Alanis Morissette and Céline Dion at the Grammys.

It may take members of the Reform Party a similar 30 years to admit that they were wrong, but we on this side of the House are here to make sure that there will be Canadian magazines for our children and grandchildren. There will be Canadian performers. There will be Canadian transportation and communications systems. We will not give up the great Canadian dream just because the Reform Party would rather we were Americans. That is the dream my father came to this country for. That is the dream I will protect as long as I live.

• (1800)

Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are here this afternoon debating amendments put forth by the Reform Party. What we have here and what Canadians had to listen to is somewhat embarrassing.

We have Reformers kowtowing to the U.S., having us run scared from a free trade agreement that they fully supported and continue to support. We have the Liberals dancing around the trade agreement.

Government Orders

Many Canadians, and certainly New Democrats, foresaw our culture being threatened and the bill is proof that our culture is not protected. The bill is not perfect but it is an attempt by the Liberals to at least right some of the wrongs brought about by free trade.

Throughout this debate I have also heard Reform cry "let the market decide". The situation Canadians have seen themselves in is certainly the marketplace throughout Canada. With the Asian crisis, everybody was saying "Oh, my gosh, we let the market decide".

Since today is International Women's Day and we know we have to let the market decide and be part of globalization, I want to take this opportunity to let the market decide and to let Canadians decide if they want to be part of that. I watched a news documentary in which a fellow by the name of Robert Ohuras who was representing an American company in Juaréz, Mexico, was commenting on a request that was made to change the hours women and young girls had to work in plants or in factories owned by Canadians and American companies.

The bodies of 200 women have been found outside in the desert Juaréz. There was a request made to change their hours of work so that they would not have to walk home at 1 a.m. Mr. Ohuras' response was "Don't forget why these companies are in Mexico. They must be globally competitive. They need to have flexible hours".

Do we need to let the market decide? Any time Reformers want to let the market decide, I want them to think of these women. This is all part of it. When the market is the only thing left to be the deciding factor, that is the outcome.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Drouin (Beauce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address my colleagues, as well as all Canadians, with respect to Bill C-55, the Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act.

This bill will make it an offence for foreign periodical publishers to sell advertising services on the Canadian market. This is an important legislative measure for the Canadian periodical publishing industry, because it will protect the health of this important cultural industry.

Revenues from advertising services are vital to any periodical publisher. Without them, periodicals would simply not exist. Revenues from advertising services pay for such things as editorial content, the cost of photos, and the development of new talent.

Bill C-55 will ensure that Canadian publishers have access to the limited advertising revenue in our country. They will thus continue to bring Canadians a wealth of diversified articles, information and viewpoints about their own country.

Over the years, the Canadian periodical publishing industry has played a very important role in developing our cultural identity. With the support of the federal government, the industry has grown.

Forty years ago, there were 660 Canadian periodicals, with an annual circulation of 28 million copies, representing 20% of all periodicals sold in Canada. Today, there are over 1,500 periodicals, with a circulation of 539 million, representing 65% of all periodicals sold in Canada.

In 1996-97, the Canadian publishing industry brought in over \$1 billion, and provided jobs for close to 6,000 Canadians. This industry illustrates the success of Canada's cultural policy, which is why it is important to support this bill.

• (1805)

I want to point out that over 60% of all revenues reported, or \$647 million, came from advertising, and this can go as high as 80% and up for general and special-interest periodicals. Paid subscriptions and newsstand sales are not enough to ensure the survival of periodicals.

Members have surely all had periodicals distributed free to their home or office. These are made possible by the sale of advertising services.

Advertising revenues are vital, as I will explain. Each page of advertising pays for one page of editorial content. American publishers have a net competitive advantage over their Canadian counterparts when it comes to supplying advertising services to Canada. This is because they can recycle content for the Canadian market. Furthermore, the size of the American market is conducive to economies of scale in the periodical industry. Bill C-55 seeks to address this unfair situation.

Parliament must ensure the economic survival of the Canadian periodical publishing industry and the continued prosperity of Canadian publishers.

As the Minister of Canadian Heritage said, periodicals differ from other products, in that they are vehicles for the expression of our unique views and experiences. We want those views and experiences to be heard.

The bill will not make it difficult to import foreign periodicals. In this regard, our country is one of the most open in the world. The United States exports more periodicals into Canada than do all other countries combined. Foreign publishers will be able to go on selling their periodicals without restriction in Canada, and Canadians will have the same access to foreign periodicals they have always had.

The new legislation will simply ensure that Canadian periodical publishers have access to the advertising revenues they need to create periodicals that give voice to our own cultural identity.

Government Orders

Canada is very aware of the advantages and opportunities of increased globalization, and intends to promote international trade and establish corresponding rules.

Canada also intends to support our cultural diversity, in which periodicals play an important role. We believe that these two goals can coexist.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill quickly because, as we have mentioned throughout the debate, it is important for all Canadians and for Canadian jobs.

[*English*]

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate the government deputy whip suggested that further debate on the bill was pointless. She noted that about a dozen Reformers had spoken and the debate was repetitive.

I would like to take a look for a minute at time allocation statistics. For example, on Bill C-36 at report stage and third reading Reform only had 50 minutes of debate on that bill before time allocation was moved. There was a total of two hours and 15 minutes of debate before time allocation was moved. The total time of debate before and after time allocation on Bill C-36 was only three hours of debate by the official opposition, for a total of nine hours and 12 minutes of debate.

On Bill C-36 at second reading Reform only spoke for one hour and six minutes before time allocation was moved.

On Bill C-43 Reform spoke for an hour and 56 minutes before time allocation was moved, and the total debate time on that bill was 3 hours and 19 minutes out of a total of 11 hours and 25 minutes.

These bills are important bill. Bill C-36 was the budget implementation bill. Bill C-43 was the custom and revenue agency bill. Not small potatoes but important bills which the Canadian public expected to be debated in the House.

• (1810)

At second reading on Bill C-2, the Canada pension plan, the official opposition only spoke for an hour and 41 minutes. When time allocation was called Reform had only spoken for an hour and 51 minutes out of a total of 11 hours and 15 minutes of debate time. That is not much time.

On Bill C-2 at report stage and third reading the official opposition again only spoke for an hour and 20 minutes before time allocation was moved. The total debate time was two hours and 45 minutes.

There are a lot of people concerned about the Canada pension plan. We saw earlier where the Minister of Finance removed the

individual who was responsible for doing the numbers on the Canada pension plan. He did not want the real straight goods on it and he did not want debate to go on in the House on that very important bill.

Bill C-4 respecting the wheat board is important to Canadians on the prairies. Reform had a total of eight hours debate on that bill before time allocation was moved. There was much to be said about that bill. There were many problems with it. It was of great interest to Canadians on the prairies.

On Bill C-3, the DNA bill, Reform had two hours and 15 minutes of debate time before time allocation was moved.

These kinds of numbers are simply unacceptable in a democratic society. This place is supposed to be about debate. It is supposed to be about discussion of ideas. We are supposed to debate the principles behind these bills and what they mean to Canadian people. We are not supposed to get into derogatory personal comments and we do not. We debate the issues. That is what it is supposed to be about. That is what we are talking about in these bills, the issues at hand. Yet if the government continually moves time allocation, what is the point of being here?

The other day when time allocation was moved on a justice bill my colleague from Wild Rose said "We might as well turn this over to the judges. There is no point in even being in this place to try to express the interests and the concerns of the Canadian public".

On the equalization bill, Bill C-65, there were three hours and 35 minutes of debate at second reading before time allocation was moved. It is an important bill, a bill that is especially important to the province of British Columbia which suffers under a socialist government. Its economy is in a nose dive and I do not think we have seen bottom. Yet we are required under the equalization bill to continue paying the piper.

The bill before us today is an important one. It is a bill that has a lot to do with the health of Canadian industry. It is a bill which fails to recognize that about \$1 billion a day of trade is done between Canada and the United States. That does not mean to say that we have to capitulate to every American complaint and everything that Americans do not find satisfactory. Far from it. What it does say is that we have to be reasonable.

Not only is this bill not reasonable, but it fails to recognize that Canadians can fend for themselves, that there is a place in the market for Canadian performers, and that there is a place in the market in Canada for Canadian magazines. They will be supported by Canadians. Canadians want to hear what other Canadians have to say about events in the world. They want to hear about what Canadians have to say about events taking place in this country. They are not prepared to simply go to U.S. sources and publications for news and items of interest to Canadians.

Government Orders

• (1815)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 2 to 21.

Hon. David Kilgour (for Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-55 be amended by adding after line 9 on page 11 the following new clause:

“22. This Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council.”

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 22 stands deferred.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is it parliamentary and do the rules permit a vote to be taken on a motion that has not been debated in the House?

The Deputy Speaker: When time allocation has been applied in a debate, all the questions necessary to dispose of the stage of the bill under review at that time must be put forthwith without debate or amendment. Those were the terms of the motion. I am complying in every respect with the terms of the motion. I am afraid the answer to the hon. member for Elk Island is yes.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

• (1835)

[Translation]

Before the taking of the vote:

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1.

[English]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 21, inclusive.

• (1845)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 328)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Obhrai
Penson	Ramsay
Reynolds	Ritz
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Stinson
Strahl	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—43	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand

Bevilacqua
 Blaikie
 Bonin
 Brison
 Bryden
 Caccia
 Cannis
 Carroll
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Davies
 Desjarlais
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Duceppe
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Folco
 Gagliano
 Gauthier
 Goodale
 Grose
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jackson
 Jordan
 Keys
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lastewka
 Lebel
 Lefebvre
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marceau
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Massé
 McCormick
 McTeague
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Normand
 Nystrom
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proctor
 Redman
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Wappel
 Wilfert

Bigras
 Blondin-Andrew
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Calder
 Caplan
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Crête
 Debien
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Dockrill
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Finestone
 Fontana
 Gagnon
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Guarnieri
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
 Knutson
 Laliberte
 Lavigne
 Lee
 Leung
 Loubier
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marchand
 Marleau
 Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
 Matthews
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 Ménard
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 Nunziata
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Power
 Price
 Proud
 Reed
 Riis
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Speller
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Jacques
 Stoffer
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Ur
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wood—180

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Anderson
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bonwick
Bradshaw	Brien
Byrne	Cullen
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Dumas
Finlay	Girard-Bujold
Lalonde	Laurin
Lincoln	Longfield
O'Brien (Labrador)	Plamondon
Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 21 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree I would propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea, with the exception of the member for Hamilton West who wishes not to be recorded on this vote.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Bill Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, with the exception of my colleague from Burin—St. George's, who will be voting no, members of the Progressive-Conservative Party present will vote yea on this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, this motion would usurp the authority of parliament so I would vote against it.

[Translation]

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I vote no on this motion.

• (1850)

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 329)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
De Villiers
Dion
Dromisky
Duceppe
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagnon
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Lee
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McTeague
Miffin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Normand
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Reed
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—165

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Brisson
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Debien
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Duhamel
Eggleton
Folco
Gagliano
Gauthier
Goodale
Grose
Guimond
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lebel
Leung
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bailey
Blaikie
Casson
Cummins
Desjarlais
Duncan
Epp
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Laliberte
Lowther
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Proctor
Reynolds
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Stinson
Strahl
Williams—57

Anders
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Chatters
Davies
Dockrill
Earle
Forseth
Goldring
Grewal
Harris
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Lefebvre
Lunn
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Ramsay
Riis
Schmidt
Solberg
Stoffer
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bradshaw
Byrne
Dalphond-Guiral
Finlay
Lalonde
Lincoln
O'Brien (Labrador)
Provenzano
Turp

Anderson
Bonwick
Brien
Cullen
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Longfield
Plamondon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 carried.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): moved that the bill be concurred in.

[English]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the House would agree I would propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea, that is the same Liberal members who voted yea on Motion No. 22.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote no to this motion.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members will vote in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: New Democratic Party will be voting yes, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, with the exception of my colleague for Burin—St. George's, who will be voting against it, all Progressive-Conservative members will vote for this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, unfettered by party discipline, I will vote in favour of the bill.

[Translation]

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 330)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Davies	Debien
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duceppe	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Gagliano	Gagnon
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan

Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Massé
McCormick	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	Ménard
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nunziata
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—178

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Matthews
Mayfield	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—44

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Anderson
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bonwick
Bradshaw	Brien
Byrne	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Dumas
Finlay	Girard-Bujold
Lalonde	Laurin
Lincoln	Longfield
O'Brien (Labrador)	Plamondon
Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

FIRST NATIONS LAND MANAGEMENT ACT

The House resumed from March 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-49, an act providing for the ratification and the bringing into effect of the framework agreement on first nation land management, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-49. The question is on the amendment.

• (1900)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 331)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Bailey	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Harris	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Obhrai
Penson	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—44

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bakopoulos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Boudria
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Caccia	Calder
Cannis	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Davies	Debien
Desjarlais	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duceppe	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Folco	Fontana
Gagliano	Gagnon
Gauthier	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Loubier
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague	Ménard
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Stoffer

Government Orders

Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—178

Dromisky
Duceppe
Earle
Eggleton
Folco
Gagliano
Gauthier
Goodale
Grose
Guimond
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé
McCormick
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proctor
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—177

Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagnon
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Itody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson
Laliberte
Lavigne
Lee
Leung
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
Matthews
McKay (Scarborough East)
Ménard
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nystrom
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patri
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Price
Proud
Reed
Riis
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Wappel
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bradshaw
Byrne
Dalphond-Guiral
Finlay
Lalonde
Lincoln
O'Brien (Labrador)
Provenzano
Turp

Anderson
Bonwick
Brien
Cullen
Dumas
Girard-Bujold
Laurin
Longfield
Plamondon
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Vanciel

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said 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:

• (1910)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 332)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Barnes
Bélair
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Brisson
Bryden
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Davies
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepolo

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Debien
De Villiers
Dion
Dockrill

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Chatters
Duncan
Forseth
Goldring
Grewal
Harris

Anders
Benoit
Casson
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Gouk
Grey (Edmonton North)
Hart

Adjournment Debate

Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Lowther
Lunn	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Ohrai
Penson	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Ramsay	Reynolds
Ritz	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—45	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Alarie	Anderson
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bonwick
Bradshaw	Brien
Byrne	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Dumas
Finlay	Girard-Bujold
Lalonde	Laurin
Lincoln	Longfield
O'Brien (Labrador)	Plamondon
Provenzano	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Turp	Vanclief

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

JUSTICE

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on February 12 I asked the Minister of Justice some further questions on what was happening with regard to possession of child pornography in Canada.

In her answer the parliamentary secretary talked about it being before the appeal court, that we had intervened, and that it would be heard on April 26 and April 27. Our argument is that is too long to wait. Every day in the country that someone is in possession of child pornography is one day too long. The government could have stepped in using the charter to make sure that did not happen.

• (1915)

The parliamentary secretary said:

To repeat what I said in the House, the law is still the law of the land. It is only one court in the land that has ruled someone can possess child pornography for personal use but we are going to be appealing. We are awaiting the decision of the court of appeal where we have intervened.

One court of the land has ruled that one can do it. Since the last time I had a chance to ask this question in the House, we had a case in Vernon where a person actually pleaded guilty to possession of child pornography. That case was adjourned by the judge because of the situation of this ruling.

We on this side of the House still say that every day is one day too long. If we do not get the right decision on April 26 to 29 on this appeal we could then be waiting a lot longer for a supreme court ruling. That is not good enough.

I quote from the member for Scarborough Southwest in a speech he delivered in the House on May 11, 1993 when debating the issue of pornography and pedophiles:

This is crucially important because the only people who are interested in the possession of child pornography are pedophiles. I would also say it is true that there are very few passive pedophiles, if I can put it that way, those who are prepared to go no further than to look at the pictures.

We also know from various studies that pedophiles prey on children. There are no one-victim pedophiles. In fact most of the studies that have been done show that pedophiles, both heterosexual and homosexual, prey on more than 200 children each in their lifetimes.

In this case we have a government that is prepared to wait. I do not think most Canadians want them to wait.

Quoting again from the member for Scarborough Southwest:

What kind of a country do we have if we do not protect our children from pedophiles? What has our government done about it? It has done absolutely nothing.

Every child depicted is a victim for life. They are scarred forever and those are the people we have to protect in this country.

I could not agree with the member more. Remember this was a bill in 1993 when Liberal government members were in opposition and making these kinds of statements. Now that they are in government they have changed their minds.

He went on:

I do say to the government that in whatever bill it has suddenly discovered is on the legislative agenda it should provide for the broadest possible spectrum of what could be defined as child pornography because I would rather err on the side of protecting child victims than on the side of protecting child pedophiles.

That is why this government should have taken the action it could have taken quite a few weeks ago to make sure that pedophiles in British Columbia cannot possess child pornography.

It always interesting in this House when one finds these speeches written by members such as one by the member for Scarborough Southwest who was in the opposition then and now sits in the government. It is now his government that is allowing pedophiles in Canada to possess child pornography. It is prepared to wait until a judge decides, instead of parliament doing the responsible thing and taking the proper action.

Adjournment Debate

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, clearly we are all concerned with the availability of child pornography in this country. As many have said, it represents evidence of the sexual abuse and exploitation of children and perpetuates the message that they are appropriate sexual partners.

That is why the federal government is intervening in the Sharpe case before the British Columbia Court of Appeal to vigorously defend the constitutionality of our laws which prohibit the possession of child pornography in any form.

We have all had the opportunity in the House to raise our concerns. Unfortunately the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast and other members of his party have been exploiting this issue and misinforming the public as well as fearmongering. This is not a question of pedophiles.

Members will recall at that time the Minister of Justice stressed the importance of respecting the rule of law, particularly where we are privileged to live in a free and democratic country where our Constitution and charter of rights are respected.

I support the minister's views, as do the majority of the members of the House. Attorneys general across the country are still enforcing the law. They are indicating their support for pursuing this matter through the courts. All of us recognize that other more drastic approaches would not be in the best interests of all Canadians.

We know that the Sharpe case has had some impact on British Columbia where it is binding on provincial court judges. However, let us be clear. Contrary to what others in the House have suggested, including the hon. future leader of the so-called united alternative, cases are not being thrown out of the courts. A number of cases scheduled to proceed before these judges are being postponed until after the Sharpe case is heard by the B.C. court of appeal. Let us not forget that the attorney general of British Columbia has indicated that cases continue to be investigated in that province and charges are being laid.

• (1920)

Officials in other provinces are also continuing to enforce the prohibitions against the possession of child pornography. The government is confident that the child pornography legislation is constitutional and will be strongly defending this legislation before the British Columbia Court of Appeal shortly.

AIRBUS

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I can see the air will be thick with party line today. On November 3, 1998, I brought to the attention of the House a citation from page 303 of the book *Presumed Guilty* by

William Kaplan. In it the Prime Minister allegedly discussed Airbus and mused about a royal commission with an Ottawa businessman in the summer of 1995. This was several months before November 20, 1995 when the Prime Minister claimed that he had learned of the investigation in a *Financial Post* article dated November 18, 1995.

I asked the Prime Minister to confirm or deny that particular conversation took place and would the Prime Minister stand by his November 1995 statement that he did not discuss Airbus prior to November. As expected, the Prime Minister did not answer the question and simply stated that the person who gave him the information did not give his name and this amounted to an allegation based on nothing.

Trite, dismissive, nonsense answers are becoming the norm and Canadians are concerned that the government could be so reckless in the pursuit of a conviction of an innocent man. Despite the Liberal government's malicious attack and continued efforts to win a conviction of some sort against the former prime minister evidence has never been found to substantiate this cause. This is a misguided investigation and the facts are disturbingly clear.

Brian Mulroney is innocent of all wrongdoings and yet the Liberal government will not cease and desist the RCMP investigation. The Liberal government has a vendetta against the former prime minister which stems from the Liberals' days in opposition. There are growing concerns that the current Prime Minister's legacy might pale by comparison. The Liberals' plot for revenge is continuing to cost the taxpayers significant dollars, \$4 million and counting.

It is obvious the Liberal Party has placed its own agenda for vengeance ahead of the fundamental freedoms of this man. It appears that while the Liberals are in government these rights do not have importance for Mr. Mulroney. Mr. Mulroney knows the Liberal agenda all too well, for he has been presumed guilty from the very beginning.

Furthermore, the Canadian public has found that its demands for responsible government in this case have fallen on deaf ears. The idea of wasting \$4 million on the Airbus investigation is clearly not what the public would want and it is not responsible, especially when the repeated attempts to find any wrongdoing have continually come up completely empty.

The Airbus investigation has amounted to an expensive embarrassment for this government. Yet, like a stubborn mule, the government would rather continue to waste public money than admitting that its insatiable obsession with defaming the character of a former prime minister has led it to getting nothing more than egg on its face.

There may come a day in a civil action when we will hear from the important players in this matter, players like Kimberly Prost, her boss Mr. Corbett, Fraser Fiegenwald, the fictitious writer Stevie Cameron and possibly even a former justice minister and solicitor general. The sad results of this vendetta may truly be made

Adjournment Debate

public at that time; all of this done in the face of deep cuts to RCMP budgets that have resulted in overloading a computer system, the CPIC information system, cuts that have affected significantly the ability of police officers to do their work.

With all that said, the following question begs to be answered yet again. When will the government simply cut its losses, put an end to this ill founded investigation and focus on replenishing scarce police resources for the betterment of protecting Canadian citizens?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kaplan's book to which the hon. member referred adds nothing new to the facts of the Airbus case except for raising unfounded allegations and inferences.

Contrary to any claims made in the book, the Prime Minister learned of the letter to the Swiss authorities and the Airbus investigation only after the letter became public on November 18, 1995. I also remind the hon. member, as the Minister of Justice, myself and other ministers who have been attacked in this House by the hon. member have done numerous times, of a settlement between former Prime Minister Mulroney and the Government of Canada which was signed on January 5, 1997 and which has been tabled in the House:

The parties accept that the RCMP, on its own, initiated the Airbus investigation.

The parties have always acknowledged that the RCMP must continue investigating any allegations of illegality or wrongdoing brought to its attention.

The parties accept that the RCMP and the Department of Justice in sending the request for assistance to Switzerland acted within their legitimate responsibilities in this manner.

• (1925)

Those are the facts. This is not hearsay. These are not anonymous quotes, as the member has brought forward.

DEVCO

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, how has the Liberal government misled Cape Bretoners on Devco? Let me count the ways.

The Minister of Natural Resources said in this House on many occasions "There is no plan to shut down Devco". The facts are different.

The federal government commissioned a study by Nesbitt Burns in 1995 to plan the sale and closure of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. This plan called for a sale in 1996 or, failing that, in 1999. The plan has been followed to the letter.

In the fall of 1998 the management of Devco said it did not have enough money to make the payroll and it had to be bailed out by a \$41 million cheque from Ottawa. Devco's management then spent \$11 million to buy new jacks, new jacks that would only be needed if new walls were being developed, new mines opened. There was \$11 million worth of jacks, a gift to whomever buys Devco.

At the same time, the corporation sold seven diesel locomotives without tender, locomotives needed to haul coal, locomotives needed to provide emergency power to the mine in the event of a power outage.

While miners have been laid off over the last two years, more management personnel have been hired.

These examples are just two of the many that prove a pattern of managed mismanagement at this crown corporation.

From the election of the Liberals in 1993 Devco has suffered from a slow hemorrhage, a hemorrhage of money, of workers and of political will. Ultimately that is the central issue. This government has been unwilling to talk openly about its very obvious agenda.

The Nesbitt Burns communication synopsis outlined problem areas for the government that it needed to address in order to facilitate the divestiture of Devco. A popular call-in show, *Talk-back*, was cited as an obstacle to easing the sale. In 1998 the show was cancelled following pressure applied by Liberal advertisers, leaving Cape Bretoners without a forum to exchange their views.

Every angle was covered. The report raised the issue of ownership of the coal leases, perceived as being a source of possible conflict with the provincial government. Just weeks ago the Liberals in Ottawa announced that the issue had been examined from a legal perspective and they were confident of their jurisdiction.

The only thing that changed between then and now was the wave of change that swept Nova Scotia. That change saw the rejection of the former minister of health because of his abandonment of the coal industry and the election of a coal miner's daughter.

I have been on the record on this issue many times. I have predicted events concerning this process, and despite accusations of being hysterical from the Liberals, time has unfortunately proven my predictions correct.

I promised to stand up for the miners when I was elected. I am here once again to demand accountability from this government. I call on the government to openly discuss the future of Devco with Cape Bretoners and, as a first step, to immediately launch a forensic audit of the crown corporation.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Natural Resources made the government's

Adjournment Debate

announcement of the future direction for Devco, he indicated that Devco's management wished to review the human resource packages with union representatives. Some of those discussions have already been held.

The \$111 million in funding which has been approved by the government for workforce adjustment measures include \$60 million for an early retirement incentive program, \$46 million for severance packages and \$5 million for training for employees who will receive severance packages.

The criteria to determine eligibility for the early retirement incentive program have not been pulled out of a hat. They are the criteria that were negotiated between Devco and its unions through a joint planning committee in 1996. They are the criteria that Devco's collective agreements indicate shall apply to the early retirement incentive program for any further workforce reductions.

I want to make it clear that the early retirement incentive program has no relationship to the pension benefits that Devco's

employees have earned through participation in one of the corporation's pension plans. Workers will continue to be eligible for any earned pension benefits.

I also want to make it clear that the provisions of Devco's collective agreements with its unions will be honoured. These provisions indicate that in the event of a site closure employees shall be laid off in reverse order of seniority.

This means that many of the longer serving employees who will not be eligible under the early retirement incentive program will continue to be employed.

[*Translation*]

The 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 7.30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, March 8, 1999

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill C-247. On the Order Private Members' Business	12523
Ms. Caplan	12523
Motion	12523
(Motion agreed to and bill referred to a committee)	12523

Suspension of Sitting

Mr. Adams	12523
(The sitting of the House was suspended at 11.07 a.m.) ...	12523

Sitting Resumed

The House resumed at 12 p.m.	12523
-----------------------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act

Bill C-55—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Boudria	12523
Motion	12523
Motion agreed to	12524

Report stage

Bill C-55. Report stage	12524
Mr. Riis	12524
Mr. Riis	12525
Mr. Kenney	12525
Mr. Herron	12527
Mr. Myers	12528
Mr. Benoit	12529
Mr. Telegdi	12530
Mr. Harris	12530
Mr. Telegdi	12530
Mr. Harris	12531
Mr. Easter	12532
Mr. Harris	12532
Mr. Harris	12533
Mr. Bélanger	12533
Mr. Riis	12533
Mr. Bélanger	12533

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Canada Winter Games

Mr. Easter	12533
------------------	-------

Canada Winter Games

Ms. Meredith	12534
--------------------	-------

Canada Winter Games

Mrs. Picard	12534
-------------------	-------

Canada Winter Games

Mr. Riis	12534
----------------	-------

Canada Winter Games

Mr. Power	12534
-----------------	-------

Film Industry

Mr. Bertrand	12535
--------------------	-------

Africa

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12535
---	-------

Puvirnituk Co-op Hotel

Mr. St-Julien	12535
---------------------	-------

Sudan

Mr. Steckle	12535
-------------------	-------

Commonwealth Day

Ms. Bulte	12535
-----------------	-------

Commonwealth Day

Ms. Augustine	12536
---------------------	-------

The late Joe DiMaggio

Mr. Mahoney	12536
-------------------	-------

Young Offenders Act

Mr. Reynolds	12536
--------------------	-------

Women Parliamentarians

Mrs. Venne	12536
------------------	-------

International Women's Day

Ms. Folco	12537
-----------------	-------

International Women's Day

Mrs. Dockrill	12537
---------------------	-------

Taxation

Mr. Kenney	12537
------------------	-------

International Women's Day

Mrs. Gagnon	12537
-------------------	-------

International Women's Day

Mr. Muise	12538
-----------------	-------

International Women's Day

Ms. Bakopanos	12538
---------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Taxation

Miss Grey	12538
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12538
Miss Grey	12538
Ms. Fry	12539
Miss Grey	12539
Ms. Fry	12539
Mrs. Ablonczy	12539
Ms. Fry	12539
Mrs. Ablonczy	12539
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12539

Status of Women

Mr. Duceppe	12539
Ms. Fry	12539
Mr. Duceppe	12540
Mr. Duceppe	12540
Ms. Fry	12540
Ms. St-Hilaire	12540
Ms. Fry	12540
Ms. St-Hilaire	12540
Ms. Fry	12540

Taxation

Mr. Blaikie	12540
-------------------	-------

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12540	Mr. Marchi	12545
Mr. Blaikie	12541	Natural Disasters	
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12541	Mr. Hoepfner	12545
Young Offenders Act		Mr. Duhamel	12545
Mr. MacKay	12541	Canadian Armed Forces	
Ms. Bakopanos	12541	Mrs. Venne	12546
Prisons		Mr. Eggleton	12546
Mr. MacKay	12541	Canadian Farmers	
Mr. MacAulay	12541	Mr. Proctor	12546
Aboriginal Affairs		Mr. Goodale	12546
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	12541	Employment	
Mr. Iftody	12541	Mr. Muise	12546
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	12541	Mr. Mifflin	12546
Mr. Gray	12541	Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Employment Insurance		Mr. Lee	12546
Mrs. Gagnon	12542	Mr. MacAulay	12546
Mr. Pettigrew	12542	Taxation	
Mrs. Gagnon	12542	Mr. Nunziata	12546
Mr. Pettigrew	12542	Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12547
Publishing Industry		Canada Marine Act	
Mr. Mark	12542	Mr. Morrison	12547
Ms. Copps	12542	Mr. Collenette	12547
Mr. Mark	12542	Reproductive Technologies	
Ms. Copps	12542	Mrs. Picard	12547
Immigration		Mr. Rock	12547
Mr. Ménard	12542	The Environment	
Ms. Robillard	12543	Mr. Laliberte	12547
Mr. Ménard	12543	Mr. Goodale	12547
Ms. Robillard	12543	Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	
Human Rights		Mr. Muise	12547
Mr. Jaffer	12543	Mr. Mifflin	12548
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	12543		
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12543	ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	12543	Order in Council Appointments	
Women Political Prisoners		Mr. Adams	12548
Mrs. Debien	12543	Government response to petitions	
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	12543	Mr. Adams	12548
Employment		Petitions	
Mr. Hubbard	12544	Sexual Offenders	
Mr. Pettigrew	12544	Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	12548
The Environment		Bill C-68	
Mr. Cummins	12544	Mr. Drouin	12548
Mr. Goodale	12544	Pay Equity	
Mr. Cummins	12544	Mr. Drouin	12548
Mr. Goodale	12544	Foreign Affairs	
The Public Service of Canada		Mr. Adams	12548
Ms. Desjarlais	12544	Pay Equity	
Mr. Massé	12544	Ms. St-Hilaire	12549
Ms. Desjarlais	12544	Marriage	
Mr. Massé	12545	Mr. Harris	12549
Child Tax Benefit		Human Rights	
Ms. St-Jacques	12545	Mr. Szabo	12549
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12545	Public Safety Officers	
Ms. St-Jacques	12545	Mr. Szabo	12549
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12545	Freshwater	
Canada-Palestine Relations		Mr. Riis	12549
Mr. Charbonneau	12545	Property Offences	
		Mr. Morrison	12549

Pay Equity	
Mrs. Venne	12549
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Adams	12549
Petitions	
Pay Equity	
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	12550

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act	
Bill C-55. Report stage	12551
Mr. Bélanger	12551
Mr. Bélanger	12552

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Request for Emergency Debate	
Bill C-55	
Mr. Mark	12552
Speaker's Ruling	
The Deputy Speaker	12552

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act	
Bill C-55. Report stage	12552
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	12552
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	12553
Mrs. Ablonczy	12553
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	12553
Ms. Bulte	12554
Mr. Anders	12555
Mr. Mahoney	12557
Mr. Adams	12557
Mr. Mahoney	12557
Mr. Hilstrom	12558
Mr. Wilfert	12558
Mr. Bryden	12559
Mr. Epp	12561
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	12562
Mr. Bélanger	12563
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	12563
Mr. Strahl	12563
Mr. Bélanger	12563
Mr. Strahl	12563
Mr. Adams	12564
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	12565
Mr. Strahl	12565
Ms. Augustine	12565
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	12566
Mr. Adams	12567

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	12567
Mr. Steckle	12567
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	12567
Mr. Shepherd	12568
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	12569
Ms. Caplan	12570
Mrs. Ablonczy	12571
Ms. Catterall	12572
Ms. Desjarlais	12573
Mr. Drouin	12574
Mr. Cummins	12575
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	12576
Mr. Kilgour	12576
Motion No. 22	12576
Division on Motion No. 22 deferred	12576
Mr. Epp	12576
Motion No. 1 negatived	12577
Mr. Kilger	12577
Mr. Strahl	12577
Mr. Bergeron	12577
Mr. Blaikie	12577
Mr. Harvey	12577
Mr. Nunziata	12577
Mr. Lefebvre	12577
Motion No. 22 agreed to	12578
Motion for concurrence	12578
Ms. Copps	12578
Mr. Kilger	12578
Mr. Strahl	12578
Mr. Bergeron	12579
Mrs. Dockrill	12579
Mr. Harvey	12579
Mr. Nunziata	12579
Mr. Lefebvre	12579
Motion agreed to	12580

First Nations Land Management Act

Bill C-49. Third reading	12580
Amendment negatived	12581
Motion agreed to	12582
(Bill read the third time and passed)	12582

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Justice	
Mr. Reynolds	12582
Ms. Bakopanos	12583
Airbus	
Mr. MacKay	12583
Ms. Bakopanos	12584
Devo	
Mrs. Dockrill	12584
Ms. Bakopanos	12584

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 : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9