



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 136 • NUMBER 071 • 2nd SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, March 24, 2000**

**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

Friday, March 24, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

#### MUNICIPAL GRANTS ACT

The House resumed from February 23 consideration of the motion that Bill C-10, an act to amend the Municipal Grants Act, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to enter the debate on Bill C-10. Essentially, we should recognize that it is a good bill. It moves in the right direction and does some of the right things. In particular, it changes the word “grants” to “payments”. They were grants in lieu of taxes and now they will be payments in lieu of taxes. In terms of what has been happening in the House in the last little while concerning grants, and the auditor general’s comments yesterday before the HRDC committee and the reports of his statements this morning in the *National Post*, we can easily see that perhaps it was even some kind of a portent on the part of the minister of public works to change the word “grants” to “payments”. There are some good reasons he would want payments rather than grants.

We need to recognize that the bill accommodates much of what ought to be happening in the world of government and in the world of business generally.

The bill is also supported by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, which has suggested that there are some things the bill should have accommodated that it did not.

I should also indicate that there was some reticence on the part of departmental officials as well as the minister to make certain

amendments. I think he should have adopted some of the proposed amendments, but he chose not to. I will speak about them a bit later.

The third thing we should recognize is that we can support the bill as Reformers because our policy is very clear. It states that all laws pertaining to individuals and the private sector apply equally to the Government of Canada, its personnel, its agencies and parliament.

We do not believe that a parliamentarian is above the law. Neither do we believe that individuals who work for the Government of Canada ought to be above the law. They are subject to the law just as any other citizen ought to be subject to the law. This is particularly relevant when it comes to the business of taxes to be paid to municipalities or tax assessing authorities where there are government owned buildings and the municipality or the taxing authority provides services in the form of roads, infrastructure and utilities. It costs money to provide those services and government should not be exempt from paying an amount that is fair, equitable and comparable to that paid by other taxpayers to the taxing authority.

• (1010)

The same issue applies to crown corporations. We should be clearly cognizant of the fact that both crown corporations and the government ought to be responsible and pay their legitimate dues to the taxing authorities which provide services to government properties.

There are some very serious issues that ought to be talked about. The constitution of Canada says very clearly that the minister or the government cannot be forced to pay taxes to the taxing authority in the municipality where a particular piece of real estate might be located. The constitution says that the government is exempt.

This legislation has been crafted in such a way that the minister may pay in lieu of taxes certain moneys to the taxing authority. The key word is “may”. It should be “shall”. Just like the people, the government should have to pay, but the constitution says that the government does not have to pay.

There is another possibility which could have been adopted, which is that the minister may not unreasonably withhold moneys.

*Government Orders*

Or, if he does withhold or amend the amount, he must give reasons to the taxing authority as to why he is amending, changing or withholding certain payments in lieu of taxes.

It does not only go to that point; it also goes to the advisory panel which provides certain advice. I will get into that in a bit more detail later.

I want to talk as well about late payment of taxes. Supposing that the government decides through its minister that rather than pay the taxes on the date specified in the tax assessment it will pay on some other date. In that case, if the government decides to make a late payment, it is up to the minister to decide how late it will be—and there could be a dispute on the dates—and he may have to pay a bonus or an interest charge.

Business people know very well that if they are late in the payment of their taxes they are assessed a service charge, interest on the late payment. I believe that the minister should be in exactly the same position and should be obligated to at least give the reasons for which he is withholding the interest charges.

The bill also provides for an advisory panel. This is a very useful mechanism. The advisory panel would give the minister advice on the assessment. If a building that the government owns is fully occupied by the government, then it should pay the full amount. If the government has leased the building to a third party, who is liable? Is it the third party? Is it the government? Who is liable? The bill provides that the advisory panel would advise the minister on these issues.

However, the minister is not obligated to take that advice. He may ignore the advice.

The panel would be comprised of people who understand what this is all about. It would be made up of tax assessors, people who know how to evaluate property for its fair market value, whether buildings or land.

There could be disputes, as there are with tax assessments on real estate. The minister might question the assessed value. He might say that it is too high. There is an appeal process. He may also talk about a variety of other issues when he comes to the appeal. He may talk about ownership and things of that type.

• (1015)

This advisory panel, which acts as a dispute resolution mechanism, may provide some advice to the minister. It may say that the assessment, which the minister says is really too high, is correct. Or, it may tell the taxing authority that their assessment probably is too high. Nevertheless, the minister, regardless of what it is, is not obligated to accept this advice. He may amend it, he may change it or he may use it. It is entirely up to him.

Why is it that we are so concerned about these issues? Why is it that the minister would want to ignore the advice of the panel? Why is it that the minister might not wish to pay taxes, or he might wish

to pay late, or he might wish to adjust, or whatever the case may be? He is not obligated. Why is it that he does not want to have the requirement of this parliament to give reasons. He should be required to give reasons to the taxing authorities as to why he would not accept the full assessment of the taxes that he is to pay. If he has the authority to pay he should be obligated to pay if he is operating in an equitable, fair and open basis.

It could be that the minister just simply wants the power to say that he is able to do this and do whatever he jolly well pleases. It is quite possible for him to do that. If we look at some of the arrogance that exists on the front bench that we have seen in the last little while, it could be that.

I happen to know the hon. minister in this connection and I do not believe that is his motivation at all. It could be something else. It could be manipulation. There could be friends in some of these taxing authorities where the money should be paid immediately. However, there should be no question that if there is a late payment the appropriate interest should be paid.

There could be other municipalities or other taxing authorities where the particular management is not necessarily friendly with the minister because they may have voted for a different party rather than the one that is in power. In this case the minister could say that maybe he should not pay the full amount, that he should wait a little while, or that he will reduce the interest rate on this one. There is a possibility of playing favourites here. I happen to know that the minister involved would not do that but the possibility exists.

When we make legislation in the House we should write the legislation in such a way that partisan politics does not become an issue. When it comes to the business of taxing and paying taxes, it should be done in a fair, equitable and transparent manner so that every Canadian is treated the same as every other Canadian. There should be no particular advantages to one group vis-à-vis another group. It should not be possible for a minister to intrude and manipulate the situation to his advantage or the advantage of the political party that he is involved with.

The very same set of arguments also applies to the panel. Why should the minister, having a group of experts that is available to him and providing him with good advice, be in a position to ignore their advice? I think the advisory panel is there as a mechanism, as a protection for Canadian taxpayers so that disputes can be resolved equitably, quickly and in an impartial way. If the minister chooses to ignore the advice of the panel he should be required to give reasons for doing so.

We also need to look at a couple of other things. The first of these are the rights of the taxpayer. What rights do we have as Canadian taxpayers who support the government, who support the programs and who pay for the programs even if they do not support them? What are the rights of the individual taxpayer? The rights of the individual taxpayer are that we should know where our taxes

*Government Orders*

are going, how much our taxes are and the basis for those taxes so that they are equitable and fair and we know exactly what is happening in each of these areas.

It goes beyond that. There are three crown corporations that are for-profit corporations. They include the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Canada Post Corporation and the Royal Canadian Mint. These are only three Crown corporations out of many more that have somehow been exempted from a requirement to make payments in lieu of taxes. Simply because they are crown corporations they can be exempt. The Business Development Bank of Canada pays taxes because it is listed in schedule IV. For some reason or other these three corporations, CMHC, CPC and the Royal Canadian Mint have been exempted. We do not know why.

• (1020)

It was suggested by the Canadian Federation of Municipalities and by our amendment that these be included, but it was ignored. Why? The National Housing Act was amended last year to allow Canada Mortgage and Housing to pay dividends to its major shareholder, the Government of Canada. Clearly, it would not pay dividends if it did not have a profit. We have here a corporation that uses the services of a municipality which are paid for by taxes. Why should those corporations not be required to make payments in lieu of taxes, just like the other crown corporations?

It is the right of the taxpayer to be protected and that the taxes be equitable, fair and universal for all those who are liable.

There is also a responsibility on the part of the minister for sound management. There have been examples of good sound management in that particular department, and I commend the minister, but that is not the issue here. On this particular issue there has been good management on the part of the department but there are other areas where the department has failed and where, I would suggest, the minister should call into question some of the management practices, in particular the Canada Post Corporation.

The way in which the rural route mail couriers are being administered by that particular organization is scandalous, particularly the way in which the contract process is being operated. Something needs to be done to ensure that the contracting procedure and process is fair and equitable. At the moment it is not.

I now want to move into the area of accountability. The minister is accountable to this parliament and he should be held to account. Parliament should know the reasons why taxes have not been paid, why payments are made in lieu of taxes, why some people are not paying as much, are late or have had their interest payments adjusted. We need to have that information.

We also need transparency. What needs to be hidden? Nothing needs to be hidden. Why should this be some kind of deep secret. It should not be. Why not tell Canadians that the minister is appealing a particular tax assessment? Why should we not know that in his or

her opinion it should be reduced? That is legitimate. If members in the House have a question we can appeal to a tax appeal authority. The minister is accountable to parliament.

Finally, there is the business of commitment. We need to know if there is commitment to peace, order and good government in this department? I will again refer to that specific instance with the contracting procedure at Canada Post. It does not promote peace, order and good government because it pits one group against another. The process is not open. It is one sided and, in many ways, discriminates against other people.

If the minister would say that he will be accountable and that he is committed to this, then we would really be able to say that we have moved a long way. It could be done with the amendments we have suggested on the report stage of the bill.

I want to say how significant this is, particularly when I refer to Mr. Desautels, the auditor general, and his comments from yesterday. This was reported this morning in the *National Post*. He said “If members of parliament are involved in the decision making process”—in this particular instance he is referring to job creation grants, but it applies everywhere—“that blurs the line and makes it harder for them to play their oversight role of government”.

I cannot underline more strongly than the auditor general did, the significance of that statement.

• (1025)

It is in the same way that I want to protect not only the minister but the taxpayers of Canada. I want to tell them that they will be treated fairly and equitably, and that the decisions we make will be transparent. If that happens, the auditor general would not have to give advice like that because we would be committed right from the start.

I suggest that we must decide to play fairly, equitably and honestly. We need to tell our municipalities that we are here to recognize them and respect them.

The principle is the same, whether it is with HRDC grants, EDC grants or loans, or with any other department. The principle is that MPs, including the minister, should recognize that all laws pertaining to individuals and the private sector apply equally to the Government of Canada, its personnel, its agencies and parliament. A commitment to that principle characterizes all Reform MPs and will characterize all Canadian alliance MPs after Saturday's decision. This policy and this commitment I give to all hon. members on my behalf and on my colleagues' behalf.

I recommend to the minister that although he missed the opportunity to protect himself and his successors, he can provide amendments in the next session of parliament to bring about those amendments that will protect him and make sure that it is clear and above-board.

*Government Orders*

With regard to the three other corporations, CMHC, CPC and the Royal Canadian Mint, the minister could then bring that amendment forward and include them under schedule four. We would then have a fair and equitable treatment of all crown corporations. They would then be obligated to pay taxes to the taxing authority.

While we agree with the bill in principle and support it, and while there are many things about the bill we like, I suggest to the minister that he has not gone as far as he could have gone or should have gone. It would have been in the interests of this parliament and all Canadians to have gone further and accepted some of the amendments that were presented to the House on the occasion of the reporting of the bill.

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the NDP caucus and the investigation that we have done on the bill, we do recognize that the bill represents over two years of exhaustive consultation with all the parties, a cross-country tour and I think a genuine effort to allow all the stakeholders to have an adequate say and adequate input into developing what we think is a very important bill.

I will go even further by saying that I believe this type of consultation process could even serve as a model for other pieces of legislation because it was such a well thought out process. All of the parties came away fully satisfied that the consultation was thorough and that they had adequate opportunity to make a difference and to help shape and craft this type of legislation.

We would like to see this happen more frequently with other bills and we would hope that all of the parties, to any piece of legislation that is crafted, could feel so positive about their opportunities.

The NDP caucus believes firmly that Bill C-10 will be a direct benefit to almost 2,000 communities coast to coast to coast. We believe that it succeeds as a piece of legislation because it will enshrine, once and for all, the principles of fairness, equity and predictability in the management of our federal payments in lieu of taxes, principles which I believe are important to all members of the House on both sides.

I congratulate the members of the joint technical committee, which was made up of representatives from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Treasury Board representatives and other government representatives. I would also like to recognize all of the municipal representatives, mayors and councillors who met with the consultation tour during 1998. They also played such a valuable role in crafting this legislation.

• (1030)

All members of the House realize that the Government of Canada enjoys a constitutional exemption from local taxation.

Nevertheless I think we all recognize and agree that we have a moral obligation as a property owner to help pay for the costs of local government. We are major occupants of space in the municipalities and obviously we use the services of the local government. It is only fair and right that we should be paying for them. Federal operations should contribute to the social and economic well-being of the community and certainly should not be a burden on the local taxpayer.

Over the past 50 years federal governments have adopted the policy of paying grants in lieu of property taxes in recognition of the valuable direct and indirect services that it gets from the municipalities. These payments are now in excess of \$375 million annually, which represents a significant transfer of federal dollars to local communities.

These federal payments contribute to the local economies. They are of great benefit and as such contribute greatly to the well-being of Canadians in general. Imagine the impact on the finances of a region like Ottawa-Carleton or the city of Hull if the Government of Canada reneged on its burden as a property owner and stopped making payments in lieu of taxes. It would be devastating.

It is fair to say that we all recognize and accept the rationale for these payments. Canadians realize their value and their necessity. That is not at issue today.

Bill C-10 deals with ways to improve the administration of the payments. Taking into account the far reaching changes that have occurred in the municipal taxation front over the last two decades, the legislation needed to be revamped and upgraded.

The NDP caucus is satisfied that Bill C-10 will bring about positive, constructive and lasting program changes. It will confirm that the federal government does have respect for the standards set for other property owners and that it values the services it receives from municipal governments.

The goal is to make the process more predictable and to strengthen the foundation of fairness and equity on which the program was built and on which it has operated over the last five decades. We want to make federal payments in lieu of taxes resemble the taxes paid by private landowners as much as possible. We believe that Bill C-10 takes us one step further to that equitable position and still recognizes the federal government's constitutional exemption from local taxation.

Bill C-10 will change the name of the legislation and the program. In future, grants in lieu of taxes will be referred to as payments in lieu of taxes. This more accurately reflects the more explicit and respectful relationship between the two levels of government. The type of language used is very important. The term "payments" rather than "grants" more accurately reflects the mutual respect between the two levels of government.

*Government Orders*

Bill C-10 also includes a goodwill clause that confirms our commitment to fairness and equity in the administration of the federal payments in lieu of taxes. This is a very positive and necessary aspect of this newly redefined relationship.

Changes in legislation include a commitment by the federal government to endeavour to meet the payment schedules put in place locally. When payments are unreasonably delayed, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services will have the power and the authority to make payment of a supplementary amount to the municipality to compensate for the delay. This is also something which municipalities needed to be able to rely on as a stream of revenue from the federal government so that their own services would not be interrupted by some late payment on the part of the government.

Bill C-10 addresses the issue of resolution of any kind of disagreement between the two parties. Any kind of relationship like this has to have some kind of mediation process that is fair and impartial and one with which both parties are comfortable.

• (1035)

For all those reasons Bill C-10 will be of service to the municipalities. We believe the local politicians in the municipalities are comfortable with it. They have had a satisfactory opportunity to have input. We believe the whole process should serve as a model for the development of other types of legislation. The NDP caucus will be happy to vote in favour of Bill C-10 at third reading.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, our party is pleased to support Bill C-10 and I am pleased to speak on behalf of it. In fact I am filling in for my colleague from Tobique—Mactaquac.

We have made important progress both on this bill and with this bill. I would like to take a few minutes to summarize what we have accomplished and how it would benefit taxpayers across the country. I want to review some of the key objectives of the bill and explain why our party supports these objectives. I also want to review some of the problems that exist in the present system and how I think the bill addresses some of those problems.

There are some problems as well within the bill itself which various groups have identified for us. I want to talk about these and how we attempted to resolve them and gauge how successful we were in resolving them. Specifically I want to revisit our amendments to the bill and the benefits Canadians will see as a result of them.

Finally I want to look ahead and identify the areas that still need to be addressed and will need to be addressed in the future.

First, I want to express personal thanks to the individuals and groups who worked with our party on this bill. The executive and

staff of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Cities of New Brunswick Association, the Ontario Municipalities Association and the Appraisal Institute of Canada all shared their insight and ideas with us.

I also want to thank my caucus colleagues, specifically the hon. members for Brandon—Souris, Richmond—Arthabaska, Compton—Stanstead and of course the hon. member for Saint John. Memory will tell us that they were all mayors in their hometowns.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from the other parties who traded ideas with us, and the minister who listened to us when we said that the bill could be improved. It is not very often we can talk about a minister who actually wants to talk to the opposition in an attempt to improve a bill as the minister did. We thank him very much.

As everyone knows, municipalities fund their activities through real property taxes and business occupancy taxes. In exchange for these levies, property owners and businesses receive municipal services such as water, sewer and waste collection.

For the first 80 years of this country, the government of the dominion of Canada received all the same services that municipal ratepayers did without paying a single cent in municipal taxes. This changed in 1950 with the passage of the Municipal Grants Act which allowed the national government to make payments or grants in lieu of taxes. The municipalities got their money from the federal government without the federal government jeopardizing its constitutional position as one of the only two levels of government authorized to collect taxes.

The system has worked quite well for both parties, except of course when disputes from time to time have arisen. In those cases of dispute, it has been the federal government that has had the final say over how much a municipality would receive on a given property with no appeal available to the municipality. It has been a very one-sided process.

Bill C-10 is an attempt to introduce a system that will be fairer to the municipalities in valuing and rating federal government real property. Another goal of the legislation is to provide greater equity and greater predictability so that municipal governments can plan their budgets in advance with some accuracy knowing approximately how much revenue they can expect from federal property.

• (1040)

The bill will allow the federal government to pay compensation when it is late paying its taxes. It authorizes the Government of Canada to make payments to municipalities when tenants on federal property default on their tax obligations. Perhaps most important, this legislation will establish a formal dispute settlement body so that when disagreements arise over the amount of payments owed to the federal government, the municipality con-

*Government Orders*

cerned or the federal government can refer the dispute to a dispute advisory panel.

The bill will also expand the definition of federal real property to include federally owned outdoor swimming pools, golf course improvements, outdoor theatres, residential driveways and employee parking improvements so that the federal government property is treated the same way as other property within the municipality. It will ensure that first nations governments receive equal treatment to that accorded other local governments under the act.

The bill also improves predictability by clarifying provisions relating to the calculation of payments in lieu of taxes on federal farm property, the calculation of deductions when municipalities are unable to provide federal property with equivalent services to those accorded to private property and the status of Parks Canada assets as federal property.

Along with Bill C-10 some other important policy changes are being made. For example, the federal government will consult with professional appraisal organizations, assessment authorities, municipalities, federal departments of the crown and crown corporations on the valuations of special purpose federal properties, such as penitentiaries, military establishments and national parks.

The federal government will also seek the advice of these stakeholders regarding appointments to and management of the dispute advisory panel. A program advisory council will be established composed of representatives of stakeholders, to provide advice to the minister on administrative policy and legislative matters.

Finally the federal government will commit to paying its municipal taxes on time, the same as everyone else. Members will have to forgive me if I choke on that one; the federal government paying its taxes on time. Who could actually believe that? Nonetheless the track record of the current federal Liberal government is not all that impressive on this point. If it can make some improvements, it would be impressive but we will hold our breath on that until we see what happens.

The bottom line is that a system that has been unfair, inequitable and unpredictable will now be more fair and predictable. The key word is predictable. Ultimately this bill and the accompanying measures will put more money into municipalities on a regular basis. That will benefit all municipal taxpayers. That is why our party supports Bill C-10.

The bill is not without its flaws. When it was first introduced many complaints were received from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities that the bill was being rushed through the House before municipalities had a chance to see the bill, study it and provide feedback to the government.

Although municipalities were generally pleased with the two year consultation process that preceded the introduction of the legislation, when the bill came out they received no notice and did not get a copy of the bill or briefing materials. We complained to the minister's office about this. I am not sure whether we can claim victory, but it seems that again the minister listened and almost immediately the schedule for second reading and the committee hearings on the bill were pushed back. Again the minister listened to those complaints.

● (1045 )

Most of the bill is straightforward but our caucus had some difficulties with the composition and mandate of the dispute advisory panel, as did some of the stakeholders to whom we spoke. One item of concern was the requirement that we have relevant knowledge or experience without defining what those terms meant.

I understand what the intention of the phrase would be. It was meant to ensure that only qualified professionals serve on the panel. Unfortunately, because this term was not defined in the bill, our fear was that it would be left up to the minister of public works to define it.

That leaves the panel open for political abuse. For example, what would happen if the minister decided that relevant knowledge or experience meant that all a person needed to be qualified would be to be a card carrying member of the Liberal Party?

**Mr. Lynn Myers:** You know better than that.

**Mr. Greg Thompson:** When the hon. member gets up I will listen very carefully to what he has to say. I am glad the Speaker is not paying attention. When I am finished with this he will understand what I am saying. It will be very complimentary but he should be patient. Members on the other side of the House are not used to compliments. When we start out they are so frightened by our words that they either hide under their desks or get up shouting in a madman fashion, which we have seen recently in the House. We are asking for a little decorum in the House, Mr. Speaker, by the member opposite. When I am through I am sure he will come over here to shake my hand in support of my speech.

At the end of this process, without a definition we could end up with some patronage in terms of stacking the deck on the panel. I am sure the member will agree that in future governments the same could happen. We do not expect this government to be in power forever and ever, amen. In fact it could come to a crashing end within the next number of months. We are looking ahead to what might happen in the future, regardless of party affiliation. We are saying that potential for abuse had to be eliminated and we are glad to see that something has been done.

We consulted a number of people in order to attempt to define the terms of the bill. I know the member for Tobique—Mactaquac

*Government Orders*

spoke with the Privy Council Office, with some municipal organizations and with the Appraisal Institute of Canada. In this case the institute was helpful in suggesting amendments to the bill that would have required panel members to be selected from a list provided jointly by it and the same organization in the province of Quebec.

This was not a bad attempt. However there are two problems with this definition. First, there are other types of professionals we want to have sitting on the panel such as real estate assessors and representatives of municipalities and federal departments. Second, there is no consistent national definition of an appraiser. It varies from one end of the country to the other. It differs from province to province and most provinces do not require licensing, believe it or not.

For now we are prepared to allow the panel to proceed as the bill describes. I would urge all members to monitor the composition of the panel, particularly the member opposite. Should problems arise in the future the government operations committee has within its power the ability to review the legislation. What more could we ask for than a review of the process?

We were effective in two other areas as well also having to do with the dispute advisory panel. In the original bill it was proposed that the panel be appointed by and paid by the minister. Its advice would be rejected by the minister without an opportunity for appeal. Any or all panel members could be fired by the minister at any time for any reason. For a panel that was supposed to impartially adjudicate disputes between municipalities and the federal government, usually the public works department, this process seemed like it was tilted in favour of the public works department and the minister.

• (1050)

At the time the member for Tobique—Mactaquac likened the process to that of a criminal trial where the accused person got to pick the jury. It sounds familiar in this place. The accused person got to pick the jury, pay the jury, act as judge and face no appeal. It did not look like a very fair system.

We received the same complaints from the municipalities and their organizations. Based on these complaints my colleague drafted amendments to make the dispute panel process much more balanced and submitted these amendments to the committee where they were considered.

The first amendment was to remove the threat of arbitrary firing of a panel member by the minister. If a member could not be fired by a minister then the member could be free to give more independent advice without the fear of reprisal. That sounds like cabinet across the street. Where the bill originally stated that panel members would serve at the pleasure of the minister, we changed

that so that members would serve on good behaviour. This means that panel members would now have tenure and could only be fired for just cause.

The second amendment we presented to the committee that was adopted was a change to the appointment process. Bill C-10 in its original form had the panel members being appointed by the minister. The amendment by the member for Tobique—Mactaquac was passed by the committee. It proposed that the governor in council or cabinet would appoint panel members.

The member for Tobique—Mactaquac and I may slightly disagree on that point. That means the Prime Minister hand-picking, but I guess that is better than just the minister himself because at least it would come under the scrutiny of cabinet. The standing committee thought these two amendments made sense and would improve the bill and the performance of the advisory panel. It adopted both amendments unanimously.

Because of these changes the dispute settlement process would be fair and municipalities could seek larger payments. Ultimately this could allow municipal taxpayers to get a break on their tax bills, something I think all municipal ratepayers would appreciate.

Having said that, there is still one area yet to be resolved that has not been dealt with in the bill. That is the outstanding matter concerning business occupancy taxes and certain crown corporations. It has not yet been determined how and to what extent Canada Post, the Royal Canadian Mint, Canada Mortgage and Housing and similar crown corporations would pay taxes and business occupancy taxes.

Certainly the mandate of these corporations has changed over the years since the Municipal Grants Act was last updated. It used to be that these crown corporations served purely for public policy purposes. In the unlikely event they ever made a profit it was more by accident than by design. Profit was never in their vocabulary. Now these corporations serve two purposes. Not only do they continue to serve an important public policy role. They also have a mandate to earn a profit to recover costs and to lessen the burden on taxpayers.

If these crown corporations are conducting business and earning a profit they should be paying business taxes. The question is how much. After discussions our party had with representatives from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, and after having questioned witnesses from FCM and public works in committee, I am convinced that this problem will soon be solved. Municipalities and the federal government are continuing to negotiate what portion of each crown corporation is devoted to purely profit making activities. The discussion is not yet finished on this issue.

I look forward to seeing this problem resolved in the very near future. In conclusion, the bill would bring a more balanced,

*S. O. 31*

predictable and fairer approach to the process of payments to municipalities.

• (1055)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It has been brought to my attention that the hon. minister has deemed to have spoken but by consent will be able to speak again. The first speaker when the bill comes back will be the minister.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I realize that you were looking at the minister and did not see the member beside me stand on questions and comments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We will go to questions and comments with the hon. member for Beauséjour—Petitcodiac.

**Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I have met with some municipalities that have serious financial problems because of the lack of taxes being paid to them when they have federal buildings in their very small communities.

It is quite a disadvantage and it is very clear that the proportion being given in lieu of taxes to these municipalities is absolutely unacceptable. These communities cannot provide the services because of this fact. What is the member's view on this point?

**Mr. Greg Thompson:** Mr. Speaker, my view would be that federal government agencies, and we are talking about Canada Post in this particular case, should be paying their fair share of taxes. They are in business now to make money. It is not a case of being subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer. If they are playing by the rules of business as every business should, they should be paying their fair share of taxes.

It places an unfair burden on municipalities that have to rely on taxes to look after their communities. I think the bill will go some distance toward improving that process and making sure that all municipalities get their fair share of taxes back from Crown corporations that are now commissioned to make money and show a profit. What is good for a private business should be good for government.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

[English]

**NATIONAL EPILEPSY MONTH**

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this month the Canadian Epilepsy Alliance and other organizations across the country are promoting National Epilepsy Month.

Epilepsy is the most common serious brain disorder in Canada. Approximately 300,000 Canadians have epilepsy. This disorder does not discriminate. People of all ages are affected by epilepsy, especially the elderly.

Unfortunately in most cases involving this disease the cause is unknown and there is no cure. Also discouraging are the myths surrounding epilepsy. These myths can be just as damaging to people suffering from this disorder as the seizures themselves.

I strongly encourage Canadians to make an effort this month to learn more about this disorder and to develop their first aid skills accordingly. Only by working together can we greatly improve the quality of life of people with this problem in this great nation of ours.

\* \* \*

**ORGANIC FOODS**

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government never learns from its mistakes. I have just learned of plans by a government supported agency to take over complete control of the certification of organic foods in Canada. If the government allows this plan to proceed it would put 45 thriving private organic certification companies out of business.

The Liberals say they want economic diversification but continue to intrude into the marketplace to eliminate competition, limit freedom of contract and infringe on fundamental property rights. Liberal actions speak louder than words. There is a great concern among the people involved in the organic growing and processing industry.

• (1100)

In this time of declining farm incomes, this industry continues to thrive. I do not want to see it hurt because of this socialist government's desire for a single controlling body.

We have had an agency like that in western Canada for the last 60 years and it has contributed to the current farm income crisis. This monopoly is called the Canadian Wheat Board. We do not need another one.

*S. O. 31*

**TUBERCULOSIS**

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North—St. Paul, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of parliament the plight of two billion people in the world who are infected with tuberculosis, 200 million of whom will develop the disease. One hundred million will die if no proper treatment is made available to them.

This may not have the impact that the image of a flood or the exodus of refugees creates, but the scale of human suffering and lives lost is no less.

We cannot afford to be complacent only because the incidence of tuberculosis in Canada is low. One can become infected simply by sharing the same air with an infected person in a waiting room, in a bus or in an airplane. It is an ever-increasing risk in our global village.

The well-being of Canada and her citizens is well served by contributing our expertise and financial resources to combat this menace to international public health.

We have a collective duty to help in the global action. This let us pledge as we mark World Tuberculosis Day today.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY**

**Mr. Yvon Charbonneau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that today is World Tuberculosis Day.

World Tuberculosis Day commemorates the day in 1882 when Dr. Robert Koch announced his discovery of the cause of tuberculosis, the tuberculosis bacillus. We take advantage of this opportunity to remind hon. members that this disease is still endemic and out of control in a large part of the world. One-third of the world's population is infected with the tuberculosis bacillus, and there are eight million new cases annually.

[*English*]

After many decades of continuous decline, unfortunately the incidence rate of TB cases in Canada has levelled off in the past several years. With the emergence of drug resistant strains and the deadly interaction with the HIV/AIDS epidemic, Canada cannot afford to become complacent in the face of the worldwide TB threat.

[*Translation*]

Tuberculosis constitutes a true global emergency, which all countries must take seriously.

On this World Tuberculosis Day, I would like to express my support of the ongoing battle being waged by Health Canada and its partners, including CIDA, against this disease.

[*English*]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian agricultural products are known the world over for their high quality.

Over the years supply managed farm commodities have ensured quality goods and stable prices. Canadian farmers, processors, retailers and consumers alike have benefited greatly from the steady and safe supply of regulated products.

Both our Canadian farmers and consumers recognize the obvious benefits of continuing such programs in the wake of a rapidly changing global agricultural landscape.

I urge the government to retain supply management for the benefit of all Canadians. Canadians have a right to enjoy a safe and healthy food supply and this should be first and foremost in our minds as we embark on WTO negotiations.

I further urge the government to continue to recognize and acknowledge that agricultural supply management programs are essential to ensure the protection and capability of Canada's agricultural production.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL PARK WARDENS**

**Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the lives of our national park wardens are in danger and the heritage minister refuses to protect them.

Federal park wardens have been forced to work without the proper equipment needed to protect themselves. Wardens constantly encounter poachers, drug dealers and others who are potentially violent and armed. Poachers face up to five years in jail and become desperate when apprehended by a park warden.

Knowing these facts, why does the heritage minister ignore her committee's recommendation that wardens should carry service revolvers? The government allows Brink's security guards to carry sidearms to protect money, but refuses the same right to wardens who protect wildlife, tourists and their own lives.

I proudly represent the people who live in Jasper National Park and I strongly urge the heritage minister to provide park wardens with the basic tools needed for their protection and the protection of the public. Why put our officers at risk when on the line of duty simply because they were denied basic protection?

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of discussion about our health care system and its

*S. O. 31*

sustainability. However, several of my constituents have recently told me that illness prevention is still the best medicine. A big part of that is a healthy environment.

I was pleased that in our recent budget there were several measures for environmental protection and I look forward to working with all colleagues in this direction.

• (1105)

I also hope that all members will co-operate on this file to improve our environment and to act upon the measures contained in the budget. Clean water, clean air and a protected environment are a big part of our heritage, the heritage I hope to leave for my grandchildren and for future generations of Canadians.

I hope this is only a down payment on what we will do as a government for the future of our people and our children. A clean environment and good health is great for Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### MEMBER FOR VAUDREUIL—SOULANGES

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges said that he would lose his riding to the Bloc Québécois in the next election if the present Prime Minister remained at the head of the Liberal Party of Canada.

The Liberal member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges is wrong in attributing such a defeat solely to poor leadership. It will also be the fault of his government, which has imposed Bill C-20 to prevent Quebecers from being the only ones to decide on their future. It will be the fault of his government, a government that has lost track of \$1 billion in Human Resources Development Canada funds, that has accumulated a fantastic surplus at the expense of the unemployed and workers, and that does nothing as gas prices skyrocket.

Unfortunately for the hon. member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges, we can only confirm his fears. The Bloc Québécois will indeed take his seat from him in the next election.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, Canadians of Hellenic descent will be celebrating the anniversary of the liberation of their former homeland from the Ottoman Empire.

In 1821, after 400 years of oppression from the Ottoman Empire, the Hellenes, with the help of heroes such as Lord Byron of England, restored freedom to Greece, the birthplace of democracy.

Since that time the relations between these two countries have not been the greatest. Recently, however, the people of Greece and Turkey have begun to build and exhibit compassion toward each other. For example, when Turkey experienced a devastating earthquake last year its Greek neighbours were there to lend a helping hand immediately. Soon after, unfortunately, Greece also experienced an earthquake, and the Turkish people were there to reciprocate immediately.

Since that time the people of both these countries have been building great relationships by working together on both social and economic issues.

By this unprecedented willingness to work together, the people of these two countries seem to be indicating their common wish to finally create a peaceful environment between their two countries.

It is also my hope, as we begin the new millennium, that these two countries will nurture positive energies for a better tomorrow.

\* \* \*

#### CONSERVATIVE PARTY

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today's *National Post* describes Joe Clark's recent nomination meeting:

Joe Clark . . . played to an embarrassingly small crowd on Wednesday night. . . in Calgary Centre. About 300, by generous estimates, turned out in a . . . room that could have held 1,000.

The event got off to a disastrous start when Jim Silye called 30 representatives from community organizations up to the stage. Nobody came forward. While waiting Mr. Silye said "Does anybody know any good jokes while I wait for these people?" He then left the podium, telling the crowd: "Have another drink; I think I will".

Facing the grim reality of the evening, Mr. Clark stated "We have a lot of work to do. I need your help, I need your prayers—"

Elections are usually run on memberships and money. Seeing as Joe has neither, I can see why he is relying on prayers.

The editorial concluded:

If 300 supporters is all (his) party can muster at a nominating meeting of its leader in a riding that many say Mr. Clark cannot win, it appears Mr. Clark may need all the prayer he can get.

I guess Joe Who has now become Joe Boo Hoo.

\* \* \*

#### OSHAWA HARBOUR

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to talk about Oshawa Harbour, which has just been granted Canadian port authority status.

Oshawa city council lobbied vigorously to take over the harbour. I opposed city council's bid because I felt that city council was not competent to run the harbour as its track record on running the airport leaves something to be desired.

Be that as it may, under control of the Oshawa Harbour Commission, traffic and profit have increased year after year.

I have been accused of seeing my city through rose coloured glasses. I plead guilty to this charge. I look at my city and say "Why not?" For a first class city, why not a first class harbour?

Just watch us. We can and we will add to the pride which all of us have in my city.

\* \* \*

**RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the NDP joins with all those who have condemned the massacre of 35 men of the Sikh faith by terrorists on March 21 at Chittisinghpura in the state of Kashmir.

Religious persecution and religiously motivated killings are to be abhorred wherever they occur. The world is an increasingly dangerous place for people of many faiths, depending on where they happen to be born or where they live. The Baha'is in Iran and the Christians in Sudan come quickly to mind, but Muslims, Jews, Sikhs, Hindus, Buddhists and all other faiths each find themselves persecuted in various contexts. What I find most distressing is state sanctioned official persecution.

• (1110)

The NDP believes, as I am sure most Canadians do, that the 21st century is a time when religious discrimination and hatred should be put behind us forever.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TAX ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS**

**Mr. Stéphan Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the representatives of Attac-Québec and Initiative Halifax expressed concern that the government seemed to be ignoring the spirit and the letter of a motion passed a year ago.

This motion sought to have the government, with the international community, decree a tax on financial transactions. Although the motion did not receive unanimous approval, the aim of it, which was to limit financial speculation, is relevant, since it affects most of us.

Every day, over \$1.8 billion U.S. changes hands in financial markets. Of this amount, only 5% to 10% is involved in transac-

*S. O. 31*

tions relating to goods and services. It seems to me legitimate therefore to control this market.

I support the recommendations of the groups of citizens wanting, among other things, to have the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, which examines issues of globalization, mandated to consider the feasibility of measures to control financial markets, such as the Tobin tax.

\* \* \*

**TOURIST EVENTS**

**Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, who has not yet heard of the international crossing of Lake Memphrémagog, a marathon swim that brings together the world's best long distance swimmers, the Bromont International, an international riding competition, which just this week was awarded the Prix de tourisme des Cantons de l'Est, of the Orford classical music festival, of the Cowansville international street musicians festival, of the arts tour and of the Bedford and Brome agricultural fair, to name but a few.

The riding of Brome—Missisquoi is bursting with prestigious events that draw thousands of visitors annually. These events are what they are today thanks to the energy of the people of Brome—Missisquoi.

A tip of the hat to the organizers, who work tirelessly and resolutely to ensure the success of these events. I would also like to thank the people for their hospitality, which endows each of these events with a touch of the unique and irreplaceable.

I therefore invite my colleagues to visit the riding of Brome—Missisquoi. I am convinced they will have an unforgettable time there.

\* \* \*

[English]

**RANDOL WHIDDEN GANONG**

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour Randol Whidden Ganong of New Brunswick who died this past weekend.

Mr. Ganong, without doubt, was one of Canada's most famous candy makers, if not the most famous candy maker. His accomplishments went far beyond the candy company that bore the family name in St. Stephen. Mr. Ganong was an Order of Canada recipient whose accomplishments were numerous. He spent two years overseas during the second world war as a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force. Mr. Ganong was also mayor of his town for two years before becoming president of the family business. He was the first president of the Confectionery Manufacturers' Association of Canada and worked as a director of both the CBC and the New Brunswick telephone company.

*Oral Questions*

Through good times and bad R. W. was loyal to his family, community and employees, and one of the most thoughtful, honourable and principled business leaders Canada has ever produced. We will miss R. W. Ganong.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL CAPITAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the privilege of representing the Minister of Industry at the launching of the new National Capital Institute of Technology and the opening of its new headquarters at Canada's Communications Research Centre in Nepean.

The institute is an impressive example of partnership between governments, the private sector and academia to advance research and development in this region and in Canada's vital telecommunications sector.

I congratulate the Ottawa Centre for Research and Innovation, Nortel, Newbridge, Bell Nexxia, QNX, the National Research Council, the Communications Research Centre, the Canada Foundation for Innovation and Carleton and Ottawa universities for this unique partnership that will benefit all Canadians and keep Canada at the cutting edge of this important economic sector.

\* \* \*

**THE CANADIAN FLAG**

**Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, how a nation views itself is a measure of its pride and self-esteem. How a nation is viewed by the world is a reflection of its collective deeds. How a nation projects this image is through its national symbol.

• (1115)

Our nation is known throughout the world for its deeds in war and peace. Canada's symbol is its flag, which floats majestically over this very House. Our flag is the embodiment of our nation's heart and soul.

To desecrate Canada's flag must be forbidden by law. To defile the symbol of our nation must have due consequence.

The House will soon decide the importance of our flag. The member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley wishes to add the significance of a cloak of law to protect our flag. I ask for all to support his stand.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BILL C-20**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of Bill C-20 and throughout the undemocratic

process applied to pass that legislation, the Prime Minister and his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs have always refused to be perfectly clear on the majority required for the federal government to fulfil its obligation to negotiate with Quebec.

While the 50% plus one rule is very clear and fair, the Prime Minister and his minister have purposely maintained a state of confusion. But, since yesterday, the cat is out of the bag. In Calgary, thinking that he was safely out of earshot from Quebecers, the Prime Minister said that a 66% majority would not be enough. This is the hidden side of Bill C-20.

This act not only rejects the democratic principle of the equality of voters, but allows parliament and the federal government to reject the democratic will of Quebecers, even if more than 60% of them decide that they want a country.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the auditor general slammed the human resources department yesterday. He said that he had never seen mismanagement on the scale of this giant fiasco.

However, the internal audit that uncovered the billion dollar bungle was only the latest in a long series of warnings that this and previous HRD ministers have received over the past two decades. The Liberals ignored those warnings because it allowed them to continue using taxpayers' money for partisan political purposes.

If the minister were sincere in wanting to clean up her department, why did she wait until she was caught before implementing a plan?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member's question has an inaccurate premise. The minister did not wait. She released the audit report and the information on her six point action plan before she took note of any request to release information.

It is important to note that the auditor general approved of the six point action plan. It is being carried out. The government is identifying the problems and addressing them. The hon. member should give us credit for that.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, every Canadian knows that the minister actually began to

*Oral Questions*

address the problem two days after receiving an access to information request to release the audit.

Let us consider the HRD minister's, by now, infamous six point plan that will supposedly clean up her mess. She stumbled, she stammered and she stifled, and then she stalled and stuttered before stonewalling. If she had spent more time addressing the problems and less time with her image consultant, perhaps taxpayers would take her plan seriously.

If the minister was serious about cleaning up her own department, why did she have to get caught before she did something about it?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's premise is totally wrong. Once again he and his party are slamming and criticizing an officer of the House, the auditor general. That is what they are doing when they are criticizing the six point action plan. The auditor general said "I do believe this is a very thorough plan for corrective action to address the immediate control problems that were identified. Some longer term action plans are also included that further strengthen the approach".

The Reform Party ought to apologize to the auditor general and to the House for the unwarranted criticism of his support of the six point action plan.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have always fully supported the auditor general. It is the Liberal government that only uses his words when it suits its needs.

It does not matter how many points there are in the minister's plan. As long as the very first point is political interference the plan is doomed to failure. With the Shawinigan fountain king staying on as leader, HRDC has no hope of fixing itself.

The minister and her predecessors have been warned for years that HRDC was rife with waste and they chose to do nothing about it.

Why should Canadians believe that the patronage and the political meddling is about to stop?

• (1120)

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again the premise is wrong. There have been no findings of improper political interference, unless we want to talk about the representations by Reform members in support of grants from the HRD department. The hon. member should be looking at himself in this regard if he thinks that this is improper. This is something he in effect is saying.

This government is dealing with these problems. It has the six point action plan. I think it deserves credit for taking note of the

problems and dealing with them in a way that the auditor general finds effective and meaningful.

Again, the Reform Party should apologize for criticizing—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Dewdney—Alouette.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party will not apologize for continuing to keep this government accountable. The auditor general has warned against political interference in his report and the Deputy Prime Minister knows it.

Just to refresh the minister's memory, that is when the boss puts pressure on the department to dole out cash for fountains and shifty hoteliers, or when she goes against the rules of her own program and drops millions of dollars into her own riding. Political interference will get in the way of any plan to restore integrity to the way grants are doled out at HRDC.

It is the same players and the same programs. How can it be expected that there will be anything different this time around?

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Reform Party spent as much time on their research as they do on their alliterations they might have some of their facts correct.

Once again, they are only telling part of the story. They did not mention what the auditor general also said. He said "Exceptional circumstances demand exceptional actions. The action plan proposed is exceptional. I believe it is a very thorough plan for corrective action". When asked about political interference, he said that he had found no evidence of political interference.

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, while the auditor general talked about facts, let us talk about some other facts. The parliamentary secretary talked about facts.

The minister took no action until she was caught. That is a fact. She tried to bury the audit for months and hoped that it would not be found. That is a fact. When she was outed by an access request she reluctantly released the audit. Since then she has stonewalled every attempt to get to the truth. That is a fact. She has not so much as apologized for this billion dollar bungle.

With this kind of track record, how can anyone expect anything but a repeat of this disaster as long as this minister is still in charge?

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to answer a set of challenges that are untrue. There is no billion dollar boondoggle. A billion dollars is not lost.

The minister has never stonewalled. She has led us into the new century of transparency by publishing 10,000 pages of information,

*Oral Questions*

which these people would do well to go through so they could for once get their facts straight.

[Translation]

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

According to the auditor general, the situation at the Department of Human Resources Development is serious. Indeed, the auditor general said that, based on his severity scale, this situation is at the top.

Beyond the six point plan, what is the government prepared to do to follow up on the auditor general's criticisms and recommendations?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the auditor general supports the six point plan. He insists that we must continue with that plan.

Once the auditor general has completed his work, in October, we will take a very close look at his recommendations. For the time being, we are following his advice and we are continuing to implement our six point plan.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the government is prepared to follow the auditor general's recommendations. Let me remind the government of one recommendation that the auditor general finds extremely important.

Yesterday, before the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development, the auditor general said that, in order to get to the bottom of things in such cases, a police investigation is always required.

What is the government waiting for to launch a police investigation, particularly in the case of Placeteco?

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do not wait when things indicate we should do it. If the opposition party has evidence that it thinks should be referred to a police investigation, it should present it.

• (1125)

Our review of this particular case suggests that we have all the invoices that document the expenses of the company and how it used our money. We are satisfied with that so there is no need for establishing an overpayment or any such thing, or referring it to the police.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, if the government wants

evidence in the Placeteco affair, it can have it: a \$1 million grant paid out under a secret agreement that left small creditors out in the cold; an HRDC trustee who is also the buyer's lawyer; several friends of the Prime Minister—Claude Gauthier, Gilles Champagne and Michel Béliveau—are involved.

What is the government waiting for to launch a police investigation so that we can get to the bottom of things, as the auditor general says.

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if that party wants to bring jobs to its province. It should know that it is difficult to acquire private sector—

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

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I cannot hear the answer.

**An hon. member:** There are limits.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Yes, there are limits to the noise in the House. Everyone is talking at once. It is impossible for the Chair to hear anything at all.

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown:** Mr. Speaker, the obsession of Bloc members with this file makes me question their desire to bring jobs to their province. Everybody knows that in areas of high unemployment it is difficult to acquire private sector investments. If they insist on asking for all this private business to be aired publicly, we will have difficulty in the future getting other private investors to put their money into Quebec and to create jobs in areas of high unemployment.

They should question themselves about the long term effect of their political posturing.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are determined that grants to create jobs should in fact do just that.

The minister is telling us that she has invoices justifying payment of the grant. We have in our hands a secret agreement allowing \$1 million to be paid without creating the jobs announced.

Would the government not agree that the only way of getting to the bottom of the Placeteco affair is to launch a police investigation as was done in the case of the Rosemont grant that found its way to Saint-Maurice?

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is

difficult to comment on secret agreements and to make any sense of the paranoia of that particular party on this file.

All I am telling those members is that they are destroying our ability to attract private sector investment to the province of Quebec. They are working against the best interests of their own constituents.

\* \* \*

## HEALTH

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister went to Alberta, looked the Premier of Alberta in the eye and blinked. The nation was treated to the spectacle of the Prime Minister playing Art Carney to Alberta's Ralph Kramden while the premier denounced the Prime Minister's Minister of Health.

Has the Minister of Health considered resigning given that the Prime Minister has pulled the rug out from underneath him?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should stop playing Barney Rubble in the House and get down to reality.

The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister spoke out strongly in support of the five principles of the Canada Health Act. He said that the government would be maintaining them, and this is exactly the position of the Minister of Health. They are working together, along with all the cabinet, in support of a universal quality health care system for all Canadians.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Canada Health Act was created in 1984 to deal with extra billing and user fees when they became a problem. What is happening in Alberta now is a new level of something that has already existed in the health care system.

I am asking the Minister of Health, not whether he wants to defend the five principles, because that may not be enough, but whether he is willing to change the Canada Health Act so that this new development in Alberta will not threaten medicare the way he knows it does threaten medicare.

• (1130)

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister himself said last night and as we have been saying in the House for some days, it is only a proposed bill before the Alberta legislature. The premier himself is talking about potential amendments. We have not yet seen the regulations. We will wait for the final product. We will assess it in relation to the Canada Health Act. As the Prime Minister stressed last night, we will be there to protect those principles because that is what Canadians want.

## Oral Questions

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, after having taken a wrecking ball to our health care system, will the minister now at least admit that he has forced the provinces to take extraordinary measures? In fact we might call it radical surgery to deal with the shortfall of federal funding.

Will the minister at least admit that the crisis has been caused by him and his government?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset we should note that the absent leader of the member's party came out this week in favour of Premier Klein's approach to private for profit hospitals.

What is needed at this time to fix medicare is a combination of innovation and long term financial commitment. That is exactly what we have offered. In fact at my suggestion, ministers of health are meeting next week. We will go to that table with a determination to deal with the number one priority of all Canadians which is to fix medicare.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC):** Mr. Speaker, this is the old bait and switch technique the minister has used for years in the House. In reality he does not recognize the difference between his aspirin and his elbow. It is time that he stood on his hind legs in the House and took his responsibility seriously in terms of the lead minister constitutionally. We are looking for guidance and leadership on this issue. Throwing it back at some other party in the House just does not cut it.

When will the minister stand up and defend health care in this country?

**The Deputy Speaker:** I assume that the Minister of Health is aware of the effects of the medicine mentioned by the hon. member; the Speaker is not.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is defending health care in a vigorous and effective way. I suggest that if the hon. Conservative member wants to take his responsibilities seriously, the first thing he should do is stand up to his leader and tell his leader to defend health care.

\* \* \*

## EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister for International Trade what portion of EDC's \$118 million net profit came from the Government of Canada writing off its bad loans. He avoided that question although he talked a lot about concessional versus commercial financing.

Let us talk about commercial financing then. In the private sector the Bank of Montreal has non-performing exposure of 1% on its loan portfolio. I ask the minister to tell the House today what percentage of EDC's corporate account loans are non-performing.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today we have to ask ourselves the question is taxpayers' money well served by funding such a shoddy Reform research office? Reform's only source of information on this file has recognized in its edition this morning that the article contained many errors. It acknowledged that the \$2.8 billion reserve in 1999 does not represent actual loan losses as alleged by Reform all week long nor—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Peace River.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a tough time understanding why it is so difficult for the minister to answer the question. The question I asked was what percentage of the commercial loans at EDC are non-performing loans. Why can the minister not answer this question? How can Canadian taxpayers know whether they are getting good value for EDC's commercial operations when EDC continues to shield this information from public scrutiny?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, will the Reform Party table in the House its own retraction as well as what was in this morning's edition? The EDC did not write off \$1.3 billion last year. Its actual loan write-off last year was zero.

\* \* \*

• (1135)

[Translation]

**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we know that \$1 million of the funds received by Placeteco went directly to the National Bank, without the projected jobs being created.

The Minister of Human Resources Development tells us, however, that she has \$1 million in invoices to justify this payment. So that means that, in total, there are \$2 million floating around, although there is only \$1 million involved.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Why is the minister refusing to make public these invoices, which would shed a bit more light on this business which is becoming more and more murky with each passing day?

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been very forthcoming on this file and regarding all our programs. I remind the member that we have put out 10,000 pages of information on grants and contributions.

Information has also been provided on this particular file. I am sure that if the member is serious about obtaining more detailed

information, he will access the channels that have been made available to him for that purpose.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is trying to cloud the issue. We are not referring to the documents that have been released, but to the invoices she has been telling us about for the past two weeks.

The auditor general admits that only through a police investigation will we be able to get to the bottom of certain things that are currently going on at Human Resources Development Canada.

When will the government ask the RCMP to investigate in order to respond to the taxpayers' concerns about how the government is managing public funds?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is not accurately quoting the exact words of the auditor general.

The auditor general supports our six point action plan and is also carrying out his own audit, the results of which we expect to have by the fall. I am therefore asking the hon. member to be accurate in quoting the auditor general, who, I say again, supports our six point plan.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the public accounts report that one category of EDC loans is worth \$140 million and indicate that payment was due in November 1997. This is taxpayers' money. The people of Canada are the only shareholders of the crown corporation known as EDC.

I ask the minister responsible to explain to the shareholders of EDC why \$140 million of taxpayers' money has not been repaid.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the correction in this morning's *Ottawa Citizen* which the Reform Party does not seem to have taken into account:

A March 18 story and an editor's note on March 22 about the Export Development Corporation contained errors. While the EDC set aside \$2.8 billion in 1999 to cover potential loan losses, insurance claims and guarantees, this sum is based on an accounting formula and does not represent actual loan losses. Nor did EDC write off \$1.3 billion—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Kelowna.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has not addressed the question at all. The hon. minister must recognize at least at one point in his lifetime that he has made a mistake.

*Oral Questions*

It is interesting to hear this minister, not only today but on other days, blather on about the fact that Canadian taxpayers are not on the hook for the bad loans of EDC. Let me read for the hon. minister a quote from the EDC which does not see it that way: "It is a fact that the Canadian government has invested in EDC in the form of equity, which makes the Government of Canada EDC's sole—"

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister for International Trade.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have said it time and again. It is \$1 billion over the last 56 years in the equity account. Let me continue to quote the correction recognized by the Ottawa *Citizen* this morning:

EDC officials say that they expect most impaired loans to be repaid eventually, and that actual loan write-offs in 1999 were zero.

Will the members opposite apologize for their misinformation in the House all the time, and all their allegations about this crown corporation which helps Canadians with exports?

\* \* \*

• (1140)

[Translation]

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister said in Calgary that more money could, if needed, be available to maintain the integrity of Canada's health care system.

My question is for the Minister of Health. Could he tell us whether the statement by the Prime Minister means that the government intends to make transfer payments to the provinces to enable them to administer their respective systems according to their own priorities?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have in Canada a countrywide health care system funded in large measure by the Government of Canada. A third of the public money spent on health care is spent by the Government of Canada.

As the Prime Minister said last evening, we intend to increase the level of funding with a long term plan to solve the problems of our health care system.

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Canada's health care system needs more money. All we want to know is how much and when?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we need two things for our nationwide health care system.

The first one is innovation, to implement innovative practices to improve the quality and accessibility of health care services.

The second is an appropriate level of funding, and the Government of Canada will do its share.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the human resources minister is responsible for a billion dollar bungle. Her department warned about it last August. She did not do anything about it until January, two days after we put in an access request for that audit.

I can see why she is trying to hold up any more releases, but there is a statutory deadline of 30 days. Dozens of requests have gone unanswered months past their due date.

Why is the minister ignoring her responsibility under the act and when will she see that these access requests are released?

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our past record speaks for itself on these access to information requests.

We have released 75,000 pages this fiscal year under the Access to Information Act. In the past 10 weeks alone, the department has received 526 requests. This is compared to the 531 requests we received in the entire 1998-99 fiscal year.

The member opposite should ask himself if his constituents want department officials spending all their time answering detailed questions or serving them.

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, our constituents would like to have some accountability at HRDC.

Much of what we requested are already completed documents. They are ready to go. The minister pretends she wants transparency. The only transparency is the apparent attempt to muzzle the department.

The Access to Information Act is clear. Departments have 30 days to return requested information. Dozens of requests have not been dealt with yet.

Is the minister's clampdown a result of some embarrassment or fear over the possible damaging content of these documents?

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no clampdown.

As a matter of fact it is odd that the members of the Reform Party differ with their researcher on this one. The researcher was

*Oral Questions*

recently quoted as saying that HRDC has one of the best access to information offices in Ottawa.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**GASOLINE PRICING**

**Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, every day we hear news that confirm the negative impact of the gasoline price increase on the economy.

The one-point rise in the inflation rate since January is evidence of that impact. However, Ottawa will collect, through the GST, an additional amount of close to \$250 million, because of the increase in the price of gasoline.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Considering the financial means at its disposal, should the government not give a break to taxpayers by immediately reducing the excise tax on oil products?

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tax reductions were recently announced in Budget 2000.

• (1145)

[English]

We know that the price of petroleum is coming down. We know that in terms of the GST it represents one cent of the twenty cent increase over the last few months. The provinces have much more excise tax on gasoline than the federal government. We are hoping that the price of crude will continue to go down. It has not had an amazing effect; it has had a very limited effect on inflation.

\* \* \*

**THE BUDGET**

**Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the recent federal budget focused on creating better lives for Canadians in a rapidly changing world.

My question is for the Secretary of State for Rural Development. Could he inform the House on how the budget has responded to the specific concerns of rural Canadians?

**Hon. Andy Mitchell (Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is a number of very specific initiatives in the budget: \$54 million for community futures; \$160 million to connect rural Canadians to the Internet; a \$2.6 billion infrastructure program, a large portion of which will go to rural Canada; and \$30 million to assist our natural resource industries both in forestry and mining.

Most important is that the budget recognized that the circumstances of rural Canadians were different from those of urban Canadians. Unlike the Reform Party there is a recognition that

government will work in partnership with rural Canadians, communities and businesses to better the lives of rural Canadians.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has no problem funnelling HRDC cash to companies with friends of the Prime Minister on their boards. At the same time only 26% of AIDA money that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food promised to farmers in December 1998 has made it to them. As a result the agriculture minister is guilty of financial mismanagement.

Why does the government find it so easy to shovel money to its rich friends and cannot get emergency help to farmers who need it?

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, leave it to a party that was to cut \$600 million from the agriculture program to find fault with a government that will be providing \$3.3 billion over the next three years.

As a matter of fact his province of Manitoba will be held harmless with the new arrangement. It got 60 crisp, brand new 60 million dollar bills just a short time ago. In addition, it will be getting another \$40 million so they will be held harmless with this program in the future.

**Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the reality of the public relations exercise we heard yesterday. It is awful short on details. Nobody knows who is going to qualify and how they are going to trigger it. There is no provincial agreement. Saskatchewan and Manitoba come up short again as the hardest hit areas.

Could the government explain how it is that HRDC grant recipients could get money without putting pen to paper and yet farm families that filled out pages and pages of AIDA applications come up with nothing?

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, they call \$3.3 billion nothing. The province of Manitoba will not receive any less in safety net moneys than it does today.

That is in addition to the \$60 million we recently gave it in the \$435 million in the new safety net program. This is there and the details will be figured out between the provinces and the federal government over the next short period.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday's report from the expert panel on

*Oral Questions*

Canada's national parks tells us what thousands of Canadians already know, that services in the parks have deteriorated because of the government's chronic underfunding.

The Narrows campground in Prince Albert National Park is one example. The park has struggled to keep the campground open but last winter people were told that this summer there might be no modern toilets or fresh water.

Will the minister commit to putting more money into Canada's national parks so that our citizens can begin to enjoy them once again?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things the member will find, if he has an opportunity to read the very comprehensive ecological integrity report, is that one of the points put forth by the panel is that we have to get our ecological house in order before we can go to the Minister of Finance for more money.

One of the reasons we have to do that is that in the past each superintendent looked upon each park simply from the perspective of delivering services in that park. What that meant was an ever arching increase in development.

• (1150)

What we need today is to make sure that we look at everything through an environmental lens, and that is what we intend to do with implementing the recommendations of the panel.

**Mr. Dennis Gruending (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, again on the environment, the study by the Pembina Institute shows that the governments greenhouse gas emissions policy is a complete failure.

The government is relying on a voluntary program to have major polluters reduce emissions, but those emissions have actually increased by 7% since 1990. We have to move quickly to put in place programs to encourage the move toward the use of renewable resources. When will the government do something real about supporting a move toward renewable resource use?

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, actually the government has been working with governments at the provincial and territorial levels and with experts across the country to put in place an action plan that will see us meet our Kyoto target.

On Monday and Tuesday the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of the Environment will be meeting with their provincial and territorial colleagues to get that agreement battened down and to make sure that we are getting things in place, because we have a huge responsibility to Canadians and to people across the world.

Voluntary action is important. It is not the only thing. We have to do other things, but it is a critical component.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the government just released its third monitoring and assessment report, following the drastic cuts to the employment insurance program. This report shows a 5.7% reduction in the number of claims from frequent claimants.

In light of this report, has the minister concluded that everything is fine regarding seasonal unemployment in our communities?

[*English*]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for the NDP even good news is turned into bad news. The fact is that this report reflects the strong performance of the economy and the creation of 400,000 new jobs last year, of which 85% were full time. Today the economy is stronger than ever and the unemployment rate is at its lowest level since 1976.

**Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, this issue is too important to me to be joked about. While the government is saying everything is well, as we speak I have constituents in my riding who see themselves with no income because of the actions taken on the part of the Liberal government.

Why is the minister refusing to recognize the degree of hardship caused by the drastic cuts to the EI program and refusing to introduce measures that will put an end to the suffering which we are seeing in our seasonal communities? Does the minister have an answer for the people who have no income now? Everything is not well.

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to make the argument that as a group frequent claimants and seasonal workers have been treated unfairly.

This year's report indicates that frequent claimants such as seasonal workers benefit from the hours based system. They now have an average entitlement period of 32.8 weeks, three weeks higher than it was before the reform to EI.

Even with the intensity rule in place, the average weekly benefit rate of frequent claimants exceeded the average for all claimants of regular benefits by 8.2%. They are having higher benefits and they are having them for a longer period.

*Oral Questions***EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**Ms. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. Would he once and for all refute the comments and the allegations that were made in the House by a desperate Reform Party looking to smear the government?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, absolutely. All week long Reform has made all sorts of allegations, now denied by its only source of information.

Let us be constructive in the House this morning after the denials and let us read the quote from Mr. Malcolm Stephens, former chief executive of the British equivalent of the EDC who said:

In my experience the facilities available to Canadian exporters are flexible and are administered with the professional expertise which has few rivals in other countries around the world.

This is what Canada stands for.

\* \* \*

• (1155)

**MEMBER FOR BRANT**

**Mr. Cliff Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in the Liberal Party members earn rewards for blowing billions of dollars while they receive applause at conventions, standing ovations in the House and even protection from an angry public.

In the real world managers would be fired with cause, but in Liberaldom they are congratulated and handed a bigger portfolio. When is the member for Brant getting the finance job?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the hon. member is getting ready to seek the job of either leader of the Reform Party or the united alternative. In spite of that his baseless question is not going to get him any brownie points even in his own party.

The member for Brant is doing a great job as Minister of Human Resources Development. The Minister of Finance, the member for LaSalle—Émard, is doing a great job as Minister of Finance. We are all very happy with that, as are Canadians generally.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a federal investigation at the Department of National Defence revealed that a number of expenses had been paid twice.

Moreover, instead of trying to recover the moneys paid by mistake, it appears the department preferred to consider these undue payments as losses.

Does the minister intend to take disciplinary and administrative action to correct this situation?

[English]

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the reference that perhaps the hon. member is making is to a duplicate payment, which was noted in the media of recent times. It has not been written off. We are taking every action we can to collect it.

We have substantially cut down this kind of problem. We are taking corrective action to reduce this kind of situation and to make sure that people are properly trained to ensure respect for the taxpayer dollar.

\* \* \*

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Is he aware that if he took VIA Rail from Halifax to Vancouver and he flushed the toilet along the way, the toilet would be flushed directly on to the tracks, leaving a trail of poo from coast to coast?

In light of the workers along the tracks and consideration for the environment, would he announce that the government will finally take steps to clean up this dreadful situation?

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we can truly appreciate the kind of environment in which these individuals are working when the toilets are being flushed along the tracks. There is no doubt about it; it is a stinky situation.

However, I point out that we have a policy that any new passenger car providing railway service must have containers. Any passenger car today that is being renovated must also have the new container system, and we are hoping that the old cars will be renovated in a very short period of time.

\* \* \*

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore, PC):** Mr. Speaker, the HRD minister has changed the application date for the student summer employment program. This was done without contacting former program recipients. This was done without advertising in local papers. This was done without contacting opposition MPs.

Did the minister contact her government MPs to indicate that the application date had been changed?

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all initiatives under the student summer job action are designed to create or help students get employment.

It is my understanding that the deadline for applications under this program is March 31, 2000, the same as it has been every other year.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday, the Panamanian flagship with a crew of 31 carrying a cargo of salt from Spain en route to New York began to take on water and sank quickly. The crew was unable to utilize its life rafts and lifeboats.

Could the minister inform members of the House on the role played by members of the Canadian armed forces in the rescue of the members of the *Leader L*?

• (1200)

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there was a Canadian naval task group, comprised of three frigates, a supply ship and a destroyer, on their way to exercises when this tragedy occurred 370 kilometres northeast of Bermuda.

The HMCS *Iroquois*, *Charlottetown*, *Halifax* and *Toronto* and the ship *Preserver* participated in the rescue. Sea King helicopters were deployed and, along with the *Hercules* and an *Aurora* aircraft, they rescued six of the crew members from two life rafts.

I think we owe our congratulations to the members of the Canadian forces for some fine work.

\* \* \*

#### EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, for days in the House we have been asking questions about Export Development Corporation based on its annual reports and based on the Public Accounts of Canada.

All we have received from the minister is a bunch of blather with no answers. He seems more intent on talking about the *Ottawa Citizen* than answering questions in the House. Why does he not answer the questions that are put to him?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have to refute the allegations that members of the Reform Party have made. All week we have heard talk of

#### Points of Order

billions of dollars of losses and now we recognize that their source of information, their articles, contain errors.

If the opposition had any dignity it would apologize for having led Canadian public opinion in the House on the wrong track in believing that this crown corporation is not doing good work for Canadians exporters all around the world.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on June 23, I submitted an access to information request with a very simple question: what is the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's process for approving genetically modified foods. Nine months later, I received some documents, but no answer to my question.

My question is for the Minister of Health. What reason is there for this lack of transparency other than that there is no approval process or that the process is so deficient that the minister is too ashamed to make it public?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we provided a full response.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-206

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my point of order is with regard to Bill C-206 and the fact that it has been dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the status of the bill was challenged by the member for Athabasca, resulting in a committee study by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Speaker ruled on the complaint of the member for Athabasca and based his ruling on the recommendation from the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which recommended:

That the Speaker require (the Member for Wentworth—Burlington) to demonstrate that Bill C-206 has the current support of at least 100 Members, including at least 10 Members each from a majority of the recognized parties in the House, by filing with the Clerk a list, in accordance with Standing Order 87(6)(a), prior to Bill C-206 being set down for the first hour of debate at second reading. For these purposes only, and without prejudice to any future cases or recommendations, "support" shall mean support that the item be added to the Order of Precedence. If (the Member for Wentworth—Burlington) is unable to demonstrate such support within the specified period of time, the Speaker should order that Bill C-206 be dropped from the Order of Precedence and replaced by the next eligible item under Standing Order 87(6)(b). Any such removal of Bill C-206 would not affect in any way (the Member for Wentworth—Burlington's) use of this procedure for Bill C-206 in the future.

*Points of Order*

During the discussions at committee, it was suggested that the member for Wentworth—Burlington be apprised of the intentions of the committee before the committee actually finalized its report, in order to allow him time to seek the recommended support for his bill. The reason for this urgency was because the committee intended the deadline to be the first opportunity for the bill to be considered for its first hour of debate. That should have been today.

By arranging to prevent his bill from being considered today, the member for Wentworth—Burlington has gone against the intentions of the committee and the spirit of the Speaker's ruling. His procedural manoeuvre blocks the next eligible bill from making it on the order paper pursuant to Standing Order 87(6)(b).

• (1205)

No other member enjoys the advantage of securing a position on the order of precedence until such time as he or she can obtain 100 signatures. All other members are now required to wait while the member dithers.

The House has been patient enough and it is unfair to all members to delay this any further. In the Chair's ruling of March 21, 2000, the Speaker said:

Failing the filing of the necessary list with the Journals Branch prior to Bill C-206 being set down for the first hour of debate at second reading, the item will be removed from the order of precedence. It will, of course, remain eligible to be returned to the order of precedence through a later filing of such a list or by the normal process of the draw.

The member for Wentworth—Burlington rose after the Speaker's ruling and sought further clarification. He clarified with the Chair that if he could secure 100 signatures by Friday, March 24, 2000, today, his bill could remain on the order paper. It is obvious that the member did not obtain the required support in time.

The member had his chance. He should now proceed as suggested in the Speaker's ruling. He should file through the normal process and stop tying up a position on the order of precedence that would allow other members to take advantage of Standing Order 87(6)(b).

**Mr. Derek Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to this representation. While I would not disagree with all or the greater portion of what was said, I suggest to the Chair that it would be inappropriate at this juncture to interpret what the procedure and House affairs committee reported to the House. It is equally or even more inappropriate to second guess the ruling of the Speaker.

If what we have here is a stick handling, a legal compliance with the rules of the House for Private Members' Business, that is every member's right and privilege. I am not so sure that the procedure that has been used to date is so egregiously out of order that it should cause the Speaker to further intervene.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Mr. Speaker, it is obviously not my intention to get into a lengthy debate today about this issue of what I feel is a circumvention of the intent of the Speaker's ruling regarding private member's Bill C-206. However, I would like to be on record as completely disagreeing with the hon. member opposite with regard to it being up to every member to stick handle through the rules.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair has heard the submissions of both the hon. chief opposition whip and the parliamentary secretary to the House leader. Obviously, in light of the allegations by the chief opposition whip in particular, it is important that the Chair hear from the hon. member for Wentworth—Burlington. The hon. member suggested that he has taken advantage of the rules to avoid having the bill called today for debate. The indication was that he was unable to proceed today. He is not present in the House and accordingly is unable to give comments today on this matter and clarify the issue for the benefit of all hon. members and for the Chair.

However, the Chair does regard the matter as serious and wishes to take it under advisement. Hopefully we will hear from the hon. member next week and then a decision will be made in due course.

I appreciate the hon. chief opposition whip drawing this matter to the attention of the Chair.

[*Translation*]

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, you would perhaps find consent but, at the request of the member for Scarborough Centre, I am truly pleased to table the tripartite protocol, which was once secret but is no longer.

I wish to table it. This might further the debate and the House could finally get to the bottom of the troubling Placeteco affair.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Ah, this is an entirely different matter from the one we discussed.

Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to table this document?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

• (1210)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, during oral question period, the Deputy Prime Minister urged me to quote the Auditor General of Canada properly, thus implying that I had misled the House and that I had attributed remarks to the auditor general that he had not made.

*Routine Proceedings*

For the benefit of the House, I simply wish to say that what the auditor general told the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities was this “In order to get to the bottom of things in such cases, a police investigation is always required”.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Derek Lee (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 two petitions.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour, and believe me in this case it is a great honour, to present in both official languages the second report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Monday, February 21, 2000, your committee has considered Bill C-23, an act to modernize the statutes of Canada in relation to benefits and obligations, and has agreed to report it with amendments.

\* \* \*

#### CANADA SHIPPING ACT

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a number of private members’ bills that are intended to bring various Canadian acts in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

I am pleased to announce in the House today that the Minister of Transport has advised me that the amendment outlined in Bill C-374, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, definition of child and infant, were introduced in the other place as part of Bill S-17.

While I thank the minister for his effort and look forward to the quick passage of Bill S-17, I would like to ask for the unanimous consent of the House that the order for second reading of Bill C-374 be discharged and the bill be withdrawn.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to the hon. member to withdraw the private member’s bill?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)

\* \* \*

### PETITIONS

#### CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present a petition on behalf of a number of residents of British Columbia who call on parliament to recognize the fact that Canadians reject the legalization of the possession of child pornography. They ask the government to intervene in this matter to establish and strengthen the laws related to the possession of child pornography to ensure that it will never be legalized.

#### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition which calls on the Government of Canada to amend the criminal code in order to prevent persons convicted of serious crimes from being released from custody pending the hearing of their appeal except in very exceptional circumstances.

[*Translation*]

#### BREAST CANCER

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present a petition from people in my riding who are concerned about the increase in the incidence of breast cancer.

They call upon parliament to strike an independent committee that would be responsible for developing, implementing and maintaining control and quality standards for mammography in Canada.

[*English*]

#### AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the Saskatchewan Farm Income Coalition group containing around 10,000 signatures.

The Saskatchewan farm families are among the most competitive farmers in the whole world. They are finding it very difficult to compete against foreign subsidies, primarily in the United States and Europe.

• (1215)

These thousands of Saskatchewan farm families are asking parliament to support them by immediately providing an additional \$1 billion in agricultural trade equalization payments to Saskatchewan farmers.

*Government Orders*

Parliament should take note of this and make a special effort to help Saskatchewan in its time of need.

## MAMMOGRAPHY

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a group of petitioners who want the House to enact legislation to establish an independent governing body to develop, implement and enforce uniform and mandatory mammography quality assurance and quality control standards in Canada.

[Translation]

## RURAL CARRIERS

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present, in the presence of the minister responsible for Canada Post Corporation, a petition signed by 445 people from Quebec, including from the riding of Verchères—Les-Patriotes.

The petitioners point out that rural carriers do not have access to collective bargaining to improve their pay and working conditions.

Too often, these workers earn less than the minimum wage and their working conditions are from an era that we thought was gone, whereas their colleagues from the private sector, who also deliver mail in rural areas, have access to collective bargaining, as do Canada Post Corporation employees.

The petitioners call upon parliament to repeal paragraph 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act, which deprives rural carriers of their right to collective bargaining.

It seems obvious to me that the government must act as soon as possible to put an end to this kind of discrimination against rural carriers.

[English]

## TAXATION

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present two petitions on behalf of the good people of Dewdney—Alouette. The first petition has to do with the high rate of taxes in Canada imposed by the Minister of Finance.

The petitioners ask the Minister of Finance to reduce taxes substantially, by 25% in the budget which was just brought down and in the next three budgets.

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from many petitioners in my riding who are asking the government to oppose any amendments to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms or any other federal legislation

which would provide for the exclusion of the reference to the supremacy of God in our constitution and laws.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**CANADA LABOUR CODE**

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (for the Minister of Labour, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-12, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part II) in respect of occupational health and safety, to make technical amendments to the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and to make consequential amendments to others acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mrs. Judi Longfield (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to begin debate at second reading of Bill C-12, an act to amend Part II of the Canada Labour Code, which addresses occupational health and safety.

The Government of Canada is committed to safety in the workplace and ensuring that Canadians live in healthy and safe communities.

This legislation also demonstrates our trust in the ability of federal employers and employees to recognize and solve their own health and safety problems together.

This bill makes important amendments to Part II of the Canada Labour Code. It is good social and economic policy because a safe workplace, combined with sound labour management relations and employee involvement in the decision making process, just makes good sense.

The bill is the second of the Government of Canada's three phase reform of the Canada Labour Code. The significant amendments to Part II of the Canada Labour Code communicate the Liberal belief that initiatives which promote a healthier and safe working envi-

ronment, which foster sound labour management relations and which encourage employee involvement in decision making constitute not only good social policy but also good economic policy.

As members can appreciate, occupational health and safety issues are highly complex.

Part II of the code sets out a legislative framework for addressing those issues for employees who are within the federal jurisdiction.

● (1220)

The federal jurisdiction under Part II includes the federal public service, certain crown corporations, industries declared by parliament for the general advantage of Canada, such as grain handling and uranium mining, as well as industries which are international or interprovincial in scope, such as railroads, air traffic, pipelines, shipping, long-shoring, banking and telecommunications. The federal jurisdiction is representative of a core infrastructure that provides for key economic linkages both nationally and internationally.

Approximately 10% of the Canadian workforce is governed by the Canada Labour Code. Part II of the code defines the duties of both the employees and the employers. It also establishes three basic employee rights in the health and safety area: the right to know about hazards in the workplace and ways of dealing with them, the right to participate in correcting those workplace hazards, and the right to refuse work which the employee believes to be dangerous or unhealthy.

The code lays out a procedure to be followed in the event of a dangerous or unsafe workplace, and also defines the roles and responsibilities of workers, employers, workplace health and safety committees and safety officers. The legislation also sets out the processes and procedures to be exercised in enforcing those basic rights.

Workplaces have changed and will continue to change. Therefore, we must periodically review the code to ensure that it meets the social and economic needs of the day. The last amendments to Part II were made in 1985. Since that time both the federal government and stakeholder groups have identified areas of Part II in which changes need to be made.

The resulting amendments were formulated, first, to ensure that Part II continues to do what it is supposed to do, namely, protect workers; second, to align Part II with occupational health and safety regulations in other jurisdictions; and third, to modernize the Part II approach to occupational health and safety regulations.

What may be less obvious is that recent changes in the workplace have forced employers and employees to confront many new issues in the realm of workplace health and safety. For example, the proliferation of personal computers has forced us to pay closer attention to the ergonomic considerations needed to prevent or ameliorate repetitive strain injuries.

### *Government Orders*

The bill not only addresses the human side of the equation, but also the economic side. Each year between 30 and 40 workers in the federal jurisdiction die on the job, and another 60,000 suffer occupational injuries or illnesses. That is one million lost workdays annually, nearly 5,000 person years, costing over \$350 million in lost wages, medical aid, rehabilitation and disability pension payments.

In Canada significantly more workdays are lost each year due to injury than to strikes or lockouts. In 1995 occupational injuries and illnesses cost the Canadian economy almost \$5 billion in workers' compensation payments. Studies indicate that the direct and indirect costs of occupational casualties comes to about \$10 billion annually. This is a staggering financial burden, but it says nothing about the anguish and grief endured by those who have lost a loved one or those who have lost a limb or suffer a respiratory disease because of a workplace hazard.

If we could reduce the annual number of workplace injuries and deaths by just 1% we would realize a saving of approximately \$11 million.

I do not mean to imply that Part II of the code is important for purely economic reasons. On the contrary, the code is an example of legislation which has far-reaching implications both socially and economically.

Occupational health and safety is a problem which we must face, and we must face it together—governments, employers, unions, workers and health professionals. Jointly we must attack the problem.

The Government of Canada has recognized that the time has come to make changes to Part II. The amendments contained in Bill C-12 are the result of extensive and exhaustive consultations, including the work that began in 1993 by a legislative committee composed of organizations representing employers and worker groups as well as officials of the federal labour program.

This committee was directed to develop proposed amendments based on the consensus of the parties involved. The process was not easy. The parties involved had to make difficult compromises on individual matters to reach an agreement on the entire package of proposals. I congratulate the parties for the perseverance they showed throughout the process. Their recommendations constitute the vast majority of the contents of this bill.

● (1225)

Overwhelmingly, the parties agreed that the existing code has worked well and that it could form a basis and a foundation for the new and improved system. In particular, the parties agreed that the time had come for a new approach to the regulation of workplace health and safety. This agreement is reflected in Bill C-12, which is based on the philosophy that the proper role of the Government of Canada is to empower workers and employers to assume responsibility for the regulation of their own workplace.

*Government Orders*

In general, the government's role should be that of a guide rather than an interventionist. Workers and employers should be given the power and discretion to identify and resolve new and emerging health and safety hazards.

I have no doubt that this is the right approach. The Government of Canada can only empower the parties rather than impose solutions from above.

This approach is evident in the amendments to the powers and duties of existing workplace health and safety committees. These bodies will be required to regularly inspect their workplaces and to deal with problems and issues as they arise, reducing the need for direct government intervention.

In terms of dispute resolution, management and employee representatives of the committee will be responsible for investigating all disagreements and conflicts. Only when the parties cannot reach an agreement will a government health and safety officer become involved.

This is an example of the trust of the Liberal Government of Canada in the ability of employers and employees to work together. It demonstrates that the Government of Canada is committed to regulating more intelligently, regulating in a way that ensures the continued health and safety of everyone.

Through Bill C-12 the Government of Canada empowers workers and employees by introducing health and safety policy committees. These committees will complement the work of the existing workplace health and safety committees. Their role will be to deal with matters such as accident prevention, education of employees and the acquisition of protective equipment.

The role of the Government of Canada in establishing these new committees is to ensure that health and safety issues make their way into the corporate agenda and are addressed at the highest possible level. For companies which operate in more than one location, the committees will also ensure some level of consistency across the different sites.

Although I hope that all companies will take advantage of this promising new mechanism, the policy committee will only be mandatory for firms with more than 300 employees. This represents a small number of employers in the federal sector, but actually accounts for 85% of all employees.

Although Bill C-12 represents a new approach to health and safety regulations and a significant realignment of the roles and responsibilities of the key players, it is clear that the Government of Canada is firmly committed to existing rights and is doing its utmost to strengthen workplace health and safety.

In the case of the right to refuse dangerous work, this commitment means strengthening and clarifying the rights of both employers and employees. For example, all employees prevented from

working as a result of an employee exercising the right of refusal will be paid until the end of their shift, whereas the employee exercising the right of refusal will be paid until the matter is resolved.

The Government of Canada is also mindful of the rights of employers, who will be given the discretion to discipline a worker when the right to refuse is abused or when it is found that a frivolous claim has been made.

In an area as important as workplace health and safety, the Liberal government has shown that it is not prepared to stand still. As promised in the red book, it is moving forward with regulatory reform which is both economically and socially progressive.

Five features of the bill seem to be particularly important and necessary. First, as a result of this bill, local health and safety committees will be mandated to conduct regular workplace inspections and will be given increased powers in dealing with complaints. This will permit the parties to identify and solve problems swiftly as they arise. This will be done with government guidance and it will enhance the role of the health and safety committees.

Second, a management and an employee member of the committee will be empowered to investigate any unresolved complaint. If they find a violation of the code, they will ask the employer to give a written assurance of compliance. If they find an immediate danger, they will shut off the machine or otherwise stop the activity. If they cannot agree on a solution, a government health and safety officer will be asked to intervene.

● (1230)

Third, a health and safety policy committee at the corporate level will be required for enterprises with 300 or more employees. This committee will address a range of issues such as injury prevention initiatives and awareness activities. This will apply to over 80% of the federally regulated workforce, many of whom have already voluntarily established such committees.

Fourth, the Liberal government is committed to help establish family friendly workplaces. This bill provides additional protection for pregnant and nursing employees. If an employee has reason to believe that an activity or condition, such as exposure to a chemical, will adversely affect her, her fetus or her child if she is breast feeding, she will be able to withdraw from the work until she has had the opportunity to consult her doctor. Under existing legislation the employee has to continue working until she receives a medical certificate.

Fifth, the bill provides for regulation that will require every employer to develop, establish and monitor in consultation with the workplace health and safety committee at both the workplace and corporate levels, a preventative program appropriate to the size of the workplace and the nature of the hazards.

*Government Orders*

These are all important changes. They reflect the Government of Canada's commitment to occupational health and safety and its confidence in the willingness and ability of labour and management to solve their problems in a mutually beneficial manner.

In closing, I want to emphasize that we take our consultative obligations in drafting this bill very seriously. It was lengthy, involved and extensive and included relevant agencies of the Government of Canada, the major labour organizations and the major employers and employer groups. They all deserve to be commended and thanked.

My hope is that the occupational health and safety problem in this country will certainly be reduced. I believe that this bill, because it tapped the commitment and concern of social partners, is an important first step toward this goal. Let the workplace be what it is supposed to be: challenging, interesting, meaningful and conducive to good health. By acting now we can ensure that Canada has in place the type of regulatory framework we need to compete and thrive in today's economic climate.

The Government of Canada has shown that it remains committed to improving and protecting the health and safety of workers under its jurisdiction. Employers and employees have made it very clear that they are eager to take on their new responsibilities and work together. It is time that we gave them a chance.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate Bill C-12, which is an act that purports to amend part II of the Canada Labour Code. It deals with occupational health and safety. Unlike parts I and III, this one also covers the federal public service.

Part II of the labour code has not been significantly updated for at least 15 years. There seems to have been a lot of suggestion that the government moved with all speed, but it has been 15 years which does not show the alacrity which was attributed to the government by the previous speaker.

A few days before dropping the writ for the 1997 general election, a bill to amend part II of the code was tabled in the House of Commons. I am sure it was not just a move to shore up Liberal support, even though it took almost another three years to bring the bill back to the House.

Employer groups and employer associations which have been involved in the lengthy consultative process now fear that if the government delays the legislation any longer, another election will be called and they will have to start all over again. There is some urgency to move ahead with this bill so that there is not the same experience as last time.

Health and safety in the workplace is the responsibility of every person on the work site. Whether it is a labour intensive industry or a high level high tech desk job, all have stress or other parts to them and health and safety factors are involved. The role of government

is to set the standards and to provide a mechanism to resolve disputes when and if they arise.

Government legislation and regulations alone cannot promote a healthy workplace and prevent accidents. This involves every one of us. All of us who are involved in the workplace, in a supervisory capacity or in the actual work activity, are responsible to make sure it is as healthy and as safe as we can make it.

• (1235 )

In November a report prepared by the British Columbia Workers' Compensation Board for example showed that the province's stringent health and safety laws were doing little to curb workplace fatalities. It just goes to show that there is another element here and that is the human element; all of us have a role to play.

According to that report, British Columbians died from work related injuries at a rate of nearly three per week over the last decade. Nationally there are approximately 800,000 occupational accidents annually of which 750 are fatal. One worker is injured on the job every nine seconds of work time. That gives us an idea of the magnitude of the problem. Work related accidents cost the Canadian economy \$10 billion a year in direct and indirect costs. Approximately 18 million days of work were lost this way in 1997. It is a serious issue.

In any workplace if accidents are to be prevented, everyone must be involved. The more people understand about workplace hazards, the better equipped they will be to prevent injury and illness. The question then is how will the proposed amendments contained in Bill C-12 help ensure that people are better equipped to prevent accidents?

The intent of the bill is laudable but some of the provisions require closer scrutiny. That is precisely what I hope will happen as the committee delves into the details of this proposed legislation.

For example, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that companies with over 300 employees shall, they are required to form a health and safety committee as well as a policy committee. The question really arises of why the number 300 was chosen. Is that some kind of arbitrary number? What happens if a company has 299 employees? Is that a materially different company from one which has 300 employees? That is the real question. The government is not so much setting a framework as saying, "This is what you shall do; this is how you shall manage your company".

The argument was made by the hon. member who spoke just before me that the government's role is to set standards and to provide mechanisms for the resolution of disputes. However here in this provision the government is going beyond that kind of situation and saying to the president of a company, "This is how you shall organize. This is what you shall do. These are the kinds

*Government Orders*

of committees we want you to have and these are the ways in which that committee is to operate and exercise its mandate”.

Another area of concern is the lack of a second stage appeal process. While we as Reformers favour a reduction in red tape, it is important to ensure that a fair and effective appeal process be set in place. Not every decision is the right one in the first instance. There ought to be an opportunity for both management and workers to appeal a particular decision.

Under section 146.3 for example, the appeal officer's decision is final and shall not be questioned or reviewed in any court. I think an appeals process is essential. If by some chance the officer errs, there is no recourse for the employer or the employee to challenge that ruling. It is my understanding that employer and worker groups have concerns about this particular provision. I am sure the committee will deal with this and get into it in some detail. Hopefully a resolution of this concern can be reached.

Recently a lot of attention has been focused on workplace stress. Mr. Speaker, in your role as Speaker you are subjected to all kinds of noise and conflict in this place and in your office. I am sure you would recognize only too well what stress can do to an individual.

Bill C-12 refers to workplace stress but it does not attempt to define it. That is part of the problem. What constitutes ordinary workplace stress and what constitutes exceptional workplace stress? Stress affects different people differently. Different types of employment have their own built-in stress. For example, the stress of an air traffic controller is slightly different from that of someone who cleans the latrines in the airport.

In some situations stress can lead to violence. While the bill contains a provision relating to workplace violence, it is vague and open-ended. I am sure the committee will deal with this and other areas when it studies the bill in detail.

• (1240 )

Bill C-12 also allows for the establishment of workplace violence regulations. Are companies and their safety officers or safety committees free to develop workplace violence regulations or will the government impose them? It is a very real question. A lot of vagueness and a lot of unanswered questions need to be addressed in this section.

In January at the coroner's inquest into the tragic shooting deaths at the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission, employees focused attention on workplace stress and violence. The jury made 77 recommendations, including one stemming from the problems encountered by police who were not familiar with the layout of the massive facility.

That is an obvious thing that should have been looked at but it was not. These are some of the things that ought to be looked at in some detail.

While up to date information may not prevent a tragedy, it may save rescuers time and ultimately help to save lives. That is really significant.

We have to look at this as well with the firefighters. In very many instances the nature of the fire and the elements that are actually in combustion dictate the kind of retardant that is applied. The firefighter needs to know what it is that is actually burning. It is not just the fire. He has to know what kind of fire it is. Also in a case like the OC Transpo shootings, it would have been good if the police officers had known exactly where to look and where to go and did not have to waste a whole lot of time in getting there.

Those are some of the areas that we plan to address and look at in some detail. I am sure the government will go along with this as we examine the provisions of Bill C-12.

In conclusion, the British Columbia Workers' Compensation Board study showed that 99% of accidents are preventable. That is wonderful. If we can prevent 99% of accidents, that is great but it depends on the workers and management working together, not some government person coming in and telling them what they have to do.

The onus is on both the employers and the employees to work together on how they are going to do this. As I said earlier, the primary role of the government is not to set the standards but to provide the mechanisms and show how the mechanisms can resolve disputes.

These amendments have been in the works for almost 10 years. All sides have spent a lot of time and effort in coming up with provisions that are progressive and acceptable to the stakeholders.

We are anxious to move ahead and get this thing done so that people will be safe and healthy in the workplace.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to speak in the House today on Bill C-12, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part II) in respect of occupational health and safety, to make technical amendments to the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

Part II of the Canada Labour Code has not undergone any substantial changes for more than 15 years, as if there had been no changes in the various areas covered by the federal legislation. That is completely ridiculous. But what can one expect of the federal government, after all?

Today, the new Minister of Labour, the hon. member for Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, is presenting her new reform of part II of the Canada Labour Code. It was high time for this

government to do something about reforming part II of the code, which has a direct impact on occupational health and safety in workplaces under federal jurisdiction. Why do I say it was high time for the minister to present her reform? Because work-related accident statistics are of great concern. I shall come back to this point later.

I would nevertheless like to draw attention to the efforts the minister and her department have focused on this reform of part II of the Canada Labour Code. Her efforts are praiseworthy and it is our duty to call attention to them.

The Bloc Québécois assumes the minister's good intentions to improve occupational health and safety in workplaces under federal jurisdiction. said, the Bloc Québécois has done its homework as well, and has carried out a thorough examination of Bill C-12. Unfortunately, it contains several weaknesses, but I shall address them later on in my speech.

• (1245)

The bill is only at second reading. The Bloc Québécois is prepared to give the benefit of the doubt to the minister and give her a chance to improve her bill. If this should not be the case, the Bloc Québécois will have to reconsider its position, but for the time being, we are only concerned about the well-being of workers in Quebec and Canada. Bill C-12 is a good basis for discussions, but certainly not the definitive answer.

As I said earlier, the situation regarding health and safety in workplaces that are regulated by the Canada Labour Code is a serious concern. It is why the Bloc Québécois strongly condemns the government's lax approach and slowness in adjusting to the new realities of the global economy and to the growing requirements for productivity and competitiveness.

These new realities, which have had a deep impact on the workplace, have also significantly changed occupational health and safety practices.

As hon. members know, much has changed over the past 15 years in the workplace, both in Canada and in the world. Unfortunately, the federal government has let things drift along. The picture of occupational health and safety is far from rosy. Let me give you an overview.

Every year, some 800,000 people are wounded or become sick in the exercise of their duties. Of this number, over 750 die, a figure that translates to an average of three deaths a day.

In 1997 one employee in five, on average, was injured at work, a figure that amounts to an accident at the workplace every 9.1 seconds worked. One worker in 31 was injured badly enough to miss work for at least one day. This translates into an accident with time lost every 18 seconds worked.

### *Government Orders*

In 1996, 38 deaths as the result of work-related illness or accident were reported in industries under federal jurisdiction. An equal number of deaths was reported in 1995. There was a death resulting from an accident on the job every seven working days, on average, or one worker in approximately 20,000 died in the performance of his duties.

The number of disabling injuries increased from 15 per million hours worked in 1995 to 15.24 for the same time in 1996. In that year, the level was not as high as the level recorded in 1994 of 15.44, and remains significantly lower than the figure for 1993 of 16.99.

In terms of economic impact, these accidents are very costly. Compensation to victims or to their families amounts to some \$5 billion a year. If the indirect costs resulting from accidents are added to this, the figure doubles to some \$10 billion. Members know full well that these figures do not reflect the great suffering and pain of the victims and their families.

To complete this sombre picture, who do you think are the main victims of these accidents? One would think that bad luck hounds this age group. Yes, as you have no doubt guessed, it is the young.

They are the most likely to be victims of an accident on the job, fatal or not. The highest number of accidents involving time off work occur among young people. Between 1993 and 1997, one third of accidents involving time off work for which compensation was paid involved young people between the ages of 15 and 29. In addition, the accident rate among men was more than twice that among women, 3.57% compared to 1.57% according to the 1997 data.

I have a very specific reason for saving the figures on young people until the end of this sombre description. I would like to take this opportunity to digress for a moment on the topic of orphan clauses. On October 14, I introduced Bill C-212, the purpose of which was to prohibit discriminatory clauses in the federal public service. Unfortunately the government did not wish to debate this in the House.

• (1250)

The effect of Bill C-212 would be to render any provision in a collective agreement concluded under certain specified acts—excluding a provision based on the seniority principle—of no force or effect where employees hired after a specified date do not receive the same employee benefits, wages or conditions of employment as those received by other employees covered by the collective agreement.

As with accidents on the job, orphan clauses, or discriminatory clauses as some prefer to call them, take a particularly hard toll on young people. These clauses are a major factor in the increase in social inequality.

*Government Orders*

Several studies have demonstrated that income inequalities in Canada are linked to wage inequalities between young and more experienced workers. Between 1981 and 1993, men aged 18 to 24 experienced a 20% drop in earnings, while men aged 45 to 54 earned 20% more.

Like work related accidents, orphan clauses are another problem that has to be remedied. They are preventing young families from providing their children with proper living conditions from a very early age.

The Canadian Institute of Child Health has made the following comment on the financial difficulties being experienced by young families:

The economic situation of young families with children is worse than was experienced by the previous generation. In 1976, a single parent with one child had to work 41 hours a week at minimum wage in order to keep the family above the poverty level. In 1993, the number of hours required had risen to 73 hours a week.

The federal government, and the Minister of Labour in particular, need to realize the long term effects of a shortsighted solution such as this, which so heavily disadvantages the young. What is even more aberrant is that the Minister of Labour and the federal government do not recognize these discriminatory clauses. Hundreds of thousands of Quebec workers coming under the jurisdiction of the Canada Labour Code are not protected against these discriminatory clauses.

When will the government realize that opposition to orphan clauses has nothing to do with intergenerational conflict and that, instead, it is these clauses themselves that are dividing the generations?

Discriminatory clauses penalize young workers and this has major social impacts on society. The intent here is not to portray young people as victims but to take time to review the facts, which seem to go against the values of solidarity and fairness required for social cohesion.

The introduction of orphan clauses in collective agreements in the workplace leads to an equity deficit between generations and this deficit is all the more intolerable within a context where wealth is getting more scarce. More than ever, in this period of restraint, we have to show great solidarity.

If we are serious about fighting and condemning the inequity suffered by the poor, the young and the elderly among others, solidarity between generations is essential.

Let us revert to the matter at hand, Bill C-12. I was painting the sad picture of the situation of work-related accidents in Canada. Let us now take a closer look at the changes the minister intends to bring about in her reform of part II of the Canada Labour Code.

First of all, Bill C-12 wants to legislate in matters of health and safety for private and public sector companies under federal jurisdiction. Without getting into a comprehensive description of all the companies to which Bill C-12 will apply, we can at least indicate that it will affect the public service and crown corporations such as Canada Post or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and international and interprovincial companies active in air, rail and road transportation, pipeline transport, banks, broadcasting, uranium mining, shipping, harbours and telecommunications.

Part II of the Canada Labour Code gives workers under federal jurisdiction basic rights, for example the right to know about hazards in the workplace, the right to be involved in eliminating these hazards, and the right to refuse dangerous work.

Part II also defines the role of the safety and health committees, and the roles and responsibilities of the health and safety officers.

Finally, Part II sets out procedures to determine whether there is a real danger when a worker refuses to work.

Let us now have a look at the changes Bill C-12 makes in Part II of the Canada Labour Code.

• (1255)

Let us start with the local occupational safety and health committees. Their mandate was to inspect the workplaces. Now, they will also have to investigate and settle complaints. If the committee cannot get both parties to agree, a health and safety officer will step in to try to settle the dispute.

Another change is the new policy health and safety committees that will be set up in companies with more than 300 employees. An example of their activities will be the development of programs for the prevention of health and safety hazards in the workplace. In addition, they will be able to investigate, conduct studies and inspect the workplace. Finally, they will evaluate workers' protective equipment.

Another major change in this reform of part II of the Canada Labour Code is a change in the right to refuse to perform dangerous work. Under the new provisions, an employee who considers his rights infringed will be entitled to select anyone in the workplace. This person will be able to participate in the investigation in the absence of a member of the occupational safety and health committee. In addition, as was the case previously, employees exercising the right to refuse to work because they deem the work too dangerous will be paid for their shift or for the usual work period.

On the other hand, if one party gives up the right to attend an investigation, the employer may take disciplinary measures against the employee abusing the right to refuse dangerous work, solely so as not to delay an employer's investigation.

The employee facing disciplinary measures may file an appeal with either the Canada Industrial Relations Board or the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

The other noteworthy change introduced by Bill C-12 concerns the appeal and review process. In fact, a position of appeals officer will be created and, as a result, the appeal process will be limited to a single stage.

Appeals from health and safety officers who concluded that there was no danger in the workplace will now be heard by a technical expert. This means that the Canada Industrial Relations Board and the Public Service Staff Relations Board will no longer hear complaints relating to disciplinary measures taken in exercising rights under the Canada Labour Code. However, these two boards will continue to hear cases relating to the right to refuse dangerous work.

The bill contains new provisions to establish, through regulations, accident prevention programs in the workplace. Measures will also be taken to prevent violence in the workplace. Finally, work space ergonomics programs will be set up.

These are the main changes to part II of the Canada Labour Code that are provided for in Bill C-12.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, the Bloc Quebecois has certain reservations about Bill C-12. According to the Minister of Labour, the new legislation seeks, among other objectives, to make employees and employers more accountable, when it comes to making their work environment safer.

What about this government's responsibility as an employer? As if the recent blunders at HRDC were not enough, now the Minister of Labour, whose department is an integral part of Human Resources Development Canada, also wants her piece of the pie; she wants to give jobs to good friends of the party. First, they gave grants and now they are giving jobs.

Bill C-12 contains a number of provisions that create a conflict of interest or a situation where the Minister of Labour and the federal government are both employer and legislator, or both judge and jury. Such situations are found in eight clauses of the bill.

There is no way the Bloc Quebecois will ignore these flaws in the sound management of public funds and public service employees.

• (1300)

Party politics is no longer appropriate when it affects the health and safety of workers in Quebec and in Canada.

I have another example where the government is judge and jury, and the Minister of Labour is in complete conflict of interest. Subsection 135(3) reads as follows:

### *Government Orders*

135. (3) Where the Minister is satisfied—on the basis of factors enumerated in subsection(4)—that the nature of work being done by employees at a work place is relatively free from risks to safety and health, the Minister may,—upon a request from the employer in the form and manner as prescribed from time to time by regulation—by order, on such terms and conditions as are specified therein, exempt the employer from the requirements of subsection (1) in respect of that work place.

In this clause, it is implicitly stated that the minister may request, as the employer, an order allowing an exemption from the requirements of subsection (1) of this section. This is another conflict of interest that the Bloc Quebecois feels is completely unacceptable.

There are many reasons why the Bloc Quebecois cannot accept this state of affairs. How are we to trust this government to treat its employees fairly when we see how it approached the pay equity issue with 200,000 of them. This government has shown itself to be unacceptably lax on this issue. These 200,000 public servants had to wait more than 15 years for payment.

Fortunately, with the unconditional support of the Bloc Quebecois, the 200,000 PSAC employees never lost hope in justice. Pressure from public servants and from the Bloc Quebecois won the day and we are very proud of that fact.

Today, the minister would like the Bloc Quebecois to accept similar provisions in Bill C-12. Surely she is not serious. The Minister of Labour will have to amend these clauses so that there is no longer any conflict of interest.

Here is another problem with Bill C-12, in subsection 135(2):

An employer is not required to establish a committee under subsection (1) for a work place that is on board on a ship in respect to employees whose base is the ship.

I must say I find this exemption quite amusing. In fact, it reminds me of a particular bill, Bill C-28, which was debated here in the House during the first session. Members will recall this bill that the finance minister was trying to have passed because it could presumably allow his international shipping company, Canada Steamship Lines Inc., of which he was the sole owner, to gain some tax benefits.

The bill was sponsored by the finance minister himself. Both these facts still appear to be a conflict of interest that violates the government's code of ethics, and the Bloc Quebecois had demanded some explanations, which, incidentally, never came.

Today, with Bill C-12, ships are again exempted without any explanation. Members will understand that there is every reason to wonder about this situation. To quote a proverb, once bitten, twice shy.

I can say that the Bloc Quebecois is shy about the ships of this government and its finance minister. We are very anxious to

*Government Orders*

discuss the matter with the minister, before the committee, to ask her some questions about this exemption.

Another section of Bill C-12 raises several questions. It is subsection 137.1(3), and I quote:

137.1 (3) The manner of selection of the members of the Commission, other than the chairperson and an alternate chairperson, and the term of office of the members of the Commission shall be such as may be prescribed.

What is involved here is the term of office and the manner of selection of the members of the coal mining safety commission. If members reread the subsection carefully, some questions will surely come to mind. Why give a very special status to the chairperson and the alternate chairperson? Why not include in the bill the term of office and the manner of selection of these two officials?

Well, once again, welcome to the land of the cronies of the Liberal Party of Canada. These are other political appointments for the government's friends.

While the Bloc Québécois is familiar with this kind of appointment, which is common practice for this government, we will put their last-ditch energy into making sure that this process is excluded not only from Bill C-12, but from all other bills the government will introduce that will include patronage appointments, like this one does at subsection 137.1(3).

• (1305)

From now on, these practices must be a thing of the past. Time has come for a shift, away from Liberal petty politics and toward political transparency.

If the Minister of Labour wants the Bloc Québécois to support the reform she is proposing to Part II of the Canada Labour Code, these patronage appointments must be eliminated. Otherwise, our party will have to reconsider its position.

This new reform of Part II of the Canada Labour Code includes a revision of the monetary penalties imposed on any person who commits an offence. The penalties are much harsher, and the Bloc Québécois wholeheartedly agrees with that, especially if we take into account the fact that, every year, in Canada, 800,000 persons suffer work related injuries or sickness, 750 of whom died. This represents three deaths a day on average.

In light of these frightening statistics, the government should send a clear message to those who do not comply with the Canada Labour Code and tell them that there might be a high price to pay for their offence. That being said, whether or not the minister gave herself the appropriate means to make sure that the offenders understand the message remains to be seen. It is not very clear.

Subsection 154(1) provides that, and I quote:

If a person is convicted of an offence under this Part on proceedings by way of summary conviction, no imprisonment may be imposed as punishment for the offence or in default of payment of any fine imposed as punishment.

What happens when the person who has committed an offence and is convicted does not pay the fine? This person does not pay the fine and is not sent to prison either. Where is the punishment then? Does that mean that if one does not pay a fine, that person is subject to no other penalty? This certainly is a funny way to enforce the law.

I would like to come back to the matter of financial penalties. We all know that the Bloc Québécois is a political party that supports all practical and straightforward measures. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The Bloc Québécois has an excellent suggestion for the labour minister on what she could do with the money collected from fines. Why not say in the bill that the fines collected should go directly into a fund that would be used for training and prevention programs in the various work places under federal jurisdiction. Would it not be a constructive approach?

This money would be used to train employers and employees, to give them the tools that they need to prevent work related accidents? This is a very positive approach that the labour minister cannot turn down, taking the money from the fines and establishing programs to prevent the situations that led to the violation, providing the means to prevent work related accidents, training and creating awareness among workers and employers regarding the need to work in a healthy and safe environment.

To achieve this however, the law will have to be enforced and, as I have said previously, Bill C-12 lacks clarity in this regard.

One last aspect of this bill the Bloc Québécois is questioning is clause 132, which deals with pregnant and nursing employees. Ever since it was elected to the House, the Bloc Québécois has always made it its duty and a priority to stand up for all women and try to improve their status, including promoting precautionary cessation of work for pregnant or nursing women.

With Bill C-12, the labour minister finally understood something had to be done for pregnant or nursing women in workplaces under federal jurisdiction. It is a start, but it is much too timid.

Quebec has always been a leader in the protection of pregnant women in the workplace. The same cannot be said of the federal government.

For years now in Quebec, under the CSST, pregnant or nursing workers who do not come under the Canada Labour Code may ask for a reassignment or precautionary cessation of work and still receive 90% of their net salary, if their work poses a risk to their health or that of the child to be born, and the employer cannot alter or change their work environment within the plant.

*Government Orders*

• (1310)

Section 132 of the federal act is greatly flawed. Quebec workers who come under the Canada Labour Code are not as well protected as those who come under Quebec law. Such discrepancy and two tier system are totally unacceptable.

At the federal level, as soon as an employee receives the physician's opinion, she can no longer invoke subsection 132(1), which allows a pregnant employee to cease to perform her current job functions.

In Quebec, upon receiving a medical opinion, the employer must assign the pregnant employee to different functions posing no risk to the foetus.

If her employer cannot reassign her to another job within the period prescribed on the medical certificate, the female employee may stop working immediately and her salary for the first week is paid by her employer and afterward she gets 90% of her net salary from the CSST.

Quebec is still leading the pack on preventive reassignment of pregnant or breastfeeding female workers. What is the federal government waiting for to follow suit?

There is definitely a consensus among Quebecers and Canadians. But the minister and her government turn a deaf ear, even if some government officials are part of the consensus. Let me clarify.

In March 1998, the Université du Québec à Montréal organized a symposium on the health of working women. The event was even funded by the oh so righteous federal health department. The symposium was attended by experts and organizations from across Canada interested in occupational health and safety, and particularly in women's occupational health.

Let us be clear, the action plan developed at the symposium cannot be disregarded, as it was produced by our best experts in occupational health for women.

Let me give you a short list of participants. For Quebec: Gisèle Bourret, head of the Status of Women Division at the Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec; Maria DeKoninck, professor at the Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Université Laval; Jocelyne Everell, union advisor at the Health, Safety and Environmental Division of the Confédération des syndicats nationaux; Carole Gingras, director of the Status of Women at the FTQ; Danielle Hébert, co-ordinator of the Status of Women Division of the Confédération des syndicats nationaux; Nicole Lepage, occupational health and safety counsellor, Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec; Katherine Lippel, professor in the department of law, Université du Québec à Montréal; and many others.

There were also equally credible experts and organizations from British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and even Newfoundland.

It is worth noting that Canada was represented by, among others, Diane Ponée, Director, Policy Analysis and Planning, Women's Health Bureau, Health Canada, and Michelle Simms, Policy and Program Consultant, Women's Bureau, Strategy and Coordination Unit, HRDC. This means without a doubt that the Labour Minister and this government are aware of the conclusions of the seminar. Let us talk about those conclusions.

The Action Plan that all participants signed, including Health Canada and HRDC officials, reads as follows:

In all federal and provincial jurisdictions, the legislation should provide for precautionary cessation of work for pregnant or nursing workers if their working conditions are a threat to their health or the health of their foetus or nursing infant.

Such programs should be modelled on the Quebec legislation which provides for reassignment to a job presenting no threat. . . They should include, whenever reassignment is impossible, the right to allowances equal to those given in the case of a disability due to an occupational injury.

Women across Canada cherish Quebec's policies on precautionary cessation of work for pregnant or nursing workers. Unfortunately, the minister will not impress the women of Canada and Quebec with clause 132 of Bill C-12.

• (1315)

I am not the one saying this, nor is the Bloc Québécois. All the women of Quebec and Canada want to benefit from the progressive policies of Quebec.

We can already see the Minister of Labour and the federal government bragging about the new maternity leave under EI, saying that employees under federal jurisdiction are now very well treated.

Let us get serious. Women need at least 600 hours of work to qualify for maternity leave. Just imagine a pregnant single mother of one; she will only get between 50 and 55% of her salary, whereas she would get 90% of her net salary with the precautionary cessation of work provision of Quebec's legislation on occupational health and safety. The federal government is light-years behind Quebec.

If section 132 of Bill C-12 is not amended, the disparity of treatment between employees covered by the bill and those covered by Quebec's legislation on occupational health and safety will remain. Does the Minister of Labour, who is a woman and a mother of two, really want to perpetuate this unacceptable disparity? Why should women be the victims of the discriminatory policies of the Liberal government? I will leave the minister with that.

As you can see, Bill C-12 is far from being perfect. The minister will have to make changes to her reform of part II of the Canada

*Government Orders*

Labour Code. The Minister of Labour can depend on the Bloc Québécois for these amendments. So far, the Bloc has done its homework and it will continue to do so.

We are outlining a very positive thought process to make Bill C-12 be even more consistent with the new realities of the workplace. But we do not yet know whether the Minister of Labour will consider this or whether she will turn a deaf ear on this.

As I said at the outset, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of Bill C-12 in principle. Who would be against a reform of part II of the Canada Labour Code in respect of the health and safety of the men and women who work in Quebec and Canada? Nobody. We strongly believe that Bill C-12 is not perfect, far from it, but it is a good start. It remains to be seen if the Minister of Labour will be openminded and allow the Bloc Québécois to play a role in this reform. We will see.

[English]

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say, without any fear of contradiction, that in my own personal life this is the most important piece of legislation that I have had the opportunity to debate.

From my background as a blue collar construction worker and as a journeyman carpenter by trade, it has always been of major interest to me that all Canadians have the basic right to a clean, healthy and safe working environment; that no Canadian gets up in the morning to go to work to die; that they get up to go to work to earn a living. They deserve to earn a living without the fear of unnecessary risk by the conditions in their workplace.

I am very pleased to be here today to talk about Bill C-12, the much ballyhooed and long awaited amendments to Part II of the Canada Labour Code. What we have in front of us today is the product of four long years of consultation, consensus building and of the development of ideas and recommendations that now manifest themselves in this very worthy bill.

The working group of labour, business and government tried its best to do everything by consensus. There was no majority vote on these issues. They worked it around the table in a spirit and atmosphere of true co-operation because they realized the nature of the work they were doing was so important and had such a direct impact on the lives of all those employees or Canadian workers governed by the Canada Labour Code.

The Canada Labour Code actually has jurisdiction over about 700,000 Canadian workers. This is nowhere near a majority of Canadian workers but it is certainly a significant number of Canadian workers, such that it can set a precedent and form a standard that all other labour relations jurisdictions should look to in terms of setting their own health and safety standards. That is what makes Bill C-12 so critical.

• (1320)

Obviously the employees of the federal government fall under the Canada Labour Code. Many are crown corporations, et cetera. Some fall under the Public Service Staff Relations Act. The work that we do here today and the work that we will do when the bill goes to committee has a direct bearing and a very important effect on the lives of many Canadians. It is critical and it is absolutely crucial.

I began by telling the House how I got interested in health and safety. It was through my own background. My first job as a kid growing up was to work in the asbestos mines in the Yukon, which is not a good career choice. I would not recommend it to anyone, frankly. The only reason I raise this is that at that time asbestos was not recognized as a hazardous material.

As young workers, we were there happily working with asbestos and earning a living. We asked our bosses if there was any truth to the rumour that this stuff was bad for us and they told us that it was a harmless, white, fireproof substance. They told us to continue shovelling it and that we should not worry about a thing.

It was not until our union finally started to get active, to do some research and caution us that were realized that the stuff was not only bad for us but that there was no safe level of asbestos. One part per billion in the air was too much. At that time we became aware that on those issues the union was the only friend a working person had because everyone else was lying to us in the name of profit and greed. That taught me a lesson when I was very young.

Later on in my work life I became a journeyman carpenter. I became very active in my union and became a shop steward for my union. A very big part of my job was to make sure our members were not put at risk by some arbitrary production schedule. As I have said before, there is no production schedule in the world that warrants or justifies putting people's lives at risk.

I can honestly say that I have dedicated much of my working life to trying to elevate the standards of working conditions in terms of workplace safety and health in this country. That is why I am so very gratified to stand here today and not only debate Bill C-12 but to actually recommend Bill C-12 with some minor amendments and modifications that I will be speaking about later. It is very gratifying for me to finally be here doing something that is in such a positive light for Canadian working people.

It was not that long ago that this really was not much of a priority for government or industry in the country. There was a sort of acceptance that some jobs are just inherently dangerous and some people are going to get hurt doing those dangerous jobs. We can no longer tolerate that mindset: (a) there is no reason for it, and (b) it is morally and ethically reprehensible to even contemplate that mindset.

*Government Orders*

As the chief job steward for the carpenters on a hydroelectric dam, I was very proud that our dam was the first hydro dam in all of Manitoba that was ever built without killing anyone. On previous hydro dams as many as seven people would be killed on the job. There was a saying in the carpentry trade that every building is a tombstone in a way because it was so normal to lose a couple of guys. Companies would actually factor that into their cost and into their productivity.

Thankfully, we have moved away from those days but it really was not that long ago. As I say, in the late seventies we really achieved something by building a dam without killing anyone. I put it to the House that there is no reason that anyone should be dying on the job. All of those accidents are preventable with the right measures, with the right legislation and with the right enforcement.

I do not really have to say anything more in this speech. I could just stand here and say enforcement, enforcement, enforcement for the next 20 minutes and that would be the most important single message that we could deliver to the labour relations community, employers and employees across the country. It is so critical.

In recent years, partly due to shortages of enforcement officers, we have been seeing more and more governments relying on what they call voluntary compliance orders. A voluntary compliance order, frankly, does not cut it, especially in the private sector where some people still view safety as a cost factor. Even though it is a terribly outdated and obsolete way of viewing things, some people still look at stopping to put up a guard rail as a non-productive activity. Where is the payback? It will slow us down and it will cost us money. It is a terrible way of doing things.

• (1325)

I will give the House some figures that will illustrate how wrong-headed that is. We all know the good, moral and ethical reasons why we do not want anyone hurt or killed at the workplace. Let me tell the House some of the economics of workplace safety and health.

In my home province of Manitoba, we lose about 50,000 person days a year to strikes, lockouts and labour unrest. It is a productivity issue. In the same period of time, we lost 550,000 person days per year to time lost due to accidents on the job. If we are so serious about elevating the levels of productivity for Canadian workers, we could clean up the workplaces, stop the carnage and save ourselves half a million person days a year in Manitoba alone.

Frankly, that does not factor in the other detail that we have looked at in the union movement, which is the secondary impact of a workplace accident. This means that when one of our colleagues is struck down, falls or is hurt, injured or killed on the job, there is a ripple effect throughout the whole workforce. Productivity is slow on the day of the accident and does not get up to full speed until many days later. I have seen that happen many times.

The whole concept of workplace safety and health legislation in this country is really geared around three things; the right to know, the right to refuse and the right to fully participate in the health and safety aspects of our workplace. Those three things define and shape what we would like to see as a healthy and safe work environment. The right to know means that we have the right to know what hazardous materials we might be working with. We do have WHMIS legislation, Workplace Hazardous Material Information System, in this country where any worker has the right to say "Are you sure this chemical I am using is not bad for me? Prove it to me". The onus is on the employer to prove to the worker that it will not hurt them. If we had that kind of legislation when I worked in the asbestos mine, I would have quit a lot sooner than I did.

It is a very complex field and it needs a lot of administration to make it work. It is very complicated now. We cannot just train people in WHMIS for eight hours and then leave them alone. We are dealing with very complicated materials now. There are secondary things that go off with the materials we work with. This element might be benign and that element might be benign, but put the two together in our kidney and they turn into a third element that will kill us. We need to know that. We cannot send workers in unprotected and ask them to do that kind of thing for the sake of economics.

Canadians are more cognizant of the issue of workplace safety and health and the issue of people injured and killed on the job. The evidence of that is that we now recognize April 28 as the International Day of Mourning for Injured and Fallen Workers. I am proud to say that the flag at the House of Commons is lowered to half-mast. It is recognized officially by a motion passed in the House of Commons. Canadians are sympathetic, aware and will be pleased that we are taking these steps to pass Bill C-12 and make their workplace that much safer. I am proud to say that it was the former labour critic of the NDP, Rod Murphy, the member for Churchill, who moved the motion to make April 28 the day of mourning.

As I said, we think Bill C-12 has a great deal of merits. We wish it to go speedily through the House, but not unamended. We have to point out a number of things that are seriously lacking in this bill. I will go through them briefly.

Almost everything in Bill C-12 was dealt with by consensus building in the committee with FEDCO, the federal employers group for the employers, the Canadian Labour Congress Workplace Safety and Health Committee for the employees and the government at the table. However, sometimes the language in the bill does not accurately reflect the consensus made and recorded at the committee. In places where we saw a gap between what we thought was agreed to and what is in the bill, we had to ask for that to be clarified and amended.

In other cases, we felt that there were things that showed up in the bill that were never brought up at the table. They are very minor

*Government Orders*

details but surely nothing in this bill should be seen for the first time by our side because it was supposed to be developed by this consensus building process.

• (1330)

We find fault with one of the details that is not exactly as it was agreed to at committee. We would like to see a two tier appeal system. The recommendation in Bill C-12 is that we go to a single person being involved in the appeal process. That person would be an appeals officer, not the Canada Industrial Relations Board. We feel that is like the fox looking after the hen house. If one has a grievance about the activities of the health and safety division, a health and safety division officer should not hear the appeal.

The second detail we find fault with is the definition of health. It may sound like we are nitpicking but frankly it is very important. Definitions are contained in the preamble. If our definition of a healthy workplace and the government's definition of a healthy workplace differ, we will have a lot of problems. We thought we agreed to use the definition of the World Health Organization as such. Until a letter from HRD on July 12, 1996, we thought we had a deal. That was arbitrarily changed by the government side and we would like to know why.

We find fault with the government's definition of health because it specifically excludes workplace stress as a physical disease, mental illness or compensable condition. We wholly disagree with that. We believe that workplace stress is a factor in a person's general health and must be included in the definition.

There has never been any complaint about stress due to traumatic events. If one witnesses a terrible tragedy in the workplace and is unable to work as a result, it is considered a compensable lost time condition because it was due to a trauma. We believe that workplace stress in general can also lead to that condition.

We find fault with article 126(1)(j). We call it the rat clause. Employees are obliged to inform on a colleague who they may feel is causing unsafe circumstances. The onus or the burden should not be placed on employees to rat on other employees. The matter can be brought to the attention of the employer but they do not have to rat on fellow workers. We want that changed.

Articles 126(1)(k) and 139(1) call for mandatory tests and medical examinations. Mandatory medical tests are now illegal under human rights law and international practice. Ontario has recently changed its law in this regard. Section 28(3) of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, reads:

A worker is not required to participate in a prescribed medical surveillance program unless the worker consents to do so.

We believe these two articles violate International Labour Organization technical and ethical guidelines for workers' health surveillance which was ratified by Canada in 1997.

Four conditions must be met for medical examinations in the workplace to be all right. First, they must be completely voluntary. Second, individual test results must be strictly confidential. Third, workers should have the right to choose the examining doctor. Fourth, there should be no cost whatsoever to the worker. Only under these conditions could we agree to have any kind of mandatory testing program or to contemplate it within the Canada Labour Code.

With regard to health and safety committee meetings, Bill C-12 calls for mandating nine such meetings per year. Our working committee believes that it should be twelve and that they should be monthly. That is what we should be shooting for.

Sometimes we do not get them all done. They have to be cancelled now and then, but at least we should set out to try to do it once a month. The single most important aspect to keeping a clean, healthy and safe work environment is the communication between labour and management. There must be a co-operative attempt to work toward a clean, safe and healthy work environment. Twelve would be the minimum.

There are provinces which already mandate that. British Columbia requires monthly meetings in its health and safety act.

• (1335)

In terms of pregnant and nursing employees we believe we should add the following language to section 132. We think it should be more rigid and state, once it is established that there is a risk to the health of the pregnant or nursing mother or to the fetus or child, that division 7 of the Canada Labour Code, part III, the reassignment section, shall apply. For greater and absolute certainty we would like to make reference in part II of the code to the provisions of part III of the code that ensure the safety of the nursing or pregnant mother.

There is another aspect currently in subsection 147.1(1) that will need some attention and of which we are critical. This clause would guard against malicious or vexatious use of the right to refuse unsafe work provisions. We realize that complaints under the right to refuse unsafe work can almost constitute industrial sabotage in a place where the labour relations climate is so hostile that the employees may seek to disadvantage the employer by somehow exercising their right to refuse in a malicious, vexatious or abusive manner.

There was a consensus among the working committee that such a clause could be present because neither party can deny that such a possibility may be raised. It was felt that the language put forward by the government did not accurately reflect the intent of the

agreement made. The proposed language we will be putting forward as an amendment will achieve the same objective but in language that we believe will be more balanced. The burden of proof is clearly on the employer to demonstrate malice or mischief, and not on the employee.

The final thing I will talk about is what we see as a huge omission, a huge oversight and a lost opportunity to include what was voted on and ratified in the House of Commons a few days ago, and that is reference to the Westray motion. We passed a motion in the House that the government should amend any pertinent legislation to pay deference to recommendation 73 of the Westray inquiry by Justice Richard. Recommendation 73 states:

The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety.

We read that to mean to amend the Criminal Code of Canada to contemplate the concept of corporate manslaughter and corporate murder. The Canada Labour Code should point to the directive of Justice Richard and the amended criminal code.

If people are found guilty of gross negligence causing workplace accident or death, they will not only be fined and penalized under the Canada Labour Code workplace safety and health provisions but will also be charged under the Criminal Code of Canada for manslaughter. That is what Justice Richard was talking about. That is essentially what we believe we ratified in the motion the other day. We would like to see some reference to it in the Canada Labour Code.

Other than that, we look forward to dealing with the bill at committee stage. We hope to work with business, labour and government to see it through the House for the betterment of all Canadian workers.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to say a few words on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party in connection with Bill C-12, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part II) in respect of occupational health and safety, to make technical amendments to the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

Part II of the Canada Labour Code addresses occupational health and safety, as they concern workers and management. The purpose of this bill is to promote health and safety with both workers and employers and to set out the rights and responsibilities of workers and employers in connection with existing or potential workplace hazards.

### *Government Orders*

Labour-related issues are mainly a provincial responsibility. However, the federal public service, federal agencies, and international and interprovincial industries come under the jurisdiction of Ottawa. These industries include air, sea and rail carriers, oil pipelines, banks, broadcasting, uranium mining, ports and telecommunications.

• (1340)

The main thrust of this bill is to expand the role of health and safety committees, by conferring upon them the power to identify and remedy existing or potential hazards, and refusals to work arising out of such hazards, as promptly and efficiently as possible.

The purpose of the bill is to strike a better balance between the responsibilities of the government, employers and employees as far as promoting occupational health and safety is concerned, by placing emphasis on the rules and procedures enabling problems to be settled locally.

The bill is the result of consultations among the government, business and the unions in an effort to modernize our legislation on health and safety, which was last amended in 1985. In general, I think that this bill enjoys considerable support among the groups concerned and, on the whole, I support it.

However, I feel I must raise a number of questions and make some observations on it. No bill is ever complete or perfect. The legislative process is a living one, and those familiar with it, like us, know that laws must continually be amended and improved with the passage of time and changes in circumstances.

Bill C-12 introduces a new concept in the area of occupational health and safety, namely ergonomics. Subclause 125(1)(t) provides that the employer is required to “ensure that the machinery, equipment and tools used by the employees in the course of their employment meet prescribed health, safety and ergonomic standards and are safe under all conditions of their intended use”.

It looks good, but it is a bit vague and short on details. For the layperson, ergonomics is a strange and sophisticated sounding word. It is, if I have understood correctly, the art or science of designing or changing the workplace to minimize the risk of accidents employees are exposed to in the normal exercise of their duties. I suppose that it is the application of the proverb an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Ergonomics is a good thing for employees and, in the long term, for employers too.

Perhaps the government intends to come out with regulations or guidelines on ergonomics, but the press kit for Bill C-12 is all but silent on the topic. However the U.S. Department of Labour has launched a major ergonomics initiative designed to prevent approximately 300,000 workplace accidents and save \$9 billion annually.

*Government Orders*

The press release describes in detail the roles and responsibilities of unions and businesses with respect to the new ergonomic standards and shows clearly that the U.S. government is very advanced in this field.

Another aspect of safety in the workplace not mentioned in the bill is the psychological protection of workers, their right to work in an environment free of harassment and discrimination. These problems may cause just as much harm in the workplace as accidents or the risk of accidents.

Although the bill provides protection against unfair disciplinary measures for workers who report potential hazards, it does not seem to make any provision for ensuring a psychologically healthy workplace.

In addition, subsection 122(1) defines health as “the absence of physical disease or infirmity or mental illness arising out of, linked with or occurring in the course of employment”, but stipulates that “for the purposes of this definition, the effects of ordinary work place stress are not considered to be physical disease or infirmity or a mental illness”. In the modern world, physical or psychological stress takes a heavy toll in the workplace, particularly if it is repetitive in nature.

It is largely in order to do something about repetitive physical stress that we are encouraging the healthy ergonomic practices I mentioned earlier.

• (1345)

Perhaps the minister will want to touch on this issue during the debate, because I think stress elimination or stress prevention should have been among the main objectives of any legislation on occupational health and safety.

There is another positive aspect to this bill in that it takes into account the particular needs of pregnant or nursing employees. Under paragraph 132(1), an employee who is pregnant or nursing may refuse to work in conditions which she believes may pose a risk to the health of the foetus or child. She must have the existence of such a risk established by a physician of her choice. However, since the employer may reassign her to another job that would be less dangerous, we will have to see how this works out in practice.

The Public Service Alliance of Canada, one of the unions that took part in the consultations, to which I belong, wonders if the employee will be adequately protected under these provisions. Since it represents civil servants, of whom a large number are women, its concerns are legitimate.

The Public Service Alliance of Canada thinks it is unfortunate that employees who work on Parliament Hill are not subject to part II of the Canada Labour Code.

Under part III of the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act, employees who work on Parliament Hill would be

subject to part II of the Canada Labour Code, but it has not been enacted yet.

[English]

It would seem that the Liberal government is less eager to improve the occupational health and safety environment of persons working in the political environment of this parliament. I am not sure if that is meant to be a reflection on all of us or just the government.

Section 147 of the act prevents an employer from taking any form of disciplinary action against an employee who has taken part in a proceeding or inquiry relating to a workplace condition or incident. Missing in this section however is any reference to the protection of an employee who testifies before a parliamentary committee looking into occupational health and safety incidents or policies.

As parliamentarians we must never forget that our committees are often courts of last resort. No citizen should ever feel intimidated in appearing before or providing evidence to a parliamentary committee. A person who believes he or she has been disciplined for taking part in a workplace intervention can make a complaint to the board, which I assume means the Canadian Industrial Relations Board or the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

These boards, I also assume, are filled by order in council and as such are political appointments by the government in power. Perhaps the minister could provide us with a listing of the individuals involved so that we can judge for ourselves if they are appointed on the basis of merit or heaven forbid, only on the basis of political affiliation.

Another concern here is that a complaint made under this provision cannot be referred to arbitration or adjudication. Similarly, section 145.1 states that the minister can appoint an appeals officer to adjudicate a decision made through a local health and safety process. Again this is to some extent a political appointment and we have no guarantee that all ministers will be as circumspect as our current minister will be.

Section 146.3 states that the appeals officer's decision is final and cannot be reviewed by a court. I have big problems with any bill that consistently denies a citizen full access to due process. Perhaps the minister could explain the need for such restriction.

Section 135(1) indicates that a workplace with 20 or more employees must have a workplace health and safety committee. Yet section 135(2) exempts a ship from being required to have such a committee, be there 20 sailors or 200. Perhaps the minister could explain why.

Section 137.1 calls for the establishment of a coal mining safety commission. Why does this industry have its own safety

commission? This commission too is appointed by the minister and serves during pleasure. If the safety of coal miners deserves special attention, I am not sure that ministerial appointments are the way to go especially when their remuneration and expenses are to be set by cabinet.

• (1350)

Similarly, section 139 empowers the minister to appoint medical practitioners to conduct medical surveillance and examination programs. Section 140 empowers the minister to designate a person as a regional safety officer. This also causes me concern that we are mixing safety and political appointments. I am not sure this is the way to go either.

The bill also contains some technical amendments to part I of the Canada Labour Code. I am told that when the minister appeared before a Senate committee on this part, the minister indicated that the next time this part was opened, the whole of it would be rendered gender neutral. The technical amendments have opened the matter but there is no sign of a gender neutral initiative. Will one be forthcoming?

All in all it is not a bad bill. It certainly makes progress in the field of occupational health and safety. However I have asked some questions and I have pointed out that there are too many political appointments, appointments that should be made in a more transparent arm's length process. I am confident the minister will address many of my concerns when she speaks again.

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

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Government Operations.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that, if you were to seek unanimous consent, the House would agree to call it 2.30 p.m.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It being 2.30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1.52 p.m.)



## **APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

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

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

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

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

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

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. JAY HILL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MacKAY

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session — Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis-H��bert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
B��lair, R��ginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
B��langer, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eug��ne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res — Les-Patriotes	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gasp�� — ��les- de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Quebec	BQ
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	Lib.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint- Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île- d'Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ind. Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	Ind.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Rivière—des—Mille—Îles	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Bas—Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	Quebec	BQ
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Quebec	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	PC
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	St. John's West	Newfoundland	

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

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

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>ALBERTA (26)</b>		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)</b>		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of the Environment	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	Ref.
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver South — Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	Ref.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay — Boundary — Okanagan	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	Ref.
Harris, Richard M.	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

#### MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for

Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification)(Francophonie)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John	Charleswood St. James — Assiniboia	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Ref.
Hoeppner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Ind. Ref.
Iftody, David, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D.	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP

#### NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Hon. Claudette, Minister of Labour	Moncton — Riverview — Dieppe	Lib.
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	New Brunswick Southwest	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	PC
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND (7)</b>		
Baker, Hon. George S., Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Labrador	Lib.
VACANCY	St. John's West	
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)</b>		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or — Cape Breton	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Musquodoboit Valley — Eastern Shore	NDP
<b>NUNAVUT (1)</b>		
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
<b>ONTARIO (103)</b>		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Oakville	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Hon. Elinor, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Superior North	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Cullen, Roy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L.	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas — Charlottenburgh	Lib.
Knutson, Gar, Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen	York North	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Limoges, Rick	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.
Longfield, Judi, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Whitby — Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton — Springdale	Lib.
Maloney, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Erie — Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria, Minister for International Cooperation	Beaches — East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Rural Development)(Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Hon. Robert D., Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Haliburton — Victoria — Brock	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry	Chatham — Kent Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John	Perth — Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Lib.
Sgro, Judy	York West	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Algoma — Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Human Resources Development	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Kitchener — Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Nipissing	Lib.

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Solicitor General of Canada	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George	Hillsborough	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>QUEBEC (75)</b>		
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères — Les-Patriotes	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac — Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis, Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau — Mirabel	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Côte-de-Beaupré — Île-d'Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Trade	Papineau — Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu — Nicolet — Bécancour	BQ
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	PC
Proulx, Marcel	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Westmount — Ville-Marie	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Brossard — La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi — Baie-James — Nunavik	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphane	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	BQ

#### SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Gruending, Dennis	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	NDP
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Hon. Lorne	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.

#### YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 24th, 2000 — 2nd Session, 36th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Sue Barnes	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	John Finlay Derrek Konrad	
Peter Adams Claude Bachand Ray Bonin Paul DeVillers	Ghislain Fournier Jim Gouk Ivan Grose Louise Hardy	David Iftody Nancy Karetak-Lindell Gerald Keddy	John O'Reilly Mike Scott Guy St-Julien	(17)

#### Associate Members

Carolyn Bennett Cliff Breitzkreuz René Canuel Serge Cardin	Bill Casey Pierre de Savoye Gordon Earle Reed Elley	Maurice Godin Richard Harris Rick Laliberte	Gilles-A. Perron Daniel Turp Maurice Vellacott
---	--	---	--

### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

<b>Chair:</b>	John Harvard	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Murray Calder Howard Hilstrom	
Hélène Alarie Mark Assad Rick Borotsik Garry Breitzkreuz	Odina Desrochers Gar Knutson Larry McCormick	Joe McGuire Ian Murray Dick Proctor	Gerry Ritz Paul Steckle Rose-Marie Ur	(16)

#### Associate Members

Peter Adams Roy Bailey Leon Benoit Rick Casson	Michelle Dockrill Jocelyne Girard-Bujold John Maloney Lee Morrison	Lynn Myers Lorne Nystrom John Solomon Guy St-Julien	Greg Thompson Myron Thompson Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp
---	---	--	--

### CANADIAN HERITAGE

<b>Chair:</b>	Clifford Lincoln	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Inky Mark Dennis Mills	
Mauril Bélanger Paul Bonwick Cliff Breitzkreuz Sarmite Bulte	Irwin Cotler Pierre de Savoye Wendy Lill	Rick Limoges Eric Lowther Mark Muise	Alex Shepherd Caroline St-Hilaire Bryon Wilfert	(16)

#### Associate Members

Jim Abbott André Bachand Claude Bachand Carolyn Bennett Rick Borotsik	Pierre Brien Serge Cardin Antoine Dubé Maurice Dumas Gordon Earle	Paul Forseth Christiane Gagnon Rick Laliberte Peter MacKay Louis Plamondon	Benoît Sauvageau Guy St-Julien Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Elsie Wayne
---	---	--	---

### THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

<b>Chair:</b>	Dennis Mills	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Steve Mahoney Inky Mark	
Marlene Jennings Raymond Lavigne	Peter MacKay Pat O'Brien	Beth Phinney George Proud	John Solomon Caroline St-Hilaire	(11)

## CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:** Joe Fontana

**Vice-Chairs:** Leon Benoit  
Steve Mahoney

Rob Anders  
Jean Augustine  
Bernard Bigras  
Paul Bonwick

John Bryden  
Sophia Leung  
Rick Limoges

Pat Martin  
John McKay  
Grant McNally

Pauline Picard  
David Price  
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

### Associate Members

Claude Bachand  
Serge Cardin  
Libby Davies

Gordon Earle  
Louise Hardy  
Francine Lalonde

Réal Ménard  
Deepak Obhrai  
Diane St-Jacques

Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:** Charles Caccia

**Vice-Chairs:** Rahim Jaffer  
Karen Kraft Sloan

Marlene Catterall  
David Chatters  
Jean-Guy Chrétien  
Nick Discepola

Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Gurmant Grewal  
Dennis Gruending

John Herron  
Joe Jordan  
Walt Lastewka

David Pratt  
Julian Reed  
Paddy Torsney

(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Peter Adams  
Hélène Alarie  
Leon Benoit  
Bernard Bigras  
Pierre Brien

Chuck Cadman  
Serge Cardin  
Aileen Carroll  
John Duncan  
Louise Hardy

Rick Laliberte  
Clifford Lincoln  
Peter Mancini  
David Price  
Nelson Riis

Judy Sgro  
Guy St-Julien  
Peter Stoffer  
Stéphan Tremblay  
Daniel Turp

## FINANCE

**Chair:** Maurizio Bevilacqua

**Vice-Chairs:** Nick Discepola  
Richard Harris

Scott Brison  
Roy Cullen  
Ken Epp  
Roger Gallaway

Albina Guarnieri  
Sophia Leung  
Yvan Loubier

Richard Marceau  
Lorne Nystrom  
Gary Pillitteri

Karen Redman  
Monte Solberg  
Paul Szabo

(16)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Rob Anders  
Carolyn Bennett  
Rick Borotsik  
Pierre Brien  
Serge Cardin  
Joe Comuzzi  
Odina Desrochers  
Norman Doyle  
Antoine Dubé

Joe Fontana  
Paul Forseth  
Christiane Gagnon  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Monique Guay  
John Herron  
Dale Johnston  
Jim Jones  
Jason Kenney

Rick Limoges  
Gary Lunn  
Peter MacKay  
Alexa McDonough  
Bob Mills  
Lynn Myers  
Gilles-A. Perron  
Pauline Picard  
Charlie Power

Nelson Riis  
Benoît Sauvageau  
Werner Schmidt  
Alex Shepherd  
John Solomon  
Guy St-Julien  
Stéphan Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Tony Valeri



**HEALTH****Chair:** Lynn Myers**Vice-Chairs:** Reed Elley  
Ovid JacksonYvon Charbonneau  
Christiane Gagnon  
Bill Matthews  
Ted McWhinneyRéal Ménard  
Bob Mills  
Marcel ProulxKaren Redman  
Paul Szabo  
Greg ThompsonRose-Marie Ur  
Maurice Vellacott  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

**Associate Members**Carolyn Bennett  
Bernard Bigras  
Serge Cardin  
Jean-Guy ChrétienLibby Davies  
Pierre de Savoye  
Michelle Dockrill  
Jocelyne Girard-BujoldJohn Herron  
Grant Hill  
Sophia Leung  
John MaloneyPauline Picard  
Guy St-Julien  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Peter Adams**Vice-Chairs:** Maurice Vellacott  
Bryon WilfertDiane Ablonczy  
Bonnie Brown  
Paul Crête  
Libby DaviesJean Dubé  
Raymonde Folco  
Christiane Gagnon  
John GodfreyDale Johnston  
Judi Longfield  
Larry McCormick  
Rey PagtakhanAndy Scott  
Judy Sgro  
Stéphan Tremblay

(18)

**Associate Members**Carolyn Bennett  
Yvan Bernier  
Bernard Bigras  
Serge Cardin  
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral  
Bev Desjarlais  
Michelle Dockrill  
Norman DoyleAntoine Dubé  
Maurice Dumas  
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Deborah Grey  
Monique Guay  
Ovid JacksonJoe Jordan  
Nancy Karetak-Lindell  
Wendy Lill  
Eric Lowther  
Diane Marleau  
Pat Martin  
Réal MénardMark Muise  
Lorne Nystrom  
Diane St-Jacques  
Guy St-Julien  
Suzanne Tremblay  
Daniel Turp  
Angela Vautour**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AT RISK****Chair:** John Godfrey**Vice-Chair:**Carolyn Bennett  
Libby DaviesRaymonde Folco  
Christiane GagnonOvid Jackson  
Eric LowtherDiane Marleau  
Diane St-Jacques

(9)

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Carolyn Bennett**Vice-Chair:**Joe Jordan  
Nancy Karetak-LindellWendy Lill  
Mark MuiseKaren Redman  
Andy ScottSuzanne Tremblay  
Maurice Vellacott

(9)



## NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

<b>Chair:</b>	Joseph Volpe	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	David Chatters Julian Reed	
Réginald Bélair Gilles Bernier Serge Cardin John Duncan	Yvon Godin Tony Ianno Ghislain Lebel	Carolyn Parrish Carmen Provenzano Werner Schmidt	Guy St-Julien Brent St. Denis Tony Valeri	(16)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott Hélène Alarie Rob Anders Pierre Brien René Canuel	Jean-Guy Chrétien Michelle Dockrill Ghislain Fournier Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Jim Jones Gerald Keddy Derrek Konrad Gilles-A. Perron Nelson Riis	Benôit Sauvageau Caroline St-Hilaire Darrel Stinson Daniel Turp
--	--	---	--

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Derek Lee	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Marlene Catterall Chuck Strahl	
Eleni Bakopanos Stéphane Bergeron Ray Bonin Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Yvon Godin André Harvey Jay Hill	Bob Kilger Gar Knutson Grant McNally	Carolyn Parrish Jerry Pickard John Richardson	(16)

### Associate Members

Peter Adams Michel Bellehumeur Bill Blaikie Michelle Dockrill	Norman Doyle Deborah Grey Joe Jordan René Laurin	Eric Lowther Larry McCormick Réal Ménard Lorne Nystrom	John Solomon Suzanne Tremblay Randy White Ted White
--	---	---	--

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Larry McCormick	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Bill Blaikie Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Deborah Grey	André Harvey	Joe Jordan	(6)

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE TELEVISIONING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Chair:</b>	Marlene Catterall	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Peter Adams Stéphane Bergeron	Michelle Dockrill	Grant McNally	Angela Vautour	(6)

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

<b>Chair:</b>	John Williams	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Steve Mahoney John Richardson	
Hec Clouthier Michelle Dockrill John Finlay Paul Forseth	Mac Harb Marlene Jennings Jason Kenney Philip Mayfield	Gilles-A. Perron Beth Phinney Benôit Sauvageau	Judy Sgro Alex Shepherd Elsie Wayne	(17)

### Associate Members

Roy Bailey Garry Breitreuz Scott Brison Rick Casson	Bev Desjarlais Odina Desrochers Christiane Gagnon Jocelyne Girard-Bujold	Gurmant Grewal Jim Jones Derrek Konrad Ghislain Lebel	Lorne Nystrom Peter Stoffer Suzanne Tremblay
--	---	--	--

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REPORTING

<b>Chair:</b>	John Williams	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	
Michelle Dockrill Mac Harb	Steve Mahoney Beth Phinney	John Richardson Benoit Sauvageau	Elsie Wayne (8)

---

## TRANSPORT

<b>Chair:</b>	Stan Keyes	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Joe Comuzzi Val Meredith
Gérard Asselin Roy Bailey Murray Calder Bill Casey	Bev Desjarlais Stan Dromisky Claude Drouin	Joe Fontana Michel Guimond Charles Hubbard	Ovid Jackson Dale Johnston Lou Sekora (16)

### Associate Members

Yvan Bernier Rick Borotsik Serge Cardin David Chatters	Paul Crête Maurice Dumas John Duncan Ghislain Fournier	Rick Laliberte Lee Morrison Gerry Ritz John Solomon	Guy St-Julien Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp Elsie Wayne
---	---	--	---

---

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

<b>Joint Chairs:</b>	Raymond Lavigne Louis Robichaud	<b>Joint Vice-Chair:</b>	Deborah Grey
Representing the Senate: The Honourable Senators		Representing the House of Commons:	
Norman Atkins Isobel Finnerty Jerahmiel Grafstein	Normand Grimard Vivienne Poy Calvin Ruck	Mark Assad Roy Bailey Marlene Catterall Hec Clouthier John Finlay Mac Harb Jim Karygiannis	Wendy Lill Rick Limoges Philip Mayfield Paul Mercier Louis Plamondon David Price Karen Redman (23)

### Associate Members

Libby Davies Maurice Dumas	Suzanne Tremblay
-------------------------------	------------------

---

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

<b>Joint Chairs:</b>	Raymonde Folco Rose-Marie Losier-Cool	<b>Joint Vice-Chairs:</b>	Grant Hill Benoit Serré
Representing the Senate: The Honourable Senators		Representing the House of Commons:	
Gérald Beaudoin Joan Fraser Jean-Robert Gauthier Michael Meighen	Lucie Pépin Jean-Claude Rivest Louis Robichaud	Mauril Bélanger Eugène Bellemare Brenda Chamberlain Pierre de Savoye Yvon Godin Bob Kilger	Raymond Lavigne Inky Mark Dan McTeague Ted McWhinney Val Meredith Louis Plamondon (23)

### Associate Members

Maurice Dumas Paul Mercier Lorne Nystrom	Suzanne Tremblay Daniel Turp
--	---------------------------------

---

## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairs:** Gurmant Grewal  
Céline Hervieux-Payette

**Joint Vice-Chair:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Ethel Cochrane  
Sheila Finestone  
George Furey  
Normand Grimard

Wilfred Moore  
Melvin Perry  
Jean-Claude Rivest

Mark Assad  
Paul Bonwick  
John Bryden  
Bill Casey  
Joe Comuzzi  
Paul DeVillers  
Ken Epp  
Ghislain Lebel

Ian Murray  
Lorne Nystrom  
Jim Pankiw  
Gary Pillitteri  
Jacques Saada  
Pierrette Venne  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(25)

### Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur  
Michelle Dockrill

Michel Guimond  
Suzanne Tremblay

---

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**Panel of Chairmen of Legislative Committees**

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

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

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

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

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

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Minister of National Revenue and Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Claudette Bradshaw	Minister of Labour
The Hon. George S. Baker	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Robert D. Nault	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Maria Minna	Minister for International Cooperation
The Hon. Elinor Caplan	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. J. Bernard Boudreau	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Western Economic Diversification) (Francophonie)
The Hon. Andy Mitchell	Secretary of State (Rural Development) (Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)
The Hon. Denis Coderre	Secretary of State (Amateur Sport)

**PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

Gar Knutson	to Prime Minister
Denis Paradis	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Dromisky	to Minister of Transport
Paddy Torsney	to Minister of the Environment
Brent St. Denis	to Minister of Natural Resources
Mauril Bélanger	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
John Cannis	to Minister of Industry
Roy Cullen	to Minister of Finance
Robert Bertrand	to Minister of National Defence
John Maloney	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Yvon Charbonneau	to Minister of Health
Jacques Saada	to Solicitor General of Canada
Carolyn Parrish	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Tony Ianno	to President of the Treasury Board
Beth Phinney	to Minister of National Revenue
Bonnie Brown	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Reg Alcock	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Bob Speller	to Minister for International Trade
Derek Lee	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Joe McGuire	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Lawrence O'Brien	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Judi Longfield	to Minister of Labour
Bob Wood	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
David Iftody	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Eugène Bellemare	to Minister for International Cooperation
Andrew Telegdi	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration





# CONTENTS

Friday, March 24, 2000

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Municipal Grants Act

Bill C-10. Third reading .....	5183
Mr. Schmidt .....	5183
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	5186
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5187
Mr. Myers .....	5188
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5188
Mr. Keddy .....	5190
Ms. Vautour .....	5190
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5190
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) .....	5190

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### National Epilepsy Month

Mr. Myers .....	5190
-----------------	------

### Organic Foods

Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	5190
--	------

### Tuberculosis

Mr. Pagtakhan .....	5191
---------------------	------

### World Tuberculosis Day

Mr. Charbonneau .....	5191
-----------------------	------

### Agriculture

Mr. Maloney .....	5191
-------------------	------

### National Park Wardens

Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead) .....	5191
------------------------------------	------

### The Environment

Mr. Jackson .....	5191
-------------------	------

### Member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges

Mr. Desrochers .....	5192
----------------------	------

### Greek Independence Day

Mr. Cannis .....	5192
------------------	------

### Conservative Party

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5192
--	------

### Oshawa Harbour

Mr. Grose .....	5192
-----------------	------

### Religious Discrimination

Mr. Blaikie .....	5193
-------------------	------

### Tax on International Financial Transactions

Mr. Tremblay .....	5193
--------------------	------

### Tourist Events

Mr. Paradis .....	5193
-------------------	------

### Randol Whidden Ganong

Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5193
--	------

### National Capital Institute of Technology

Ms. Catterall .....	5194
---------------------	------

### The Canadian Flag

Mr. Goldring .....	5194
--------------------	------

## Bill C-20

Mrs. Guay .....	5194
-----------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Human Resources Development

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5194
Mr. Gray .....	5194
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5194
Mr. Gray .....	5195
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5195
Mr. Gray .....	5195
Mr. McNally .....	5195
Ms. Brown .....	5195
Mr. McNally .....	5195
Ms. Brown .....	5195
Mrs. Tremblay .....	5196
Mr. Gray .....	5196
Mrs. Tremblay .....	5196
Ms. Brown .....	5196
Mr. Crête .....	5196
Ms. Brown .....	5196
Mr. Crête .....	5196
Ms. Brown .....	5196

### Health

Mr. Blaikie .....	5197
Mr. Gray .....	5197
Mr. Blaikie .....	5197
Mr. Rock .....	5197
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5197
Mr. Rock .....	5197
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest) .....	5197
Mr. Gray .....	5197

### Export Development Corporation

Mr. Penson .....	5197
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5198
Mr. Penson .....	5198
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5198

### Human Resources Development

Mr. Bergeron .....	5198
Ms. Brown .....	5198
Mr. Bergeron .....	5198
Mr. Gray .....	5198

### Export Development Corporation

Mr. Hart .....	5198
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5198
Mr. Schmidt .....	5198
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5199

### Health

Mr. Dumas .....	5199
Mr. Rock .....	5199
Mr. Dumas .....	5199
Mr. Rock .....	5199

### Human Resources Development

Mr. Mayfield .....	5199
Ms. Brown .....	5199
Mr. Cadman .....	5199

Ms. Brown .....	5199
<b>Gasoline Pricing</b>	
Mr. Cardin .....	5200
Mr. Cullen .....	5200
<b>The Budget</b>	
Mr. McCormick .....	5200
Mr. Mitchell .....	5200
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Hilstrom .....	5200
Mr. McGuire .....	5200
Mr. Ritz .....	5200
Mr. McGuire .....	5200
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Gruending .....	5200
Ms. Copps .....	5201
Mr. Gruending .....	5201
Ms. Torsney .....	5201
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Ms. Vautour .....	5201
Ms. Brown .....	5201
Ms. Vautour .....	5201
Ms. Brown .....	5201
<b>Economic Development Corporation</b>	
Ms. Sgro .....	5202
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5202
<b>Member for Brant</b>	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....	5202
Mr. Gray .....	5202
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Laurin .....	5202
Mr. Eggleton .....	5202
<b>Transportation</b>	
Mr. Riis .....	5202
Mr. Dromisky .....	5202
<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. Keddy .....	5202
Ms. Brown .....	5203
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Richardson .....	5203
Mr. Eggleton .....	5203
<b>Export Development Corporation</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	5203
Mr. Pettigrew .....	5203
<b>Genetically Modified Foods</b>	
Ms. Alarie .....	5203
Mr. Rock .....	5203
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Bill C-206</b>	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5203

Mr. Lee .....	5204
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	5204
The Deputy Speaker .....	5204
<b>Tabling of Documents</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay .....	5204
<b>Oral Question Period</b>	
Mr. Bergeron .....	5204

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lee .....	5205
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Justice and Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Grose .....	5205
<b>Canada Shipping Act</b>	
Bill C-374 .....	5205
Mr. Harb .....	5205
(Order discharged and bill withdrawn) .....	5205
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Child Pornography</b>	
Mr. Riis .....	5205
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Mr. Riis .....	5205
<b>Breast Cancer</b>	
Mr. Assad .....	5205
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Hilstrom .....	5205
<b>Mammography</b>	
Mr. Harb .....	5206
<b>Rural Carriers</b>	
Mr. Bergeron .....	5206
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. McNally .....	5206
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. McNally .....	5206
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lee .....	5206

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canada Labour Code</b>	
Bill C-12. Second reading .....	5206
Mr. Gagliano .....	5206
Mrs. Longfield .....	5206
Mr. Schmidt .....	5209
Mrs. Guay .....	5210
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	5216
Ms. Vautour .....	5219
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .....	5221
Mr. Kilger .....	5221
<b>Appendix</b>	

**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**