



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 089

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Monday, June 20, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 20, 1994

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

### NATIONAL PATRIOTS' DAY

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should officially recognize the historical contribution of the Patriotes of Lower Canada and the Reformers of Upper Canada to the establishment of a system of responsible democratic government in Canada and in Quebec, as did the government of Quebec in 1982, by proclaiming by order a National Patriots' Day.

He said: Madam Speaker, in the Canadian history course I took when I was in my fourth year at high school, we had to write a paper on the theme, "Louis-Joseph Papineau: Traitor or Hero"? This provocative theme eloquently illustrated the equivocal perception and the historical ambiguity that surrounded, and still surround, Louis-Joseph Papineau and the thousands of men and women who answered to the name of "Patriote" and "Reformer".

The dramatic events known as the Rebellion of 1837-38 have often been depicted in textbooks and tourist pamphlets as the feat of a band of criminals—what today we would call terrorists—who challenged the established order.

The aim of the motion I have just respectfully submitted for the consideration of this House today is to rectify this perception and to achieve, at long last, recognition of the historic contribution of the Patriotes of Lower Canada and the Reformers of Upper Canada to the establishment of truly responsible and truly democratic government in Canada and in Quebec.

It is important to make clear that the motion does not request a pardon for the Patriotes: they were pardoned by Queen Victoria in 1849. I think it is high time the federal government recognized that the Rebellion was part of a historic current of social and political unrest that affected not just the colonies but their motherlands, starting in the 18th century and stretching into the first half of the 19th.

The rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada were not the work of a restricted segment of the population. Merchants, manufacturers, professionals, farmers, colonists, all shared the goal of freeing themselves economically and politically from Great Britain's colonial grip.

(1105)

The Patriotes in Lower Canada and the Reformers in Upper Canada were fighting essentially for civil and political rights, for the establishment of truly democratic and responsible institutions, and for a certain degree of national emancipation. How can it be that the role of the Patriotes has been denigrated for so long? Everyone knows that our perception of history evolves according to the values and ideologies prevalent in a particular society, and according to ambient social and political interaction. The best example of this phenomenon is certainly the French Revolution, whose main protagonists came to be viewed over time as visionaries, then as pariahs, and finally as heroes. The Revolution has been described as the best thing that ever happened to France and even to mankind and as a bloody period in history that should have been avoided.

I contend that the time has come for the federal government to make up for lost time and recognize the undeniable contribution to history made by the Patriotes and the Reformers. Previous Canadian governments should be ashamed and embarrassed that the Bloc Québécois had to be elected before this issue was raised in this House.

Some citizens' groups, primarily from Quebec and Ontario, have been working hard for a number of years to ensure that the Patriotes in Lower Canada and the Reformers in Upper Canada receive their due recognition and find their place in Canada's history. The ultimately violent nature of this political movement must never obscure the inestimable importance of the democratic institutions and representatives that were bequeathed to us.

What we must in fact remember are the basic ideas for which the Patriotes fought. Basically, these people were fighting for three goals. The first was the recognition of the people of Lower and Upper Canada as nations capable of taking control of their own future. Even then, the Patriotes showed their openmindedness and that sense of nationalism that did not rest on ethnicity but rather on their strong sense of belonging to the area. I submit as evidence the wording of a Patriote resolution adopted in Saint-Marc on May 15, 1837 and which reads as follows: "(the delegates) adhere and will adhere under this agreement

*Private Members' Business*

to the following principles: equality of citizens, regardless of origin, language or religion”.

The second goal was the establishment of truly democratic institutions. Specifically, they demanded the establishment of the principle of ministerial responsibility or, in other terms, the creation of an executive formed primarily of representatives in the House of Assembly and responsible to it—that is, accountable to the people rather than to the British crown. At the meeting mentioned earlier, one of the resolutions passed required delegates to adhere to the principles of an elected legislative council, an executive responsible to the people, and finally legislative control over all public moneys from any source.

The third goal concerned, to a large extent, the civil, political and economic liberties that many peoples of the world were beginning to adopt.

In addition to being clearly set out in the hundreds of resolutions passed by the various Patriote assemblies, these three main goals were also mentioned in assembly proceedings, statements, newspaper articles, speeches in public and in the House, petitions to the British Crown and throughout the literature of the movement published at the time. For many long years before they took up arms, the Patriotes peacefully defended their civil rights. The pen and the word were the Patriotes' main weapons, before they turned to pitchforks and shotguns. When they saw that their speeches in parliament, their demonstrations in the streets and the articles they published in newspapers were powerless to reorient the governor's autocratic and arbitrary power and that he preferred to further limit their rights, some Patriotes finally decided that they had no choice but to take up arms against Britain's authority.

Some people might wonder whether it is relevant to debate and vote on such a motion today in this House. In answer to their protests, I say that citizens who are interested in history and justice, descendants and friends of Patriotes and Reformers, have been striving for many years to ensure that parliaments recognize, finally and officially, the very source of their existence.

Besides these aspirations that have been held by certain segments of the population, historical arguments can also be raised to justify passing the motion before the House today.

The Patriotes and the Reformers, before some of them decided that peaceful means would not be adequate to the task, were what we would call today model citizens who were involved in community life; they worked toward establishing a government that was responsible for its acts, and promoted self-determination and representative elections.

(1110)

But our interpretation of history is often quite unreliable; our collective memory seems to retain only what suits it. It must be remembered that some persons who are now described as Canadian heroes were closely linked to the patriot movement. We have only to think of George-Étienne Cartier, a lawyer but also an active politician and later a father of the Canadian Confederation and Prime Minister from 1857 to 1858. We can also think of Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine, an ardent supporter of the Patriote cause, imprisoned without having taken part in the violence and later Premier from 1848 to 1851.

We can also think of Louis-Joseph Papineau, an MP for 25 years, a politician and above all a free speaker, admired by his peers and by the public; or of William Lyon Mackenzie, an MP from Upper Canada, expelled from the Upper Canada Assembly for libel and then re-elected five times, who chose arms as a last resort. Finally, we can think of Robert Baldwin, who shared the democratic ideals that Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine believed in, so much so that these two men became the leaders of the reform parties in Upper and Lower Canada respectively.

Paying tribute to these persons who ensured that we may live in this democratic system of which we are so proud means, among other things, not denying a part of their lives or the strength of their convictions just because it suits us to do so. The motion tabled today is part of a lengthy historic evolution. In fact, it is one more step toward the recognition of the historic contribution of the Patriotes, which has been laborious and full of unexpected twists.

In February 1849, the Amnesty Act signed by Queen Victoria granted royal pardon to those involved in the skirmishes of 1837 and 1838. That Act paved the way for reparation for losses borne by the people of Lower Canada during looting by British troops. We note that a similar act had been proclaimed in Upper Canada four years earlier, in 1845. This royal pardon made waves in loyalist circles, resulting in the fire in the Parliament buildings at Montreal in April 1849.

A number of years were to pass before a monument to the glory of the Patriotes was unveiled in 1926 by Lieutenant Governor Narcisse Pérodeau, in front of the former Prison du pied-du-courant in Montreal, where 12 Patriotes, including Joseph Narcisse Cardinal, MP for La Prairie, had been hanged nearly a century earlier.

One hundred years after the events, in 1938, the Government of Canada seemed disposed to promote the cause of the Patriotes. An imposing arch to their memory was built at Niagara and unveiled by Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King. This arch bore a plaque on which were engraved the names of the 32 martyrs of 1837-38, both French speaking and English speaking. Unfortunately this arch was destroyed in 1967, the year of the centennial of the Canadian Confederation, and all

*Private Members' Business*

indications are that the then Ontario government seemed to find this weighty souvenir too much of a burden. It was only in 1984 that the ruins of this arch were displayed to the public.

In 1982, the Quebec government decided to move ahead with the process of recognizing the historic contribution made by the Patriotes. Referring to the ideal of liberty, Premier René Lévesque paid tribute to the Patriotes in these terms: "The Patriotes of the 19th century expressed that ideal in their own way, with the means they felt they had to use. No one can doubt the honesty of their approach, whatever judgment one may pass on what has been termed the Rebellion. And we must remember that we owe them a debt for having laid the groundwork here for the advent of responsible government, genuinely popular government". It is from this perspective that the National Assembly voted for the introduction of a Journée nationale des Patriotes, which since then has been marked each year on the Sunday closest to November 23.

In 1987, the bishops of Quebec reacted as well, lifting the previous religious sanctions against the Patriotes who had fallen in battle during the uprisings of 1837 and 1838. At the same time, the bishops recognized that the social and political background of the time had influenced the decision that had been made by the religious authorities. As a result, religious burial of the rebels' remains was finally allowed.

At the federal level, unfortunately, there have been stumbling blocks in the way of slow progress toward regaining respectability for the Patriotes. In 1988, Canada Post, claiming to have lost a file, categorically refused to issue a stamp paying tribute to the Patriotes. This refusal was all the more surprising and incomprehensible since in 1971 Canada Post had issued a stamp to the memory of Patriote and reformer Louis-Joseph Papineau.

I would also regret it if I did not stress one event, one of the oddest and most indicative of the ambivalence of successive federal governments.

(1115)

In 1970, the Right Hon. Pierre Elliot Trudeau, then Prime Minister of Canada, took part in the unveiling, in Australia, of a monument to the memory of the 58 Patriotes from Lower Canada, exiled and imprisoned there for two years and then freed conditionally before most of them decided to return home.

On this plaque can be read, in both of Canada's official languages, the following words: "—in commemoration of the 130th anniversary of the Canadian exiles' landing in Australia and the sacrifices made by many Canadians and Australians for the advent of independent, equal and free countries within the Commonwealth".

We also note that a monument in honour of the 92 Reformers from Upper Canada, who had been exiled to Tasmania, was also unveiled by a Canadian official that same year. It would seem that the Australians have a keener sense of history that did the governments of Canada of those times. This absence of official recognition by successive governments and Parliaments of Canada is all the more odd since we find numerous references to the Patriotes enshrined in the very walls of the building in which Canadian democracy is exercised.

Indeed, sculptures of George-Étienne Cartier, Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine and Robert Baldwin can be found at the entrance to the House. Cartier is also one of the persons in the famous painting entitled "The Fathers of Confederation". What is more, in the northeast corner of the grounds of the Parliament Buildings is a statue of Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine and Robert Baldwin. We note in passing that coins struck in honour of the Patriotes were legal tender in this country in the 19th century.

While it is very disappointing to see that, until now, successive governments of Canada have not deigned to recognize the historic role played by the Patriotes and Reformers, we can still be glad that they have shown more diligence in other cases. One particularly interesting precedent reminds us to challenge the implacable verdicts of history. I refer, of course, to the resolution of May 29, 1992, passed unanimously in this House, recognizing Louis Riel as one of the founders of Manitoba and of the Canadian Confederation.

From that point on, no one could challenge Riel's contribution to the historic development of Canada. Although Riel participated in violent uprisings and was hanged in 1885 for high treason, the House recognized the value and the historic role played by that former MP, who had reached the conclusion that change could only come by force of arms. Joe Clark said, referring to Riel: "We must rely on the positive aspects of our experience rather than the negative ones".

The historic vacuum or, more precisely, the historic ambiguity that has persisted since pardon was extended to the Patriotes in 1849 and the Reformers in 1844 must be remedied. Until now, federal governments and Parliaments have been particularly silent on this issue. The vote that will end the debate beginning now on this motion will clarify formally the position of Canada's Parliament on this issue. By means of this vote, the House will have an opportunity to say whether it prefers unctuous endorsement of the decision made over 160 years ago or whether it is time, in light of the findings of the Durham report, the creation of the Canadian federation, and the introduction of responsible government, to take a fresh look at this period in our history.

*Private Members' Business*

For me, and for the people of the constituency of Verchères, this motion is especially meaningful. Indeed, I have the honour of representing the constituency that was, in large part, the theatre of the events we are discussing today.

According to popular history, first of all, most of the 92 resolutions adopted by the House in 1834 were written during meetings held in the LeNoblet-Duplessis house in Contrecoeur, and probably at Mr. Masse's inn in Saint-Denis, now the Maison nationale des Patriotes.

In 1837, several assemblies to protest the Russells resolutions took place in Saint-Charles, Verchères, Saint-Marc, Boucherville and Varennes. The famous assembly of the six constituencies, in which Papineau participated, took place in Saint-Charles on October 23 and 24, 1837, bringing together 6,000 persons, including 12 MPs and one legislative advisor.

On the eve of the wave of arrests decided on by Governor Gosford, Papineau and 30 other Patriote leaders decided to take refuge in Saint-Denis.

That is also the reason the first battles between the Patriotes and British troops took place there. On the morning of November 23, the British army, 500 strong, was stopped by 250 Patriotes at Saint-Denis. In the afternoon, 200 more Patriotes arrived from the west bank of the Richelieu—from Saint-Antoine, Verchères and Contrecoeur—led by none other than George-Étienne Cartier, future father of the Canadian Confederation. Twelve Patriotes died during the encounter, including the member for Vaudreuil, Ovide Perreault. The British troops retreated, conceding victory.

(1120)

Two days later, following a series of mistakes, the Patriotes were brutally squashed in Saint-Charles and lost 35 men. The village itself was looted and burned down. More than 30 Patriotes were taken back to Montreal as prisoners.

That same year, on December 4, a huge meeting of delegates from all constituencies was due to be held in Saint-Charles to form an «assembly», such as the one held in Philadelphia in 1776, to solemnly proclaim Lower Canada's independence. As the story goes, on December 2 or 3, the British troops were back in the area and plundered and set fire once more to the town of Saint-Denis.

Each year, Saint-Denis and Saint-Charles host the most important event held in honour of the Patriotes. That is also where the Quebec government has established a national Patriotes museum, in Mr. Masse's old inn. Finally, it is where the greatest number of monuments honouring the Patriotes are to be found.

Route 133 between Sorel and Iberville, along the eastern shore of the Richelieu River, has also been known, since 1979, as Patriotes Road.

But beyond monuments and with historical hindsight, the goals of the Patriotes and the Reformers are easier to discern. It cannot be concluded from these events that they simply rebelled against the Establishment. The Patriote movement was far from a spontaneous blaze ignited by a handful of individuals. It was indeed the logical outcome of a long process characterized by a strong rallying of the people.

The Canadian Parliament must look at this period of our history with new eyes. It must put into perspective, according to our society's present values, the significance of the 1837 and 1838 events. Thanks to these rebellions, we have inherited a system of responsible government and democratic institutions and traditions admired the world over.

If the national liberation movement started by the Patriotes and inherited by the present sovereignty movement has not yet come to its logical conclusion, the same cannot be said of our civil and political rights and of our democratic and representative institutions. Yet, democracy is a fragile treasure to be cherished and protected, namely by honouring the memory of these heroes and promoters.

This House is the heir to and the embodiment of the ideals fought for by the Patriotes and the Reformers. It is therefore up to this House to give them, today, the legitimate recognition history has always denied them.

[English]

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for presenting this motion and welcome the opportunity to give my views on the question of establishing a new national holiday.

[Translation]

Since the early seventies, this House has been asked several times to consider proposals for the creation of a new national holiday. The date most often suggested is the third Monday in February since there is a long period without a national holiday between New Year's Day and Easter Sunday. It is argued that a holiday in this long winter period would do a great deal of good to Canadians.

[English]

Proposals for the name of the new day have been wide ranging. Some have suggested the celebration of common elements of our heritage. Examples include proposals for a heritage day, a communities day or a multicultural day. Others, like my hon. friend, have proposed that the contributions of specific Canadians be celebrated. Examples here include Macdonald-Cartier day, Baldwin-LaFontaine day, prime minister day and national heroes day.

*Private Members' Business*

[*Translation*]

The proposal to create a Baldwin–Lafontaine Day is surely of great interest to my learned friend since it would mark the contribution of Robert Baldwin and Louis Lafontaine to the establishment of responsible government.

My colleague will surely not want to overlook the richness and originality of the contribution made by the first champion of responsible government in Canada, the great Nova Scotian Joseph Howe. Howe was the one who established the first form of responsible government in the colonies which were to become the great country that is Canada.

[*English*]

While I agree that Canadians should celebrate the achievements of those who contributed to the establishment of a system of responsible government, I have two difficulties with the proposals of my hon. friend. First, I do not believe that we should narrowly focus on the contributions of individuals he refers to as patriots. Second, I do not believe we need a formal national holiday to celebrate responsible government.

(1125)

On the first point, I have already pointed out that the proposal of the hon. member for Verchères ignores the contribution of the father of responsible government in Canada, Joseph Howe. It was his courage in facing the executive branch of government in Nova Scotia that led the executive branch for the first time in Canada to be fully responsible to the elected members of the House in 1848.

As Howe stated: “This achievement came without a blow struck or a pane of glass broken”. Many Nova Scotians already celebrate his achievement each year. All Canadians should take pride in his critical contributions”.

[*Translation*]

In fact, thousands of Canadians have played a role in the process which led to the establishment of responsible government. They came from all regions of Canada and they contributed in various ways to the establishment of a more genuine democracy.

Real responsible government was not achieved merely by adopting a model in which the executive branch is accountable to the legislative branch. Women did not have the right to vote in Canada until relatively recently. The efforts of Nellie McClung and others resulted in Manitoba being the first province which gave the franchise to women in 1916. Only on May 24 1918 did all the women in Canada acquire the right to vote in a federal election.

Thérèse Casgrain played a major role in the fight to obtain for women the right to vote in provincial elections in Quebec, which was granted to them only in 1940.

If we want to celebrate the establishment of democracy and responsible government, we must also recognize the contribution of great Canadians like Nellie McClung and Thérèse Casgrain.

[*English*]

Our First Nations people were denied the right to participate until much more recently. For example, status Indians were not granted the right to vote in federal elections until 1960. I suggest that if we were to celebrate responsible government we should celebrate the breadth of contributions by the many Canadians who made true responsible government possible.

My second point is that I do not believe that Canada should declare a new national holiday at this time. There are a number of reasons for my position.

First, the federal government only has about 10 per cent of the Canadian workforce under its legislative control. Thus the creation of a national holiday would only directly affect the employees of the civil service, the banks and the crown corporations. I ask hon. members if most Canadians would not be annoyed rather than celebratory if they had to work while our banks, government offices and post offices were closed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Sauvageau:** Madam Speaker, I think the hon. Liberal member is straying from the debate since he is not speaking to the motion for the creation of a national holiday.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** That is a matter for debate. Resuming debate.

**Mr. Bertrand:** Madam Speaker, if we want the new holiday to have a truly national dimension, all provinces and territories should adopt it.

Moreover, considering our economic difficulties, I believe it is important for members to think of the cost of creating a new holiday.

[*English*]

To shut down the Canadian economy for one more day out of the current working year would according to some commentators cost the economy—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bergeron:** Madam Speaker, as mover of this motion, I must remind the hon. member for Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle that the motion is not at all aimed at—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry but this is again a matter for debate. Resuming debate.

*Private Members' Business*

[English]

**Mr. Bertrand:**—approximately .4 per cent of the gross national product. This represents close to \$3 billion. Is the hon. member for Verchères prepared to accept that magnitude of burden on the economy?

(1130)

As our economy has started to emerge from the depths of a devastating recession, can we afford to introduce a measure that risks reducing overall productivity and GNP while increasing the need for overtime work?

In our increasingly globalized economy can we afford to introduce another statutory holiday when our competitors are not doing the same? Surely the hon. member for Verchères recognizes that Canadian industry must strive to remain competitive and that the addition of a new national holiday would add a significant cost to doing business.

[Translation]

Thirdly, if we create a new national holiday, will the hon. member from Verchères not want the government to create programs to celebrate it? Where will we find the additional funds for that purpose?

I am not opposed to the idea of underlining the contribution of historical figures to the establishment of responsible government. Quite the contrary. Canada Day already gives all Canadians the opportunity to stop a minute and think about the greatness of their country and the contribution made by every citizen.

[English]

Further, Canadian citizens have privately organized celebrations of a number of aspects of their heritage. Many Canadians have been celebrating Heritage Day for years on the third Monday in February. While not benefiting from a full day off, they have used the occasion to reflect on the cultural, architectural and social heritage as well as the political contributions of our citizens. May I suggest that those members interested in the celebration of responsible government use their position to organize private celebrations of our democratic heritage.

Our Canada Day programs provide Canadians with the focus for a national celebration each year. Should Canadians wish to additionally celebrate our democratic heritage on another day, I would suggest that this be organized at the local level providing considerable flexibility for Canadians to tailor their celebrations to their particular community.

[Translation]

Schools could also organize historical re-creations of the debates which surrounded the advent of responsible government. They could ask local historical societies or heritage

conservation groups to help them. None of these activities would require the creation of a new national holiday. The initiative would come from citizens wanting to promote and celebrate the tradition of democracy which they have inherited as they do for the celebrations surrounding Heritage Day.

**Mr. Bergeron:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I bring to your attention citation 459 in Beaudesne's *parliamentary Rules* concerning the relevance of the arguments brought forward by my colleague from Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle. Obviously, my colleague has completely misread the motion before this House since the reference to Quebec's National Patriots' Day serves only to indicate that the government of Quebec has already formally recognized the historical contribution of the Patriotes and the Reformers to the establishment of responsible government in Canada and in Quebec.

Our aim is simply to give the Canadian government the opportunity of choosing the way it wants to recognize this historical contribution. The aim of this motion is merely to get the Canadian government to recognize this contribution.

I think this debate has been seriously sidetracked.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I merely wished to remind the Member that, first, the motion is entitled National Patriots' Day.

Second, citation 459 of Beaudesne which he mentioned says:

Relevance is not easy to define. In borderline cases, the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt, although the Speaker has frequently admonished Members who have strayed in debate.

(1135)

I would also like to remind the member that, were the rule of relevance strictly applied, this House would have serious problems.

**Mr. Bergeron:** Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention—and I think it is important to do so now—that I did not suggest the title National Patriots' Day. It was made up by the people working on *Hansard*, I think, or by the private members' business office, who interpreted the motion to have this meaning. I insist on repeating in the House, if I may, that this is—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. If he finds the title given to his motion unacceptable, he can go to the Clerk of the House of Commons who will help him change it, if necessary.

[English]

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak to this motion. It is very important that Canadians remember their history and that from time to time there be occasions for considering what has gone before.

The motion the hon. member for Verchères has put forward is a controversial one. He is talking about issues which have never really been settled in history. Canadians will have to make individual judgments about the appropriateness of recognizing that some people are considered to be great patriots and others are considered to be traitors, as he himself mentioned. That is one of the major reasons I cannot support this particular motion.

Although I think it is entirely appropriate for the Government of Quebec or local municipalities to make a decision about this, it is wrong for Parliament as a whole to make a judgment about an event in history that is still controversial in the minds of many Canadians.

I also want to echo the remarks of the member from across the way who talked about the narrowness in scope of this motion and how it does not recognize that a lot of people have made significant contributions to responsible government in this country. I will talk about that in just a moment.

Finally, I speak against it because we do have a day when we can consider what has gone on in the past and the people who have made great contributions to this country. That is Canada Day. The different efforts made over the years to bring responsible government about culminated in Confederation on July 1, 1867. Each year on July 1 we can pay tribute in our own ways and remember these people.

It was just about a year ago to the day when Reformers came to Ottawa. At that point it was as candidates because we knew an election was coming. Our leader took a bunch of us around, about 100 or 150 of us. We were here to check out the House of Commons, choose our seats and that kind of thing. We talked about the big job ahead of us.

I remember extremely well how our leader, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest, showed us the statues of Baldwin and Lafontaine. He pointed out the tremendous contributions these gentlemen had made in bringing about responsible government in Canada. I for one appreciate very much the efforts of those gentlemen.

Even the constitution of the Reform Party pays tribute to many great reformers who have contributed and have helped develop the government and the system throughout Canada's history to where it is today. However it would be a mistake to set aside a specific day devoted to the memory of particular people who have made contributions, particularly ones whose legacies are controversial.

(1140)

It is accurate to say the patriots had some legitimate concerns, there is no question of that. However, we would be doing a disservice to the idea that we can have free debate and achieve

### *Private Members' Business*

things through peaceful means by implying that we give credibility to the idea that the end justifies the means, that somehow we are giving our tacit approval for the violence which took place during the revolts of 1837 and 1838. Many people were killed during those uprisings. We would certainly not want to suggest that is the proper way to bring about change.

As the member across the way pointed out, in the 1840s and 1850s Joseph Howe fought for responsible government in Nova Scotia. He was one of the people responsible for bringing about responsible government. He did that without having to resort to violence. That is a good lesson.

This motion is too narrow in scope. It does not recognize the contributions of gentlemen like Joseph Howe and others who came after Confederation. I want to talk about them for a moment. I mentioned Joseph Howe. I mentioned Robert Baldwin and Louis Lafontaine. There are others who came after them. There are some of the populist movements which took place during the 1920s.

The Progressives came into this place in 1921, 64 of them. In fact the first Progressive ever elected to the House of Commons was from my constituency of Medicine Hat in a byelection, a coincidence I am sure. In 1921 it was that group of Progressives which brought with them the first woman ever elected to the House of Commons, Agnes Macphail. Those Progressives deserve to be recognized as well.

In the 1930s a couple of groups sprang up. The CCF sprang up in 1932. The founding convention was actually held in Calgary. For years it had been preceded by labour groups. However it was a populist movement. Populism has become an important movement in Canadian politics as evidenced by this Parliament.

In 1935 the Alberta Social Credit movement got under way. William Aberhart played a critical role. The gentleman who followed him in that movement was Ernest Manning, the father of the present leader of the Reform Party.

In 1921 the Alberta wing of the Progressives was headed up by Henry Wise Wood. There were two wings of the Progressives, the Manitoba wing and the Alberta wing. The Alberta wing believed very strongly that MPs had to be accountable to their constituents. That was a novel idea at the time and I would suggest in many quarters of this place it still is today. I hope it is something that will continue to evolve. Hopefully at some point in the not too distant future we will have truly accountable MPs who will be required to do the bidding of their constituents.

Finally I wish to speak on the appropriateness of setting aside yet another day to recognize history. There is Heritage Day, as someone referred to and we can use that day to think back on our history. However, Canada Day recognizes all the history in the development of this country. That means many things. It recognizes the social and historical developments and the contribu-



*Private Members' Business*

tions our troops made during the various wars. Of course there is also Remembrance Day.

We can reflect on our history on Canada Day, which is a national holiday. It is entirely appropriate. It is good that Canada Day does not necessarily specify who we should be recognizing. Canadians can make those judgments themselves.

In conclusion although I appreciate the intentions of the hon. member, our party will not be supporting this motion.

(1145)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne):** Madam Speaker, right away, before giving my speech, I would like to inform you that we on this side of the House find it deplorable that Reformers and Liberals are trying so hard and so sincerely to change the nature of the debate. Rather than opposing the motion for the sake of opposing it, taking exception and arguing against the merits of the motion, they are trying not to talk about it, they are talking about other issues, and are beating about the bush.

I would also like to point out that we are not trying to establish a National Patriots' Day as we have in Quebec. Yes, we celebrate that in Quebec, but this is not what we are after here. We are asking the Canadian government to recognize the role of Patriots and Reformers in Canada.

An NDP member proposed that hockey be recognized as the national sport of Canada, as well as lacrosse. What more does that involve? What national day is hockey day? That is not the issue. So we would appreciate it if people would oppose the motion, not just the winds around the motion.

That being said, I will begin my speech. The motion tabled, and I am talking about the motion that was tabled and not something else, is of very great significance for us in the Bloc Québécois.

It is essential to recognize that Patriotes and Reformers played an important part in the birth of a true democracy in Canada. In fact, we must, this House must recognize the significant role that these people played in the history of Quebec and Canada and their undeniable contribution to our current political structure.

The motion tabled in this House by my hon. colleague from Verchères is, therefore, of prime importance. I repeat, we are not trying to set up a National Patriots' Day. They did it in Quebec, but there in Quebec they are ahead of their time, not you. The name of the Patriotes must be cleared so that they can take their rightful place in history.

It is also true, however, that the means they used to reach their ends may seem to us, to some of us, drastic, but a closer look at the situation shows that their demands were legitimate, not their actions.

I think it would be a good idea, and I feel this even more strongly now, having listened to the two previous debates, to present an historical overview of the circumstances surrounding the rebellions of 1837–38. It would be my pleasure to do so, perhaps people will learn something. We should say, quickly, that over a period of a little more than a hundred years, from 1760 to 1867, the constitutional status of British North America changed five times. There was the Royal Proclamation in 1760, the Quebec Act 14 years later, then there was the Constitutional Act of 1791, the Act of Union in 1840 and finally the British North America Act in 1867. Five changes in a little over 100 years. But for 125 years we have not dared to touch this sacrosanct piece of paper on which the Constitution is written, with the exception of the 1982 mistake.

We will deal specifically with three of these documents. The Quebec Act of 1774, when England—we must also point out that these rules are always imposed from outside, and it is always from the outside that rules are imposed on francophones. This is what is known as colonial status. This is what we want to leave behind.

With the Quebec Act, England realized that the assimilation of Francophones in Canada was, to all intents and purposes, futile.

In order to ensure that the province “of Quebec”, as it was called then, did not move toward the hand held out by the future United States south of its borders, the Crown offered what might be called a gift to the province “of Quebec” that re-established some of their rights, abolished the oath of allegiance, and recognized a French lifestyle in this British territory in North America.

After the United States gained its independence, a number of people loyal to the crown, the Loyalists, came to find refuge in this part of the British colony that is today called Canada. They asked their motherland, England, to allow them to have rights and exercise them in a land of their own.

Granting their request, England imposed the Constitutional Act of 1791 that divided the area in two—Upper Canada for the majority of Loyalists, and Lower Canada, Quebec, for the French speaking majority.

(1150)

Therefore, in 1791, England recognized the distinct status of the French fact in North America, which our neighbours today cannot understand.

The Constitution Act introduced two new principles into the Canadian political system: parliamentarism and the representa-

tive system. For the first time, the inhabitants of the area were able to elect their representatives who would meet in Parliament.

The birth of democracy was, however, very quickly marred by mistakes. The people suddenly realised that the legislative assembly elected by the people had no authority over the two councils appointed by London. The legislative council and the executive council were composed of a majority of merchants and professionals who lived in the territory and were appointed by the British crown, which thereby maintained control over decisions concerning the French-speaking population.

The Loyalists in Upper Canada, now known as Ontario, experienced the same anti-democratic stalemate as the francophones. And William Lyon Mackenzie and his party of Reformers also rebelled against this state of affairs—they were not, of course, the Reformers we have today, but the Reformers of the time.

In Lower Canada, the Patriotes and Papineau opposed this injustice. An important point to note here is that francophones were in the majority at that time throughout all of Upper and Lower Canada.

These two political movements attempted peacefully to denounce the constitutional impasse. The Patriotes presented a list of 92 resolutions—weaknesses to be corrected in the Canadian political system. The answer soon arrived—Lord Russell refused to agree to the demands made by Papineau and his party.

There were then only two roads open to the leader of the Patriotes: submission or revolt.

Since 1834, the economic, social and cultural context had been seething. Economically, difficult access to land made it more and more difficult to settle numerous families. Socially, the English-speaking elite controlled almost everything, and particularly jobs. In connection with culture, the Legislative Council refused to respond to the need for an education system as requested by Lower Canada, a little like the situation in Ontario today, in Kingston, for those who are not aware of the issue.

Political instability, economic instability, social and cultural instability were all perfect ingredients for the pot to boil over in Lower Canada and Upper Canada.

The Patriotes, then, wanted to exercise real power over the decisions affecting the future of the people living in Lower Canada. One of their principal demands was ministerial responsibility, which involved having an executive council comprised of members of the legislative assembly—elected officials who made decisions and were responsible to the public for their actions.

London's refusal had regrettable consequences—we must point that out—and they were called the Rebellion of 1838–38. I

### *Private Members' Business*

will willingly spare you the details of the Rebellion, as they were described earlier, and go on immediately to the situation analysis carried out by Lord Durham.

After studying the situation in Upper and Lower Canada, and noting that francophones were in the minority at that point, Lord Durham, no fool he, proposed the union of Upper and Lower Canada, that would then be called "United Canada", with an English-speaking majority. Remember that because of this union Lower Canada's debt increased by a factor of 16 to pay for Upper Canada's infrastructures.

After an eight-year adaptation period, in 1848, London recognized the second recommendation in the Durham report—ministerial responsibility. Remember that date: 1848—the birth of true democracy.

We can, without fear of contradiction, state that Mackenzie's Reformers and the Patriotes were the initiators of what is known today as responsible government.

These men, who were killed in combat, hanged or exiled, made it possible for us today to work in one of the most democratic political systems in the world, and they deserve recognition from the Canadian government for their enormous contribution to our political institutions.

(1155)

Quebec has done this already by proclaiming November 22 as Patriot's Day. Pierre Elliott Trudeau himself did it. In 1970, on the sly in Australia, he inaugurated a monument to the Patriotes. It is now up to us to clear their name for the collective memory of Canadians.

[*English*]

**Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to address the House on Motion No. 257 to establish a National Patriots' Day.

While I agree with my hon. colleague from Verchères that it is important to celebrate the individuals who have helped to establish our system of responsible government, I have several difficulties with his proposal. The first is the lack of inclusiveness of the proposal. Another is the duplication of what already exists. The third is the peculiar interpretation of the development of responsible government in Canada.

In the first place, as my colleague pointed out earlier, there is the possibility of additional cost.

[*Translation*]

We do not need a new national holiday to highlight these achievements. Canada Day provides us with an opportunity to celebrate the contribution of many Canadians to the establishment of our democratic system of government.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Thousands of Canadians currently celebrate Heritage Day in February and Canada Day in July. They organize events that draw the attention of Canadians to the cultural diversity of this great country and to the patriots of our past. They celebrate its past, present and future.

I find the motion most peculiar in that it links responsible government directly to the actions of the reformers and les patriotes of 1837. It is a linkage that Papineau himself would not have accepted. If we recall our history lessons it was the Durham report, which followed responsible government, that was the direct result of the 1837 rebellions. The Durham report called for responsible government and the union of the Canadas. Papineau opposed both.

The Durham report indicated:

I entertain no doubt of the national character which must be given to Lower Canada. It must be that of the British Empire, that of the great race which must, in the lapse of no long period of time be predominant over the whole North American continent.

That was Durham's hope. His hope was assimilation but it was fortunately not to be. That it did not occur was the result of the moderate reformers. The Liberal Party was the original and true reform party, and it was the work of Lafontaine and Baldwin. Professor Careless has said:

The idea of responsible government was taken up in the 1830s in British North America by loyal admirers of the British model, who sought both to remedy discontent with unyielding local oligarchies and to keep the provinces securely, though freely, within the Empire. Radicals such as William Lyon Mackenzie and Louis-Joseph Papineau preferred American elective patterns, but Joseph Howe in Nova Scotia and Robert Baldwin in Upper Canada showed far better comprehension—better even than Lord Durham—since they realized that an organized party system was vital. Howe in Nova Scotia, and Baldwin and Louis Lafontaine in the Province of Canada, built up strong, moderate reform parties to gain responsible government, and by 1848 saw it fully operating, accepted by a Liberal, imperial Britain.

Indeed it was Howe of Nova Scotia who first achieved responsible government. Let us never forget that responsible government was not fully democratic. Should we not honour those other great Canadians such as Nellie McClung and Thérèse Casgrain who fought for the franchise for women in the first four decades of this century?

I do not disagree with my hon. colleague that we have national patriots. I accept that Papineau and Mackenzie were patriots. Mackenzie was the grandfather of the founder of one of the great prime ministers of this great party that I represent.

I agree that Baldwin and Lafontaine merit special recognition. They worked together to achieve responsible government in a remarkable demonstration of tolerance shown by Canadians of that day.

In 1841 Lafontaine lost his seat in an election of that year and Baldwin found one for him in the heart of Upper Canada, Canada West, in Newmarket, Ontario. Two years later Baldwin

lost his seat and Lafontaine had him elected in the constituency of Rimouski which was 99 per cent francophone. I suggest to my hon. colleague we may switch some day in the same fashion. That was the spirit of the times and the spirit of the toleration and co-operation that created this great country.

(1200)

There have always been those who had doubts about this country and its future. Joseph Howe, it must be admitted, doubted that Confederation would work. He opposed it in 1867 and called it both a toleration not Confederation. Within a few years he became caught up in the vision of a great nation from sea to sea. So did Wilfrid Laurier, who had opposed Confederation in 1867, and so did W. S. Fielding of Nova Scotia who opposed Confederation in the 1880s in a campaign for premier that he led for the Liberal Party. Ten years later Fielding was in Ottawa as a part of Laurier's cabinet.

Is it not possible that 10 years hence the hon. member for Verchères and indeed the Leader of the Opposition himself, who has shown such a willingness to change his political views in the past, might together with all of us on this side celebrate Canada Day and Heritage Day in Ottawa?

*[Translation]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The period set aside for Private Members' Business has now ended. Under Standing Order 96(3), the item is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-30, an act to amend the Department of Labour Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (for the Minister of Human Resources Development)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Collenette (for the Minister of Human Resources Development)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity address the House about

*Government Orders*

not only Bill C-30, but also about the broader context of this vital amendment to the Department of Labour Act.

It is important that Canadians understand the long term goals which frame the government's response to the challenges presented by the breakdown of the traditional fishery. They need to understand our efforts to meet these challenges with meaningful, co-ordinated programs that acknowledge the inevitability of change and recognize the urgent need to establish a more diversified, relevant economic base for the Atlantic region.

We also recognize that the human dynamics of this tragic situation calls for a response that is fair and flexible, particularly as it applies to those hardest hit and least able to adjust to the change.

Certainly no group of individuals has been more affected by the decline of the groundfish industry than older fishers and fish plant workers. These are people who have spent their working lives, who have made their living in the fishery and who in many cases now find their chances for re-employment not very encouraging.

That is why the Atlantic groundfish strategy includes a fish plant older worker adjustment program. It is why an amendment to the Department of Labour Act, Bill C-30, is needed to include eligible workers who will reach 55 within their period of eligibility under the strategy.

(1205)

The Atlantic groundfish strategy was designed in consultation with provinces, unions, businesses, industry and of course the communities and individuals who have been affected by the situation in Atlantic Canada, those individuals whose livelihood has been affected by the dependence that they had on a diminishing resource in that area of Canada.

In developing the comprehensive strategy, all aspects of change were considered, which is why programs that target the circumstances faced by specific groups such as older workers, are included as part of this wide adjustment strategy.

We have introduced a very comprehensive avant garde way of looking at the problem. We are using a modernized, restructured approach toward addressing the issue of change in Atlantic Canada. Fundamental in this discussion is the fact that we as a government, as a people, must understand that the only constant in today's society is change.

It requires new, more innovative ways to deal with the challenges facing the people in Canada. The changing dynamics, the changing configuration of the Canadian economy, particularly in Atlantic Canada, necessitate a new approach, a new way of enhancing our labour market strategy, of finding new ways to deal with structural unemployment, new ways of dealing with the lives, by providing opportunities, by providing the tools, by giving Canadians a tool kit to deal with the type of

change that in many ways has devastated a resource, namely the fishery.

How we deal with that as a government, how we respond to the changing dynamics of Atlantic Canada's economy, is fundamental to the success not only of our region but also of our nation. It goes above and beyond that industry. It speaks to the fact that we as Canadians must abandon old ways, must realize and accept that change is here, that the economy simply does not function the way it used to.

Therefore this crisis in Atlantic Canada has in many ways challenged the traditional approach of dealing with changes in our economy. As we looked and analysed and reviewed and in some ways invented new ways of dealing with this issues, foremost in our minds as always when we are dealing with public policy, when we are dealing with the livelihood and lives of young and old in a region like Atlantic Canada was that we as a government have a responsibility to provide opportunities for our people.

In turn, the responsibility of the people of Atlantic Canada affected by this program is to make the most out of those opportunities provided by the Government of Canada in partnership with all the key stakeholders in the Atlantic Canada community. It is not a question of just giving income support for the sake of income support. We are dealing with changing the dynamics in an economy that requires innovative ways of dealing with the problem of diminishing resources, namely the fishery.

(1210)

We need a variety of ways of dealing with the issue at hand and to give the people affected by the diminishing resources a variety of tools. The government, always in full partnership with the communities, the businesses and the individuals, has created a series of programs to help with the transition that is necessary in the Atlantic region.

Among others, we have initiatives such as the career planning and employment counselling. These services will help us to assess individual employment possibilities, set goals, develop a personal agenda for the individual Canadian who is looking to improve his or her chances in an economy that is forever changing.

We are also offering a self-employment assistance program. It is a program that will basically kickstart new business outside the fishery. In essence it will give hope and opportunity to Canadians in Atlantic Canada to engage in entrepreneurship training.

Through this process of extensive, wide-ranging consultation, everyone involved was brought into the consultation process. As a government we felt fundamentally that any program which we initiated must have the full support and co-operation of the people.

*Government Orders*

We have to bring it back to the community level. We have to engage people at the community level. It is for this reason that one of the initiatives speaks to a communities opportunity pool, allowing individuals to develop and contribute to community based projects and initiatives where they live.

We are also cognizant of the fact that we live in a changing world where the environment and sustainable economic growth are extremely important to the lives of Canadians regardless of which region they are from. It is for this reason that we introduced, as part of the package, green projects that connect the environment and the community with the view to improve the skills and long term employment opportunities for those people who choose to participate in this initiative.

Fundamental to this program is also mobility assistance, to provide relocation support for those who wish to find work outside their community and of course portable wage subsidies to allow employers outside the fishery to hire people and provide on the job training.

It is extremely important to note that where these initiatives are concerned we have built safeguards that will ensure there is no abuse of the programs and services offered.

(1215)

We must remember that while TAGS is an active support measure, the fish plant older worker adjustment program is more in line with the traditional way of giving support to people. It will provide income support to older workers who have worked all their lives and, may I add, worked very hard. This program is an investment in their dignity and in their self-worth.

I believe it is essential to reiterate the Atlantic groundfish strategy. One of the key features of this strategy is that it is built on mutual responsibility. That is a very important principle. As such, it represents a significant change from the traditional way of giving income support provided by the previous groundfish programs that ended on May 15, 1994. Of course I am referring to NCARP and AGAP.

No one is obliged to participate in the strategy. Anyone can opt out for an alternative. That is their personal choice.

In addition to active income support, the strategy is a departure from the traditional, ineffective at times, ways of the past. At no time under this strategy program will participants be trained for jobs that do not exist. They will work at jobs that need to be done or trained for employment that will give them a chance at a future job.

In short, what is fundamental to note about this program is that TAGS is the opposite of a cynical, short lived, make work program. Those types of programs are part of the history books.

As a nation in financial, social and economic terms we simply cannot afford to go on in the same manner in which we have for decades. Conditions are simply not the same.

Other measures to encourage and assist workers include continued employment counselling, literacy programs and general education upgrading, all with the objective of connecting people to the emerging reality of a diversified economy, of giving people the skills and opportunities required to meet the challenges of this century, to meet the challenges of a nation in a global economy that is changing at a very fast pace.

When we say that people must continue to upgrade, when we say that most jobs by the year 2010 will require over 16 years of education, when we say that the future really belongs to the learners, the people who are willing to upgrade their skills, the people who are willing to take risks and challenges, the people who are willing to take the time to acquire the new economy skills that are required, those individuals are going to be the winners of the new economic system, those people who are willing to challenge future trends.

That is a message not only for the Atlantic fish workers and plant workers we are talking about today, but that is the challenge for all Canadians regardless of where they come from.

(1220)

Atlantic Canadians are faced with diminishing resources on one hand and a changing economy on the other. This program we are speaking about today speaks to the challenges they are facing, adding to the effectiveness of the strategy that will be implemented in a context of wider commitments to eliminate duplication, overlap and to support development efforts in a co-ordinated manner. This means we must bring government departments together and toward this end the initiatives of the Atlantic groundfish strategy will complement the functions of regional economic development agencies such as ACOA and FORD-Q.

Even within government we have to accept change and even within government we must adapt to the realities of the new economy.

As members are aware, FORD-Q is focusing on economic diversification for eastern Quebec and the north shore. This initiative has as its clientele fishers and communities affected by the crisis, small and medium sized businesses, entrepreneurs, new business start-ups and non profit organizations such as Alliance des pêcheurs du Québec. FORD-Q serves an umbrella function, facilitating local and regional initiatives in concert with the Quebec government.

ACOA will place a similar emphasis on community economic development in finding innovative ways to enhance the potential of the communities, of the people, of the labour force; their potential within an Atlantic Canada context.

*Government Orders*

While we acknowledge that hardship will be felt in each of the hundreds of communities affected by the fishery adjustment it is necessary to recognize the potential of communities to develop new economic structures. Therefore ACOA is encouraging communities to group together, to take a regional approach to alternative industry development.

How well we are dealing with the crisis. Our approach as a government, our approach as communities, as a nation, should be not simply to view this as a crisis but it must also be to view this as an opportunity to bring about positive change in this particular area.

When we look at the way government is going to deliver the programs we will make sure that in terms of delivering effective, relevant economic development programs every effort must be made to ensure the harmonization of all existing and anticipated initiatives. That is fundamental to the success of this program. We must remember that government in co-operation with community, unions, business leaders, the people, the various communities, must act in concert, together, toward a common vision as we move forward.

(1225)

It is critical then that the Atlantic groundfish strategy reinforces the community development thrust of FORD-Q and ACOA. Because we owe that to the people of the area, to the taxpayers of Canada, nothing less than the most efficient, effective and user friendly initiatives that can be designed should be delivered; initiatives that are at once pragmatic, compassionate, developed through consultation, initiatives such as fish plant older worker adjustment program.

This program in a very practical way recognizes the long term contribution of older workers with many years of attachment to the groundfish industry. This change will help these men and women maintain their dignity. It will reduce the impact of communities when it comes to dealing with the damaging consequences of significant job losses.

Bill C-30 as such represents an important component of delivering a truly effective, relevant adjustment package for older workers between the ages of 50 and 64. The programs of the Atlantic groundfish strategy, including the fish plant older worker adjustment program, are each designed to meet the specific needs, to serve as a catalyst for community economic growth and individual adjustment in the face of unprecedented change and disruption.

Bill C-30 is just one response under the strategy to the realities of change but it is an essential response to those Atlantic Canadians who have given so much for so long and who now during this crisis, yet opportunity, during this time when

they are challenged by unprecedented conditions in the fishery industry really need our support.

It is for this reason that when we were drafting this legislation we took into consideration the various components. We took into consideration the fishery industry. We took into consideration the attachment that these people have to that industry, the economic conditions, the past economic practices and structures of Atlantic Canada.

We feel that through this legislation we are not only addressing a crisis but we are giving people the necessary tools to upgrade their skills, to put their experience into action in community opportunity pools, to provide them with tools like self-employment assistance and portable wage subsidies. We are doing all this because we understand fundamentally that what is occurring in Atlantic Canada today requires an intelligent, pragmatic, rational response.

It requires an innovative, flexible system that can give the opportunity to people in Atlantic Canada to react to a new situation, a new economic system and new challenges that obviously they did not face before.

As I said earlier, the role of the Government of Canada in partnership with all the rest of the stakeholders in the various communities, individual fishermen and plant workers, unions and business is to provide opportunity to the people of Atlantic Canada. I am 150 per cent sure that in the same responsible manner in which the Government of Canada provided those opportunities the people of Atlantic Canada will respond to those challenges, to those opportunities, by making the most out of it.

(1230)

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased today to speak to the measures introduced by the government in this bill. I think more than anything this bill demonstrates the difference between the Liberal principles and Reform principles.

It clearly demonstrates an old way of thinking about government and a new common sense way of thinking that Reformers are hearing from Canadians across this country. Maritimers and Newfoundlanders are just now beginning to hear from Reformers. I hope they are listening today.

Bill C-30 is one small component of the government's Atlantic groundfish strategy called TAGS in bureaucratic language. TAGS was announced in April by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister of Human Resources Development as the Liberal government's \$1.9 billion response to the continuing human tragedy unfolding in Atlantic Canada. It resulted from the virtual disappearance of Atlantic cod from our eastern fisheries.

*Government Orders*

TAGS took effect on May 16 and replaces two Conservative government programs, the northern cod adjustment and recovery program and the Atlantic groundfish adjustment program.

The Atlantic groundfish strategy is a five year program which will provide a range of options for an estimated 30,000 groundfish fishermen and plant workers. It has several components which I would like to review at this time.

First, there is financial support here of between \$200 and \$382 per week. Second, it provides for training programs including literacy training, adult basic education, university study programs, leadership training, career guidance training and entrepreneurial training.

Another aspect of it is that participants will take part in employment projects called green projects which will be designed to preserve and enhance the environment and designed to provide fishermen and plant workers with new skills and job experience.

Another thing that TAGS will do is provide an employment bonus to participants who find and accept work outside the fishery. It will also provide an affordable wage subsidy which will be paid to employers outside the fishery sector to hire fishermen and plant workers in permanent, full time employment and provide on the job training.

Another thing is that this program will provide employment counselling, mobility and relocation assistance to those workers who want to move to find work. Program participants will also have access to self-employment assistance to help them create their own jobs. All of these can be very positive measures.

Finally, we come to the Atlantic groundfish strategy which will provide an older worker adjustment program or an early retirement package for fish plant workers between the ages of 50 and 65 who do not want to participate in any of these other programs. This is the reason for Bill C-30. That is why the government introduced it and that is the reason we are here today.

(1235)

First, I commend the government for the Atlantic groundfish strategy. Reformers believe that it is an improvement over the programs that it replaces. It requires participants to participate in training and upgrading programs, work on community projects and a range of labour adjustment options and incentives to get fishermen and plant workers back to work.

I think many of the measures were designed to provide participants with a number of choices to fit their particular circumstances and needs. I also think the programs were designed to save the government money in the long run by trying to get these participants back to work. I commend the government for the thought that went into these programs. There seems to

have been some real innovative thinking based on the premise that what we have done in the past has not worked.

I believe the program design indicates a legitimate desire on behalf of the government to try and use these programs to avoid or break up the dependency cycle which often accompanies government programs of this nature.

I look forward to finding out how they actually work, to see if any of these measures have application in the rest of Canada particularly as they relate to the larger task of reforming our social programs currently under review in the Department of Human Resources Development.

So much for the compliments. Let us get to Bill C-30, the plant older worker adjustment program. The innovative thinking seems to have stopped at this point. Bill C-30 will amend the Department of Labour Act to allow the Minister of Human Resources Development to enter into federal-provincial agreements and provide for an early retirement package of up to \$1,000 per month for approximately 1,200 fish plant workers between the ages of 50 and 65. This is estimated to cost between \$53 million and \$67 million. The total cost of the program is to be shared by the federal and provincial governments on a 70 per cent 30 per cent basis respectively.

The government will purchase annuities for older fish plant workers, the amount to be calculated on the basis of 70 per cent of their UI benefits, up to a monthly maximum of \$1,000.

While this guaranteed income is currently only available to fish plant workers, government officials advise that a similar package is now being designed for fishermen. As we can see the measure is going to be expanded.

It seems every time we target a new program for a certain group it creates inequities and others say "Me too", so we create another program. It has a snowballing effect. We get into the mess we are in now and it is costing us millions and billions of dollars.

Government officials explained the rationale for this new program. They said that some fish plant workers will not want to participate in the other program options offered by the government. They said that providing up to \$1,000 per month to these older workers would in fact save the government money. Benefits under the Atlantic groundfish strategy will range from a minimum of \$867 per month to a maximum of \$1,655 per month.

Unfortunately, Reformers believe the government has not thought this final measure out very well. Under TAGS the 30,000 unemployed fishermen and plant workers will be required to participate in a wide range of measures designed to get them back to work, that is if they are under 50 years of age. However, the fish plant older worker adjustment program and any subsequent early retirement package designed for fishermen are designed with the view that these workers are no longer employable. Age 50 and you are no longer employable, no

*Government Orders*

longer capable of being a productive employee, a human resource that is no longer needed to revitalize the economy of Atlantic Canada.

Reformers believe that these early retirement packages should not be an option that we consider for workers in the prime of their life. Workers between the ages of 50 and 65 have accumulated a lifetime of knowledge and experience that should not be lost by putting them out to pasture. For half of their adult life they will be on some kind of a pension. Can we in good conscience make this kind of a move? All workers should be asked to participate in the other innovative options provided in the Atlantic groundfish strategy.

(1240)

Let us think about what we are doing here. If we are going to put these valuable workers out to pasture, and I am not saying we should, the federal government already pays for a program to do just that. It is called social assistance.

If the government has given up on these workers and if the workers want to give up on themselves and go on welfare, that is the option that is available to them. Not only is it available it is cheaper than the 70:30 cost sharing proposed in this bill.

The Canada assistance plan provides financial support through the provinces on a 50:50 cost sharing arrangement, plus the bureaucracy is already in place in each of the provinces. There is no need to set up another bureaucracy to establish yet another glorified welfare program administered by the feds.

This duplication of effort is reason enough for Reformers not to support this bill. We came to Ottawa to eliminate duplication of effort and to save money. That is why we cannot go along with this.

Here is a program that is a complete duplication of effort between the federal and provincial bureaucracies and it costs the federal government even more money. Reformers say: "How about taking all the money spent in the administration of this earlier retirement program and put it in the hands of fishermen and fish plant workers to help them get back to work?"

All the other programs put forward in the Atlantic groundfish strategy have been designed to get fishermen and fish plant workers back to work, but the fish plant older worker adjustment program is designed to do the exact opposite. This early retirement package will act as a disincentive to re-enter the work-force, a disincentive to retrain, a disincentive to start a small business and a disincentive to move to find work. This is another reason why Reformers do not support Bill C-30.

Reformers do not have such a defeatist attitude that they give up on 1,200 workers before even trying to get them back in the labour force.

Another reason not to support this bill is the discriminatory aspects of it. This bill is discriminatory in three ways. First of all it is discriminatory on the basis of age. It is discriminatory on the basis of industry. It is discriminatory on the basis of region. This bill discriminates on the basis of age by providing benefits for older fish plant workers between the ages of 50 and 65. What about worker who is 49 and in the same situation as the 50 year older worker? Could he not challenge his ineligibility because it discriminates on the basis of age?

This early retirement program also discriminates against older workers facing similar hardship but not working in that particular industry or some of those fish plants.

What about those older workers who work in other service companies who are indirectly dependent on the fish plants and the fisheries? They were thrown out of work. What about the older workers who have been laid off in thousands of small industries and businesses in hundreds of communities in Atlantic Canada because of the fisheries crisis? Could these older workers not challenge this program because it discriminates against them on the basis of industry?

The fish plant older worker adjustment program also discriminates because it is targeted only to the Atlantic provinces. What about older workers in the rest of Canada who read about the special treatment of older workers in the Atlantic region? Could older workers in the rest of Canada who are also in serious financial straits not challenge this program because it is not available to them?

The Reform Party believes in true equality and is opposed to the discriminatory aspects of this bill, the fish plant older worker adjustment program. In fact Reformers are opposed to all older worker adjustment programs implemented by the government over the last number of years. The Reform Party principles would have programs apply to all laid off workers equally regardless of age, place of residence, industry and targeted to those most in need. Let us not forget that key point: target the programs to those most in need.

(1245)

Finally, the Reform Party is opposed to the bill because of its defeatist approach to the east coast fishery. Neither Bill C-30 nor the Atlantic groundfish strategy describes how these programs relate to the total restructuring of the Atlantic fisheries so that it is sustainable once the recovery has taken place.

Reformers believe that the east coast fishery can be revitalized by fundamentally restructuring the industry so that it is



*Government Orders*

market driven and competitively structured with individual harvesting rights which will lead to economically viable vessels and processing units.

In closing I would like to say that we have here a classic case, a clear demonstration of the calamity caused by government intervention. For over 300 years the east coast fishery has thrived. In the last 50 years the government got too involved in managing the fishery and look at it today. What a mess.

Thirty thousand people who used to be gainfully employed and paying taxes are now dependent on a \$1.9 billion make work project. I find it ironic that throughout the whole of the 50 years of government intervention the only job security has been for the tinkering, meddling bureaucrats and politicians. Those are the ones who have been assured of a job. This program is another make work project for them.

Every time the government introduces a new program it seems to create more work for bureaucrats. If it is anything like agriculture there is one bureaucrat now for every 5.7 farmers who make a living off the land. That is unsustainable. That cannot work. We have to look at how much government we have and find ways to downsize.

This is where the Reform Party is strongly opposed to the direction the government is taking. Even in this the east coast fisheries darkest hour the bureaucrats and politicians are finding ways to employ even more bureaucrats. I am sure most people in Atlantic Canada appreciate the money, the support and the programs. I cannot help but wonder what kind of fishery we would have had if the bureaucrats and politicians had not stuck their noses in where they were not needed and let the people of Atlantic Canada run their industry, make the choices that needed to be made and not have it run from Ottawa.

What kind of fishery would we have had if we had put our faith in Atlantic Canadians, if we had depended on their ingenuity, their hard work, their creativity, their productivity and their competitive instincts? What kind of east coast fishery would we have had if we had relied on free markets, free enterprise and the entrepreneurial talent of Atlantic Canadians?

The free market and free enterprise system could not have done worse than what the government has done in this case. Reformers believe that the bureaucrats and politicians have had their chance. They have messed things up big time. I believe it is time to give easterners a chance to prove themselves. Let us use this fisheries crisis to rethink the way we have been doing business. Let us give Atlantic Canadians the freedom they need to restructure the east coast fishery the way they think it needs to be done, not the way some experts in Ottawa think it needs to be done.

Instead of more government let us demand less government. Instead of higher taxes let us demand lower taxes. Reformers would rather see the future of the east coast fishery in the hands of Atlantic Canadians than in the hands of government bureaucrats. Reformers trust Atlantic Canadians to make decisions that

are in the best interests of the fishery, their families, their communities, their provinces and Atlantic Canada. We trust those people.

Finally, if Atlantic Canadians are given this freedom they will revitalize the east coast fishery. It will be good for the entire Canadian economy.

(1250)

Reformers look forward to working with Atlantic Canadians in the years ahead to transform all four Atlantic provinces from have not provinces to have provinces. The Reform's approach is very different from that of the Liberals with regard to this strategy.

I would like to make one more comment as I close. Meaningful work enhances the quality of life. We are telling these people through this older worker fish plant adjustment program to go. They are 50 years old, in the prime of life, and will be given a cheque every month. This is unacceptable. We cannot go along with it.

The basic philosophy of the Reform Party is very different from that of the government.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak at the end of this session on Bill C-30, the purpose of which is to allow workers in the fishing industry to take early retirement, at age 50. We want to say from the outset that the Bloc québécois will support this government initiative, for the following reasons.

When you come from a maritime region made up of very small communities, you see that there is no economic diversity at present. What is a 50-year old man or woman who is asked to go back to school supposed to do? Many of us realize that going back to school is very hard. The most painful thing for these workers we are discussing today is that going back to school for a period of two or three or five years, and then rejoining the labour force, is still pretty dicey. The point is not that these persons will be unable to work—I would be the first to hire them—but we must be realistic and work with the present economic conditions in the regions of Canada. The jobs are not there.

If I take my constituency as an example, the unemployment rate is 27 per cent. I have already said so, but at the end of this session I may take the liberty of sending that message again to the government side. An unemployment rate of 27 per cent, an activity rate of 42 per cent, means that four persons out of 10 who are old enough to work are looking for a job or are working. And that means there are six persons out of 10 who are not working.

In my constituency, the unemployment rate is 27 per cent. If I try to draw a parallel with the rate in Quebec, that province as a whole has an activity rate of 62 per cent; there is a 20-point spread. If, in order to compare the constituency of Gaspé with

the province of Quebec, I add that 20 per cent to the unemployment rate for Gaspé, I get 47 per cent, or nearly 50 per cent.

These figures can be found in many maritime communities. That is what has forced me to have discussions with my colleagues and reach the following conclusion: I, too, would like to be able to say, like the members of the Reform Party, that it is against my principles to hand out money, but we must face the facts: jobs are scarce.

For the enlightenment of the Reform Party, I will raise two points. Mr. Félix Leclerc, speaking about the unemployed and about paying people not to work, said, "It would kill them".

(1255)

Yes, in our Quebec culture, we, too, have self-righteous people telling us that everyone old enough to work should pitch in. But the situation, this year and for the next few years, is not conducive to that philosophy.

The other small point I would like to make to my Reform colleagues is that I was a little surprised—but pleasantly surprised—to see that they would allow fisheries management by Maritimers themselves. I think the heart of the problem lies there.

I think that, if the people of the Maritime provinces had been responsible for managing or allocating their resource, we would not have the same problem we have today. I can say from having worked on the standing committee on fisheries that the witnesses we heard reflected that thinking. People want a part in decisions. They are the ones who experience the day to day problems, and very often there are local solutions to a local problem. Ottawa is a long way from Gaspé. Ottawa is a very long way from Newfoundland. How far? Six hours by plane from Newfoundland, and four and a half hours from my constituency. And it is even longer by car: remember that people in fishing communities cannot afford airfare.

If management were given back to the regions, things would be very different. But before people take sides on that idea, I would just like to say that it will not lead to any big constitutional squabbles about whether most fish stocks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic come under individual quotas. The Government of Canada—since everyone is still Canadian for the moment—has already given responsibility for some of those quotas to the fishermen.

I know that there are members of this House who do not share my opinion, but I want to pursue this idea to its conclusion nonetheless.

### *Government Orders*

I was saying, then, that in the Gulf of St. Lawrence 80 per cent of stocks come under individual quotas. Based on that fact, the remaining 20 per cent of fish stocks are allocated to inshore fishermen. If we had listened to the inshore fishermen long ago, we would not have had the problems we now have, because the inshore fishermen were the first ones who could not catch their share of Canada's quota. It may have been five years since they were last able to catch their share.

Using these figures, it may be easy to divide up the remaining quotas, on paper, for the time when the fishery reopens, provided we do not get greedy try to take more than our share. That is a suggestion I have for the government, that each fishing quota be further divided into individual quotas. After that, if all members here agree, we could whisper this suggestion loudly in the ear of the Minister of Fisheries.

Later, and this is the most difficult thing to manage, the total allowable catches will have to be determined jointly by the provinces and Ottawa or, if Quebec becomes sovereign, by Quebec and Ottawa within NAFO. These organizations need not be reinvented since they already exist. We would simply use the tools available.

We have not yet reached the sovereignty stage, however. I therefore suggest that Ottawa work in co-operation with the provinces to define the total allowable catch.

You would thus have Newfoundlanders stating their views concerning their own coasts, views that might be different from those along the gulf. Take, for example, the Gaspé area, which lies at the very end of the Gulf and where most of the fish caught are migratory. These fish will swim along the coast of Newfoundland before coming to Gaspé. The same goes for the southern part of the gulf. From Cape Breton, the fish will go up the coast to Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick before ending up off the Gaspé coast.

We have to act jointly so that everyone will understand the migratory movements of these fish. I find it extremely important that this point was raised by Reform members.

(1300)

I have already expressed this view on other occasions. I know that the Premier of Newfoundland and I disagree sharply as well on the future of Quebec and Canada. However, I believe the Newfoundland premier's position is not that far off from the one I took during the election campaign. It is a position my Reform colleagues are now beginning to agree with. The Premier of Newfoundland spoke of setting up a committee in the province to set TACs and to divide up resources.

Where I disagree with him, however, is on the contention that a province should be allowed to set its own quotas, because

*Government Orders*

provinces share the same waters. When our TAC percentage is set before we sit down at the table, all that is left for us to do is to manage the resource properly. Provincial officials then go home and issue the licences needed to meet their quota, because each province has its own fleet. The provinces finance the fleets as well as the processing plants. This connection is very important.

Why am I speaking about this today in relation to Bill C-30 which provides for early retirement at 50 years of age? I always believed that wisdom would come with age. It galls me to have to support this measure but I want history to remember this so that these fishery workers will not have to pay twice for the administrative mistakes of the federal government.

Other points could also be mentioned. My colleagues raised a number of them at second reading. I would, however, like to emphasize one thing again at this time, namely that administrative rules should not prevent those taking early retirement from benefiting from economic initiatives. In time, some of the early retirees may decide they want to embark on a second career and they should not be prevented from doing so. Once they are back up to speed, they will be filing tax returns and the state will come out even on the deal, as they say. At this point in time, however, it is important that this bill be passed so as to ensure that these individuals, whether they live in Quebec, New Brunswick or Newfoundland, have food to put on the table.

Another concern of mine was—I asked questions to certain senior officials last week and put the question to the minister; perhaps we can get an official answer—will fishermen also be eligible under the same act? I have here a document which says that in the spirit of the existing legislation and the spirit of the fisheries recovery legislation—I do not remember the exact phraseology—fishermen would indeed become eligible for this pre-retirement plan when they turn 50. But I have not received a clear and firm answer on that. Yet, as one of our colleagues from the Reform Party pointed out at second reading, the Auditor General of Canada stated in his report that the government has to put a specific motion to the House before it can introduce such bills or authorize such public expenditures.

I have, on the one hand, the advice of the auditor general and, on the other hand, that of senior officials. First, I would like to comment on the bill as it now reads and second, I would like the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to administer its own pre-retirement program for fishermen.

(1305)

I wanted to look at the next problem from this perspective. Much remains to be done. As far as the industry rationalization boards are concerned, some steps were taken but they have not been set up yet and we do not know what their membership will

be. Why bring this up? Because establishing pre-retirement programs for fishermen will require extensive discussions with the provinces. As I said earlier, fishing boats were subsidized by the provinces.

How can we reconcile on the one hand, Ottawa giving fishermen a pre-retirement allowance and on the other hand, the province refusing to forgive the debt on boats? That would not make any sense. Again, how much of the \$1.9 billion the minister has made available will be spent on pre-retirement programs? I do not want to see one single dollar of this money go to waste. I hope that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will come to an agreement with his provincial counterparts on this subject.

Failing which I would suggest that the resource envelope allocated to this measure be handed over to the province so that it can make appropriate arrangements. These are the general points I wanted to raise. Much was said about the high costs associated with this pre-retirement program and with the loss of expertise, but we did not hear much at all from the government, about ideas for the fisheries of the future.

Let us hear about it. This represents a \$1.9 billion investment. I want to be sure we do not end up no further ahead after spending this kind of money. When he presented his program, the minister gave us the impression that we would have a better idea of the situation after six weeks of consultations. I do not have the date handy, but these six weeks must be almost up. We are coming to the end of the parliamentary session. Should I conclude that there will not be any new developments on these issues before the fall?

I think it would have been a good sign for the minister to issue guidelines before the end of the parliamentary session, in order to guide industry and continue discussions during the summer. If we wait until the fall, we should decide quickly what to do with fishermen. The minister's program deals with community and environmental projects—the expression “green projects” is used—but I want to remind you that it is difficult to work on the environment in late October. We should make plans right away to ensure that something will be put forward this summer.

Future involves other things as well. What industrial structure do we want to set up? Quebec and Canada were discovered because of our resources, namely fish or cod to be more precise. We exploited this resource in a traditional fashion. The first effective way to preserve fish was to salt and dry it. We still do it, but it has become a special product. There are other species of fish. When freezers arrived on the scene, as I mentioned, we produced frozen cod blocks, but there are still other species we have not exploited.

The current market trend is fresh fish. It is therefore necessary to handle smaller volumes of fish but consumers are willing to pay a little more in return.

*Government Orders*

(1310)

My wish is that, during moratorium years, we could establish a system to try to optimize catches for each species—we would, of course, only keep mature fish to avoid depleting other stocks and repeating the mistakes we may have made with cod—in order to commercialize these species.

That is something we heard a lot of under the former Conservative government. Why did it not work? Because tools were missing and it was too marginal, we were told. But now, regarding the few cod stocks still open in Canadian zones, I can tell you that dogfish catches may be as large if not larger than current cod catches in the other zones that remain open.

The missing tool is a hopper on the wharf, so that fishermen can converge on a site. This hopper will allow us to concentrate on certain species, so that there will be enough to make people take notice. I call them “unloading areas”. There are some in Europe. Of course, in certain places, it also led to a concentration of ships.

Nevertheless, the coastal villages around these landing sites are not closed, except that the fish is landed somewhere and the nearby plant, which wants to have the product, can process it. For this, the fish must be kept cold. But we can do all that now, since we have skilled workers who are especially eager to work because working is also an honour.

People now collecting a cheque at home would really like to do something constructive and know that the dry period they are going through will end. There must be light at the end of the tunnel. They do not have any now. Something important to have would be landing areas.

In addition to that is what I proposed, a provincial hub for marketing these resources. There is a way to do that as well. These are things that must be done. Some supporting figures—I see some hon. members from Nova Scotia watching us—a manager of a Nova Scotia company told me once: “Yvan, 20 per cent of the fresh fish we land account for 40 per cent of our profits.”

It is easy to extrapolate from that. I realize that it takes a certain volume, but I would really like this idea to be used. Maybe the government opposite can change it a little, because if the suggestion comes from an opposition member, sometimes it is not considered good, but I would remind them that I did not hesitate to support Bill C-30, as I did not hesitate to support the bill on overfishing. So, as a demonstration of good faith, I think that the Bloc is here to promote sound management, but not to hide its political orientation.

But when we look at disorders and problems such as we see here today, I think that I can set aside my partisanship for the sake of good fishery management. I wanted to add a few words on how workers could benefit from this aid.

*[English]*

I want to be sure that every worker in the fishing industry is well represented under this new agreement. I hope they will have union representation and some provincial agreements because I want to be sure that workers will not be less themselves in front of the big machine of Ottawa. That is what I want to add on that.

(1315)

*[Translation]*

In closing, I want to make a wish: I hope that these industry workers will meet the challenge now. May they now be assured of subsistence through a financial allowance for early retirement and may they get down to work to earn a little extra for making ends meet. I would ask them to work with their communities and call on everyone to do his bit so that in five years, there will be something else, always keeping in mind that the fisheries might recover, but analyzing what can be done about it now.

I would like to leave you with these remarks, Madam Speaker, and remind you that the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-30 and hope that the government will consider past federal mismanagement and what people in the provinces and the maritime communities are saying so that we never have to relive what we are going through.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate this morning in the debate, at third reading, of Bill C-30, and I am also pleased to see that the hon. member for Gaspé gave his party's support to this very important legislation for the workers of the Atlantic fishing industry.

I listened with great interest to the comments and suggestions made by the hon. member to rebuild an industry which is so vital to many communities on the East coast. I find the hon. member's approach to be very interesting and fruitful in many respects. Our government thinks that the time has come to rebuild this industry and, in fact, this is the objective of the adjustment program announced on May 15 by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister of Human Resources Development. The purpose of that initiative is to help displaced workers and those who have been left without jobs following the crisis in that industry. The program is aimed at giving individuals and communities a chance to rebuild their lives, and to rebuild that industry on a more solid foundation than in the past.

*[English]*

Bill C-30 is part of the government's strategy for helping the workers that have been laid off and unemployed by the crisis in the Atlantic fishery to adjust to the situation. We have to consider the horrendously difficult circumstance in which many fish plant workers find themselves, particularly older fish plant

*Government Orders*

workers. Through absolutely no fault of their own, many older workers are out of a job and their prospects are slim to none for getting another one. This is the problem that Bill C-30 addresses. Canadians want us to show compassion for these individuals. We are showing compassion. We are bring in positive measures to address this unprecedented crisis. The government is approaching this problem through a component of the Atlantic groundfish strategy which will involve income support for older workers. It is a program that will be negotiated, financed and implemented with the provinces.

(1320)

However there are some workers who cannot be helped under the current legislation. I am referring to those workers who are under the age of 55, who were at least 50 years of age on May 15 of this year and who are eligible to participate in the Atlantic groundfish strategy. They do not qualify for older worker adjustment assistance under current legislation. That is the reason why Bill C-30 is so important, it addresses their plight.

Hon. members have given valuable input to this legislation. Last week Bill C-30 was studied by the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development. The committee gave careful consideration to the issues raised by hon. members opposite. For the benefit of the House I would like to address some of those concerns.

There is always justifiable apprehension that with a new program, tax dollars earned through the sweat of Canadian workers are going to end up in the pockets of people who do not qualify for the program. I can assure my hon. colleagues that will not happen with this program. To be eligible for benefits first an individual must be determined eligible under TAGS; the individual must be a fish plant worker or a trawler person; he or she must have a long term attachment to the groundfish industry; the person has to be out of a job because of a permanent reduction of the workforce at the fish plant and that permanent reduction has to be the result of a decline in fish stocks.

So that this is absolutely clear, the only people we are talking about here are older fish plant workers, including trawler persons. All told we estimate that involves about 1,200 men and women. Of that number about 700 will have reached the age of 55 during their entitlement period under TAGS by May 16 of this year when the Atlantic groundfish strategy came into effect.

We estimate there will be an additional 500 workers who would reach the age of 55 during their entitlement under TAGS. It is those 500 dedicated men and women that the passage of Bill C-30 is designed to help.

Some members have said that if we are going to help older workers who happen to be out of a job because of fish plants closing, then should we not also help older workers who have

lost their jobs because of restructuring in other industries? That analogy does not hold here. The groundfish industry is not just one of many industries in Atlantic Canada, it is its lifeblood, and in those communities which are dependent on the fishery there really is no alternative source of employment for older workers.

The demise of this industry will lead to the demise of entire communities unless we help these hard working men and women deal with the crisis. Simply put, there are few options available to older workers in this situation.

Yet there is a legitimate question about the ramifications of the decline in the groundfish industry for the rest of the Atlantic economy. I am sure that hon. members realize that these adjustments do not take place in a vacuum. There is a domino effect that spreads throughout the entire Atlantic seaboard. In Newfoundland alone there are some 1,300 communities affected by the groundfish industry. Of that number, 800 depend solely on economic activity from groundfish. The government would be remiss not to take this into account. We are taking it into account.

Hon. members will recall that the budget provided \$800 million for the strategic initiatives program. Projects under this program will be funded on a 50:50 basis with the provinces and territories. They will explore innovative approaches to training and getting people back to work. In Atlantic Canada the program will complement TAGS by helping men and women who are not directly employed by the fishery.

Since the major downturn in the fishery has taken place in Newfoundland, that province will be the first to receive assistance under the strategic initiatives program.

(1325)

Last Thursday the Minister of Human Resources Development, along with the minister of fisheries of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and ministers from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador announced funding of \$20 million for projects in Newfoundland under the strategic initiatives program.

I realize that this debate on Bill C-30 is not the place for details of strategic initiatives but I can tell the House that these projects will provide financial incentive to encourage students to stay in school. They will help recent graduates to find jobs and they will encourage entrepreneurship outside the fishery.

The funds will also provide employment and training opportunities for unemployed and underemployed individuals on social assistance or at risk of moving on to social assistance. It is a partnership, co-operation among all levels of government, the private sector and community organizations to ensure that programs such as TAGS and the strategic initiatives address the

*Government Orders*

entire economic picture in a way that will help to revitalize the Atlantic economy.

Some hon. members have expressed concern that this income assistance program will duplicate the general social assistance programs. Let me assure them that this is not so. This is a program that addresses specific individuals who meet specific criteria within a specific age group. General social assistance programs apply to all citizens and have very different criteria.

As well, this program will not be a disincentive to seek work because it is only one part of a broad range of options under TAGS to help fish plant workers adjust to these drastic changes taking place in their lives. Older workers will be able to participate in the other components under TAGS such as green projects, self-employment assistance, and community opportunity pools and others.

At a federal level TAGS is a joint initiative of human resource development and fisheries and oceans. The two departments are working closely together to implement this program for the benefit of the greatest number of workers affected by the demise of the groundfish industry. Fisheries and oceans is currently consulting with its partners to develop a similar income support program for fishers who would qualify.

An hon. member inquired when the program will start and how long it will last. TAGS came into effect May 16 and eligible workers are entitled to labour adjustment measures and income assistance for a period between two to five years, depending upon their attachment to the groundfish industry.

The provisions made available under Bill C-30 to assist older workers will provide a dignified exit to those unemployed fish plant workers in my riding and elsewhere in Atlantic Canada who, having reached the age of 50, know full well that there are no reasonable opportunities for employment in their communities for them and the only alternative course once their unemployment insurance expires would have been social assistance. This program gives those workers a form of early retirement.

In the meantime it will allow the industry to be rebuilt with the younger people who are coming behind them. At the same time it will provide them with an opportunity to have a dignified exit and to be able to deal with the consequences of this crisis without the additional burden of loss of income and the need in some cases to leave their communities where all of their assets are located.

In closing I encourage hon. members to consider the tremendous hardships being faced by these older fish plant workers and to support Bill C-30 so that the government can give them the assistance they very much deserve during this severe crisis in their lives.

(1330)

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta):** Madam Speaker, at second reading of this bill the member opposite who followed me said that he was surprised that there was not unanimous consent for the bill. At the time I was not surprised at his comment because it seemed to me that the government solution for dealing with this crisis has simply been to throw more money at the problem. It has not dealt with the core of the problem which is fewer opportunities or lack of opportunities and alternate employment in eastern Canada. That really is the core of the problem.

The solution that the government has proposed simply creates a dependency rather than independence among people in eastern Canada. It destroys families rather than saving them. It does not address the needs of Atlantic Canadians in so far as it is a band-aid for a gaping wound. What is needed in Atlantic Canada are jobs, jobs, jobs. Economic diversification is the only way to answer that need.

The government solution it seems has been to create a need for early retirement. That early retirement package has many things wrong with it. It is destructive to the social fabric. We are saying to unemployed workers in eastern Canada: "Here is \$750 or \$1,000 a month. Take the money, go away and don't bother us". It is saying that you as the breadwinner for your family will not be able to provide so the government will provide. The children who are left at home view their father or their mother, the wage earner, simply as someone who goes to the post office once a month to pick up the cheque, not as someone who is contributing. That is not helpful to the family and it is not helpful to us as a nation to create that sort of dependency in one region of the country.

Another problem that the government does not seem to be able to face is the problem that it must in fact encourage development in Atlantic Canada. I find very curious for example the spending of millions of dollars to keep the port of Montreal open year round in an attempt to make it a year-round port when in fact we have year-round ports in eastern Canada in Halifax and Saint John which could do very well with the business.

We have rail lines that are withering in eastern Canada because there is a lack of use, yet those rail lines and the employment that goes with them could be part of the resurgence of the economy of eastern Canada. Somehow we got it mixed up and think that we have to spend this money to keep one port open while at least two others die. All that does is add to the cost, adds to the tax burden and makes it much more difficult for businessmen across this nation to stay in business.

At second reading I raised the issue of a need for clear legislative authority for all parts of the TAGS program. I appreciate that the auditor general and the public accounts committee have already given some consideration to those parts of TAGS coming under the authority of the Department of

*Government Orders*

Human Resources Development. Bill C-30 responds to one of the recommendations of the Auditor General in his last report to Parliament when he considered the previous Atlantic groundfish strategy:

“The government implemented a program for which in our view no clear satisfactory authority had existed. At no time did it go to Parliament to seek proper substantive authority for its actions. Parliament was thereby denied the proper opportunity to review and debate the government’s proposed program as part of the normal legislative process, to decide on its objectives and to approve expenditures to achieve those objectives”.

The auditor general wisely went on to caution that if action were not taken the same thing might happen with a successor program: “The government should present to Parliament legislation that will provide the proper authority for this program and any future program of a similar nature”.

The minister of human resources is to be congratulated for the introduction of Bill C-30 as was recommended by the auditor general, but where is the rest of the TAGS legislation? Bill C-30 is a minor bit of housekeeping legislation. It does not give the opportunity to debate the program’s objectives.

(1335)

Again on third reading I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to lay before Parliament a bill to provide legislative authority for those parts of TAGS that DFO is delivering. DFO will be attempting to retire fishermen, their licences and to create industrial renewal boards.

This part of the TAGS program or what some call Tobin’s Atlantic groundfish strategy is without legislative authority. I call on the government to bring in the remainder of the required legislative authority.

We are told that the minister intends to use the Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act as his authority. The Auditor General has already ruled that the Atlantic Groundfish Restructuring Act is not adequate legislative authority. That act, the Auditor General noted, was passed in the mid-1980s to permit the then Liberal fisheries ministers to implement the Kirby commission’s recommendations.

It is worth remembering that the Kirby report and the Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act were founded on the expectation of a doubling of the groundfish harvest. The Kirby report saw the problem of the fishery as one of finding ways to market the growing supply of fish, the oversupply and not the lack of fish.

The Tobin strategy expects to reduce the capacity by 50 per cent. The underlying assumptions of TAGS and the Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act are incompatible. The Kirby report said that one of the bright spots in the fishery was: “The outlook

for the harvest is that by 1987 the cod catch should be more than triple the 1976 harvest. The total groundfish catch will have more than doubled”.

The act expanded the catch potential and the fish were caught. Now there are none. Liberal governments and their bureaucratic advisers somehow have changed very little in the intervening years. Let us be done with any talk of using the Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act to deliver any part of TAGS.

Again, I call on the government to bring into this House a comprehensive bill that would outline its objectives and that would give it the necessary authority to carry out the needed changes to the Atlantic groundfish fishery.

Earlier this month when the public accounts committee was again considering the auditor general’s report on the previous Atlantic groundfish strategy, the chair of the fisheries committee, sitting as a member of the public accounts committee, allowed that the previous Parliament and in particular the Liberal opposition had acquiesced and never demanded legislation.

He equated the failure of the opposition Liberals to speak up as a kind of parliamentary approval by the opposition of what the government of the day was doing. He said: “I was a member of the opposition when this program came in and I do not recall anybody on my side saying that they have usurped the authority of Parliament. We did not raise those alarms. The reality is that by our lack of action, we agreed”.

It seems the Liberals, whether in government or in opposition, have the same respect for the need of parliamentary legislative authority for these Atlantic groundfish strategies, a need that the Auditor General has already addressed. Let it not be said in some future Parliament that no one in the opposition in this Parliament failed to request legislation.

Dwindling stocks caused in part by a failure to manage the fishery created the need for TAGS, turning a blind eye to and even promoting overfishing by Canadians within the 200 mile limit and by foreigners outside it. It is sadly appropriate that the overfishing that followed the Kirby report and the Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act must be addressed by another set of Liberal ministers.

Today’s Liberal ministers are better at shooting missiles over the horizon at so-called pirate boats from third world nations than maintaining effective surveillance and enforcement programs within our 200-mile limit.

When the government is spending some \$2 billion on TAGS due to this failure to manage and protect the fish stock we have the minister of fisheries and the chairman of the fisheries committee rallying to protect recent government misadventures with the fisheries observer program in the Scotia-Fundy region.

*Government Orders*

In the letting of the observer contract earlier this year for the Scotia–Fundy region, fisheries officials in Halifax did not even follow the basic rules of tendering. The tender requirements were manipulated to give the contract to a company that had no experience with foreign vessels in the offshore.

The winning company has been allowed to use observers without the necessary experience on certification, all that the tender documents required. There has already been overfishing as a result. There have been published reports in sector 3–O of vessels without observers that were catching undersized fish and dumping the unwanted fish at sea.

(1340)

There have been problems with the Cuban vessels in the silver hake fishery, vessels that by law must have certified observers. The Cubans have fished in Canadian waters this year without experienced observers on board as a result of the new contract.

This makes a mockery of what TAGS is all about. Again, I pick up on the words of the chairman of the fisheries committee recently when he was at public accounts: “This opposition member does not intend to acquiesce to the demands of government on the observer contract”. A mistake was made and I call on the government in the name of fisheries protection to act. The fisheries committee has studied the letting of the observer contract and has undertaken to prepare a report for the minister outlining the inadequacies in the letting of that contract and the problems caused as a result.

The report prepared by the fisheries committee and given to me last Wednesday by the committee clerk speaks volumes in the priority this government places on fisheries protection. The report rather than censuring officials for the letting of the contract called on the government to make the observers into public servants.

The fundamental problem given in testimony before the committee was a seriously flawed tendering process. Rather than dealing with this flawed tendering process and the contract brought into existence, the chairman’s report unfortunately states that members of Parliament were obliged to accept the opposed view that everything was completely above board and goes on to state: “we appear to have little choice but to accept this interpretation at least in the narrow legalistic sense”.

Nowhere were the flaws of the tendering process outlined. The committee never did receive the legal opinion it requested from the minister even though the minister made an undertaking to give it to committee.

Why would the chairman state that DFO’s testimony was plagued by confusing and contradictory statements and that they were not convincing, yet find the committee had little choice but to accept the contract as awarded?

Two of the bidders acted on the best information available on past practice and on the tender documents. Unfortunately the requirements for certified and experienced observers were not followed in the award of the contract nor were the time line requirements for the submission of lists of qualified observers.

If the winning bidder does not have to follow the basic requirements of the request for proposal in bid set up dates from DSS the award of the contract is fundamentally flawed. Not surprisingly, we have inexperienced observers now at sea as a result of this contract award.

The report does not address the real problems. The requirements of the request for proposal and bid set up dates were not followed. They were intentionally ignored so as to break the observers union. The company most likely to continue to engage in unionized observers was treated the most harshly in the tender evaluation. The president and general manager of the winning company has refused to meet with the president of the observers union. In a published letter he states: “We see no use in meeting with you at this time. Simply put Mr. Siddall, I do not trust you and you are too late. I will not stand idly by as the Minister of Fisheries and his officials engage in thinly disguised union busting actions against a small independent union”. I will not as a member of the fisheries committee participate in the white-wash of this action.

The chairman’s recommendations reflect either an attempt to cover up the problem or a failure to understand it. One bid set up date placed in evidence before the committee indicated when the list of 30 certified observers was to be submitted DFO chose a later date. The department did not require the winning bidder to submit the list of 30 names to beat the basic certification and experience required in the tender documents.

Testimony before a committee of DFO officials acknowledged that a substantial number from the list by Biorex had to be retested before they could be certified in any region. The reasoning behind the requirement to submit a list of 30 certified and experienced observers by April 5 was to have the winning bidder use the bulk of existing Scotia–Fundy certified observers, thereby guaranteeing continuity and experience in the program. When these basic requirements were ignored the process largely broke down. We ended up with the bulk of the observers not having the requisite experience and certification.

The tender process, the Scotia–Fundy observer program and the government’s ability to protect our fish stocks were compromised. The strength of the observer program is in the knowledge and experience of its members. A recent fisheries journal article on the American observer program makes the same finding:

About half of the first time observers never repeat a trip— Much of the data collected by first time observers is error ridden and takes weeks to correct on their return. Some of it is unusable. But as observers gain experience they evolve into professional field technicians who know fish and the way around a deck.



*Government Orders*

(1345)

I would ask that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans take swift action to ensure that experienced observers are at sea in the Scotia–Fundy, observers who are employed by a contractor who has received the contract by following the rules, the rules that everyone else was required to play by.

I am concerned for not only the Scotia–Fundy observers, the fundamental element in the observer program, experienced observers who have been tossed aside because they happen to belong to a small, independent union, but also for the observer program itself, which is Canada's first line of defence against foreign overfishing and probably the cheapest and most accurate source of abundant, scientific data available.

I would recommend the minister strengthen enforcement and enhance coverage levels to effectively conserve fish stocks so we may never need another TAGS program. In speaking to second reading of this bill, I noted that we on this side of the House envision an east coast fishery that is viable, self-sufficient and sustainable.

We believe that the fishery can and should be a cornerstone of a more diversified economy in Atlantic Canada. We are confident that Atlantic Canadians can compete in a world economy. The government would have Atlantic Canadians living dependent on government handouts in a constant state of instability.

It is a desire of reform members to encourage the implementation of a comprehensive program of change which would see the people of Atlantic Canada not only working but working in an environment that is both profitable and satisfying.

I wish that we had seen the last of this type of program, the type of program we are debating today. Unfortunately I fear for the worst. I think we all want to see a more prosperous Atlantic Canada. If the government would introduce a comprehensive bill which would deal with the restructuring of the economy of Atlantic Canada rather than the band-aid solution it has provided to date, we would all do better.

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the government's response to one of the most important challenges facing the Canadian government at the present time. I am referring specifically to the unemployment crisis in eastern Canada.

Bill C-30 is an attempt to deal with this crisis. In every respect this piece of legislation falls terribly short of this goal. At the present time there are 192,000 unemployed in the four eastern provinces.

Provincial unemployment rates range from 13 per cent to 21 per cent. Obviously measures should be introduced to ensure the long term viability of the most economically depressed regions of Canada. The question remains why does the government continue to pursue this course of action?

It was mismanagement of fishery resources by past governments which resulted in the economic crisis that Atlantic Canadians are paying for today. Many of the people affected by this crisis have worked at plants for their entire careers. They were capable enough to hold these jobs.

Now, thanks to government short sightedness and poor management, they have seen their source of income all but disappear. However, the solution proposed by Bill C-30 is in my opinion just as short sighted and poorly managed. This program proposes to reduce the technical level of unemployment in Atlantic Canada, not by strengthening the economy or promoting job creation but by encouraging people to drop out of the workforce.

Is this the government's agenda for reducing unemployment? The Reform Party would prefer to see a vigorous plan for the revitalization of Atlantic Canada. Perhaps this is what we should be debating here today. An interesting aspect of this program is the way in which it will be administered.

The government plans to purchase annuities for each of the affected individuals. As most members present will know, an annuity is created when you invest in an asset which will provide you with a future stream of earnings. In this case the government asset will be in the form of a bond.

(1350)

Like most Canadians the Reform Party prefers to consider the individual as the asset. An individual invests in himself through training, whether it be formal schooling, on the job training or years of experience. The return comes in the form of a stream of pay cheques from a job, not government handouts. In addition, when we invest in ourselves we gain a sense of achievement and self-worth. We gain it from earning the money that we receive and converting our effort into tangible goods and services for ourselves and for our families.

This program provides neither a sense of achievement nor the satisfaction of accomplishment for those it is supposed to help. The long term impact of this decision is to create a cycle of dependency for the very recipients it is supposed to help. The workers being targeted by this program are in a period of their lives when planning for their retirement is most crucial. The recipients are to be between the ages of 50 and 65. At this age the children of many of these parents are leaving home, relieving

*Government Orders*

their parents of financial obligations. Individuals in this age bracket are typically earning the highest income of their lives.

The obvious impact of higher earnings combined with reduced expenses is increased savings. People between the ages of 50 and 65 contribute to RRSPs and pay down their mortgages. In addition, higher income earners pay higher Canada pension plan rates which in turn increases the benefit levels for CPP when the individual retires.

According to the most recent taxation statistics available, Canadians between the ages of 50 and 64 contribute \$23.49 more than the average tax filer to CPP; \$113.25 more to registered pension plans and \$571.06 more to RRSPs. What this means is that Canadians between the ages of 50 and 65 contribute over \$700 more per year toward their retirement, or 54 per cent more than the average taxpayer.

By removing these able bodied individuals from the workforce the government is sentencing these Canadians to a subsistence living made up of this annuity and welfare for the next few years. This will offer these Canadians only a subsistence living in their post-65 retirement years, comprised of guaranteed income supplement and old age security program payments. These people are going to be tomorrow's poor seniors and the government is doing nothing which would prevent this.

We have to ask what can be done to bring about economic prosperity for regionally depressed areas of Atlantic Canada. There are numerous measures the government could take to achieve this. One such measure is a plan for real deficit reduction and tax relief for Canadians. Eliminate marginal or useless government spending. Put money back into the hands of Canadians by not taking it out of their hands in the first place.

In many of the poorer provinces we have seen how a government downturn leads to more government spending and then to increased taxation which saps income from the very people it was intended to assist.

A second measure would be improving the access of Atlantic Canada to the lucrative eastern U.S. market. Canada's economy has always been dependent on trade, and the areas of Canada which have flourished economically have done so as the result of strong links to our trading partners.

A third measure would be a plan for proper management of Atlantic Canada's resources. This would not only include better management of Canada's fishery but better management of human resources. This would ensure that 15 years from now we are not telling another generation of Canadians that its skills are obsolete.

I am not advocating increased government intervention. On the contrary. It was government bureaucracy that was responsible for much of this problem in the first place and government money is not going to bring back fishery jobs.

(1355)

However, the government can encourage young Canadians to choose their career paths wisely, assist people in identifying emerging industries in Canada and can help to ensure that Atlantic Canada is prepared to take advantage of future opportunities.

In conclusion, I will not be opposing this bill because it provides laid off fisheries workers with a subsistence living when their unemployment insurance expires. Who could wish to add to the hardship they are already experiencing? Certainly not I and certainly not my Reform colleagues.

However, I will oppose this bill because it fails to provide a path to the long term economic recovery of Atlantic Canada. Bill C-30 fails to provide financial independence to the fish plant workers who have devoted their careers to a traditional industry and wish to continue to earn a living. What these Canadians need is a tool to earn that living.

**Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester):** Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I listened to the comments of the hon. member from the Reform Party today. If he had spent very much time along those fishing coasts of Newfoundland and Labrador, along the shores of Cape Breton Island and throughout Nova Scotia he would see and perhaps have a little more empathy for the dire straits these people find themselves in.

I would ask the hon. member at this time if he so opposes this bill what suggestions might he have to solve this immediate crisis and to have some impact as we take direction for the long term future of these people who have known nothing but the history of the sea, fishing, for over 200 years.

**Mr. Mayfield:** Madam Speaker, the difficulty with this bill is it comes in the midst of a lot of nothing. We have had years of the government ignoring the difficulties that the fisheries on the east coast have been experiencing. There is no insight into this bill at all about the long term solution. This is another band-aid being applied, a band-aid which will simply forestall the long term planning that is required.

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, listening to my hon. friend, it is a bit like saying that since we do not have a cure for cancer we will not take any steps to bring you some peace of mind and some effort to resolve your problems in the short run.

While I will be the first to say that this legislation is not the long term solution to the economic plight faced by those people living in Atlantic Canada and on the short end of the stick regarding the collapse of the cod fishery, to say that we should do nothing, to say that we should simply turn our backs on these people and let them fend for themselves at this point is not a Canadian way to respond. Canadians by definition are people with compassion who go out of their way to assist their citizens in troubled times in other parts of the country.

*S. O. 31*

**An hon. member:** The Canadian way is not to drive people into the poor house.

**Mr. Riis:** My friends in the Reform Party say that since this is not a perfect solution and it does not have the long term implications economically for Atlantic Canada we are going to cut these tens of thousands of people adrift and simply turn our backs on these people who have lost their livelihoods. That is highly irresponsible.

**An hon. member:** Bring in a bill that brings long term as well as short term.

**Mr. Riis:** My hon. friend from the Reform Party says bring in a bill that brings long term. The point is what do you do to those tens of thousands of men and women who today are facing a hopeless situation economically because of the collapse of the cod fishery? Through no fault of their own they find themselves in this position. The Reform Party says cut them loose, turn your backs on these people and ignore their plight. I say that is not the right step to take. That is not the appropriate—

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

**The Speaker:** The hon. member will of course have the floor resuming debate after the question period.

It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### HIGHWAYS

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House the need for an upgraded national highway network. I encourage the government to consider a dedicated fuel tax as one way to cover the federal share of upgrading critical parts of our national highway system.

A safe and efficient highway is key to our national economic health and international competitiveness. The absence of such a system is deterring our economic growth, our competitiveness and our recovery from the recession.

Starting construction now will create more jobs, enhancing employment opportunities created by the launch of our international infrastructure program. It would also provide a very real and long term benefit to Canada's highway infrastructure. Upgrading the national highway system would also lead to considerable financial savings to various sectors of our economy.

Finally a commitment by the government to upgrade Canada's highway system would demonstrate a determination by both national and provincial governments to work for the benefit of Canadians from all regions and sectors.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, as you will remember, during the last election campaign, the Prime Minister often said that he wanted to put an end to Conservative cronyism in the federal administration. In fact, this is one of the promises made in the red book.

Yet, the daily *Le Droit* says that a review of 25 order in council appointments for high level and top jobs within the federal administration since last fall shows that only three francophones were appointed. The majority of those positions are held by Ontarians.

The Liberals have indeed fulfilled one of their promises: They have replaced Conservative cronyism with a new Liberal version.

I want to remind the Prime Minister that order in council appointments should reflect the structure of the Canadian population as a whole, and not just favour members and friends of the Liberal Party.

In the Canada that he envisions, more and more room will be made for one group and less and less for another.

\* \* \*

[English]

### BRITISH COLUMBIA SUMMER GAMES

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the 1994 British Columbia Summer Games will be held right in the heart of the beautiful Okanagan Valley in Kelowna from July 21 to July 24.

Over 4,200 of the best amateur athletes, more than double the number at Lillehammer, Norway, for the Olympics, from all over British Columbia will be competing in more than 30 different sporting events.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the many hundreds of volunteers that have helped already and will continue to help make this event the largest single community event ever held in Kelowna.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite you and all the members of the House, as well as all other Canadians, to come to Kelowna and witness the athletes in action and enjoy a holiday in the spectacularly beautiful Okanagan Valley.

Again my thanks to all those involved in getting Kelowna ready to host the province. Let the games begin.

## PARLIAMENTARY PAGES

**Mr. Paul Steckle (Huron—Bruce):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the House will join me today in thanking an extraordinary group of young men and women, the parliamentary pages.

Often we come into the Chamber in a rush, preoccupied with our busy agendas, but we are always greeted with friendly smiles and cheerful attitudes. It may at times seem we take them for granted, but I wanted to let them know that we appreciate very much the work and assistance they give us while we are in the House. Without them our jobs would be much more difficult.

A couple of days ago I had the opportunity to speak with a few of the pages outside the Chamber. They were charming, intelligent and very much eager to learn about not only the political system but about myself and the people and riding I represent. Their dedication and enthusiasm needs to be greatly commended.

I want to say that the parents and families of the pages can truly be very proud of them and their achievements. I hope their experience here, although somewhat shorter than hoped, was enjoyable. I wish them well in their future lives and careers. I hope the next time they are in Ottawa they will stop in to visit us.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## HOLIDAYS

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, two major holidays are coming soon in Canada. Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, on June 24, which was first celebrated in Montreal in the 1800s, is the national holiday for francophones across the country, including of course Quebecers.

Then there is Canada Day, on July 1, which is celebrated by all Canadians across the country.

[English]

Canada Day will be celebrated from coast to coast to coast.

[Translation]

These two major holidays are opportunities to celebrate with friends what unites us and makes this country one of the best in the world.

(1405)

[English]

It is a wonderful opportunity for all of us as Canadians to celebrate these two great events within the next few days.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, as we approach the summer recess I cannot help but comment on how proud I am of the work we have accomplished in the eight months that have passed since we were elected.

We are keeping the promise of creating opportunity and hope for Canadians by addressing their needs first and bringing integrity back to public service. Indeed we have all faced many challenges in the Chamber since the House of Commons convened on January 17. However the challenges faced by my colleagues and I in the Chamber pale in comparison to the challenges you have faced in your inaugural session as Speaker of this place.

On occasion the emotion and anxiety displayed in the Chamber have threatened to disrupt the good work of the House of Commons, but you have managed to quench the flames of fiery debate without diminishing its substance. Mr. Speaker, to you and to all my colleagues in the House, have a safe and happy summer with family, friends and constituents.

**The Speaker:** I was going to cut him off, but I thought I would let him go on.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## NORTH KOREA

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères):** Mr. Speaker, it was a relief and very satisfying to hear the encouraging news brought back by former U.S. president Jimmy Carter from his trip to the Korean peninsula.

It seems that his efforts to defuse the situation created by the nuclear crisis involving North Korea were successful, since Pyongyang has agreed to freeze its nuclear program and will allow international inspectors to enter the country. A third round of discussions on the nuclear controversy between Washington and Pyongyang may very well be resumed through diplomatic channels.

We can only applaud this breakthrough created by the former U.S. president, who felt that the crisis seemed to be over. It will no longer be necessary for the UN Security Council to adopt strict sanctions against North Korea, if Pyongyang abides by the agreement obtained by Mr. Carter.

The Official Opposition would like to congratulate the former president on this valuable contribution to the cause of peace, in a tense situation that was deteriorating rapidly.

*S. O. 31*

[English]

### JUSTICE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Mr. Speaker, both the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General have indicated that they believe the criminal justice system is working well and requires only minor changes.

Members of the government and the media have referred to a recent Statistics Canada poll that indicated the level of crime had not increased over the past five years. However nobody in the government or in the media seems horrified that the poll also showed that one out of every four Canadians is a victim of crime every year.

It is because of this fact that so many Canadians are afraid to walk the streets. It is because of this fact that so many Canadians have their homes and cars wired with alarms. It is because of this fact that our insurance rates and deductibles are going up every year.

If the criminal justice system is indeed working, why are there so many examples of it having gone wrong? Unfortunately flaws in the criminal justice system are all too often fatal flaws.

Canadians do not agree with the ministers. They believe the justice system is crumbling and they are demanding change.

\* \* \*

### MEDALS OF BRAVERY

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Russell Snudden and Jason David Srigley, two constituents from my riding of Victoria—Haliburton who received the medal of bravery at a ceremony at Rideau Hall with the Governor General on Friday, June 17.

Both men received the medal for risking their lives attempting to save three people from a burning house in Pontypool, Ontario, on April 27, 1993.

They are volunteer firemen and during that cool spring evening they searched a living room that was completely engulfed in flames. The heat was so intense that their equipment started to melt. These gentlemen are true Canadian heroes who have risked their lives to save others. I ask all members to applaud their heroic act.

\* \* \*

### OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY WEEK

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge that this week is Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week.

Having worked with injured workers in Ontario for many years, I know of the hardship and suffering caused by workplace

injuries. The sad reality is that every 12 working hours of the year one Canadian worker is killed on the job.

In 1992, 714 workers died in the course of their duties; over 864,000 workers were injured; and more than 19 million working days were lost. This is not only a terrible human waste; it is also an economic waste. When we add up the direct and indirect costs of workplace accidents over \$10 billion are wasted annually.

During Occupational Health and Safety Week one message to Canadians will be that increased training, education and information are needed to combat this problem. Another message is that occupational health and safety are directly related to the economic health of Canadian business.

(1410)

I urge all members of the House to join with business and with labour in ending this tragic and unnecessary waste of human and economic resources.

\* \* \*

### FOLK ARTS

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, last month St. Catharines celebrated its 26th Annual Folk Arts Festival.

Some 35 local ethnic organizations participated in the festivities held in the last two weeks of May. The folk arts festival welcomes visitors to see the world from its doorstep. Indeed the organizations that participated in the festival's activities brought the food, the culture and the multitude of ethnic festivities and activities from around the world to the city of St. Catharines.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the organizers of the folk arts festival, the president, Ann Stavina, and all those who participated. Their tireless efforts ensured the success of the festival this year.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### INTEREST RATES

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, for a number of days the Liberal government has tried in every possible way to divert attention from the real causes that are helping to maintain interest rates at high levels. Government voices keep blaming the uncertainty caused by the question of Quebec's sovereignty. Why was Canada's and not Quebec's credit rating for Canadian debt in foreign currency downgraded by Moody's?

The facts are all there. Canada's finances are in poor shape mainly because of the incompetence of the present government, which did not have the nerve to bring down a budget that generates confidence among foreign investors. Let the federal

government act responsibly, for a change, when handling the financial and economic affairs of this country.

\* \* \*

[English]

### FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, in the 1993 forest industry in B.C. report Price Waterhouse advised that after several years of losses the British Columbia forest industry earned a profit of \$520 million on sales of \$14.3 billion and 215 million trees were planted in addition to the 275,000 hectares of land reclassified to satisfactorily restocked.

The forest industry in British Columbia directly and indirectly employs over a quarter of a million people, some 18 per cent of B.C.'s workforce. Across Canada the industry is the mainstay of 346 communities including 116 in British Columbia. Of the 116 several are in my own riding of Cariboo—Chilcotin.

As we enter the 21st century we need Canada to remain a world leader in forestry. This will not happen unless governments and the public take pride in what Canada does best by offering support to forestry workers as well as taking the benefits of what they provide.

Forestry is the main industry in the country. Let us salute all who work in the forest industry providing jobs and financial stability to small—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing.

\* \* \*

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, prior to the last election the Liberals promised repeatedly that they would scrap the GST. We know this tax has hurt lower and middle income Canadians, small and medium sized businesses, and has cost hundreds of thousands of Canadians their jobs. We need a tax system which is more unfair, not more unfair, and we deserve a government which keeps its promises.

What does this new Liberalspeak mean? It means applying GST to food and prescription drugs. It wants to tax families on the bread they eat and on the prescription drugs they buy for their children. Yet it leaves the sales of stocks and bonds free of GST.

How perverse can this be? Once again the rich get a break and the middle and lower income Canadians get hit. That is Liberal tax reform.

The government should earnestly search for a more progressive system of taxation which closes loopholes for the wealthy and large profitable corporations and gives middle and lower income Canadians a break. Most of all the government should stop breaking its election promises.

S. O. 31

### THE LATE CONSTABLE TODD BAYLIS

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Constable Todd Baylis, the Toronto police officer tragically killed in the line of duty last Thursday night.

Todd was a resident of my riding. The 25-year old policeman was liked by co-workers and neighbours. He was intelligent, popular and faced a bright future with his fiancée, Janice Graham. Todd was a true life hero and role model.

Constable Todd Baylis was a young man who had his life taken by the senseless, brutal action of a criminal who should never have been on the streets. He was the second officer killed in the line of duty since 1984.

On behalf of all Canadians I offer my deepest sympathy to Todd's family, fiancée and co-workers.

\* \* \*

(1415)

### CANADA

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, as this House nears the summer recess may I extend to you our gratitude for your generosity and understanding toward all members of this House. Your quick wit and fair attitude has been appreciated.

During this session we have heard comments on Atlantic Canada, Quebec, central Canada, western Canada, B.C. and the north. I should tell you and this House that each of these components is important to my Canada and will continue to be. My Canada has no greater province or people nor does it have any lesser province or people. It is but one Canada and one people, equal in every way.

According to a recent poll 61 per cent of Canadians approve the Chrétien government actions.

Mr. Speaker, to you and to all members of this House, have a great summer. May God bless Canada and all Canadians.

\* \* \*

### JUSTICE

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, it has been stated a number of times in the House that the justice system in Canada is working fine. These statements made by the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General are not, I repeat are not, the same feelings of the rank and file Canadians throughout the country.

This government's efforts to being in change and make Canada safer are mediocre at the very best. This government

*Oral Questions*

claims the answer to a lot of our problems is to bring in gun control because that is what Canadians want.

If this government is truly listening to what Canadians want then surely it is hearing the majority cry out for such things as consecutive sentencing, non-release of violent offenders, and the return of capital punishment. Or, is it only hearing the bleeding heart segment of our society? With the tinkering of legislation which is presently going on I would suggest the bleeding hearts are the only ones who are being heard.

As more policemen die, violent crime continues to rise and young offenders get bolder and bolder, very soon the voice of the majority will be heard. What will the minister do then?

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

### THE BUDGET

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, Saturday's *Globe and Mail* reported that the Minister of Finance asked his colleagues to accept new spending cuts in order to counteract the effect of rising interest rates. It seems that at a meeting on the weekend, the cabinet was split on the minister's proposal, with a number of ministers preferring to wait and see before making additional spending cuts.

Does the Minister of Finance intend to table a supplementary budget in the fall to reduce government spending by at least \$3 billion, in order to counteract rising interest rates and keep the deficit down to \$37.2 billion as announced in his budget?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, the cabinet is not split. We had a very useful meeting on the weekend. I have regular meetings with my colleagues to discuss ways to make government more effective, and I think we are seeing the results of those meetings.

As I said in this House last week and the week before, we do not intend to bring down a minibudget in the fall. As we said in the budget, we intend to present our economic forecasts in order to have a basis for consultation on the budget to be tabled next February.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to conclude from what I read in the *Globe and Mail* and from the minister's reply that his proposal for additional spending cuts was defeated by his Cabinet.

I would like to ask the minister more specifically whether he would admit that he is primarily responsible for rising interest rates and whether he realizes that these increases are a direct

result of the severe judgment passed by a financial community that is dissatisfied with the spending cuts in his last budget.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons for the increase in interest rates. First of all, this is an international phenomenon. We are seeing this not only in Canada but elsewhere as well. Of course, Canada's level of debt does not help either.

However, if we look at the past two or three weeks, clearly the rise in interest rates is due mainly to the irresponsible statements made by Jacques Parizeau and the Leader of the Opposition.

(1420)

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Instead of taking political cheap shots, I would urge the Minister of Finance, through you, Mr. Speaker, to behave more responsibly, and more specifically, I would ask him to answer the following question: If, as the minister claims, political uncertainty has caused the rise in interest rates we are experiencing today, then why does this increase not affect securities issued by the Government of Quebec and Hydro Quebec, and why does it affect securities issued by the federal government?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, probably because Quebec has been spoiled by a Liberal government for nine years, and not Canada.

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

[*English*]

Anyone who has any doubt as to the irresponsibility and effect of the statements by the Leader of the Official Opposition and the leader of the opposition in Quebec, only has to look to the statements of people from Nomura Securities from Japan, from the United States and from Germany. They indicate those statements are putting not only the political but the economic structure of this country in doubt.

We are going into a very difficult time. I ask the Leader of the Official Opposition and through him his colleague in Quebec to understand that hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs are put at stake every time they make an irresponsible statement.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party was elected on a promise to abolish the GST. In fact, this was one of the main commitments in the red book. Moreover, on May 2, the Prime Minister told this House, in

reference to the GST, and I quote: "We hate it and we will kill it". According to today's media reports, however, not only is the GST here to stay but it will be hidden in order to better extend it to basic goods and services.

After making a formal commitment to abolish the GST, how can the Minister of Finance justify the fact that his government is considering maintaining this tax in a hidden form while extending it to food, medicine and health care?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, I am told that the committee report will be presented to the House this afternoon. I am eager to read it. The member is on the finance committee and should know better than to quote newspapers before the report is even tabled in the House.

When the report is presented, we shall see—and I am very confident because the members worked very hard—whether the committee managed to replace the GST, as we promised.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Mr. Speaker, since low-income earners, the sick and the elderly will be the first victims if the GST is extended to basic foodstuffs, health care and medicine, can the finance minister explain to us, in the light of the recent unemployment insurance cutbacks for which he is primarily responsible, why his government persists in hounding the most disadvantaged members of society?

[English]

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, the member keeps making reference to a finance committee report which is going to be submitted to the House.

I hope at the same time the committee report is submitted that Bloc Québécois members will be giving us their views. I hope that unlike the previous question those views will be constructive and not simply destructive.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

During the election campaign Reformers said we would cut spending, balance the budget and then get rid of the GST. The Prime Minister said he would scrap the GST. He said: "We hate it and we will kill it".

Does the Deputy Prime Minister and her government still adhere to this policy?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

(1425)

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we are going to adhere to our time schedule today with answers like that.

### Oral Questions

Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit it was irresponsible for her party to campaign on a promise of scrapping the GST when it has no plans to make the spending cuts necessary to really get rid of the GST?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the only party that has done a 360 degree turn on its position on the GST is the party to which the hon. member opposite belongs. His leader campaigned in favour of the GST. However when he read the public opinion polls, he turned around and campaigned against it.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, 360 degrees puts us back where we started.

It is obvious the Liberal government plans to introduce the son of GST, an allegedly new tax with a new name that will be called the value added tax. I predict that if this becomes government policy, very soon Canadians will be calling it the very awful tax, just as they do in Great Britain. If the biggest change to the GST is just its name, this is a betrayal of Liberal campaign promises.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister admit that she has created a political hot potato because she has not been clear with the Canadian taxpayers and is now trying to double talk her way out of an election promise?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the only party that has been double talking the Canadian taxpayers is the party opposite.

The Liberal Party campaigned on a promise of getting rid of the GST. From the very moment the Prime Minister made that promise, he told the Canadian people very honestly that when the GST was abolished it would have to be replaced by something. The report we are going to read this afternoon will underline the contents of various options which will be examined by cabinet and by the Prime Minister.

I can say one thing. There is one person in this House who fully intends to live up to every promise he made. He is the Prime Minister of Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, according to Statistics Canada figures published in the daily *La Presse*, Ottawa makes overpays native band councils by over \$1.2 billion every year. This money is paid to over 70,000 apparently non-existent natives and represents nearly one quarter of the overall \$5.5 billion budget allocated annually by Ottawa to native communities.

My question is for the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs. Can the minister confirm this report?



## Oral Questions

[English]

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I read the article in *La Presse*. It is a very respected paper, but a very speculative article. It was based on a 1991 Statistics Canada examination. Even in that article it will be noted that Statistics Canada was unable to get reports from 78 First Nations.

In 1993 a corporate management group was put together with the bottom line of better fiscal regimes, a better basis for this type of interplay between ministries. There have been difficulties.

As my friend knows, in the last eight or nine years there has been a tremendous population explosion. The birth rate on reserves is twice that of the non-aboriginal birth rate. With respect to the C-31 returnees, when we passed the legislation the speculation was that perhaps there would be a 10 per cent increase on reserve. In fact, it is almost 40 per cent.

Not all these things are done strictly on numbers. It is more an art form than a science. When we build a road, put in a health service or look at a school, we are looking to the future. If a band has 250 when it should have 300, or 350 when it should have 300, we are still going to go with the project. We look at the project more than the numbers.

I want to assure the hon. member this government is not in the business of giving money to non-existent, non-aboriginal people.

[Translation]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, does the minister not agree that the only way to determine the native population on reserves is by ensuring that Statistics Canada census takers have access to these lands?

(1430)

[English]

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with the member. He probably knows me well enough now that when I put out money I want to see a product and I am looking for stricter fiscal regimes.

As part of self-government negotiations we are looking at those things. There may be more freedom as far as jurisdiction is concerned but there has to be more strict fiscal regimes, improved fiscal responsibility and a better database synchronizing the collection of the data so that it comes in at one time. This will ensure there are stricter regimes, not only for aboriginal people but for the employees at DIAND who are doing the analysis. I agree with him. It is there. It is being studied. There will be work plans out that my friend can examine because the First Nations will be examining them over the next two or three years.

## IMMIGRATION

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, the minister of immigration has on several occasions said that immigrants who commit crimes are few and far between.

This is no comfort to the family of Constable Todd Baylis of the Toronto police department who was gunned down last week by an immigrant who had been ordered deported in March 1991.

Can the minister tell the House how it is that after having been ordered out of the country and after having an appeal denied, this 10-time repeat criminal could still be in Canada to commit the terrible crime for which he is now charged?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minister of immigration and all members of the House, I want to express our real sympathy for the very tragic circumstances and give all our condolences to the family of Constable Baylis who was tragically killed on the weekend.

As the House knows, the minister of immigration has just introduced new immigration legislation which is designed specifically to provide for more effective tools of enforcement. I am told by him that his department was successful in both getting a deportation order and also having any recourse to appeal dismissed.

However, the hon. member should recognize that in many cases and in particular this case the Canadian government has difficulty in obtaining travel documents from other countries to which the deportee has been assigned. As a result the minister of immigration is now seriously investigating this case to ensure that these kinds of practices do not continue.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, we do appreciate the concern on the government side but this just continues to happen week after week after week. We bring in examples of this.

I believe these particular reforms would have had no effect in this case. Clinton Gayle was ordered deported but that order, like thousands more, was not carried out.

Under this minister, staff on the front lines have been cut and as a result only 40 per cent of deportation orders are being carried out. There are now only 30 officers responsible for the deportation of 40,000 illegal immigrants in Toronto.

Will the minister admit that his alleged deportation reforms are virtually useless because of his cuts to enforcement and he will accept accountability for this latest, needless tragedy.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I would if I might be allowed to repeat one important fact in this case. The government did obtain a deportation order. However, in order to have deportation orders

carried out we must rely on the co-operation of both the country of origin and also air lines.

Apparently in this case the co-operation was not forthcoming. That is why we are carrying out an investigation. The new enforcement rules built into the new legislation can be of some substantial assistance.

In the specific question of the hon. member, it is not true that the effect of this case was as a result of any cutbacks in enforcement. The restructuring has been going on to reduce the amount of money assigned to administration. It has no impact whatsoever on field staff who are the key players in this kind of operation.

We are trying to cut back on the administrative bureaucratic side so resources can be freed up for more effective enforcement.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### JOB DEVELOPMENT

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

(1435)

Last Thursday, as part of a concerted effort, nearly 1,000 groups, civic and community organizations as well as national coalitions in Quebec signed a letter to the Minister of Human Resources Development urging him to: "maintain the regular component of the job development program as long as no other alternative has been put in place".

Does the minister intend to follow up this pressing demand from the signatory organizations, given the essential role these front-line organizations play in their relations with the less fortunate, and in particular people who have no jobs and no income?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to take representations from these organizations because certainly I agree with the hon. member that they play a very important role in helping to combat unemployment.

However I would like to point out to the hon. member, as I have in the past, that we have been looking at alternatives. One of the most important reallocations, redirections, we have been making is to target specifically the problem of youth unemployment.

#### Oral Questions

We all recognize the great tragedy that takes place when young people are unable to get the resources they need to be properly trained, to have access to the workplace, to make that transition between school and work.

Yes, we are making some reallocations but because of the very deep and serious plight of young people, it is a very worthy objective. We will certainly meet with these groups to discuss how they can assist in helping us to meet that objective.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, does the minister not realize on the one hand that these groups have developed an extremely valuable expertise in employability, and in particular in the employability of young people, and on the other hand, as they say, that cuts in programs to develop job skills readiness jeopardize the very existence of essential services to those who have been hit hard, often the hardest, by the last recession?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, just to make the record clear, in fiscal 1994-95, the year we are in now, we have allocated over \$800 million of funds specifically for the province of Quebec. That is an increase over last year. There have been no cutbacks. We have increased the funds and we are devoting a substantial proportion of federal expenditures.

I must say that I am very pleased to have the member, the very outstanding and very competent critic for employment matters from the Bloc Quebecois, once again requesting federal involvement and federal resources for employment in Quebec.

\* \* \*

#### GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is using public opinion polls to justify the imposition of harsher gun controls against law-abiding Canadians in his effort to reduce the criminal use of firearms. These same opinion polls support the return of capital punishment.

Is the minister consistent in his adherence to public demand or does he heed it only when it fits his own personal philosophy and that of the Liberal cabinet?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, no part of the government's justice agenda is determined or established by public opinion polls.

Our focus during the six months that Parliament has been in session has been in fulfilling the undertakings we made during the campaign by introducing legislation to strengthen the Young Offenders Act, by strengthening the sentencing laws and by

*Oral Questions*

introducing last week a bill that included literally 100 amendments to the Criminal Code to improve and modernize it.

The hon. member raises the question of capital punishment. We ran for election last year on a very specific platform in justice matters. This government, instead of looking at polls as suggested by the hon. member, is concentrating on fulfilling those commitments.

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, the former government that refused to listen to the people is now sitting with two people in behind us. I suggest that he should be listening to the people.

My supplementary question is this. In light of the shooting death of Toronto police constable, Todd Baylis, and in view of the consistent public demand for the return of capital punishment, would the minister be willing to support a binding referendum on capital punishment, tying it in with the next federal election to eliminate the cost?

(1440)

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, let me say two things. First of all we were elected last year on a platform which did not include the restoration of capital punishment.

As recently as seven years ago the House debated capital punishment at length and on a free vote decided it should not be restored. That is the first observation.

Second, the hon. member speaks of consistency. I would ask him to be consistent. He has referred to the tragic case of last Thursday in which a police officer was shot to death. Preliminary indications are that the weapon used in that murder was a hand gun that was stolen from someone who owned it lawfully and had it registered. Now if that is not further indication of the need for gun control, I would like to hear what is.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PROGRAM FOR OLDER WORKER ADJUSTMENT**

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development. On June 3, the House was presented with a private member's bill to modify the program for older worker adjustment. This bill was intended to make companies that lay off more than 20 workers eligible, thus ending the discrimination against Montreal textile, clothing and retail workers in particular.

Can the Minister of Human Resources Development tell us why his department refuses to modify POWA to benefit Montreal workers, when he presented a bill extending eligibility for fishery workers? What justifies this double standard?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, one thing of which the hon. member should be aware is that the specific program for older workers is a joint federal-provincial program run by both levels of government.

Any changes we would want to contemplate would have to be done in close consultation and co-operation with the provinces. It certainly would be one of the major agenda items we would pursue during our discussion of social security reform.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us if he agrees with his colleague, the member for Saint-Léonard and government whip, that POWA should be universal and have no eligibility criteria for laid off workers?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member points out, the private member's comments came from our chief whip. I have learned over my 22 years of parliamentary experience never to disagree with the chief whip.

\* \* \*

**GREAT LAKES SPORT FISHERY**

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The fishing industry on the Great Lakes is used by four million anglers, generates \$2 billion to \$4 billion annually and supports some 75,000 full time jobs.

Now there is evidence to suggest that the sea lamprey eel is making a strong comeback in the Great Lakes. What is being done by the government to address this problem before it gets totally out of hand?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is right. The Great Lakes sport fishery is a multibillion dollar industry and it ought to be acknowledged by the Government of Canada when it makes policies in fisheries and oceans.

For that reason I am pleased to announce on behalf of the government today a 33 per cent increase in our financial commitment to preserving this multibillion dollar industry.

The control program comes under a joint U.S.-Canada commission. Recently I had discussions with the U.S. ambassador to discuss this matter, among others, and I am confident that the United States will announce a similar increase on their side as well.

*Oral Questions***GUN CONTROL***[Translation]*

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

In the wake of the tragic murder of Constable Todd Baylis, the Solicitor General stated that the killing pointed out the need for tighter gun control. Yet information released in the wake of the shooting indicates that the man who apparently shot Constable Baylis was already in illegal possession of the gun.

Could the minister advise the House how tighter gun control would have prevented the shooting?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I rely on press reports in pointing out that the weapon used in the crime was a handgun.

(1445)

The indications as I said earlier at least preliminary are that the handgun was initially purchased by a person with lawful intent who registered it according to the law, had it in a residence from which it was stolen.

I invite the hon. member to observe with me the logical connection between the presence of that handgun in a community from which it was taken by someone with criminal intent and the fact that it wound up allegedly being used in the commission of a murderous crime. The connection is quite obvious.

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Mr. Speaker, my supplemental is also for the Minister of Justice.

In a recent joint sting operation by a number of Ontario police departments, 17 handguns were purchased illegally. Sixteen of these guns were illegally smuggled into Canada from the United States.

How would a total ban on handguns prevent criminals from getting their hands on guns?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, it is implicit in the hon. member's question that the government intends to look at just one and not all aspects of this issue.

Indeed we have already started to examine specific aspects of the smuggling issue. We do intend to address it effectively and with concrete action but that is only one aspect. It is not only smuggling guns. It is also people with criminal intent stealing weapons from those who lawfully own them in Canada that is a threat to the safety of our communities.

**AIR TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. The status of French at airports has not improved much since Quebec aviation workers waged their famous fight and managed 20 years ago to obtain the right to communicate in French in Quebec airspace. Let us take, for example, a Transport Canada order on air navigation which barely tolerates the use of French at Canadian airports.

Since the ability to speak in both official languages is at the heart of the Canadian duality, how can the minister justify banning the use of French in air traffic operations in Canada, except in Quebec, while closing Quebec City's terminal control unit, one of only two French-language air control centres in Canada?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, if my hon. colleague wanted to be frank with the House of Commons, he would know that 99 per cent of all flights in Quebec airspace are served in the pilot's language of choice. However, when airplanes are flying at an altitude of more than 29,000 feet, there may be, at a certain point, a lack of communications in French.

In general, these airplanes are flying to destinations outside Quebec where they will have to operate in English on arrival. It is the Department of Transport's fiduciary and primary responsibility to ensure the safety of the people using Canada's transportation system, and if the hon. member wants to fight for bilingualism, I would ask him not to do so on the backs of the people who use Canada's transportation system.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, does the minister admit that only Montreal and Quebec City are certified by his department as bilingual and that, as a result, Moncton's radar control unit, although located in a bilingual province, is not in a position to offer services in French in some regions of New Brunswick and Quebec, namely the North Shore and the Magdalen Islands?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for my hon. colleague's information that 99 per cent of flights in Quebec airspace can be guided in the pilot's language of choice. I know how much the hon. member and his opposition colleagues are interested in Moncton and in the French fact outside Quebec. I know how much they are really interested in ensuring that services are provided in both languages outside Quebec. We know what kind of support they have given us on this issue historically.

*Oral Questions*

(1450)

*[English]***YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

The operation of the juvenile justice system's results as seen by average Canadians seems overly protective of young offenders. The Young Offenders Act has extensive rules of non-disclosure, secrecy and the destruction of records.

Will the minister explain to Canadians why there is a need for this inequity between the juvenile system and the adult system, for surely justice must be seen to be done as well as done?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that the juvenile justice system in Canada was developed through many years and was provided for in a statute in 1984 which had the support of all parties in this House when the Young Offenders Act was enacted.

The underlying principle is that the distinctions to which the hon. member has referred are appropriate when we are dealing with youth who have their lives in front of them, who are particularly appropriate for rehabilitation efforts.

At the same time, as we undertook to do last year when we campaigned for office, we have now introduced in Bill C-37 proposals for specific amendments to strengthen that statute, to deal with 16 and 17 year olds who commit the crimes of most serious violence in a particular way that will presume they are to be tried in adult court, to share the information with school boards, principals of schools and members of the community when there are young offenders who are accused or suspected of crimes that might endanger the public safety, and make a variety of other changes including increasing the maximum sentence for murder.

This government with those proposed changes in my respectful view has proposed to strengthen the Young Offenders Act while preserving the main elements of juvenile justice.

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, could this minister cite any cases in which there has been harm which has given rise to the necessity of the secrecy provisions of the Young Offenders Act, for in contrast on occasions I have mentioned in this House where there has been death as a direct result of the misguided Liberal idealism?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that a relative handful of crimes each year for which there are convictions in youth courts involve serious crimes of violence or homicides. The vast majority of crime among young people is non-violent, either property related or crimes of theft.

The provisions to which the hon. member refers are intended to ensure that when young people make a mistake of that character, yes they are punished and yes they have learned a lesson, but they are not through the publication of their names in the media stigmatized for life, prevented from completing their education or from gaining employment. Surely that is in the public interest in this country.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***LOCAL TRAINING BOARDS**

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The federal government is about to announce the creation of local training boards in Ontario. Will the minister assure this House that the membership of these local boards will reflect the spirit of Bill 8 in Ontario regarding the provision of services in French, and will he ensure a fair and proportional representation of Ontario francophones on these boards?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier for his question and also congratulate him for his many years of efforts to protect the rights of francophones everywhere in Canada.

Indeed, we are currently discussing the establishment of local training boards with the Ontario government, and with all the other provincial governments.

These boards will include representatives from the business sector, unions, social groups and educational institutions. I can tell you that I will make sure that there is a fair and proportional representation of francophones on these boards in Ontario.

\* \* \*

**MASS LAYOFFS**

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development, and he surely does not have a prepared response because I did not give him the question in advance.

The industrial base of the Sorel-Tracy region has been collapsing for the past ten years, and dramatic plant closures have become everyday occurrences. After MIL Tracy, Tioxide and Beloit came the news recently that Soreltex was closing. The pressing needs resulting from these many shutdowns drove the Sorel Employment Centre in April to ask the department for an additional \$2.2 million to offset the demand generated by these mass layoffs.

(1455)

Given the urgency of this situation, can the minister pledge to allocate these funds immediately from the \$400 million which he has earmarked for launching new programs?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, if I recall properly, the hon. member was a member of the previous government at the time when the downsizing of that particular industrial operation took place. It would seem to me if there was any urgency with dealing with the problem it should have been dealt with at that time.

[Translation]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, such a pat answer—I was a member of the Conservative Party until 1990. I refer to a situation in the Sorel–Tracy region in 1994, and the only answer I get is an arrogant, typically Liberal response.

I am asking you, Mr. Minister, if you are prepared to re-establish—

**The Speaker:** Order. I would ask the hon. member to always address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister prepared to re-establish the specific program for mass layoffs, given that the funds required to meet these needs have been drawn from the general account for some time? Can the minister re-establish this mass layoff fund to meet the needs of the Sorel–Tracy region, for example?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the hon. member for the workers affected. The point I was trying to make is that good industrial labour policy is to establish proper programs at a time when companies begin to downsize, not when it reaches a crisis proportion.

I think the hon. member as a full and active member of this House during the time of the previous government of which he was member should have ensured at that time that those measures were put in place.

At present we will certainly look at the issue. I would suggest—

[Translation]

I would suggest to the member that he is concerned about workers in his riding, so he has asked me a specific question and made specific proposals. It is not by asking questions in the

### Oral Questions

House. Give me reasons, not a discussion between two people. This is not something you can get through a question.

\* \* \*

[English]

### LOBBYISTS

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister announced the appointment of an ethics counsellor. The ethics counsellor is merely a slight expansion of the assistant deputy registrar general's previous role; the same job, the same person, a new name.

The lobby reforms changed tier one and tier two lobbyists into consultant and organization lobbyists; the same role, a new name.

Does the Prime Minister or the deputy really believe that these cosmetic changes will solve the problems of influence peddling in government decision making?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, the level of understanding that was demonstrated by the member in his speech the other day perhaps is explained by the fact that he did not attend the briefing session that we offered Reform members on the bill.

He should know that influence peddling is covered under the Criminal Code where it belongs and where it will stay with other criminal offences.

With respect to both the role of the ethics counsellor and the introduction of the amendments to the Lobbyists Registration Act, we have met the promises that we made in the red book almost item by item. We did retain the distinction between tiers of lobbyists. We put this proposal to a House of Commons committee before second reading hopefully so that somebody on the other side as well as our own members will take the time to study it and make useful proposals. If he has something to offer let him offer it.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to offer that. I would like to know right now whether this government is ready to put some teeth into its actions at the level that it is proposing.

(1500)

Many believe that the ongoing Pearson negotiations are at least as unethical as the original deal and that the negotiations now deserve to be investigated.

Can we have the assurance that the Prime Minister will direct the ethics counsellor to launch an immediate and total investigation into all of the Pearson negotiations with all of the findings to be made public?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Pearson deal and the cancellation of the agreement, the investigation and the judgment that was brought to that deal by the people of Canada speaks for itself. There are

*Speaker's Ruling*

33 members of Parliament who understand very well as the people of the greater Toronto area understand very well what Pearson was all about. We did not need an ethics counsellor to tell us that.

\* \* \*

**TRADE**

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of International Trade.

Over the past 25 years more than 1.5 billion disposable plastic lighters have been imported into Canada from the Orient. If laid end to end that is enough to circle the world three times. These cannot be recycled and Canadian taxpayers have to pay the cost of putting them into landfill sites.

The Eddy Match subsidiary, Canadian Splint, is closing and 56 people in the Pembroke area will be losing their jobs. No more wooden matches are made in Canada as a result of this unfair competition.

What action is the government going to take to stop this flooding of the Canadian market and the destruction of Canadian jobs and the environment?

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It reflects his ongoing concern about environmental issues in our country, particularly the question of how best to dispose of unrecyclable materials, those materials which do not lend themselves readily to recycling.

I want to salute the member for drawing to our attention this question which has been of concern to the government as it addresses in the environmental arena such concerns as he has raised today. I only add that it is not a matter primarily of trade policy but rather a matter of environmental policy as we address these questions.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Dr. Carlos Saul Menem, President of the Argentine Republic.

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

\* \* \*

**POINT OF ORDER**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley

on Friday, June 17, 1994. It concerns the appointment of the hon. member for Yukon as an associate member of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development during the committee's consideration of Bill C-33, the Yukon First Nation's land claim settlement act, and Bill C-34, an act respecting self-government for First Nations in the Yukon Territory.

At this time I would also like to thank the hon. members for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Kamloops, Mississauga South, Roberval, and The Battlefords—Meadow Lake for their valuable contributions to this discussion.

[*Translation*]

As was pointed out, Speakers have always been hesitant to interfere in the proceedings of committees of the House.

(1505)

However, as Speaker Fraser explained in a ruling on March 26, 1990 at page 9756 of the *Debates*:

The Speaker has often informed the House that matters and procedural issues that arise in committee ought to be settled in committee unless the committee reports them first to the House. I have, however, said to the House that this practice was not an absolute one and that in very serious and special circumstances the Speaker may have to pronounce on a committee matter without the committee having reported to the House.

[*English*]

In the matter now before us I must also conclude that this is serious enough to require the intervention of the Chair because it concerns a fundamental right which belongs to the House and not to a committee, namely the right to establish the membership of a committee. Furthermore, the committee has reported to the House on the said bills and the proceedings of the committee are now before the House.

Let me now address the concerns raised by the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

First, the hon. member, citing Standing Order 114(2)(c), argued that since the hon. member for Yukon was not an associate member of the committee she could not be appointed a substitute member. Second, the hon. member noted that he had raised objection to the acceptance of the member for Yukon as an associate member but that this objection had been dismissed by the chair of the committee. Third, the member argued that a breach of the standing orders had occurred and that the remedy to deal with this breach of the rules was not to be found inside the committee.

Finally the hon. member requested that the Speaker take certain actions specifically. He asked that the reports of the committee concerning the legislation presented on Friday, June 17, 1994 be ruled out of order and that the committee therefore be required to reconduct the clause by clause examination of the bills in question. Arguing that the chair of the committee had knowingly allowed the rules of the House to be broken, he also demanded that the current chair of the committee resign and that

*Speaker's Ruling*

another be chosen to preside over the re-examination of the bills.

Having reviewed the interventions of all members on Friday as well as the minutes and transcripts of the committee proceedings, and also having consulted with the table, I am satisfied that the difficulties which arose in the committee were the product of an erroneous interpretation of Standing Order 114. The advice given to the chair of the committee concerning the procedure for substitution of members was incorrect and unfortunately the actions taken by the chair were based on this advice. May I also add that in no way was the hon. member for Yukon at fault in this matter.

[*Translation*]

While it is a tradition of this House that committees are masters of their own proceedings, they cannot establish procedures which go beyond the powers conferred upon them by the House. For example, a committee must seek the permission of the House to travel as they themselves are not so empowered. Likewise, committees do not have the power to establish or change their membership. This power is retained by the House and, in the present situation, is spelled out explicitly in Standing Order 104(4) which states:

(4) The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs shall also prepare lists of associate members for each Standing Committee and Standing Joint Committee referred to in this Standing Order, who shall be deemed to be members of that committee for the purposes of Standing Orders 108(1)(b) and 114(2)(a) and who shall be eligible to act as substitutes on that committee pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 114(2)(b).

[*English*]

Any report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs made pursuant to this standing order must be concurred in by the House for such an associate membership change to be effective. As no report appointing the hon. member for Yukon an associate member had been presented by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and thus no such report had been concurred in by the House, the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley was absolutely correct when he stated that the hon. member for Yukon did not meet the requirements as an associate member of the committee under the standing orders in order to function as a member of the committee.

(1510)

[*Translation*]

Under the rules of the House, all members are free to participate in the proceedings of committees, within clearly stated parameters. As Standing Order 119 reads:

119. Any Member of the House who is not a member of a standing, special or legislative committee may, unless the House or the committee concerned otherwise orders, take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but may not vote or move any motion, nor be part of any quorum.

[*English*]

As well, citation 766(1) of Beauchesne's sixth edition notes that members of the House who are not members of a committee may participate during the committee's examination of witnesses, but they do so usually at the discretion of the chairman and the committee.

Several members noted in their remarks that it was not the presence or the participation of the hon. member for Yukon in the work of the committee that was in question. In fact several even noted that since she is the only representative in this House for Yukon her contribution was valuable. Rather, what was in question, as the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley noted was that in allowing the hon. member for Yukon to vote in the committee the standing orders of the House had been breached.

[*Translation*]

The problems presented by the proceedings in this committee have served to illuminate for us possible difficulties with the understanding of the new rules regarding associate memberships of committees and the methods for choosing substitutes, particularly, as in this instance, where the active participation of a certain member could be extremely beneficial to the work of both the committee and the House.

[*English*]

The members of the committee are to be commended for wishing to include the hon. member for Yukon in their deliberations on matters which directly affect her constituents. However, it is incumbent upon the members of all committees to ensure that proper procedures are followed. This said, I must concur with the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley that by allowing a member to vote who, under the rules of this House, did not legitimately have status as a committee member, the standing orders were indeed breached.

I must therefore rule that any vote cast by the hon. member for Yukon in the committee proceedings on Bills C-33 and C-34 is void as she did not have the right to participate in any of the votes.

The hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley has also argued that because the proceedings in the committee had been irregular, the report should be irreceivable. However, as the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell pointed out, none of the votes taken in the committee would have been altered by the vote of any single member. Having reviewed the minutes of the committee I must agree with this conclusion. Therefore, I do not find grounds on which to declare the reports out of order. Hence, the House can proceed with the report stage of these bills.



*Routine Proceedings*

I hope and I expect that all those involved with committees of the House will take note of my comments today and will make every effort to ensure that such an incident will not reoccur.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honour to table, in both official languages, the annual report entitled "Export of Military Goods from Canada: Annual Report 1993" put out by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

\* \* \*

(1515)

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and an undertaking made in this House by the minister on May 30, 1994, I would like to table on behalf of the Minister of National Defence and Veterans Affairs, in both official languages, a series of documents entitled measures taken by the Department of National Defence to address the issue of harassment in the Canadian forces.

\* \* \*

### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board a document requested in this House, a review of service provision options for the administrative flight service.

[Translation]

The report is an exhaustive review of options for the administrative flight service, in both official languages.

\* \* \*

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### FINANCES

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to this House, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Finance.

[English]

This report is about replacing the GST, options for Canada. This work could not have been accomplished without the tremendous hard work and non-partisan co-operation of all members from all parties of the finance committee.

\* \* \*

### RESERVE FORCE ACT

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-261, an act to facilitate participation in the reserve force.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for seconding this bill.

Canada is relying more on reservists to meet its military commitments and with the recent downsizing of the regular force the demand on reservists will undoubtedly increase.

The auditor general in his 1992 report to this House found that reservists had a serious training deficit when compared with trades and ranks in the regular force. He put much of this down to the reservists being unavailable for training, often due to the demands of their jobs or difficulty in scheduling time off to coincide with the training exercises and courses offered. Many reservists use their annual vacations to attend exercises essential to developing their military skills. This is a great price for them to pay and for their families to have to forfeit a well deserved vacation to serve Canada.

If we are to have an effective volunteer reserve force and if Canada is to be able to meet its international commitments we must take steps to ensure that reservists are able to get the training they need and the time required to get that training.

This bill will enable reservists employed by the federal government to be given up to a two month leave of absence to attend reserve training and exercises. This bill in a small way seeks to ensure that the Government of Canada lead the way to demonstrate leadership by ensuring that the federal government provides leadership of all Canadian employers in facilitating the development and professionalism of the Canadian reserve force.

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

*Routine Proceedings*

(1520)

*[Translation]***PETITIONS**

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to table two petitions signed by residents of eastern Quebec, mainly constituents from the ridings of Rimouski—Témiscouata and Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

The date of December 5, 1990 is imprinted on the memory of the people of eastern Quebec as the sad day when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation announced it was closing its three television stations located in Rimouski, Matane and Sept-Îles. This decision has had a very negative impact on the economy of the region. It has also limited considerably access to information.

These petitioners ask that CBC service be restored to Eastern Quebec so that the region will no longer be isolated and will be able, through this essential communication tool, to make a valuable contribution to the effective development of the francophone and Acadian communities of Canada.

*[English]*

## VIA RAIL

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present three petitions on behalf of my constituents.

The first is dealing with the suspected cancellation of the VIA Rail service from Sarnia to Toronto which is the second most patronized route in Canada. This is about the 10th petition I have presented on this.

## SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition states that the majority of Canadians pray that physicians in Canada should be working to save lives as most physicians agree and they petition we must not sanction suicide or euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition deals with the extension of societal privileges to same sex relationships and the amendments to the Human Rights Act to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation as a grounds for discrimination.

These petitioners have asked that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or Charter of Rights and Freedoms in a way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex marriages and/or allow adoptions.

*[Translation]*

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling, a petition regarding the 1990 closure of CBC's television stations in Sept-Îles, Matane and Rimouski.

According to these petitioners, this decision has had disastrous effects on the people both in terms of the economy and in terms of the right to information. It has resulted in many jobs being lost, has not produced the expected benefits as far as restoring the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's financial health is concerned, and all the while the people of Eastern Quebec have been deprived of a communication tool essential to the effective development of the community.

The petitioners ask that CBC stations in Eastern Quebec be reopened immediately.

*[English]*

## UNITED NATIONS

**Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from the residents of Brampton calling upon parliamentarians to encourage the flying of the UN flag throughout Canada in recognition of the fine work being done by our UN peacekeeping troops throughout the world.

*[Translation]*

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table a petition signed by people from the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gaspé Peninsula concerning the closure of Radio-Canada's regional stations in Matane, Rimouski and Sept-Îles.

The people who took the time to sign this petition denounce the cuts made in the regions by Radio-Canada, the French network of the CBC. I want to point out that Radio-Canada cut almost 2,000 hours of regional programming, so that regionally-produced programs have all but disappeared.

When Radio-Canada acts as it did, communities such as ours that are located far from major centres lose not only jobs but mostly a communication tool allowing us in the east to communicate with one another and tell major centres and governments about ourselves.

I therefore table this petition.

(1525)

*[English]*

## SENIORS

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, in the first instance the petitioners point out that seniors have contributed and continue to contribute significantly to the quality of life that we enjoy in Canada today. They point out that as the population ages there will be a need for more housing, more

*Routine Proceedings*

affordable and accessible health care and more appropriate and adequate pensions.

They ask government that whenever it undertakes any legislative or program changes, it reflect upon its seniors, their contributions and the changing demographics in Canada.

## MEDIA

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, in the second instance we have petitioners who condemn abuse in the media, whether it be physical abuse, abusive language or other forms of abuse. They point out that abuse often counteracts the efforts of parents to raise their children. They also point out that abuse is not necessary in order to entertain or to inform.

## VIETNAM

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition duly signed by 95 constituents from my riding of Calgary Southeast.

These 95 constituents are petitioning Parliament to use trade sanctions to urge the communist government in Hanoi, Vietnam to eliminate human rights abuses, establish a multi-party democracy by the means of free elections, respect human rights, release all political prisoners and respect religious freedom.

Finally, the petitioners urge that Parliament make representation to the United Nations High Commissioner to ensure that all Vietnamese refugees are treated with fairness and dignity.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a petition from a group of constituents who wish for the government to toughen the Young Offenders Act. It is my duty to table over 150 signatures from my riding.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present the following petition which reads in part: "Your petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the Human Rights Code to include in the prohibitive grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation."

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the duty to present two petitions today.

The first petition is from 534 constituents of the riding of Oxford. These petitioners request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of

homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibitive grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## ETHANOL

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford):** The second petition, Mr. Speaker, I present on behalf of my colleague from Kent. This petition is signed by hundreds of the constituents of Kent who call upon the government support a domestic ethanol industry in light of the fact that a \$170 million plant for Chatham is in jeopardy without federal involvement. Since legislative support of ethanol is Liberal policy, the petitioners want it to become government policy.

## ABORTION

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting six petitions on three subjects on behalf of the constituents from Cecil Lake, Tumbler Ridge, Fort St. John, Dawson Creek and other communities in the Prince George—Peace River riding.

The first two petitions call upon the House of Commons to act to extend protection to unborn children by amending the Criminal Code.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, the next two petitions request that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or to include sexual orientation explicitly in the prohibited grounds for discrimination.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, the last two petitions are petitioning Parliament to make no changes to the law which would allow or sanction assisted suicide or passive or active euthanasia.

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table today in this House a petition that circulated in my riding and in other eastern Quebec ridings. The stations in Matane, Sept-Îles and Rimouski closed down in 1990, which led to job losses and deprived the population of important communication and development vehicles.

This petition asks the federal government to reopen Radio-Canada television stations in eastern Quebec so that the population can be served well by state television. I hope that this House will take the petitioners' request into consideration.

(1530)

[English]

## BOSNIA

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition of Ayub Hamid, Kalid Igbal, Golam Kibra and 236 others who are calling upon the Government of Canada to take the lead and use its influence in the UN to take any and all actions required to restore the territorial integrity of Bosnia.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I present a petition today signed by some 1,100 constituents of Red Deer.

By signing the petition these citizens are expressing to the government their sentiments that it is time to take harsh action against young offenders. Currently our Young Offenders Act has many deficiencies. Our penalties must be designed to fit the crimes. It is my pleasure to present the petition today.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present two petitions on behalf of residents of the communities of Millgrove, Carlyle, Waterdown and Branchton in the Hamilton area of Ontario.

The first one prays that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, my second petition calls upon Parliament to ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition is primarily from constituents of my riding of Scarborough West.

It calls upon Parliament not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way that would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights act to include in the prohibited ground of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 36 to present two petitions.

*Routine Proceedings*

The first one is on behalf of my constituents in the Burns Lake area, over 900 of whom have signed petitions indicating their concern that the Canadian judicial system is not adequately maintaining law and order in the country and calling on the Government of Canada to reform the justice system in order to ensure greater protection of life and property within Canada.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition I am pleased to submit under Standing Order 36 is from several petitioners in an area known as Houston in the Prince George—Bulkley Valley constituency.

Fundamentally the petitioners humbly pray that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way and uphold the Supreme Court of Canada decision on September 30, 1993 to disallow assisted suicide or euthanasia.

## KILLER CARDS

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present three petitions today.

The first was delivered to me by Cathie Raddatz, a constituent in my riding of Victoria—Haliburton, Ontario. Cathie was able to gather over 400 names on a petition which calls on Parliament to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of killer cards in Canada among other things.

The second petition was signed by numerous constituents at my riding office. It also calls on Parliament to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of killer cards in Ontario.

## YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition was sent to me by another constituent, Anne Bridgewater, of Harcourt, Ontario.

This petition, duly recognized by the clerk of petitions, humbly calls on Parliament to review and revise our laws concerning young offenders by empowering the courts to prosecute and punish young law breakers who are terrorizing our society, by releasing their names and lowering their age limit to allow prosecution to meet the severity of the crime.

[Translation]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues from Rimouski—Témiscouata, Matapédia—Matane, Gaspé and Charlevoix, I am presenting a petition for restoring Radio-Canada as it was before 1990. A great many losses have been caused by these closures, financial losses, of course, job losses and maybe most important, information losses. As politicians, we have a duty to promote our regions, but when the flow of information keeps getting cut off, how do you expect us to sell a region when we do not have the means to

*Routine Proceedings*

talk about it? It is important and this situation must be corrected.

On behalf of more than 1,000 people who signed the petition that I am tabling today, we ask that it be restored, as it should be anyway.

(1535)

[*English*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, pursuant to Standing Order 36, a petition which has been duly executed by constituents residing in the municipality of Victoria, British Columbia.

The petition opposes euthanasia and assisted suicide and prays that Parliament will not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code.

I support the petition and now table it with the honourable House.

## RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition from residents of Fraser Valley West with which I wholeheartedly concur.

The petition asks that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

[*Translation*]

## AIR TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert):** Mr. Speaker, Transport Canada changed the route for seaplanes using the Lac Saint-Augustin base. This new route is very inconvenient for residents of the Jouvence area in my riding. Accordingly, the petitioners ask Transport Canada to review its decision of April 28.

[*English*]

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions.

The first is from 154 constituents in my riding who humbly submit that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the human rights act, or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 50 constituents who humbly submit that section 24 of the Criminal Code of Canada not be repealed or amended in any way and that the section disallowing assisted suicide be upheld as it recently was in the Rodriguez Supreme Court decision.

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to table this petition, which is a heartfelt appeal from more than 500 citizens, mostly from the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, who call for the necessary action to be taken so that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation reopens the television stations in eastern Quebec that were closed in 1990. All in all, we have tabled more than 4,000 signatures in the House this afternoon to overturn this iniquitous decision of the former government.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Questions Nos. 48 and 53 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 48—**Mr. Simmons:**

With respect to the Auditor General's finding in his 1992 report that, for 1989 and 1990, the Canadian Coast Guard's "search and rescue vessels and aircraft were instrumental in incident resolution less than 20 per cent of the time", (a) what specific action has the Department of Transport taken to redress this, (b) will the use of other federal and non-federal resources, such as the Canadian Marine Rescue Auxiliary, be expanded, and (c) will a set of search and rescue service standards, and a national search and rescue program, be developed in full, as recommended by the Auditor General?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** (a) and (c) The Canadian Coast Guard has established levels of service, as well as comprehensive operating and performance standards. In 1992, the national search and rescue program concept was approved by the lead minister for search and rescue, the Minister of National Defence. The Coast Guard continues to look for ways to improve the effectiveness of the national search and rescue program in order to save as many lives as possible. Figures for 1992 indicate that primary Coast Guard search and rescue vessels responded to over 41 per cent of all marine search and rescue taskings in Canada and saved the lives of 1,200 persons in distress.

*Routine Proceedings*

(b) The Canadian Marine Rescue Auxiliary provides invaluable assistance to mariners in distress. Expansion of the membership and capability of the auxiliary is a goal of both the Coast Guard and the auxiliary.

**Question No. 53—Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):**

What are the names of the Indian Bands, (a) which have their financial affairs fully managed by the Department of Indian Affairs, (b) that are under the alternative funding arrangement?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** (a) No first Nations have their funds fully managed by the department.

(b) A current list of the 156 AFA recipients is shown below. Each year an updated list is published in Part III of the main estimates. It appears on pages 2–112 to 2–115 of the 1994–1995 estimates.

## Indian Organizations under an Alternative Funding Arrangement

Abegweit Band	Flying Post Band	Mikisew Cree Band	Sagamok Aneshnawbek Band
Akwesasne Band	Flying Dust Band	Mississauga of The Credit Band	Saint Mary's Band
Alderville Band	Fort Folly Band	Mississauga of Scugog Band	Saint John River Valley TC **4 bands**
Alexander Band	Fort Alexander Band	Mississauga Band	Sakimay Band
Ashcroft Band	Fort Severn Band	MLDC Mgmt Co **8 bands**	Saskatoon District Tribal Council **7 bands**
Athabasca Tribal Council **5 bands**	Fountain Band	Montagnais du lac St-Jean Band	Saulteaux Band
Attawapiskat Education Authority	Fox Lake Band	Montagnais de les Escoumins Band	Seine River Band
Barren Lands Band	Gitksan Wet'Suwet'in Loc. Serv. Soc. **9 bands**	Moose Deer Point Band	Selkirk First Nation Band
Bear River Band	Gitwinskihkw Band	Moose Factory Band	Serpent River Band
Beardy's & Okemasis Band	Heiltsuk Band	Mushkegowuk TC **6 bands** *1 Association**	Shamattawa Band
Bearskin Lake Band	Henvey Inlet Band	Muskeg Lake Band	Shibogama TC **5 bands**
Betsiamites Band	Hiawatha Band	Muskoday Band	Siksika Nation Band
Big Island Band	Horton Band	Na-Cho NY'A'k Dun Band	Skidegate Band
Big Grassy Band	Iskut Band	Naicathewen Band	Southern First Nations Secretariat **7 bands**
Bimose Tribal Council **10 bands**	Kahnawake Band	Nak'azdli Band	Stanjikoming First Nation Band
Boothroyd Band	Kasabonika Band	Nanaimo Band	Starblanket Band
Buffalo Point First Nation Band	Kashechewan Band	Nation Huronne Wendat Band	Stoney Tribe Band
Burnt Church Band	Keewatin Tribal Council **11 bands**	Nipissing Band	Sucker Creek Band
Campbell River Band	Kettle Stoney Point Band	North Coast Tribal Council **6 bands**	Swampy Cree Tribal Council **7 bands**
Canim Lake Band	King Fisher Band	North Shore Micmac D.C. **7 bands**	Swan Lake Band
Cape Mudge Band	Kingsclear Band	North Thompson Band	Taku R./Atlin Band
Carrier Sekani TC **12 bands**	Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg Band	Norway House Band	Talleree Band
Cat Lake Band	Kluane First Nation Band	Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council **14 bands**	Tobique Band
Champagne/Aishihik Band	Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Independent School System	Ochapowace Band	Treaty 7 Tribal Council **5 bands**
Chapel Island Band	Lac La Croix Band	Ogemawahj Tribal Council **6 bands**	Tsuu T'ina Nation Band
Chapleau Cree First Nation Band	Lac Simon Band	Ojibway 1850 Treaty Council **8 bands**	Uashat et Malietenam Band
Cheslatta Carrier Nation Band	Lac La Ronge Band	Okanese Band	United Chiefs & Councils of Manitoulin **5 Bands**
Chippewas of Sarnia Band	Lake Nipigon Band	Old Masset Village Council	Wapekeka Band
Chippewas of Rama Band	Lake Babine Band	Onegaming Band	Washagamis Bay Band
Chippewas of the Thames Band	Lake Kw'alaams Band	Onyota'A:Ka Band	Weenusk Band
Couchiching Band	Lennox Island Band	Opaskawayak Cree Nation Band	West Bay First Nation Band
Crane River Band	Lesser Slave Lake Indian Reg. Council **9 bands**	Opasquiak Ed. Auth. Inc. **1 Band**	Westbank Band
Cross Lake Band	Lheit Liten First Nation Band	Peguis Band	Whitefish River Band
Curve Lake Band	Lillooet Band	Peter Ballantyne Band	Williams Lake Band
Dakota Ojibway T.C. **8 bands**	Lower Kootenay Band	Pikangikum Band	Wunnumin Lake Band
Dakota Tipi Band	Mainland Micmacs **6 Bands**	Poplar Hill Band	Yellowhead Tribal Council **5 bands**

*Government Orders*

Dawson Band

Makwa Sahgaiehcac Band

Poundmaker Band

York Factory Band

## Indian Organizations under an Alternative Funding Arrangement

Edmundston Band

Mathias Colomb Band

Pwi-Di-Goo-Zing Ne-Yaa-Zhing

Eskasoni Band

McLoed Lake Band

Adv Serv \*\*10 Bands\*\*

First Nation Technical Institute Band

Miawpukek Band

Rainy River Band

*[English]*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask a question of the parliamentary secretary. When might we expect an answer from the government to Question No. 47 which I have had on the *Order Paper* for 47 days now?

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I thought it was Question No. 41 and I anticipated having an answer to that one tomorrow. With respect to Question No. 47, I will investigate to find out what particular problems have resulted in the delay in answering the question.

The government has been fairly diligent in its work in preparing answers to these questions, some of which involve a great deal of information. I will see what I can do to provide a response to the hon. member later this week.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

(1540)

*[Translation]***EXCISE TAX ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-32, an Act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Deputy Speaker:** There are three motions in amendment on the Notice Paper at report stage of Bill C-32, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act.

*[English]*

Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 will be grouped for debate and a vote on Motion No. 1 will apply to Motions Nos. 2 and 3.

*[Translation]*

I will now put Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 to the House.

## MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue)** moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-32 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-32 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-32 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have decided to table amendments to Bill C-32 and I will briefly explain why. Then my colleagues will make additional comments.

First, we must put Bill C-32, which is entitled an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act, in its proper context. Originally, the purpose of this legislation was to implement the federal action plan on tobacco smuggling, as well as changes proposed to the tax structure by the government, this past January or February.

However, clauses 2, 3 and 4 of that bill include measures which affect air transportation and result from the last federal budget. These clauses provide that, on flights with a ticket price of more than \$500, the total tax amount, which is currently \$40, will progressively increase to \$50. However, for tickets costing \$700 and more, the tax payable will now be \$50.

We feel that this is totally unacceptable, given that most remote areas were very affected by the deregulation in the air transportation sector. Considering the current cost of airline tickets to these regions, it seems totally unacceptable to

*Government Orders*

increase the burden for consumers living in these regions as well as for taxpayers who are already making a very big contribution.

This is why, through our amendments, we propose to bring that tax back to at least the previous levels. At the same time, we urge members of the transport and finance committees to review the situation and bring airfare to a more reasonable level as regards remote destinations.

Here I do not mean the Quebec, Atlantic or western regions. I am referring to regions such as mine, Abitibi—Témiscamingue, Quebec's north shore and Gaspé regions and, in fact, most regions of Quebec and northern Ontario. Several Atlantic regions will also be adversely affected by the new tax. This measure went unnoticed in the last budget and is now hidden in Bill C-32.

We propose these amendments so that the Department of Finance does not get \$24 million more this year and \$44 million more next year at the expense of taxpayers living in remote areas. Indeed, we think this is totally unacceptable. I do hope that the government will realize the impact of this bill and withdraw clauses 2, 3 and 4.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services):** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to present the government's arguments, which I find quite rational in that they will reduce the tax burden on short-haul domestic and transborder flights.

The present uniform tax of \$10 will be reduced to \$6. To increase the recovery of the cost of air transportation facilities and services, the maximum air transportation tax on domestic and transborder flights will be increased from \$40 to \$50.

I think most people would agree that there is a substantial saving nonetheless for short flights.

(1545)

The drop from \$10 to \$6, however, is not enough. In order to recover as much as possible to pay for these facilities and services, it seems essential to look for money elsewhere. So we, the government, decided to focus our efforts there.

[*English*]

Those are really the only two comments I want to make. I want to point out for those who take shorter distance flights that the tax will be reduced from \$10 to \$6, which is an important reduction. At the same time for those who will be taking longer flights it will indeed be increased to try and recuperate as much as possible to pay for public installations and services that these people are using.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Abitibi, and the residents of all remote ridings, concerning Bill C-32. This bill to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act essentially contains amendments to taxes on tobacco products and, in sections 2, 3 and 4, amendments to the air transportation tax.

It is particularly in reference to these airline ticket taxes that I would like to address the House for a few minutes, in order to show that the government has not achieved its objectives and that, in addition, regions outside the network of major population centres will be penalized.

In order to judge this new rate structure, I will take a few minutes to compare the present and proposed tax rates. The present rate consists of a basic tax of \$10—as the parliamentary secretary mentioned—on each ticket, plus 7 per cent of the price of the ticket, to a maximum of \$40. The new structure would feature a basic tax of \$6, plus 7 per cent on the price of the ticket, to a maximum of \$50 for expensive tickets.

To justify this new structure, the government cites the following objectives: first, to increase the amount of money recovered—which seems fair and legitimate—for air transportation facilities and services provided by Transport Canada; and second, to reduce the tax burden on short-haul flights to small localities. We, in remote areas of the country, are those small localities. We are directly affected, and we do not understand why the second objective could not be achieved.

This new rate structure does not achieve the targeted objectives, in particular reducing the tax burden on flights to small localities—mostly to remote areas of the country. Obviously, the new rate structure will make it possible to collect much more money to cover Transport Canada's costs. As the member for Témiscamingue put it, \$24 million more will be collected in the first year and \$44 million more in subsequent years.

This money will come primarily from the increase in the maximum tax from \$40 to \$50, notwithstanding the loss of revenue from having lowered the basic tax to \$6 from \$10. This meets the government's first objective to increase the recovery of the cost of facilities. Of course the government has another reason for introducing this new rate, and that is why we will focus mainly on the second objective, which is to reduce the tax burden on short-haul flights.

However, this objective has not been met. In fact, air transportation to remote areas has been adversely affected since deregulation, since the full cost is now being borne by these areas. The price of a ticket to some destinations has gone up considerably in recent years. For instance, Montreal-Rimouski costs \$552 plus tax. Ottawa-Montreal-Val-d'Or, a flight I take every week, costs me more than \$550 plus tax.



*Government Orders*

The reason is, of course, that there is less demand for these flights, and to make a profit, carriers have to raise their rates, as opposed to busier routes like Montreal–Toronto, where a regular ticket will cost around \$400 for about the same distance. The new tax rate is based on the price and does not take traffic or distance into account. The government assumes there is a perfect correlation between price and distance, which is not the case. The price is based on two factors: distance and traffic.

(1550)

This means that the government is wrong if it thinks that charging less tax on cheap tickets will benefit air transportation to remote areas. This policy will tend to benefit short-haul, high-volume flights like Montreal–Toronto, used constantly by business people, and charter flights.

Remote areas are already facing service cuts due to the present policy of privatizing air services. For the sake of fairness, people in the regions should be offered the same service as people in large urban centres. Regional air traffic control, firefighting services and weather forecasting will be mostly phased out or administered from the large urban centres.

Air services are vital to people in the north, and here I am referring to the Cree and the Inuit for whom air transportation often provide their sole access to basic services such as food, health care and postal services. In many regions, especially in the North, tourism is the only way they can develop their economy and become independent in the future.

With this new tax rate, travel will become even more expensive for foreign tourists, for the French and all the Europeans who come to see the vast expanses of our country, because of the already high cost of a regular ticket, which I mentioned earlier. This cost factor will prevent people in the North from developing their economy.

Here are a few examples of fares for these regions. If you want to go from Montreal to Iqaluit, in the Inuit territory, you may have to pay between \$800 and \$1,100, even more if you want to go to La Grande 2 or Saluit, and this is only one way. The return fare would be \$1,100 to \$1,600. Certainly, all these flights would be subject to the maximum tax of \$50.

You could tell me that given the small number of flights it would not affect very many people. As I said, for Iqaluit there were 4,700 passengers in 1992, the last year for which data are available. By comparison, there were 86,900 passengers for Val-d'Or in 1992. For an area like Waskaganish, where air transport is the only thing available, 11,400 passengers. These people will have to pay increased fares.

I would like to tell the parliamentary secretary that it might have been possible—he said that they favour short distances—to add \$4 or \$5 to the Montreal to Toronto fare, and the Department

of Transport would have collected as much money without penalizing people who depend on air transportation.

I would like to conclude that for people in my riding or any remote riding in Canada, clauses 2, 3 and 4, which may look innocuous, will mean an extra \$10 per trip on the average. If you add this to all the other difficulties in remote areas, it becomes very difficult to control the tools of development. The government is siphoning more and more.

The motion presented by the Bloc Québécois would delete clauses 2, 3 and 4 of Bill C-32, and maintain the status quo instead of hitting remote areas.

**Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-32 contains a deliberate glitch involving clauses 2, 3, and 4, dealing with the increase in the air transportation fee schedule for remote areas. Once again, the Liberal government has decided to pick on people who can ill afford to pay, having had the guts to be true pioneers in remote and less populated areas.

(1555)

This comes after Bill C-17 and the attack on regions with a very high unemployment rate, such as my riding of Manicouagan, after the fishery adjustment program which, although it is very generous, does not take into account regional characteristics, especially regarding sports fishing which attracts a lot of tourists and is vitally important to us. And now, the Liberal government picks on these same people, striking at the key component of this region's economic development, namely air transportation.

However, the objective, which is to lessen the tax burden on short-haul flights to small communities, has not been met. As a matter of fact, deregulation has had a negative impact on air transportation to remote areas. These areas have had to assume the entire cost of transportation, and fares to these destinations have significantly increased over the past few years. As an example, let me give you a few statistics which might help us draw some comparisons. These examples will help us better understand what the problem is with the transportation system on the North Shore.

First, before getting to the statistics, let us review some basic geographical information. Let us talk about the east side of Manicouagan, a riding so huge it seems to me like a whole continent. To give you an idea, it is 46 per cent of the size of Ontario. The coast is 1,200 kilometres long. For comparison's sake, travelling 1,200 kilometres from Ottawa in a north-west direction will get you near Thunder Bay, and in a north-east direction to Sept-Îles. That is awesome. Out of these 1,200 kilometres between Franklin and Blanc-Sablon, which is only a part of my riding, 500 kilometres are connected to the national highway system, hence to the Quebec system, but the other 700 kilometres along the coast are not linked to the Quebec highway

system. You might see some sections of roadway linking together a few villages along the coast, but nothing connecting these villages to the Quebec system.

I will divide my speech in two. I will start with the communities accessible by road and then deal with the communities which are not accessible by road. In a riding like Manicouagan, where regional economic development is concerned, air transportation is very important, because it usually facilitates the first contacts between an investor and the territory he or she wishes to develop. Once they have flown to the targeted area, investors look at the various facilities they and their employees could benefit from. Of course, air services are a big consideration when advantages and disadvantages are reviewed.

That is why this issue cannot be treated lightly. For the people in my riding of Manicouagan, flying is not a luxury, it is a crucial service not only to ensure regional and economic development, but to maintain the quality of life they are entitled to as taxpayers. More than 85 per cent of small and medium sized communities are located within 150 kilometres of a major urban area.

A major urban centre is a built-up area where you can find all the important health and government services. In Quebec, we are talking about Montreal, Quebec City, Chicoutimi, Trois-Rivières, Sherbrooke. So, in those areas where there is significant population density, they are not usually lacking for much of anything to meet the basic needs to achieve a decent standard of living in 1994.

(1600)

But what is the decent standard of living that the Manicouagan taxpayers have a right to expect in 1994? The bill talks about equity in relation to cost distribution. So, for analysis purposes, I did some brief calculations where equity must represent the same rate, must mean that we should pay the same price for an air kilometre, no matter where.

That gives us some really interesting data. For example, between Quebec City and Montreal, which is undoubtedly the busiest corridor, some percentage of variation could be acceptable. We could agree with that, but to go from simple to double, as I will show you, is an aberration. It is not only an exaggeration, but an aberration. For Quebec City—Montreal, we arrive at more or less \$1.10 per air kilometre; for Sept-Îles—Natashquan—as people cannot get to that area by road, they must take a plane for emergencies or whatever—\$1.34 per kilometre; for Sept-Îles—Blanc-Sablon, \$1.82. We should not forget that the rate for Montreal—Quebec City is still \$1.10. The equity must be somewhere. We will talk about Natashquan—Montreal, which is \$2.29 per kilometre; that is more than double the rate. Another

### *Government Orders*

one which is more than double: Saint-Augustin—Montreal, \$2.32; for Blanc-Sablon—Montreal, \$2.40. This is an aberration. But, according to the minister, there is equity somewhere in there. It does not make any sense.

Those people who are not linked to a road system, those living in communities that are not located within the road network of Quebec, have the same basic needs as those I mentioned earlier, but of course they also have particularities.

Let us take for instance health clinics. Suppose we have an emergency where a child is involved, or any other person, and needs special care. Since these clinics cannot provide the treatments, a sanitary plane of the Government of Quebec will be used to take the patient to a centre, Quebec or Montreal, as required. However, people who accompany the patients have to disburse considerable amounts of money to go with them.

Let us take Blanc-Sablon, for instance. A mother who is morally obligated to accompany her child to a Quebec hospital will have to pay almost \$1,500 in transport, whereas if she resided in Baie-Saint-Paul, she would not have to bear such costs since that community is linked to the road system.

Air transport is not a luxury in the riding of Manicouagan.

That fact is mentioned in a resolution of the city council of Natashquan which I have here. The city council naturally sent a letter to the provincial minister and I would like to quote a few lines of that resolution which refer to the various preambles dealing with the specificity of those regions.

“Given the geographic difficulties”, and this is not trivial, because the North Shore is not flat and you do not play golf every day in that area. “Given the health and education problems linked to transportation”, teachers, doctors, people travelling to every corner of the North Shore go by plane because they have no other choice. Air travel is so outrageously expensive that the city council mentions it in its resolution. Although every city council could say the same thing but I mentioned only that of Natashquan.

They also explain how this affects supplies. I would like to tell you a short story dealing with food commodities. Here, a T-bone steak is expensive, and a tomato is certainly a lot cheaper, but if you go to Natashquan or Chevery, like I did in February, a tomato costs almost more than a T-bone because to buy a tomato in February, it has to be shipped there practically by November, so imagine what it will cost in February if it is still good to eat. This is of course an extreme example, but we have to consider these regional differences. Air transportation is a major factor here. And that is part of the reason why we are rising in the House today.

*Government Orders*

(1605)

When the government thinks that its policy to charge less tax on cheap tickets will benefit air transportation to remote areas, it is wrong. Its policy will benefit the short haul, high volume flights between Montreal and Toronto, for instance. These destinations will benefit, but at what price? The price will be paid by people in remote areas, as if they were not paying enough already.

Montreal-Toronto flights have a high volume of business people, and business charter operations will benefit as well.

Bill C-32 will merely increase the burden on the regions and further isolate remote areas. And this is a measure that has absolutely no connection with the other measures in this bill. It should not even be in Bill C-32. The government put this measure in to make things difficult for everyone. Summer is coming, and they want to sneak this through the House.

The Bloc Québécois believes that regional transportation services should benefit. The government had a chance to set up a rate system that would have benefited regional transportation. It was a wonderful opportunity for the Liberal government to prove, just for once, that it has the regions' best interests in mind. But of course, they failed to rise to the occasion.

The regions have suffered enough as a result of deregulation. It is time to turn the situation around and let the burden of regional transportation costs be shared by remote regions and urban regions. That would be fair.

In conclusion, today the regions are at a tremendous disadvantage as far as transportation costs are concerned, a fact that is adversely affecting their development and has made them second class citizens.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise and speak on this bill.

I represent an area that has a large number of tobacco producers in it. They look quite favourably on this bill and what it will do to rationalize and give the industry which has been attacked over the years in a number of different areas more certainty on where it will go in the future.

I want to talk about a particular part of the bill. I follow this issue quite a bit. One of the areas this bill deals with is how tobacco is processed and gives a definition of a processor and manufacturer.

In section 182 on page 61 of the bill is a definition of tobacco manufacturing which states "means any activity (other than farming) relating to the manufacture or processing in Canada of tobacco and tobacco products". That could pertain to almost anything. It could pertain to people who make cartons or people

who make the paint that goes on the cartons that we put the tobacco in.

In fact there is one company in my area of Haldimand—Norfolk that is hit by this. It does not manufacture cigarettes. It had nothing to do with the smuggling situation. It is an independent group, not tied in with any of the big three. The intent of the legislation, other than to reduce taxes to deal with smuggling, was to hit back at the big three, those the government felt might have had, remotely, something to do with the smuggling that was going on cross border.

This small independent company processes tobacco, meaning it buys from the tobacco board, threshes the tobacco, bundles it up and ships a good majority of it overseas to export markets. It had nothing to do with the problem but because of the way the legislation is written it is caught up in it.

(1610)

I ask the Minister of Finance if he could look into the situation of these small companies and see what he can do to help alleviate the taxes. They have to compete internationally with other companies and I do not see why they should be caught up in this legislation.

I believe the intent of the legislation is not to catch them, but unfortunately it will. Therefore I call on the government today to do something about it.

Finally, I will conclude by saying that I support Bill C-32. It will do what it is intended to do; stop the smuggling.

The 200 some odd smoke huts that were throughout Haldimand—Norfolk and on the Six Nations reserve are no longer there. Only a few of them are left. This bill has already done what it was intended to do. It has sent a strong message that we will not support this type of activity. It has done a lot for the communities, especially the Six Nations. A number of the elders have come to me to say thanks for bringing forward legislation like this. They feel that sort of activity should not happen on the Six Nations. They feel anything they can do to help us out in this regard they would gladly do.

There are other parts of the the bill which I obviously do not support, such as the export tax, but I can say quite heartily that I and the producers in my area support this bill as a whole.

**Mr. Garry Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make in addition to what I said at the previous readings. These remarks are with regard to the amendments presented by the Bloc, the Official Opposition, on the air transportation tax.

We will be opposing the bill because of the reduction in taxes on tobacco and so on. Basically we support the government in the other aspects of this omnibus bill. We support the government's changes to the air transportation tax. It is moving toward privatization, moving toward user pay, moving toward cost recovery so that this part of the industry does not have to be

supported by government. That is why we oppose the amendments the Bloc is making because it will take away from the direction in which the government is moving.

There is currently a flat fee of \$10 plus 7 per cent to a maximum of \$40 on all airline tickets purchased in Canada. These fees are part of the Excise Tax Act even though they appear to be closer in function to a user fee than actual taxes. All the revenue is directed toward the Department of Transport which routes the funds to the aviation component of their expenditures. This tax makes up most of the funding for aviation services provided to all Canadian airports whether they are public or private. These services include air traffic controllers, aviation control for take off and landing and air navigation costs.

Current revenues from this tax of nearly \$600 million do not fully cover the government cost of aviation which runs at about \$870 million. Because of the implementations the government wants to make, this airport tax would come closer to meeting the actual costs of this by the airlines, then we would support that and therefore oppose the amendment.

To reduce the tax burden on short haul, domestic and trans-border flights by decreasing the flat charge per ticket and increasing the maximum fee is one change that was to be made, along with a flat fee decreasing to \$6 and the maximum increasing to \$50. This is good.

Last, the change would bring an additional \$24 million in 1994 and an additional \$41 million in 1995. That is a positive move. The burden on the taxpayer would be reduced.

(1615)

In analysing this, this levy should not be part of a complicated tax system. The funds do not go into general revenue but are spent specifically on aviation. Therefore we should change this into a user fee on a full recovery basis.

We support these changes toward this move to more fully recover the costs that are experienced in this area. However we also acknowledge the difficulties with giving any department both a monopoly on revenues and a monopoly on service delivery. Mechanisms must be in place to ensure cost effective delivery.

Perhaps we should look closer at what the possibilities for privatization of these services are. We could probably even save the government more money if we looked at this whole area of privatization.

We support this change. It makes the air transportation tax move toward a full cost recovery basis. Further moves in this direction should include changing the tax to a user fee administered by the Department of Transport. This would necessitate adequate competition in place to ensure cost effective service.

### *Government Orders*

In summary, we are opposed to the amendments that the Bloc is making. We support the direction in which the government is going. It is not far enough but it is heading in the right direction. We would like to see it consider more privatization of this and more of a user fee cost recovery basis.

[*Translation*]

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

*And the division bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), I have been requested by the deputy government whip to defer the division until a later time.

[*English*]

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) a division on the question now before the House stands deferred until later this day at 6.30 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

\* \* \*

### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-30, an act to amend the Department of Labour Act, be read the third time and passed.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

*Government Orders*

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

(1620)

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) I have been requested by the deputy whip of the government to defer the division until a later time.

[Translation]

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), a recorded division on the question now before the House stands deferred until 6.30 tonight, at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

\* \* \*

[English]

**MISCELLANEOUS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT,  
1994**

**Hon. Diane Marleau (for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** moved that Bill C-40, an act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies and errors in the Statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of a non-controversial and uncomplicated nature in those statutes and to repeal certain provisions of those statutes that have expired, lapsed or otherwise ceased to have effect, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-40 is to allow minor amendments of a non-controversial nature to be made to a number of federal statutes without having to wait for particular statutes to be opened up for amendments of a more substantial nature.

The amendments contained in this bill were tabled in Parliament on April 15 of this year as proposals and were studied by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and in the Senate by the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

Both these committees, after studying the proposals, have come to the conclusion that they were not controversial and did not involve the spending of public funds. Also, they would not prejudicially affect the rights of persons and they would not create a new offence or subject a new class of persons to an existing offence.

Both committees approved all proposals without any change or deletions for inclusion in this bill. The content of Bill C-40 is identical to those proposals.

Because the content of the bill has already been studied by a committee of the House, I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that unanimous consent will be given for referring the bill to committee of the whole this day and for dealing with all remaining stages today.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House to proceed in this manner?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm with the hon. member across the floor that the committee did look at it clause by clause and that the Reform Party is very comfortable in supporting the recommendation to take this through all stages today.

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I think the hon. member has already indicated that the Bloc Québécois agrees with this proposal.

[English]

(Motion deemed agreed to, bill deemed read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Kilgour in the chair.)

(1625)

**The Chairman:** Order. House in committee of the whole on Bill C-40, an act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies and errors in the Statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of a non-controversial and uncomplicated nature in those statutes and to repeal certain provisions of those statutes that have expired, lapsed or otherwise ceased to have effect.

**Mr. Boudria:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if there would be consent for the Chair to put the questions from clauses 2 to 79 inclusive in the same motion.

**The Chairman:** Is there consent to move all of the clauses in one motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chairman:** Shall clauses 2 to 79 inclusive carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Clauses 2 to 79 inclusive agreed to.)

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Clause agreed to.)

(Title agreed to.)

(Bill reported.)

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Moments ago when the Chair asked for second reading of the bill I believe the bill was moved by the Minister of Health and seconded by a parliamentary secretary. Perhaps I could ask the House that the

*Government Orders*

seconded be changed to the government House leader to ensure that ministers have moved and seconded the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to do that?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**The Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Gray (for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

**Mr. MacLellan:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank all members of the House for their co-operation in the passage of this bill. It has been done expeditiously and in the best interests has been debated fully.

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Given the progress to date I think you might find unanimous consent to suspend the sitting until 6.30 p.m. at which time we will proceed with the various divisions on bills as agreed to on Friday and earlier this day.

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House to suspend the sitting until 6.30 p.m.?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 4.28 p.m.)

## SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona—Transportation Subsidies.

[*English*]

**YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

The House resumed from June 16, consideration of the motion that Bill C-37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, be now read a second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 62*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	Deshaiés
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand	McLaughlin
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Péloquin	Riis
Rocheleau	Solomon
St-Laurent	Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—49	

**NAYS**

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)

*Government Orders*

Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Churchill)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson
Johnston	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Loney
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Rock
Rompkey	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton—York Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Serré	Shepherd
Silye	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood—179	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

## Members

Anderson	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Clancy
Dalphond—Guiral	Dubé
Dupuy	Eggleton
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lincoln	Loubier
Marchi	McTeague
Ménard	Young

(1900)

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the amendment negated.

[English]

**Mr. Gagliano:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply this vote in reverse to the vote on third reading of Bill C-28.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to do so?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Ouellet:** I could not make the first vote, Mr. Speaker, but I would appreciate that my vote be recorded with that of my government colleagues in the ones to come.

(1905)

[English]

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, if somebody is not here for the first vote why would they be allowed in for the second vote? I thought when somebody walks by you are not allowed to come in.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary Centre asks a good question. I am told by somebody much wiser than I am that is the proper thing to do. I appreciate that may not satisfy the member for Calgary Centre.

\* \* \*

## STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ACT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-28, an act respecting the making of loans and the provision of other forms of financial assistance to students, to amend and provide for the repeal of the Canada Student Loans Act, and to amend one other act in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Bill C-28. We will vote on the deferred motion as listed on the Order Paper.

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

(Division No. 63)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden

*Government Orders*

Bélaïr  
Calder  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Cohen  
Collins  
Copp  
Crawford  
Cummins  
Dhaliwal  
Dromisky  
Duncan  
English  
Fewchuk  
Flis  
Forseth  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)  
Gilmour  
Gouk  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Grose  
Guarnieri  
Harb  
Harper (Churchill)  
Harris  
Harvard  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Johnston  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)  
MacDonald  
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)  
Mayfield  
McCormick  
McKinnon  
Meredith  
Milliken  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Mitchell  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Reilly  
Pagtakhan  
Patry  
Peters  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Ramsay  
Regan  
Rideout  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Scott (Skeena)  
Shepherd  
Skoke  
Speaker  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Szabo  
Terrana  
Thompson  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Volpe  
Wells  
White (Fraser Valley West)

Caccia  
Cannis  
Cauchon  
Chatters  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Cowling  
Culbert  
DeVillers  
Discepola  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Epp  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Frazer  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Gerrard  
Goodale  
Graham  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Grubel  
Hanrahan  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hayes  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hopkins  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Keys  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
Loney  
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
Maheu  
Maloney  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Massé  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
McGuire  
McWhinney  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Minna  
Morrison  
Murray  
O'Brien  
Ouellet  
Parrish  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
Proud  
Reed  
Richardson  
Ringma  
Rompkey  
Scott (Fredericton—York Sunbury)  
Serré  
Silye  
Solberg  
Speller  
Steckle  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Thalheimer  
Tobin  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Whelan  
Wood—180

## NAYS

## Members

Asselin  
Bachand  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Brien  
Canuel  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Davault  
de Savoye  
Duceppe  
Fillion  
Guimond  
Lalonde  
Langlois  
Lebel  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Marchand  
Mercier  
Paré  
Plamondon  
Péloquin  
Rocheleau  
St-Laurent  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne—49

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bellehumeur  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Blaikie  
Bélisle  
Caron  
Crête  
Debien  
Deshaies  
Dumas  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Jacob  
Landry  
Laurin  
Lefebvre  
Leroux (Shefford)  
McLaughlin  
Nunez  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pomerleau  
Riis  
Solomon  
Taylor  
Tremblay (Rosemont)

## PAIRED MEMBERS

## Members

Anderson  
Bouchard  
Dalphond—Guiral  
Dupuy  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Godin  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Lincoln  
Marchi  
Ménard

Blondin—Andrew  
Clancy  
Dubé  
Eggleton  
Godfrey  
Guay  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Loubier  
McTeague  
Young

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

## EXCISE TAX ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-32, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Motion No. 1 at report stage of Bill C-32, an Act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Gagliano:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent that the vote taken on Bill C-37 can be applied to the amendments at report stage of Bill C-32.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?



*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 64)***YEAS****Members**

Asselin	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Blaikie
Brien	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	Deshaies
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand	McLaughlin
Mercier	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Péloquin	Riis
Rocheleau	Solomon
St-Laurent	Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—49	

**NAYS****Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Berger	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chatters
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Cowling
Crawford	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromiskiy	Duhamel
Duncan	Easter
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazier
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grey (Beaver River)
Grose	Grubel
Guarnieri	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)

Harper (Churchill)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irvin	Jackson
Johnston	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Loney
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McWhinney
Meredith	Miffin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Ringma
Rock	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Serré
Shepherd	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood—180

**PAIRED—MEMBERS****Members**

Anderson	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Clancy
Dalphonde—Guiral	Dubé
Dupuy	Eggleton
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lincoln	Loubier
Marchi	McTeague
Ménard	Young

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

*Government Orders*

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Motion agreed to.)

**The Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read the third time, by consent later this day?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-30, an act to amend the Department of Labour Act, be read the third time and passed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-30, an act to amend the Department of Labour Act.

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

*(Division No. 65)*

**YEAS**

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélisle	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cohen	Collenette
Collins	Comuzzi
Copp	Cowling
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaies	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepolo
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Easter	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hopkins
Ianno	Ifody
Irwin	Jackson

Jacob	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchand
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Péloquin
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Skoke
Solomon	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood—188

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazier
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Johnston
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ramsay
Ringma	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Strahl	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)—41	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Members

Anderson	Blondin—Andrew
Bouchard	Clancy
Dalphoné—Guiral	Dubé
Dupuy	Eggleton
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godfrey
Godin	Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lincoln	Loubier
Marchi	McTeague
Ménard	Young

*Government Orders*

(1915)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

I might put on the record that the House leader for the Reform Party indicated—I did not hear it—that the Reform Party would not give consent to Bill C-32 to be read a third time today. Therefore that matter will count as if it were noted earlier.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on Bill C-37 to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, and the amendment put forward by the Bloc. This bill has been introduced at this time only in response to the pressure exerted by certain radicals and a certain press thirsty for sensationalism which revels in fuelling the common perception that crime is on the increase among young people.

Passed in 1984, the legislation has been amended twice, in 1986 and 1992. Really, can the situation have already deteriorated to such a point that it now warrants introducing this bill?

(1920)

*[English]*

In his final report called "Beyond the Red Book", a workshop on recommendations for amendments to the Young Offenders Act, Mr. Doob of the University of Toronto said: "We do not have a youth just crisis that requires immediate fundamental change in the Young Offenders Act. Members of the public, especially those in the media who purport to represent public opinion about crime, have for centuries expressed the view that youth crime is out of control. Youths commit a disproportionate amount of crime in society. They always have and always will. But changes in the Young Offenders act are not likely to have any measurable impact on crime".

*[Translation]*

In Quebec, a compromise has been struck between the principles of youth protection and societal protection.

I would like to remind hon. members that a motion on this subject was adopted on May 5 last by the Quebec National Assembly. It read as follows: "That this Assembly demand that any amendment to the federal Young Offenders Act respect Quebec's laws and policies with regard to youth protection". The motion was unanimously endorsed by Quebec's two main political parties.

In Quebec, youth protection workers help the young offender and his family discover the best options for reintegrating into society and the community. Of course, the system in place is by no means perfect, but at least it places equal emphasis on prevention programs and on rehabilitation and reintegration programs.

The bill now before us does not provide this kind of balanced approach. On the contrary, the emphasis here is on repression in that the preferred option appears all too often to be referral to the courts, while no provision seems to be made for rehabilitation. With the passage of this bill, 16 and 17 year olds would have their cases proceed in adult court. For the purposes of the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, the term "young person" now includes 10 to 16 year olds. Furthermore, depending on their age group, young persons will be treated differently by the courts.

Although the legislation does not distinguish between 12 to 15 year olds and 16 to 17 year olds, it is clear that as a result of these amendments, these two groups will be treated differently in the case of offences involving serious bodily harm. Some lawyers will argue that this flies in the face of section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which guarantees equal treatment to all under the law.

While public safety demands that young offenders be sometimes kept in secure custody, rehabilitation should always be our overriding concern. Young persons who are in contact with other offenders are exposed to influences which fuel their delinquent behaviour.

In an article published in *La Presse* on June 8, Mr. Trépanier, a criminologist and researcher at the Université de Montréal, reminded readers that: "Quebec compares favourably with the rest of Canada. Quebec is the province where the number of

*Government Orders*

young people in drop-in and rehabilitation centres is the lowest, about half the Canadian average”.

According to research done on crime rates in American states relying on punishment as a deterrent against crime, there is no significant difference as opposed to states having a different approach based on the fight against crime. In this regard, the American experience in the area of crime and crime prevention clearly demonstrates that stiff sentences have little effect on the crime rate.

[English]

Getting back to the report “Beyond the Red Book”: “Few saw any serious problems with the act that could not have been remedied by proper and creative administration of the act. Repeatedly the view was expressed that the most serious problem in the Young Offenders Act was the way in which it was administrated in some provinces. Most cases involving violence that come under the control of the Young Offenders Act can be dealt with under the present legislation”.

So much for the necessity of new legislation. What about increasing the severity of sentences?

(1925)

In the same report Mr. Doob noted:

With adolescents, increasing the severity of dispositions has no real impact on offending behaviour; either for the youth before the court or other youths. That is, despite its apparent logic and appeal, increasing the severity of dispositions has neither specific nor general deterrent value—The data supports the conclusion that rehabilitation is more likely to be accomplished in non-custodial settings—It was suggested that if the federal and the provincial governments were serious about protecting the public, then the governments should invest money in prevention and in educating the public about youth crime. It is cheaper and more effective to prevent crime than to put kids in custody when they commit offences.

[Translation]

Therefore, this bill is premature. We do not have a long enough experience, here in Canada, to assess the effects of the amendments introduced in 1992. I should remind members that, in 1992, the sentence for murder what extended to five years. However, such a sentence should also be imposed. At the present time, considering the lag time in the availability of statistics, we cannot determine the impact of this amendment. How can we justify what we are doing now? Why not wait for the results of the previous amendments before taking more repressive measures?

Crime, lest we forget, is an extremely complex issue. Generally speaking, criminologists recognize that the causes of crime are many. Violence and crime are interconnected and it is therefore important to address the root cause of crime by impressing on young offenders at the earliest opportunity that they are responsible for their actions. Sanctions or penalties directly tied to the offence must be enforced. Automatic incarceration or isolation in secure custody have no rehabilitative value. The deterrent effect of these measures can even be called into question.

Getting back to the question of public perception, last February, Jean Trépanier of the University of Montreal spoke at a symposium on crime and shared some statistics on the subject. According to Mr. Trépanier, only one in every six persons who commit an offence is a minor whereas the public’s perception is vastly different. It is commonly believed that nearly 50 per cent of crimes are committed by young persons.

The February 3, 1994 issue of *La Presse* reported that youth crime had even declined by 7.6 per cent in Quebec over the past 15 years. The same is true for Montreal. The number of juvenile delinquents was reported at 10,145 in 1979, compared to 6,679 in 1992. This represents a decrease of 34 per cent in 13 years.

More recently in the June 8 edition of *La Presse*, Mr. Trépanier stated the following: “According to Statistics Canada, the delinquency rate in Quebec per 100,000 residents is the second lowest in Canada after peace loving Prince Edward Island”.

Over the past decade, the number of serious crimes such as murder, manslaughter and aggravated assault has either remained stable or declined.

“The increase noted in the number of violent crimes is due to a large extent to a 127 per cent increase in minor assaults from 1986 to 1991. According to national statistics on crime, a minority of young offenders are involved in crimes of a violent nature. In fact, only 13 percent of charges laid in 1991 were in connection with crimes of violence. However, nearly half of the charges laid against young offenders in 1991 involved first level assaults, which means that the offense was committed without the use of a weapon and that no bodily injury was inflicted upon the victim”.

Tim Weiner from the *Ottawa Citizen* reported in March 1991 that “one Canadian out of three is under the false impression that violence is as widespread in Canada, if not more, than in the United States.” The fact of the matter is that a far greater number of violent crimes are committed in the United States than in Canada.

The Americans have doubled their police forces and the size of private police forces has increased fourfold over the past 30 years. Their inmate population has doubled over the past 10 years to a record high of four per 1,000 residents, which is at least four times higher than anywhere else in the Western world. Yet, violent crime rates in the U.S. are three times higher than in other industrialized countries.

(1930)

As for the transfer to adult court, the amendments to the 1992 act clarified the applicable criteria to determine if a young offender must be transferred to adult court. Youth court must now take into account society’s interest, in particular the public’s protection and the teenager’s reintegration into society, and determine if it is possible to reconcile these two objectives by keeping the teenager under its jurisdiction. If the court thinks that it is impossible, society’s protection prevails. The required

*Government Orders*

mechanisms seem to be in place but the stakeholders refuse to use them.

I now come back to the June 8 article in *La Presse*, which quotes Normand Bastien from the youth division of Montreal's community legal centre. He said: "The real problems come from the fact that the average waiting periods before sentencing are too long—266 days on average in Valleyfield, 180 days in Montreal, 163 days in Joliette—and that only 29 per cent of problems are resolved". So why this bill, since the current act already has adequate provisions to deal with young offenders?

I repeat, a repressive law without rehabilitation measures and left to the discretion of various stakeholders will not bring the violence phenomenon under control. Current documentation does not support the argument that longer sentences act as a deterrent. As I said before, the American experience demonstrates the ineffectiveness of these coercive measures.

To conclude on the transfer to adult court issue, it seems that the burden of proof will now rest with the young people themselves. Too bad for the presumption of innocence. All this is intended to silence some people who will never be satisfied. It makes light of the balance between deterrence and rehabilitation which has proven itself in Quebec. Above all, it encourages laxity in certain provinces.

In the reading I have done on this bill, how does one explain some particularly troubling statistics concerning cases in youth court that resulted in a guilty verdict? In Quebec and the Maritime provinces, guilty verdicts were rendered in over 80 per cent of cases; in the Western provinces, barely 70 per cent; and in Ontario and Manitoba, 55 and 59 per cent. How come in Alberta, 34,372 people are accused and convicted out of a population of 1.2 million, compared to 16,000 in British Columbia? One province convicts half as many people as its neighbour. Are we not justified in thinking that we should pay more attention to the administration of justice instead of drafting new laws?

[English]

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, when the government introduced the Young Offenders Act and said that it intended to make some changes to the act it was very pleasing for me because if ever there was an act that needed modified it is the Young Offenders Act. However, that pleasure quickly faded when I found out that all the changes it really had in mind was just a little bit of tokenism.

One of the major things we are concerned about of course is 16 and 17 year olds and whether they are going to be treated as kids or whether they are going to be treated as adults when they commit crimes.

The government has taken a little portion of this. It has said for 16 and 17 year olds it intends, most of the time at least, to raise them to adult court. The onus will be on them to show cause

why they should not be tried in adult court and why in fact they should be tried as young offenders.

This raises two problems. One of the basic problems is if they are tried as adults while still being young offenders they are still treated differently than people who are regular adults being tried in that adult court.

The second problem, and this is the larger one, is that we have a tremendous bureaucracy now. This bureaucracy is part of what drives the deficit and debt as high as it is and climbing continually.

(1935)

What is going to happen is every time one of these young offenders is proposed to be raised to adult court we are going to have them appealing this and trying to fight it. What we are going to be faced with are trials to determine where the trial is going to be held, whether it is going to be in juvenile court or adult court. That is not doing anything to the legal system. That is not doing anything to resolve the problem of bureaucracy and it is certainly not doing anything to bring justice to this act.

One of the things we think should happen is that the age should be dropped. Sixteen and seventeen-year olds should be tried as adults and should be classed as adults. We think the overall age should be dropped. If you have 10 and 11 year olds committing crimes there has to be some facility to deal with that other than saying that was not very nice and sending them home to their parents, especially when the government is also talking about changing the act so that even once they send them home to their parents the parents are powerless to do anything.

Another thing the government is touching on, but again it is only tokenism, is identifying the criminal activities of young offenders. What we had proposed is that all crimes of 14 and 15 year olds should be readily available through the media and for those 10 to 13 they should be made public if, in the judge's opinion, the need for the public to know and protect itself is greater than the need for confidentiality on the part of the offender.

If you would consider a situation in which one of these young offenders may be exhibiting some form of violent behaviour and is released back to a classroom full of other children, should not the school authorities for one and the parents of the other children there know that there was a potential problem and take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of their own children?

Another area that did not get touched on at all is the need to change the face of the way our correctional facilities work. What we need is a facility that bases its primary actions on education, skills training, community service and one other thing that the government seems loath to introduce, discipline. We do not have a structured type of system that is going to provide some type of education, some kind of knowledge so that they can become useful people instead of sitting in what often are considered country club resorts compared with what many law-abiding

*Government Orders*

young people have on the outside. We are doing absolutely nothing but making a mockery of our entire system.

The final area where we believe there has to be some major change and something where the government did not even involve itself in tokenism on is the concept of parental responsibility. We believe that whenever there is a young offender and it can be shown that lack of parental control is a factor in the crime being committed then those parents must be responsible for identifying the victim for their losses.

We will have some people arguing as to whether that is fair to the parents. Maybe the parents could not stop the problem. Maybe it is not really being fair to the parents of this young offender. We have to look at the two sides of it. On one side we have a parent, in the situation we are suggesting, and it has been demonstrated that their lack of exercising parental control was a contributing factor to the offence being committed.

On the other side we have the victim. The victim is wholly innocent. There is no question of the innocence of a victim in these types of situations. Who really should have the financial burden placed upon them by the actions of this offender? Should it be a wholly innocent victim or should it be a parent who perhaps should have exercised more control in preventing that offence in the first place? If there is any injustice in this at all it certainly should be on the side of the one where there could be presumed certain responsibility for this. There is no question that it should not fall on the victim who is wholly innocent.

We believe that these are basic changes to the act that must take place. The Liberal government has not addressed this concept whatsoever.

One of the things that involves the Young Offenders Act and in fact the entire criminal justice system is what is this act in place for. Who are we trying to protect? Who are we trying to reward or make life easier for? Is it the victim or is it the person who perpetrates the crime? I suggest that we have to provide protection for the innocent people.

(1940)

There may well be cause for people to say the poor youth, they have had a bad upbringing, they come from a broken home, they come from poverty. These things may all be true and may have in fact contributed to the person committing the crime.

We have to deal with those issues separately. Our first premise is that we must protect law-abiding citizens and their property. The Young Offenders Act needs to be changed and the reason it needs to be changed is for protection of society at large and also for young people themselves who are the most frequent victims of juvenile crime.

I had high hopes when they talked of introducing this change to the Young Offenders Act and I am very disappointed that they have gone half measure. On one side, we might say that something is better than nothing but on review it seems that what they are offering us is nothing at all.

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to stand tonight to say a few words on this bill because it is one that we have been waiting for for a long time.

Having brought it forward now, it is one that has improved the initial act. I am sure that all of us know of cases in which the previous act was applied and was not certainly considered sufficient for the crime and certainly not a corrective measure to any extent either.

Some will say that there is a crisis with youth offenders today. Some will say there is not. We have heard that on the floor of this House. People who witness youth or adult crime know there is a problem. Communities that have witnessed a problem out there in youth crime know there is a problem.

It is easy to judge from afar and from a safe perch but when it comes home to people, that is the time that they get serious about these issues. Of course the media wants something spectacular or there is nothing newsworthy about it. Some will say that the media is responsible for the hype about issues and others will say that it is only reporting the news.

Be that as it may, there is always room for improvement in legislation of this nature. Young people usually get their first sense of authority, their first feeling that there is authority around them, in the home. If they get the feeling at home, that there is an authority there, when they get out to face society they are able to handle it because they are accustomed to it.

When youth are not accustomed to discipline, a sense of authority and sound practices in the home they rebel when suddenly confronted with it in society because they have always had their own way. When they cannot get their own way they become angry.

I want to quote from a paper written by Dr. Victor Szyrinski who is a well known medical doctor and doctor of psychiatry. He has a PhD as well. In his very learned way he says: "Parents are the first people who gratify the child's basic needs and in this way provide him with evidence of their love and stimulate similar reactions in return".

At another stage in his paper: "Generally speaking, security is provided by parental love. Here, however, in accordance with David Levy, we might consider the harmful aspects of "too much love" and "too little love". Children overfed with love in their early days by overprotective and overaffectionate parents find it too difficult to face the real frustrations present in the outside world".

*Government Orders*

(1945)

Today we know that in the outside world people in a community have a fear of law breakers. There are home robberies reported that have been witnessed and there have been many business break-ins. Older people want security. When something happens in their community they have a great sense of fear.

Medical attention becomes very important as a corrective measure while a young offender is incarcerated. It is all right to talk about long sentences and so on, but while that person is in prison they must receive the proper medical attention. If they are not ready to be back on the streets when their time is up then a very definite assessment should be made of the case at that time.

I was interested in the words of the minister in his statement, his news release, on the day he tabled the bill when he said poverty, alcoholism, family violence, racism, illiteracy and many other factors may lead to criminal acts by young people and adults alike. Of course we have witnessed that from adults and young people alike. The conditions of our times certainly contribute to the moulding of the character of individuals today.

The increased sentences for teenagers convicted on first degree murder would be ten years, seven years in and three years out in the community under supervision, and seven years for second degree murder, four years in and three years under supervision in the community.

The personal injury offences would be in adult court unless they can show a judge that public protection and rehabilitation can both be achieved through youth court. They have to prove that they should be heard in youth court if they are 16 or 17 years of age. Otherwise they go to adult court.

Those who have been convicted of murder in an adult court must serve before they can be considered for parole. It is important that a person who is not ready to be out on the streets should not be out there. I mentioned that a moment ago but I think this is one of the largest fears people had about the previous legislation, that a person would be out on the street. There were a number of cases that have been very well documented and very well publicized and of course it helped to really drive that point home.

We know that in the present legislation the maximum sentence for young people convicted of murder in youth court is five years. It used to be three years. There is no parole in the youth system at the present time. However, the proposals that the minister brought in recently would increase sentences in youth court to ten years. There is a reason for it, and that is why I am repeating that particular part. With the previous three year sentence there was no timeframe for the medical attention that person should have been receiving and there was no medical attention for the proper assessment before they went back out on the street.

The minister will be meeting with ministers of health from the various provinces and territories later this year on this very important provision. The provinces are in charge of health care and we must have the proper number of people involved in the system who are well qualified to make assessments on young offenders and to make recommendations for their treatment while they are in prison. If that does not happen the additional years are not going to mean very much. The person will only come out with the same attitude with which they went in.

(1950)

In my view, and having gone through a couple of very traumatic situations with families who were involved with youth murders, it is a very difficult situation for them. It is very serious for the parents but it is also very serious for other people in the family. Certainly it is serious for the people in those communities, particularly if the communities are small and people know one another. I want to emphasize the importance of proper medical care for these young people once they are in prison.

I commend the minister for increasing the sentences and lowering the age limit for people being brought into adult court. If measures of this nature are not taken, then crime will continue to grow among those people who are today laughing at the law. When people start smiling and laughing at the law it is not only they who are in trouble, our whole society is in trouble.

This is very important legislation for this Parliament. It is very important to put it in place. The follow through is going to be very important because it is going to spell the success or the failure of this new initiative.

I want to say to the ministers and to the members of the House that as this bill unfolds and as the legislation, the regulations and the provisions for medical care are brought forward there will be a number of us in the House watching the procedure very carefully to make sure that the proper provisions are being carried and that it is going to be useful to society and useful for the young offenders who get into trouble.

A lot of improvements can be made if we have the proper discipline in the home and some direction in the home to begin with. We should encourage that while we are discussing this bill.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm):** Mr. Speaker, on June 6, when I rose to support the amendment tabled by the Bloc Québécois regarding the Young Offenders Act, I asked the Minister of Justice to say who, in Quebec, had hoped for such amendments.

I am still waiting for an answer, but I know that it will never come, because nobody in Quebec was in favour of such repressive changes as those proposed by the Minister of Justice. If there are people in favour of such changes, it has to really be a small minority. In fact, when I see the minister remain silent, I

*Government Orders*

think that it must be an extremely small minority, otherwise I would have heard from him.

As for me, I did not waste my time. I checked with those who are really concerned by this issue to find out what they thought of those amendments. I am referring to those who will have to implement the legislation. I consulted these people and no one, absolutely no one agreed with the bill. On the contrary, they all rejected it.

On May 5, 1994, before Bill C-37 was tabled, Quebec's National Assembly voted almost unanimously in favour of asking the federal government to ensure that any amendment to the Young Offenders Act is in compliance with Quebec's laws and policies regarding youth protection.

(1955)

After reading the report released by the Minister of Justice, the Quebec Liberal minister disapproved of the decisions made by its big brother and stated that he was concerned and disappointed by the position taken by the federal government on this issue. He is not the only one. Whether it is the official justice critic for Quebec, the Association des centres jeunesse du Québec, the Maison Bosco, the CUM Director, some Quebec police associations, renowned criminologists like Jean Trépanier and Marc Leblanc, and many more, all agree that the bill introduced by the minister is counterproductive and goes against the educational direction Quebec has been trying to follow for at least 15 years.

We must realize that reactionary measures will not help us to overcome these problems. Things are far from perfect, but the direction taken by the province of Quebec is far more worthy than that chosen by the Minister of Justice. Despite some horrendous crimes that have been committed, this is not the time to blindly opt for repression and intolerance, which will only add to the problems instead of solving them. We should not use this issue to play petty politics, which the government seems to be doing by trying to pull a fast one on Reform members on the one hand and silencing the minority advocacy groups on the other hand.

Yes, we must realize that the praiseworthy efforts made by the province of Quebec on this issue reaffirm once again its special status. Yes, from the debate on this issue and many others addressed here in this House, we can see that there are two countries within this country. The federal government is responsible for creating a greater gulf between our two people. It is slowly but surely helping us on our way to separation.

It will all be explained in due course to Quebecers. Till then, however, I remind my constituents and Quebecers who almost unanimously opposed this bill that Ottawa just gave in to the

mass hysteria that mainly took over western Canada and those hooked on televised information and isolated but sensational cases.

The minister gave in this time and it is legitimate to ask ourselves if and when he will give in again. Will he do it when some members from western Canada ask to legalize corporal punishment against the young or to lower the age at which one can be indicted pursuant to the law or to return to capital punishment? What will the Minister do then? His actual stand worries me. Will he give in again? Unfortunately, if it can bring some temporary and unrealistic glory, this heir apparent of the Liberal Party of Canada will undoubtedly do it.

This issue is too important to put the interest of a politician or a party before that of society and especially that of the young. Should I remind the Minister that today's young are tomorrow's society? Even if they are given a prison sentence, they will come out some day. That is why education, social reintegration and rehabilitation are so important.

More prisoners become real bandits than rehabilitated citizens. We must not fall into this trap. As I said, this bill does not solve anything and reflects a purely repressive philosophy. The government should understand this and withdraw the bill. Those national standards forced on Quebec, which does not want them, give its courts less flexibility in sentencing.

As a Quebecer, I understand that the federal government imposes standards that are divorced from reality. In the end, these standards will fill up prisons, increase court costs and add to the legal red tape—all areas of Quebec's jurisdiction. That gives us another good reason to free ourselves from this constitutional straitjacket, where the federal government always did what it pleased while ignoring Quebec's demands and imposing national standards without any consideration for our legitimate wishes. But the time for that is almost past.

I confess, I believed that the federal Minister of Justice was a progressive man who listens to those responsible for administering justice. Unfortunately, I was wrong; that is what I confess. I made a mistake, because had he been such a man, he would not have proposed such amendments. He could have tried to correct some problems in the enforcement of the law, within his own jurisdiction.

(2000)

We heard many members say in this House that the problem is not the act itself, but its application. Everybody knows that. Neither Quebec nor Ontario now for the last few years seems to have understood the intent of the Young Offenders Act. The rest of English Canada uses this act to put away problem teenagers. That is not the intent of the YOA.



*Government Orders*

Do people really think that increasing sentences from 5 to 10 years or even from 7 to 10 years will help us achieve the aims of the act? Do people really think that reversing the onus to force the young offenders to demonstrate that they should be proceeded against in youth court instead of adult court will solve the problem and help us achieve the aims of the act? Do members opposite think that? Are Reform Party members of this opinion? Does the government think that increasing the period of time that a young offender who has received a life sentence must serve before being eligible for parole will help us achieve the aims of the act?

I have to believe that the minister did not ask himself these questions. The Liberal federal government, through its Minister of Justice, made a point of stating in clause 1 of the bill that crime prevention is essential to the protection of society and that a multi-disciplinary approach is needed to deal with this problem.

It is even stated in clause 15 that an order of custody is not the solution. However, the bill provides absolutely nothing to strengthen what is stated. Finally, they try to put on a smoke screen, to put everybody to sleep, saying that it will pass without a hitch. Well, no, it will not pass without a hitch. In Quebec, we do not want this bill. We feel unanimously that this bill is harmful to youth and that is not the solution. The solution lies in the implementation of the act as it now stands. The solution lies in social rehabilitation.

What I ask the Minister of Justice to do is simply to postpone this piece of legislation, not to have it given second reading in order that the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs can properly analyze the issue and report to this House. We will then see whether or not the act should be changed.

For the moment, the minister is saying: I am bringing changes to it and you go and study it. This is not the way things are supposed to work. That is not the way to improve legislation.

I would simply ask the minister to backtrack as common sense would require.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure tonight to address Bill C-37 respecting the Young Offenders Act. Although I believe the government is perhaps considering changing the Young Offenders Act, I do not feel Bill C-37 really addresses the issues.

I have two main concerns with the bill. One of them is the reverse onus that everybody seems to think is a real change, something that is going to make a real difference, sort of the meat and potatoes of the bill. I would argue that the reverse onus, which means that the youth courts will put the onus on the

16 and 17 year olds to prove that they should be heard and dealt with in youth court, is really going to solve the problem.

My concern is that the people presently in the youth court system are the ones who make a decision on whether or not youths 14 years old and up will be tried in adult court. These same people are the ones who will hear the cases of 16 and 17 year olds and make the decision on whether they will stay in youth court.

The past will show us that judges in the youth court division are very reluctant to place 16 and 17 year olds into an adult court to face the serious charges of murder, second degree murder and manslaughter. They seem to be very reluctant to have the younger people move up to adult court.

I do not see that the bill will make any change. I do not see where these same people will force young people to be tried in adult court. What we will see is that the people who make these decisions will continue to allow 16 and 17 year olds to be tried in youth court.

(2005)

One of the cases that comes to my mind is the young person who was convicted of killing Jessie Cadman. He was a young offender at the time of the murder. The youth court judge determined that he would be tried in youth court. It was only because of the pressure put on by the community that that youth judge was forced to consider adult court. Isaac Deas was eventually tried in adult court and was convicted of murdering Jessie Cadman.

I suggest to this House that the same thing is going to happen where the youth court judges are going to act in favour of the young people and keep them in youth court as opposed to moving them into adult court. I do not feel that this change in the bill is going to make any bit of difference to the way that 16 and 17 year old serious offenders are going to be treated. I have great concerns about that. I think it would have been a much stronger message for the government to automatically lower the ages so 16 and 17 year olds are tried in adult court without any kind of dilly-dallying around in the youth court system.

The other concern that I have is in lowering the ages. It concerns me when I hear some colleague from the Bloc suggesting that the only reason this government introduced Bill C-37 was because of complaining and hysterical comments from the west, that people in the west want to throw their young people in jail and throw away the key. I think they are misrepresenting what the people in the west are saying.

Westerners are very concerned about the direction in which young people are headed and the way our justice system is not treating them. We suggest that young people and adults have to be responsible for their actions. For every action there is a reaction. If the action is serious, the reaction should be duly serious. If we have young people out there creating physical harm to other young people, young people who are murdering

*Government Orders*

with intent or without intent other young people or adults, they should take the responsibility for their actions.

We are suggesting that 16 and 17-year olds are old enough to take that responsibility in an adult court situation. We are also suggesting that we cannot just forget about young people, 10 and 11 year olds, who have made a decision to commit crime, things that they know are wrong. We have to bring them into the system so that we can deal with the problem at that early age. If the problem is showing itself at 10 and 11 years it is very important that the system deal with that problem.

I suggest that when my colleagues from the Bloc say that people out west just want to lock away their kids and not deal with the problem, to ignore the problem, that perhaps they are ignoring the problem. Not too many weeks ago there was a 15-year old boy who was stabbed to death in Hull. Last week or perhaps the week before a 10-year old boy took two loaded handguns to school and threatened his classmates.

I suggest by not dealing with those problems, my colleagues are ignoring the problem in their province. If they really think that people in their province are not concerned about safety in their homes and on the streets and that young people bear the responsibility for their actions, they are fooling themselves. I do not think this problem only concerns western Canadians. I think it is a problem all Canadians are concerned about.

The results of various polls show that people in my constituency, representing all different classes of people and economic situations, feel that we have to lower the ages to 10 and 15 years old, and to let 16 and 17 year olds be dealt with in adult court. I received 3,500 replies to the poll included in my householder. Of those 3,500 replies over 90 per cent of the respondents were in favour of lowering the age.

This is not an insignificant number. Over 90 per cent of the respondents of 3,500 replies feel that the age limit should be lowered.

(2010)

In a poll separate to mine taken by the community newspaper only 12.7 per cent of the readers who responded felt that the age limit should be kept the same. Over 80 per cent wanted either to eliminate the age restrictions with the Young Offenders Act or to lower them. I would suggest that I am in a position of representing my constituency. It may be in western Canada, but it is telling me loud and clear that my constituency feels one of the major changes the government should have considered in its amendment to the Young Offenders Act was to lower the ages.

I mentioned earlier that another concern of mine was reverse onus. It will not make any difference at all. I do not think we will see any changes in the numbers of young people who are raised to adult court. It certainly will not deal with offenders who are under 16. The present act as it stands right now allows 14-year-

olds and older to be raised to adult court. I do not see the same kind of conditions in this piece of legislation.

In summation, the only feeling of hope is that this is the first of two stages. The bill is only the first stage in amending the Young Offenders Act. The second stage, which is a 10-year review of the act, will allow the kinds of changes I feel Canadians are demanding, Canadians all across the country and not just in western Canada.

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to say a few words on second reading of the bill. I have been listening carefully to comments by both the Official Opposition and the Reform Party in respect of the bill. I want to make a few preliminary remarks in that regard.

First, quite frankly the position of the Bloc Quebecois startles me. I was here in the last Parliament when the Conservative government introduced certain amendments to the Young Offenders Act. At that time the vast majority of members of Parliament from the province of Quebec were from the Conservative Party. They supported the bill. They supported the so-called strengthening of the Young Offenders Act at that time. They spoke as Quebecers, specifically stating that the people of Quebec wanted the Young Offenders Act strengthened, that there were problems with young offenders not only in Quebec but throughout Canada, and that it was necessary in order to make certain amendments.

Unless I am not hearing things clearly, it would seem as if there has been a startling transformation in the opinions of the people of the province of Quebec as represented by the Bloc Quebecois. I find that a bit hard to believe. I am very interested in knowing where they are coming from. I find they are literally coming out of left field. They are not representing the people of the province of Quebec as I understood the concerns of the people of the province of Quebec for five years prior to the last election. Maybe things have changed but I honestly do not believe so. I have to discount much of what the Bloc Quebecois is saying with respect to the bill.

Until I start hearing some realistic comment and I start hearing some acknowledgement that the Young Offenders Act applies exactly the same way throughout the country or does not apply exactly the same way throughout the country rather than hearing that those in Quebec do this and that as if there were a different Young Offenders Act in the province of Quebec, that is absolutely untrue because the Young Offenders Act applies from coast to coast to coast.

With that said let me turn then to the bill and to the approach we in the Liberal Party have decided to take with respect to young offenders. We do not pretend that the act is perfect. We never have. It was clearly stated in the red book and in our campaign that we acknowledged the people of Canada were not happy, if nothing else, with the perception of how the Young Offenders Act was working. It may have been working extremely well. I am not one who believes it was but it may have been.

*Government Orders*

However that is not the important point. The important point is that it was perceived and still is perceived by the people of Canada not to be working to the best effect that it could. We decided as part of our campaign strategy that we would agree to do something about the Young Offenders Act.

As soon as the Minister of Justice took office he began holding meetings with his colleagues in the Liberal Party to develop a strategy. The strategy that was developed was mentioned by my hon. friend, the last speaker. It was very clearly a two-stage process.

(2015)

Stage one is to deal with the immediate concerns that we feel were brought to us by the people of Canada, namely, violent offenders, young offenders. Stage two is to conduct a complete, extensive section by section review of the act, taking as much time as is necessary, examining it in parliamentary committee, listening to the views and concerns of the Bloc Québécois, of the Reform Party, of the Liberal government and anybody else who feels like coming in. For example, the the NDP might want to come in and make a contribution.

When we take that second step process, we will then be able to examine and consider with the benefit of expert testimony and opinion the various points that have been made throughout this debate including, for example, lowering the age to whatever age it might be. Should it be 10? Should it be eight? Should it be seven as it was under the juvenile delinquents act? Why was it raised from seven to twelve? I do not know. Should it be moved down to 10? Should it be moved down to seven? These are the kinds of questions that are going to take some time to discuss.

In the meantime we have something in front of us, Bill C-37. I really only want to spend the few minutes that I have on three sections. I would ask colleagues on the other side whether they agree or disagree with the preambles found in section 1 of this act which I am going to read in their entirety as they would amend paragraph 3(1)(a) of the Young Offenders Act.

(a) crime prevention is essential to the long-term protection of society—

**Who would argue that?**

—and requires addressing the underlying causes of crime by young persons and developing multi-disciplinary approaches to identifying and effectively responding to children and young persons at risk of committing offending behaviour in the future;

All that says is that we have a problem. Let us see if we can figure out how to deal with it before the young offender offends.

(a.1) while young persons should not in all instances be held accountable in the same manner or suffer the same consequences for their behaviour as adults, young persons who commit offences should nonetheless bear responsibility for their contraventions.

With great respect, I doubt very much if there are too many Canadians who would disagree first, that people should bear responsibility for their contraventions and second, that children

are not adults. In my view children should not be treated in exactly the same way as adults.

Therefore the debate then becomes this. What is a child? Under what circumstances is the behaviour so egregious that it is necessary to take that child and say: “Okay, you are not a child. For the purposes of what you have done, you will be treated as an adult”. Those circumstances are few and far between.

They are delineated in section 8 of the bill dealing with section 16 of the Young Offenders Act. Those are very clearly set out. If a young person is alleged to have committed first degree murder or second degree murder, the taking of a life, it is something that is sufficient to take them out of the realm of being dealt with as a child.

Second, attempting to commit murder, a very serious offence; manslaughter, technically one step below murder; aggravated sexual assault or aggravated assault, these are all violent crimes. They are the kinds of crimes which make people say that enough is enough, young people are not going to be allowed to do that and then be given the opportunity to be treated as if they had walked into a local Beckers store and stolen a chocolate bar because the two offences are entirely different.

While society might tolerate a 13-year old who goes in and steals a chocolate bar, a pen, some books or a girlie magazine or whatever it may be, they are not prepared to tolerate that kind of behaviour if someone takes a life. The bill says in those circumstances, if you are 16 or 17, you are going to be tried in adult court unless you can demonstrate why you should not be. Anytime a line is drawn, any line, some will say the age is too high and others will say the age is too low, but the fact is that lines have to be drawn. In this case it seems to me that 16 and 17 years of age is reasonable. You can drive a car at that age so if you are charged with committing a murder at that age, presumably you have the wherewithal to be able to be tried in adult court.

(2020)

Now what about the perceptions of Canadians? I happen to have a petition signed by hundreds of people from the metropolitan Toronto area. I want to tell my friends in the Bloc that I absolutely refuse to believe that the people of metropolitan Toronto are any different from the people of Quebec, Montreal, Chicoutimi, or any other place when personal safety is at risk.

The petitioners believe what this petition states. Whether the stats are exact is irrelevant. That is what they believe and this is what they have signed: “Violent crime in Canada has increased by over 40 per cent since 1984. Youths age 12 to 17 although representing only 8 per cent of the population account for 23 per cent of all persons charged with criminal code offences”. As I said, it is not relevant whether or not the figures are accurate to

*Government Orders*

the exact percentage. What is more relevant is that people believe them to be true.

The petition goes on: "Canadians from coast to coast are calling for changes to the Young Offenders Act and for heavier penalties for all those convicted of"—and I underscore this—"violent crime". That is the key. We do not want to lock these poor kids away at age 12 for looking through a window while somebody was changing or something like that. We do not want to treat them the same way we treat violent criminals who need much more time for rehabilitation. After all if you are that age and doing this kind of thing something is very seriously wrong with your life.

So the petitioners have asked that the Criminal Code of Canada and the Young Offenders Act be amended to provide for heavier penalties. Indeed what they see is the Liberal Party doing just that.

We know the act is abused. In my riding there is a particular street where every night on any night of the week drug transactions are taking place. Most times children under the age of 12 are used to run the drugs or to carry the bags from the customer to the vendor. In exchange they get a nice gold bracelet or gold chain or some sort of bauble. The perpetrators, the scum of the earth who deal with drugs, use and abuse these children because they know there is no way the law can reach them. Believe me, many of these kids know exactly what they are doing regardless of their age.

In preparing for the debate on the Young Offenders Act I spoke with my 11-year old daughter. I asked her a few questions about right and wrong in general, what she thought was right and what she thought was wrong and what her views were of the news. There is no doubt in my mind that she is a person who at age 11 knows precisely that if you kill somebody you are doing something wrong. She knows that if you take something that belongs to someone else you are doing something wrong. I have no doubt that is the case.

I am very sympathetic to lowering the age, but I am prepared to wait to hear the evidence in committee. I am prepared to hear the departmental officials tell me why it was that in 1917 people were deemed capable of answering for their actions at the age of seven, whereas in 1984 it was felt that people could only be responsible enough to deal with their actions at the age of 12 and over.

There may be reasons. There may be psychological studies, tests or any number of pieces of evidence to demonstrate a reason for the age of 12. Frankly, I rather suspect it is what I was talking about earlier. It was simply a question of drawing a line. If the line was drawn at 10 years there would be those who would say seven. If the line was drawn at 14 years, there would be those who would say 10 or 12. I guess for whatever reason, in 1984 our counterparts in Parliament chose the age of 12. I assume we will hear the reason in committee.

(2025)

I underscore that we have a two-step process. Step one deals with the immediate violent criminals in the young offenders system. Step two will be a section by section examination of the act with recommendations to the justice minister and the cabinet. I have no doubt that everybody will have an opportunity for their input.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, whenever I have the honour and pleasure of rising to speak in this House, I always think of my constituents in the riding of Shefford, to whom I owe this privilege.

This evening, I would like to present my views on Bill C-37 to amend the Young Offenders Act.

Because of my own training and education, I tend to favour the rehabilitation of young offenders over repressive measures. I believe that the present Act contains all of the provisions required by courts and prosecutors to adequately protect society.

The real problem lies in enforcing of the provisions of the Young Offenders Act, not in subjecting it to an in-depth review. I understand that certain painful events in recent years have generated public anger and misunderstanding, and have fuelled the debate on how minors found guilty of very serious crimes are treated by the courts.

I can see that the public is deeply concerned about the need to control youth crime, but I cannot tolerate people like the Minister of Justice, my colleagues across the floor—the Liberals—and my colleagues in the Reform Party believing that harsher sentencing is the best way to curb criminal activity among young people.

Basically, the provinces which complain about the present Act do not enforce it rigorously; Quebec and Ontario, on the other hand, have the right attitude and see no problem with the Act. It seems to me, quite obviously, that the justice minister has yielded to the demands of the western provinces and the right-wing faction of the Liberal Party.

I must question the relevance of this bill, since studies indicate that the average number of homicides committed by young people has declined sharply since the 1970s.

Would it not be more accurate to say that the minister is simply trying to keep an election promise from the last campaign, armed with the knowledge that the Canadian Sentencing Commission, in its 1987 report, found that three quarters of the Canadian population believed that 30 per cent of crimes were violent? In reality, according to 1992 statistics, only one of every ten Criminal Code offences reported to police were

*Government Orders*

violent crimes. From 1982 to 1992, even the number of murders committed in Canada increased only marginally.

This public perception is contrary to the reality as shown by those facts. Is this a sufficient political reason to change the Young Offenders Act? In my humble opinion, the Minister of Justice, by tabling this bill in the House, is only trying to look good for a portion of the electorate, at the expense of his social obligations to young people, without any consideration for the social and economic effects of such measures. The effect which this bill will have on society, in Quebec as well as in Canada, is catastrophic. By increasing sentences and lowering the age to be considered a young offender, we will fill the prisons faster and increase the number of idle youth who will live off society for the rest of their lives.

(2030)

Is this what we want? Is this the effect that the Liberals, who are in power, and the Reform Party want? The Minister of Justice should try to prevent young people from committing criminal acts and should react effectively instead of taking harsher measures like longer sentences, lower age limits for young offenders and stiffer penalties.

As a teacher, I worked for a long time with young people, and I can tell you that the solution is not to punish more harshly, but to help young people through better supervision and better efforts at reintegrating them into the community. I am deeply convinced of that. The deterrent effect of longer and harsher sentences is not supported by the literature and experiments to date.

Crime prevention requires that we examine the economic, educational, social, moral and legal conditions that foster crime, and that we make an effort to correct those conditions. The co-operation of many departments, the private sector, and the community are needed. Developing effective crime prevention programs is a big challenge we have a duty to meet. The result of such programs, namely crime reduction, is much more advantageous to young people and to Quebecers and Canadians, who could otherwise become victims of crime.

However, even the greatest efforts to prevent crime cannot eliminate crime altogether. Social rehabilitation of young offenders must therefore be one of the main objectives of the legislation. It is really a form of long term crime prevention aimed at making young offenders stop their reprehensible behaviour.

The proposed amendments to the bill fly in the face of the objective sought, namely the protection of juveniles and of society.

To conclude, I would like to remind this House that Quebec is a distinct society, not only because of its language and culture, but also because of our beliefs, philosophy and social concerns. In Quebec, we know what are the main principles behind the protection of juveniles and of society. The objective is to avoid, as much as possible, criminalizing cases involving young offenders. First of all we seek the rehabilitation and reintegration into society of young offenders because, in Quebec, we believe that is the way to go. You would be surprised at the results we are getting.

I would like to remind my colleagues that, under certain conditions, these young people can be helped to become productive and responsible adults for the good of society as a whole. Moreover, a cost benefit analysis shows that the money invested by society to rehabilitate a young murderer is paid back in less than five years when he becomes a productive adult.

In conclusion, I would like to remind all my colleagues that it is essential for Quebec to maintain its own approach regarding the reintegration of young offenders. Therefore, I am asking them to take into consideration the fact that any amendments to the federal Young Offenders Act must respect Quebec legislation and policies regarding the protection of juveniles and of society.

(2035)

[English]

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, on May 12 of this year members on this side of the House presented an opposition day motion. The purpose of that motion was to call upon the government for positive and immediate action with regard to the Young Offenders Act. I commend the government for bringing forward so quickly some amendments which are a step in the right direction.

I rise today however to demonstrate my lack of enthusiasm for this bill. I believe that although measures were taken they certainly are far from enough.

In an attempt to help calm the fears of Canadians we proposed three basic amendments to the Young Offenders Act. The first was to have the age limits changed from 12 to 17 to 10 to 15. This was in recognition of the fact that there are offenders under 12 years of age who currently slip through the system and go on to be full-fledged youth criminals because police are unable to charge them or to deal with them in any way. As for older offenders, we believe that youths aged 16 and 17 are old enough to assume full responsibility for their crimes and should therefore in serious cases be tried as adults.

Under Bill C-37 the justice minister has proposed that 16 and 17-year old youths who are charged with murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault and aggravated assault be tried in adult court unless an application is granted for the youth cases to be heard in youth court. The onus is now on the young offender to demonstrate why he or she should not be

*Government Orders*

tried in adult court and the court will have the discretion to accept or reject the application.

Although this amendment will be somewhat positive in nature it misses the point that we tried to raise some weeks ago. Sixteen and 17-year olds, given today's society and the rate at which our youth are maturing, according them the same degree of responsibility and accountability as an adult, should be considered adults and thus treated as such, particularly when it comes to criminal activity and when they become a threat to society.

The Reform Party had proposed increasing sentencing. I am therefore pleased to see that the minister has recommended increased sentences for first degree murder from five to ten years. We also recommended that amendments to the Young Offenders Act include a permit to publish the names of young offenders who have been convicted of any offence involving the use of violence, who have contravened any Narcotic Control Act or Food and Drug Act or who have been convicted previously of two offences.

Unfortunately Bill C-37 has failed to provide this amendment and it is this topic I wish to elaborate on today. I firmly believe that the publication of the names of young offenders is essential for the protection of Canada's innocent children. For example, a school principal may not know that one of his students had been convicted numerous times for drug trafficking. A parent may not know that his child is associating with an offender convicted of a series of rapes. The young man next door whom you have entrusted to babysit your children could be another Jason Gaumache.

Who should we be protecting, the vast majority of Canadians who are law abiding, hard working and caring people who will continue to be the building blocks for a productive society or the local high school's drug dealer or an unknown rapist in the neighbourhood? I do not think that is a hard question to answer. Undoubtedly it is these offenders who must be made known to our society.

We are not talking about the youth who makes a small mistake and comes in contact with the justice system on a single occasion wherein the best interest of the public may not be served by publishing the details. However, we do propose and firmly believe that in order to make community protection the number one priority, the publishing of violent youth offenders' names must not be prevented by law as it is today and is continued in Bill C-37.

The first penalty paid for committing a criminal offence against society ought to be full disclosure of who you are, where you come from and what you have done. This is completely exempted from this act and from the amendment.

The names of victims and the horrific details of the crimes perpetrated on them are open to public scrutiny but the names of the offenders remain a state secret. The young faces in Canada's courts and jails are like masks. They hide society's ugliest scars, scars that will fester if they are not exposed.

(2040)

The Reform Party on behalf of our many constituents had asked the government to establish a registry of child sex abusers. The government has provided its typical response to a request of this nature. It knows there is a problem. It knows Canadians want something done about it. Therefore it has promised to study the issue and consult the proper authorities. In other words, the government is dragging its feet and in the meantime children will continue to be sexually abused and violently attacked by repeat offenders that the government is guilty of protecting by refusing the public the information they need to protect their children and society in general.

In their effort to understand the need for a child registry, Health Canada, Justice Canada and the Ministry of the Solicitor General commissioned a study. The federal ad hoc interdepartmental working group on information systems on child sex offenders prepared a discussion paper. Do you know what the conclusion of that study was, Mr. Speaker? We need another study and we need further consultation. However, contained in that paper is information which clearly indicates both the need for the child registry and for the publishing of young offenders' names.

I really have to wonder what purpose all these studies, reviews, consultations and more consultations serve. Are they to find viable solutions to problems we already know exist or are they a means to keep full the hands the taxpayers are feeding at the present time?

The ad hoc group reports that current research indicates that the development of sexually intrusive behaviour may begin as early as childhood and adolescence. The report goes on to say that statistics compiled on all violent crime committed against children in Canada indicate that young offenders, those aged 12 to 17, account for approximately 23 per cent of all accused offenders.

It is important to note that the same age group only represents 7.9 per cent of the Canadian population. Studies have repeatedly indicated, states the report, that sex offenders have one of the highest recidivism rates of any criminal group with an estimated 40 per cent reoffending within five years of release. Furthermore research examining the effectiveness of offender treatment programs has shown limited results.

I ask, does the right hand of the government know what the left hand is doing. Did the Minister of Justice not read the report of the federal ad hoc group? If he did, he would know that sex offenders reoffend. If he could do simple calculations he would know from the statistics that 23 per cent of sex offences in Canada are committed by young offenders. If 40 per cent of that 23 per cent reoffends, violent, sadistic acts will continue to be committed against the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society and the government could have prevented it. If it had read its own report and acted immediately on the findings of

*Government Orders*

that report, unspeakable acts and attacks upon our children could have been thwarted.

However I believe the government is in direct contravention of article 34 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child which states: "States, parties undertake to protect the child from all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse".

Bill C-37 does not undertake to protect our children from the Jason Gamaches of this world. It does not protect us from the faceless, nameless monsters who pose behind the masks of adolescence.

The government is in direct violation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Furthermore the weight is still balanced in favour of the young offender. The protection of society, the protection of our children, is still outweighed by the so-called rights of violent and delinquent young Canadians.

All we are asking is that the scales be evened out, that the rights of the victims, and the rights of the potential victims, that is the rights of our children, be given priority and that the protection of society outweigh the protection of violent young offenders who have no respect for the lives and the rights of others.

I reiterate my opening remarks. Bill C-37 is a step in the right direction but the stride is not long enough for the people walking on my side of the street.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

(2045)

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), I have been requested by the chief opposition whip to defer the division until a later time.

[*Translation*]

Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), a recorded division on the question before the House stands deferred until tomorrow at 3 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will ring for not more than 15 minutes.

[*English*]

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps Your Honour could find unanimous consent in the House to delay the adjournment for a maximum of 15 minutes.

I understand that the member representing the New Democratic Party participating in the adjournment debate has not yet had time to physically reach the Chamber. We could adjourn to the call of the Chair for a maximum of 15 minutes. If the member has not arrived by then at least the House would have done the respectful thing, that is given a reasonable opportunity for the member to attend.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I say to the hon. member across the way that I too was running to the House to try to speak on the last debate so I think if we are not here in our seats we are not here in our seats. If such is not the case then I would like to rise to speak to the motion.

**The Deputy Speaker:** We took the vote. The Chair should indicate to the hon. member that I made note of the fact he was not in the Chamber. I knew he wanted to speak, but because he was not in the Chamber we had to go on to the vote, at least the voice vote.

Whether the House wants to give unanimous consent to let the member speak is entirely a question for members.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, do I understand there is unanimous consent to suspend the commencement of the adjournment debate to the call of the Chair or a maximum of 15 minutes in order to permit the New Democratic Party member to attend in the House?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Chair takes it that there is not unanimous consent to suspend for 15 minutes to give the member for Kamloops a chance to participate in the adjournment debate.

[*Translation*]

Perhaps I could rephrase.

[*English*]

There is unanimous consent to wait 15 minutes. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, the House theoretically would now be suspended until ten o'clock unless we give that unanimous consent because that is the adjournment time. The adjournment debate would take place at that point.

*Government Orders*

Perhaps I could ask the question again, whether we could agree to wait a maximum of 15 minutes or until the appearance of the member in order to proceed with the adjournment debate. If not, I would remind hon. members that they will be waiting one hour and 10 minutes instead of 10 minutes. Perhaps that would help the House a little.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Somebody will be waiting an hour and 10 minutes. I am not sure it will be members of the House.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Mr. Speaker, may we call it ten o'clock and adjourn?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member is asking for unanimous consent to call it ten o'clock. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is unanimous consent to call it ten o'clock.

Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5) the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 8.48 p.m.)

---



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Friday, June 17, 1994

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### **Lobbyists Registration Act**

Bill C-43. Motion for second reading .....	5503
Mr. Manley .....	5503
Mr. Lebel .....	5504
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	5506
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	5507
Mr. Paré .....	5508
Mrs. Ringuette—Maltais .....	5510

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### **Medal of Bravery**

Ms. Torsney .....	5511
-------------------	------

### **Francophone Public Servants**

Mr. Fillion .....	5511
-------------------	------

### **The Family**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	5511
----------------------------------	------

### **Water**

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) .....	5512
---	------

### **Education**

Mr. Shepherd .....	5512
--------------------	------

### **Victims' Rights**

Mr. Finlay .....	5512
------------------	------

**Quebec Sovereignty**

Mr. Deshaies ..... 5512

**Grand Rabbi of Lubavitch**

Mr. Harris ..... 5512

**Blood Fractionation Plant**

Mr. Gallaway ..... 5512

**Communications**

Mrs. Brushett ..... 5513

**Black Watch Regimental Band**

Mr. Allmand ..... 5513

**AIDS**

Mr. Ménard ..... 5513

**RU486**

Mr. Hill (MacLeod) ..... 5513

**Environmental Achievement Awards**

Mr. Adams ..... 5513

**The Reform Party**

Mr. Boudria ..... 5514

**Transport**

Mr. Taylor ..... 5514

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Interprovincial Trade**

Mr. Loubier ..... 5514

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5514
Mr. Loubier .....	5514
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5514
Mr. Loubier .....	5514
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5514

**Social Program Reform**

Mr. Laurin .....	5515
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	5515
Mr. Laurin .....	5515
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	5515

**Indian Affairs**

Mr. Chatters .....	5515
Mr. Irwin .....	5515
Mr. Chatters .....	5515
Mr. Irwin .....	5515
Mr. Chatters .....	5515
Mr. Irwin .....	5516

**Ethics**

Mr. Brien .....	5516
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5516
Mr. Brien .....	5516
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5516

**Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Harris .....	5516
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	5516
Mr. Harris .....	5516
Mr. Young .....	5517

**Kanesatake**

Mr. Caron .....	5517
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	5517
Mr. Caron .....	5517

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 5517

**National Referendum**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) ..... 5517

Mr. Massé ..... 5517

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) ..... 5518

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 5518

**Recycling**

Mr. Pomerleau ..... 5518

Ms. Copps ..... 5518

Mr. Pomerleau ..... 5518

Ms. Copps ..... 5518

**Parole**

Mr. O’Brien ..... 5518

Mr. Gray ..... 5519

**The Family**

Mr. Benoit ..... 5519

Mr. Peters ..... 5519

Mr. Benoit ..... 5519

Mr. Peters ..... 5519

**Pay Equity**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 5519

Mr. Eggleton ..... 5519

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) ..... 5519

Mr. Eggleton ..... 5520

**Criminal Code**

Mr. Forseth ..... 5520

Mr. Rock ..... 5520

Mr. Forseth ..... 5520

Mr. Rock ..... 5520

**Alexandre Makar**

Mr. Loney ..... 5520

Mr. Marchi .....	5520
------------------	------

### **Radar Control**

Mr. Paré .....	5520
Mr. Young .....	5520
Mr. Paré .....	5521
Mr. Young .....	5521

### **Gun Control**

Mr. Morrison .....	5521
Mr. Rock .....	5521
Mr. Morrison .....	5521
Mr. Rock .....	5521

### **The Environment**

Mr. Caccia .....	5521
Mr. Manley .....	5521

### **Government Programs**

Mr. Riis .....	5522
Mr. Gray .....	5522

### **Points of Order**

#### **Comments during Question Period**

Mr. Chatters .....	5522
The Speaker .....	5522

#### **Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

Mr. Harris .....	5522
Mr. Boudria .....	5523
Mr. Riis .....	5523
Mr. Szabo .....	5523
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	5524
Mr. Taylor .....	5524

### **Convention on the Rights of the Child**

Ms. Guarnieri .....	5524
---------------------	------

## **Order in Council Appointments**

Mr. Milliken ..... 5524

## **Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Milliken ..... 5524

## **Government Expenditures**

Mr. Eggleton ..... 5525

## **Immigration Act**

Bill C-44. Motions for introduction of the first reading deemed adopted ..... 5525

Mr. Peters ..... 5525

## **Government Expenditures**

Mrs. Guay ..... 5525

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 5526

## **Committees of the House**

### **Procedure and House Affairs**

Mr. Milliken ..... 5526

## **Point of Order**

### **Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

Mr. Harris ..... 5526

The Deputy Speaker ..... 5527

## **Committees of the House**

### **Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

Mr. Anawak ..... 5527

### **Citizenship and Immigration**

Ms. Bethel ..... 5527

## **Committees of the House**

### **Procedure and House Affairs**

Motion ..... 5527

Mr. Milliken .....	5527
(Motion agreed to.) .....	5527

**Petitions**

**Assisted Suicide**

Ms. Meredith .....	5527
--------------------	------

**Kashmir**

Mr. Flis .....	5527
----------------	------

**Human Rights**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) .....	5527
Mr. Jordan .....	5527

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Boudria .....	5528
-------------------	------

**Serial Killer Board Game**

Mr. Boudria .....	5528
-------------------	------

**Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Finlay .....	5528
Mr. Milliken .....	5528

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken .....	5528
--------------------	------

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Lobbyists Registration Act**

Bill C-43. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	5528
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	5528
Mr. Boudria .....	5530
Mr. Caron .....	5531
Mr. Iftody .....	5532
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	5533

Mr. Shepherd .....	5535
Mr. Bergeron .....	5537
Mr. Bryden .....	5538
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	5540
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) .....	5541

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Criminal Code**

Bill C-211. Motion for second reading .....	5541
Mr. Riis .....	5541
Mr. Stinson .....	5543